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PROCEEDINGS
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. We have all members present. I'm going to reconvene the Judicial Merit Selection Commission. I will entertain a motion to go into executive session for legal advice.

MR. SAFRAN: So moved.
SENATOR HEMBREE: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have a motion by
Mr. Safran. A second by Senator Hembree. Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: No discussion. We will move immediately to a vote. All in favor indicate by saying "aye."

BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it. We are now in executive session and turn off your microphones.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have risen from executive session. No decisions have been made, no votes taken. Mr. Hitchcock moves
that we recess until 11:35 -MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Is there a second? MS. BELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: There's a second from Ms. Bell. All in favor indicate by saying "aye."

BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it. So we're in recess until 11:35.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Let's come back to order. We already came of executive session and so we were in recess and so we'll come back into session. We will take Jeffrey Bloom as Circuit Court, At-Large, Seat 1.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome, Mr. Bloom. Sorry for the delay.

MR. BLOOM: Not at all, I know you have many other responsibilities.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Yes. Please raise your right hand.
(The candidate was sworn.)

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

MR. BLOOM: I have.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MR. BLOOM: They are, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

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

MR. BLOOM: Not at all, sir.
CHAIRMAN BLOOM: It will be done at this time in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 1, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JEFFREY P. BLOOM, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 2, SWORN STATEMENT FOR JEFFREY P. BLOOM, ADMITTED]

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you have some people you would like to introduce?

MR. BLOOM: My wife is here, Karen
Newell Bloom.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome, Karen.
MR. BLOOM: She is here to support me and then -- and then just a friend of ours also is here.

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

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

MR. BLOOM: Very briefly. I would like to comment that I appreciate this opportunity from the Committee to appear before it. And I want to -- I know this may be odd as an opening statement, I want to commend the
process we have in South Carolina. I am also a licensed attorney in North Carolina and their judges have to campaign with campaign contributions and billboards and signs and the process that this body goes through is ten times better not only than our sister state, but any other state. And -- and so I commend the process and the time that you all have devote to it and I mean that sincerely. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Please answer counsel's questions.

MR. MALDONADO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidates $P D Q$, which has been included in the record with the candidate's consent, Jeffrey meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Maldonado)
Q. Mr. Bloom, why do you now want to serve as a Circuit Court Judge?
A. My answer is offered in all humility. Quite simply, Mr. Chairman and Members, I think I'd be
good at it and I think I would bring honorable and positive service to this state.

I have practiced law for over 25 years as a trial lawyer. I can think of no better experience in preparation for someone who is going to be honored with -- with a Circuit Court position.

I have appeared in every circuit in this state. I know sherif's, clerks of court, solicitors, as well as members of the private bar and I think I would bring both strong ethics as well as courtesy, civility, and -- and -- and knowledge of the basic rules of evidence and how laws practice in our trial courts.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Bloom. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you in becoming an effective Circuit Court Judge?
A. It -- and I may have answered that so I don't want to repeat myself too much. I -- I -- I can honestly tell this Committee I am not aspiring to -- to -- to be a Circuit Court Judge and then attempt to move on from there to an Appellate Court or anything of that nature. I truly love the experience of trial law, being in court every day. Practicing the rules of evidence. Practicing with members of the bar both in the civil bar and
opposite members and solicitor's offices and -- and I think the experience and skills I've attained in that would -- would be of benefit on the Circuit Court bench.
Q. Mr. Bloom, what do you perceive as the most important issues facing state courts today?
A. Probably the docket. You can go into any circuit and -- and both in Common Pleas Court as well as General Sessions Court. The -- the administration of those dockets, the clerks of court will tell you, the long wait that -- that citizens have in terms of getting into court whether it's a civil case or the prosecutors have in terms of getting a case before a jury or a judge. And -- and that is probably one of the most compelling issues that -for -- that face our Circuit Courts these days. And it -- and it's not an easy problem to fix.

My -- my brief response to that is I don't think there's any one cookie cutter approach that can fit Horry County, or Lancaster County, or Newberry, or Aiken, or Bamberg, or Cherokee. It is something that $I$ think circuit judges have an obligation to work with their local sheriffs, their local clerks of court, their local solicitors, and the local private bar with -- with solutions that
work for that county and that circuit to move those dockets forward.
Q. Mr. Bloom, if you became aware of unethical conduct on the part of the trial advocate in a case in which you were presiding, how would you handle it? Do you believe judges should be required to report attorney misconduct?
A. Well, the -- the Judicial Canons govern that and an unethical conduct is a broad panoply of potential hypotheticals. I suppose that the short answer it would really depend upon what the particular situation is.

If -- if, you know, it was something that is not a -- a serious breach of ethics, I have often seen very wise and experienced circuit judges not berate those attorneys in open court, but to call them into chambers and counsel them on the matter. Obviously, if it's something more serious of a nature it would need to be reported. I hope that answers your questions, but -- but it covers a broad area of -- of potential conduct.
Q. Sure. Mr. Bloom, the Commission received 145 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 21 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments.
"Jeff Bloom is a legal scholar and a person of highest moral character. I feel confident that he will use his talents and intellect to benefit the legal community as well as all the citizens of South Carolina. We would be well served to capitalize on his years of legal study and practice by electing him to the bench. As a prosecutor that deals with judges every day it would be wonderful to have someone on the bench who possesses his breadth of legal knowledge and experience."

Also, "I have been in the trenches with Mr. Bloom on multiple cases involving complex litigation. His ethics and morals are beyond reproach. He is a legal scholar. He's the best candidate for this seat on the bench."

Four of the written comments express concerns. For example, "although Mr. Bloom is a friendly and likable individual I again question whether he would be unbiased and fair in criminal cases."

Another comment read, "much of this candidate's works goes beyond being merely critical of the justice system and instead denotes that he does not believe in any system of justice is appropriate in the society. Do not believe that this candidate could preside in an objective, even-
handed manner or issue a decision based on -solely upon the law without injecting personal bias."

What response would you offer these concerns?
A. I -- I appreciate that and I appreciate that opportunity. Let me address the two last comments, Mr. Maldonado, you cited.

One, is a concern of -- from a prosecutor as to whether or not I would be biased. My approach in that is, you know, I'm a Boy Scout. I've been a Boy Scout all my life. My sons are Eagle Scouts. I'm the Scout Master at the local Scout Troop and I try to let the Scout Oath and Law guide my moral compass, as well as my courtesy and civility. And if I heard a comment like that, to me feedback is a gift. And I would make every effort to strive to address that attorney's concerns, whether they were made to me or made anonymously or though another source. I would be open to that feedback as a gift. And so I would strive to address those potential concerns of bias.

There are judges out there whom I admire very much, such as Judge Newman, out of Kingstree, a former Attorney General; Judge Keesley out of Lexington, a former solicitor. And -- and I would
attempt to model as they have done to breach that -- that concern of potential bias and make sure everyone is treated fairly.

The last comment, however, I -- I -- I appreciate the opportunity to address to, the -regarding the win at all cost kind of comment. My father taught me that while feedback is a gift, one also needs to balance that with strength and wisdom along with humility. If you look at the character letters that have been submitted on my behalf, I have never been that kind of attorney. I've never been an attorney who tries to win at all costs or -- or cast aside the interest of justice.

I have letters in my packet, as you have seen, from the Sheriff of Horry County, Phillip Thompson; from the Sheriff of Calhoun County, Thomas Summers; both non-lawyers and whom I've dealt with over the years. Solicitor Barry Barnette from Spartanburg has submitted a written letter of endorsement. There are numerous other solicitors in this state who -- who have told me, since we are limited to five letters of character, that they would be glad to attest to my character and my sense of fair play. Jimmy Richardson from Horry County knows me well and would do that. Scarlett Wilson from

Charleston is a solicitor who knows me well and would attest to that. Dan Johnson from here in Richland County knows me well and attest -- would attest to that.

So in that regard, while feedback is a gift, at some point one also has to recognize that there will always be critics and -- and one has to go forward with humility and courtesy, but balance that with strength and wisdom.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Bloom. I have a couple of 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, 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, I understand that.

MR. MALDONADO: I would note that the Midlands Citizens Committee found Mr. Bloom to be qualified in the evaluative criteria of the constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability; and is well qualified in the remaining criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. The Midlands Committee also stated Mr. Bloom is intellectually bright and has experience in both criminal and civil law. He displays an excellent temperament. This wide breadth of experience prepares him well for this position. Mr. Bloom is motivated to serve his community for all the right reasons.

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

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any members have any questions for Mr . Bloom?

Representative Rutherford.
EXAMINATION
(By Representative Rutherford)
Q. Mr. Bloom, I just want to start off by stating that I've known you since I started practicing law and I find you to be a zealous advocate, but not over zealous. But I didn't want you to take too much offense to those negative comments because that seems to be par for the course for any lawyer that runs for something, somebody has got something negative to say.

Your comments about the docket and one of the things that -- I'll take you back to that. One of the things that has concerned me over the years, and other members of the Committee as well, is how do we balance -- and maybe you don't have an answer to this and if you don't that's fine too, but how do we balance the docket and the need for the docket to continue moving with lawyer quality of life? How do we balance allowing an advocate in
the process on General Session side, the solicitor to call the case and balance that with the defense attorney's quality of life and being able to prepare a case when you're getting notice a week out on a case that's four years old or -- how do we balance that which if we don't hold it dear, we certainly should, which is lawyers' ability to be lawyers, to work at a craft, a profession, without feeling the need to drink on a daily basis or to raise the suicide rate among lawyers; how do we balance that successfully? And you've been practicing law long enough that I'm hoping you'll have some insight as to how we do that.
A. I -- I don't have a magic answer to that, but given the context of why we're here, I think a circuit judge has a huge part to play in that. Representative Rutherford, you and other members know me. I've been a public defender. I've been in private practice. My wife, Karen Bloom, is an Assistant Solicitor in Chester County. I get it. I get both the law enforcement side as well as the needs to balance lawyers.

And I -- I think the role a Circuit Court Judge can play in that is, one, to make sure all parties, both the litigants in a case as well as
the lawyers are -- are -- feel that they' re being treated fairly. That defense counsel, whether it's a civil or criminal case, don't feel that they're being surprised at the last minute or -- or -- put upon to do more than they can handle, particularly lawyers in private practice, solo practice, I get that.

On the other hand, I get solicitors who -who've attempted to call a case multiple times with continuances. My wife -- as I said, Karen goes through that in Chester County. They have court one week a month so that one week is very important to them.

And I -- I think as a circuit judge you need to be aware of all those moving parts. You need to be aware of lawyers who have conflicting schedules and conflicting responsibilities. And try best to get the parties together to work it out. You know, I -- I consider myself very privileged. Whether you select me or not $I$ grew up in a legal environment in Horry County before there was that big beautiful courthouse that we now have, under Sidney Floyd, the late Sidney Floyd, who served in this body and -- and other judges of that nature. And -- and -- and we used to get yelled at in court
and dressed down and -- but I learned from that and I grew from that.

And -- and we've had much other -- you know, other judges these days who are more open to making sure the parties work together. And one of the things I learned when $I$ was in Horry County is that your word is your bond and that's a two-way street between lawyers and judges. And if you look at the character letters I've submitted from sheriffs and solicitors you will see that my word is my bond and I think that has a huge part to play in docket control, as well as the quality of life for solicitors, private attorneys, and public defenders, that you try to work through that.

Often times we would spend -- when I was a baby lawyer, more time in the judges chambers trying to work things out with courtesy and civility, than we did filing motions in the courtroom. And -- and I'm not talking about the ex parte conversations. I'm talking about trying to bring parties together in -- in a realm of courtesy and civility.

I had lunch just last week with solicitor elect Rick Hubbard of Lexington and -- and some of what we talked about was our families and other
things and some was of legal nature, which $I$ won't go into. But it's those kinds of relationships, I think, that are important in our legal community so people feel that -- that they're not being surprised or coerced or put upon, but that we're all part of a judicial team working towards justice.

I hope that answers your question. I hope it wasn't to long.
Q. That's all right.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Representative Smith? REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXAMINATION
(By Representative Smith)
Q. Mr. Bloom, Senator Malloy and I both serve on the Indigent Defense Commission and I notice from time to time you get appointed to --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- death penalty cases. So my concern here or what I want to understand from you is where -- how many death penalty cases do you have? Where are you in the process? If you were elected a judge, is that going to disrupt any scheduled trials for a death penalty case you have pending?
A. I appreciate that question. The short answer is, no. I currently only have two cases in South Carolina. One is in Federal Court out of Greenville and is on a stay. The other, it was a State Court case, but it -- but it's in federal habeas. The other is a retrial out of the 11th Circuit that it happens to be with no trial date set.
Q. No trial date has been set.
A. My co-counsel in that is actually is from the Indigent Defense Office, Bill McGuire and -- and he has protection in -- in the Charleston case. So the other case is in early stages and -- and if I were honored with such an election it -- substitute counsel could easily be --
Q. Okay.
A. -- stand in.
Q. So no trial dates have been scheduled or anything?
A. No, sir, just those two.
Q. All right. Thank you, Mr. Bloom.
A. And if I may, I know -- I know this question wasn't asked but -- but some folks say, well being a death penalty litigator, you know, how can you be fair? I -- I have three short responses to that if I may. One, I'm the only attorney in South Carolina
that I know of who has gone through victim training and I paid for that myself. I went through a two week course at a college in the Shenandoah Valley and then I went through a 40 hour course out of Atlanta, Georgia, to sensitize myself and appreciate what victims go through, whether it's a shoplifting case at the Bi-Lo or a homicide case. So I don't think you have a letter from sheriff's or solicitor Barnette or the other solicitors I've mentioned if they felt that my prior capital litigation would interfere with my judgment or any bias.

And in that regard the law is the law. I've been asked the question, what if you were a judge in a capital case? You make the law. I believe in separation of powers, deeply. Judges do not make our law. We apply what the legislature gives us and I could apply the law in any case.

Third, as I said and I -- I hate to keep going back to her, but she's a wonderful woman. My Karen Fryar Bloom is a solicitor. I get it. She brings home every day stories of victims she's dealt with and the hard cases she's had. I think that experience and working with other solicitors such as Rick Hubbard, Barry Barnette, Jimmy Richardson,

Scarlett Wilson, I appreciate the job we all do together. Thank you. I didn't mean to ramble on there.
Q. Mr. Bloom, let me follow up on that with you because I -- I didn't mean to imply when I asked that question -- I'm more concerned about disrupting the process of a death penalty because that's a serious case for both the defendant and the victims in this matter. But $I$ want to tell you is I see you having death penalty experience as an asset to the bench. And whether it's the solicitor or whether it's the public defender, someone with experience in death penalty cases is a rarity that's come on to the bench. And I think you've seen of late a lot of these cases are being overturned on issues of once they -- just mistakes or errors of law that's occurred and I see more and more death penalty cases overturned. So I think the importance of having someone with knowledge of the death penalty law is an asset that we need to have more of on the bench because a lot of these judges are learning trial by fire.

I mean, I'll tell you, I handled one, the guy appointed when $I$ was a public defender, one death penalty and it was difficult, it was made easier by

Judge Knox McMahon -- my prosecutor, Senator Hembree, and he was a pleasure to work with in that case. But if I had to now defend a death penalty case, I couldn't do it. I don't have the experience. I have not kept up with the law. And I'm still questioning whether I should be death penalty certified and, you know, that's one thing with the capital trial division I think that's been afforded to the system of justice, but the experience that you bring on that end, whether you're a prosecutor or whether you're a defender is something that's -- is an important asset to bring to the bench.
A. Thank you, sir. I believe that cases are tried best one time.
Q. Yes, sir.
A. I would note too out of any concern, I -- over the last five years I have practiced a good bit in Common Pleas. I -- I -- I quite intentionally went out and sought colleagues of mine who had civil cases. I've done bankruptcy cases, landlord/tenant cases, a personal injury case where a teenage girl was hit in a crosswalk and her leg was broken, nothing major.
I -- I have done -- I suppose a weakness of
mine would be class action suits or -- or major product liability cases. I -- I acknowledge I haven't done those, but $I$ understand the Rules of Civil Procedure as well. I get summary judgment and -- and discovery. And quite frankly, the rules of evidence that apply in criminal cases apply in civil cases. So I think what $I$ would bring is -is over 25 years of -- of knowledge of real trial law -- real trial law and $I$ would be humbled and honored if -- if this Committee sought to -- to acknowledge that experience.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any other questions?
(No response.)
EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Campsen)
Q. Mr. Bloom, I know that personally I've been on several Boy Scout camping trips --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- with the troop. You had a troop in Columbia that my nephews were in.
A. Correct.
Q. I remember one night camping in the snow in Calhoun County. We got --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- at my brother-in-law's farm.
A. Kind of frisky.
Q. And just a question, brief responses --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- we are kind of behind, but --
A. Yes, certainly.
Q. -- are there any character traits that lead you to be a volunteer in Boy Scouts that would make you a -- would be of benefit to you as a judge? What is the -- what are the common -- what are the character traits that lead you to -- because you've been very involved I know, that would -- how would that impact your --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- serving as a judge?
A. And I'm a current Scout Master of -- of a troop that's very much in need. Forty percent of the scouts there come from single parent households and -- and I continue to serve that way and I enjoy it. I love it. My short answer, Chairman Campsen, would be my daddy was an Eagle Scout, my brother is an Eagle Scout, $I^{\prime} m$ an Eagle Scout, my two sons are Eagle Scouts. I take that seriously. I -- I take the -- the Boy Scout law that honors trust and honesty, that honors civility through a scout who's
courteous and loyalty -- loyalty to a judge's oath and to this state.

I would humbly and respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that those are the qualities that would guide me and -- and I humbly believe make me a -- a good Circuit Court Judge. Not because I'm the smartest lawyer in the room. I appreciate those accolades Mr. Maldonado read. And not because I the best trial lawyer in the room, but I have always -- every time I step in that courtroom been guided by trust, civility, courtesy and respect for whoever the other lawyer is on the other side.

Every time I finish a trial, I shake the hands of that prosecutor. I've done that and I learned that in Horry County from the judges and the lawyers there. So I appreciate that. Thank you, Chairman Campsen.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Mr. Bloom, 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 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. BLOOM: Thank you very much. (Candidate excused.) CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome, Ms. Jefferson.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Please raise your right hand.
(The candidate was sworn.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MS. JEFFERSON: Yes, I have.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MS. JEFFERSON: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

MS. JEFFERSON: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you object to our making these documents and any attachments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

MS. JEFFERSON: I do not.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 3, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MELIAH BOWERS JEFFERSON, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 4, SWORN STATEMENT FOR MELIAH BOWERS JEFFERSON, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you have some family members or friends with you today that you would you like to introduce?

MS. JEFFERSON: Yes, sir. I also want to make clear for the record that I did make an amendment to my PDQ, which is -- which Ms. Legare has and I just wanted to make sure that was also part of the record.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay.
MS. JEFFERSON: But I do want to briefly acknowledge and thank my husband, Shawn Jefferson, for his support today.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome, Mr.
Jefferson.
MS. JEFFERSON: And also my dear friend and cousin Unicka Saunders for being here with me today.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome, Ms. Saunders.

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

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

MS. JEFFERSON: Chairman, I would simply like to thank you and the members of the Commission for your service. I also would like to thank Elizabeth Brogdon, Ms. Legare, and Paula Benson for all of their help to me through this application and screening process. I truly appreciate the opportunity to be here today.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Please answer counsel's questions.
MS. BENSON: 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, Meliah Bowers Jefferson meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Benson)
Q. Mrs. Jefferson, why do you now want to serve as a Circuit Court Judge?
A. Well, the primary reason that I am here is because I have a fundamental belief in the fair and efficient administration of our legal system. And I believe that it depends on commitment of intelligent, hard working, and dedicated public service to make sure it functions at its best and highest levels for the good of all South Carolinians.

I hope that you see those types of characteristics in me and $I$ would add that of those characteristics, the judges that I most respect are those who recognize the significance of public
service. The importance of service to the community was an integral lesson that $I$ learned very early in my career. And every career decision that I've made since then has been influenced by my desire to make a difference, a larger impact on the community around me.

So I want to be a Circuit Court Judge because I am passionate about the law. I am committed to -- to the work of making our courts more effective and efficient. I want to contribute to the positive view of the judiciary and build confidence in our judicial system. But most of all, I want to make a difference through service to the community at one of the highest levels that I can do through my legal skills.
Q. Thank you. Mrs. Jefferson, how do you feel that your legal and your professional experience thus far will assist you in being an effective Circuit Court Judge?
A. When I -- when I think about this particular question I have to look back at the experiences throughout my career and I feel as though I have been trained to be in this office for my entire career since I left law school. My experience has been an interesting mix of private practice and my
experience through judicial clerkships.
That has given me a very balanced and comprehensive perspective useful to a judge. I have been involved in an adjudication of a very wide range of civil and criminal matters from various viewpoints, as a litigant, as an advocate, as a clerk in the trial court, and as a clerk in the Appellate Court system.

In my law practice, I represent plaintiffs and defendants in state and federal court, both at the trial and appellate levels. I handle cases involving personal injury, commercial law, constitutional law, class action litigation, and disputes over intellectual property for a wide variety of clients, including elected officials, government agencies, businesses of all sizes, and people from all walks of life.

As a clerk at the South Carolina Supreme Court I worked on a broad range of civil matters, post conviction relief cases, and criminal appeals, including death penalty appeals. I was also privileged to have the opportunity to see and participate in court administration activities.

Perhaps the best experience I had that are directly transferrable to what a judge does on a
day-to-day basis, was the time that $I$ spent as a clerk to a Federal District Court Judge. While I recognize that there are differences between the two courts, I think that there was no better training than sitting beside the District Court Judge during many motion hearings, during trial, after trial, and we had a lot of trials, and helping her work through her case management and her workload as her lead law clerk. That was excellent training, I think, for the work that I would do as a trial court judge on the Circuit Court level.

My personal experiences I think also enhance my ability to be an effective judge. I understand what it's like to be -- to navigate the court system as a litigant and as a victim. I'm a small business owner. I am -- and not just from the perspective of my partnership interest in my law firm, but my husband and I own a trucking company. And we have employees who have had interactions with the state court system and the way that our system is set up does not easily accommodate the average employee, but I think that my background has given me some context in which I can handle those employee situations perhaps in a different
manner than other employers with less experience with the system.

I've been a victim of crime and I understand how the temperament and demeanor of a judge can make that experience either one that can move you past that bad experience, or keep you in that moment of terror. And I've also had to use the courts to protect my interest as a litigant. So my -- my whole point is that $I^{\prime}$ ve seen the court function from many different viewpoints and each of those experiences will help to make me a better judge.
Q. Mrs. Jefferson, what do you perceive as the most important issues facing state courts today?
A. I think that some of the most issues facing the court right now are the efficient administration of caseloads. Our dockets are extremely clogged and I think that we are currently working on that problem. I know as being an active -- very active part of the South Carolina Bar and being involved with some activities that the South Carolina Supreme Court is currently doing, I know that we are trying to come up with effective solutions to solve that such as electronic filing and things like that.

But we still have a system that moves really slowly and a slow judicial system is an ineffective judicial system, particularly for our businesses who expect that their issues will be decided quickly for purposes of moving their business forward and for individuals who need finality and resolution to different things that are going on. So I think that there is a real opportunity for us to observe what the federal courts are doing, to observe what other states are doing, and incorporate some of those innovative technicians into how we run our court system to make it more efficient and fair to everyone.
Q. Mrs. Jefferson, if you became aware of any unethical conduct on the part of a trial advocate in a case you were presiding over, how would you handle it? And do you believe judges should be required to report attorney misconduct?
A. I think -- I absolutely think that judges should be required to report attorney misconduct. And if there's someone before me who is not acting in an ethical way or someone who's violating our professional rules of ethics then $I$ think that it is incumbent upon me as a judge, someone who's presiding over those proceedings, to make sure that
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I bring attention to that. Make sure that they -whoever is not acting ethically to make sure that they know that, that behavior has not gone unnoticed if it is appropriate for me to do so. And also to make sure that it is properly addressed with the appropriate authority. If -- if that is the Disciplinary Counsel then that's who I need to report it to. But we need to make sure that everybody in the system is treated fairly and justly and I think an intrical part of that is making sure that the advocates in our systems are operating under the appropriate ethical rules.
Q. Thank you. Mrs. Jefferson, the Commission received 113 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 18 additional comments being made. There was -- there were a number of very positive comments, including "excellent candidate, perfect temperament, gracious, smart, compassionate, one of the bar's young superstars."

Only one of the comments indicated a concern and that was that at this stage in your career you do not have the experience necessary for a judicial position. What would your response be to that concern?
A. Well, I -- I acknowledge and appreciate that
someone would bring their concerns to this body. But I would also like to point out that my experience should not be categorized just simply by the number of years that $I^{\prime}$ ve been out of law school. That comment is probably reflective of my age and probably not representative of the type of legal work that $I^{\prime}$ ve done since $I$ got out of law school.

My private practice, my law practice is quite sophisticated. I have a number of matters that I handle as lead attorney or the sole attorney. I have done trials -- full bench trials and jury trials. And I have had the opportunity to handle civil and criminal matters from the side of the bench that $I^{\prime} m$ now asking you to find me well suited to -- to -- to see -- to do now.

So I think that I've had a very wide breadth of experiences that make me well qualified to sit as a Circuit Court Judge and those experiences may be not necessarily traditional, but they are elaborate and comprehensive.

MS. BENSON: Mr. Chairman, I would just note for the record that Mrs. Jefferson disclosed in her PDQ that she had once been named as a defendant in a civil rights case.

That was during a time when she was a law clerk for Judge Childs. Judge Childs along with a number of public officials were also named in that. It was a pro se prisoner lawsuit and the end result was that the case was found to be frivolous and dismissed with prejudice.
Q. Is there anything else that you would add about that case?
A. Nothing else about that case.
Q. Thank you. Thank you, Mrs. Jefferson. 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, 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, I have not.
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, I have not.
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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 which are that it's a misdemeanor and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than a $\$ 1,000.00$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. BENSON: And Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record that the Upstate Citizens Committee reported that Mrs. Jefferson is qualified as to constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. And well qualified as to ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

I would also note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation have been incorporated in the questioning today and I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any questions for Mrs. Jefferson?

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: I've got a few
questions.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Representative Bannister.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## EXAMINATION

(By Representative Bannister)
Q. And this is a quick question. I just want to clarify. On your sworn statement, question number six, what is your philosophy on recusal, especially in situations in which a lawyer legislator appear before you. You answered -- let's see, "Judges should also consider whether recusal is appropriate in any circumstance where the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned in cases involving lawyer legislators, I would only find that recusal is warranted if my impartiality is reasonably in question." Would that ever be in question if it's -- the only issue is that a lawyer legislator is appearing in front of you?
A. If the only issue is that the attorney appearing before me or already appeared before, is that that party or attorney is a legislature -- legislator, that would not affect my impartiality and I would not recuse myself for that purpose.
Q. Thank you. I just -- I was just making sure.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Ms. Jefferson, thank you so much 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 such time if the need arises. Thank you for offering and thank you for your willingness to serve South Carolina.

MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome, Judge McFaddin.

JUDGE MCFADDIN: How are you, sir?
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Good. Please raise your right hand.
(The Judge was sworn.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

JUDGE MCFADDIN: I have, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Well, I -- I did make some changes since my interview here a couple of weeks ago. I had made some mistakes and I provided those corrections to the screening committee personnel. I -- I was -- I think everything else is correct, sir, I mean, I --

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Do you object to our making these documents and any amendments a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE MCFADDIN: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 5, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE GEORGE MARION MCFADDIN, JR., ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 6, SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE GEORGE MARION MCFADDIN, JR., ADMITTED.]

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

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

JUDGE MCFADDIN: I want to make it clear, sir, that $I$ don't desire to leave the Family Court bench because $I$ don't like being a Family Court Judge. I enjoy my job there. It is challenging. It is taxing and irksome at times, however, I have enjoyed my work there. I seek a position with the Circuit Court to perhaps take to that court some of the things I may have done good as a Family Court Judge to try to make that system work, not necessarily better, but more efficiently, sir.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: And thank you. JUDGE MCFADDIN: I do like challenges.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Thank you. Please answer counsel's questions.

MR. COHL: 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 McFaddin, meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for the position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Cohl)
Q. Judge McFaddin, why do you want to serve as a Circuit Court Judge?
A. I do like challenges in life. Although my job now is still challenging from day-to-day, from time-totime, I -- I truly believe as a Family Court Judge and prior to that as a Magistrate, that every case is different. No two cases are alike.

I would like to take that mindset of thought to the Circuit Court knowing that cases there are not alike all the time, if ever alike. I've -I've had some methods employed in Family Court to -

- that I hoped moved things along quicker, especially for foster care children. And while there is no foster children issues in Circuit Court, perhaps I could take some chambers days there, like I did in Family Court, and turn those into plea days or General Sessions Court where there are backlogs and just have nothing but extra plea days from time-to-time. There must be -probably are some ways that things can be improved, although, I don't claim to have the answers to everything, sir.
Q. Thank you. Judge McFaddin, how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you as an effective Circuit Court Judge?
A. Well, I deal with Family Court criminal matters in Juvenile Court almost every Thursday, when in Sumter and whenever I travel to other counties at least one day a week there will be criminal court. The same principles apply there that would in General Sessions Court also.

And then -- just -- just to reiterate to be always mindful that no two cases are alike. One size doesn't fit all in any court.
Q. Thank you. Judge McFaddin, what do you perceive as the most important issues facing state courts
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A. Growing caseloads. Although they -- those caseloads have been addressed well to some degree, efforts of the judiciary and the legislature. Mediation and arbitration have played a great role I've heard in Circuit Court in civil cases.

I'm not sure about General Sessions Court how that might could be somehow modified to help there, I don't know that. But as is -- as always more being done with sometimes less and less resources.
Q. Thank you. Judge McFaddin, if you became aware of unethical conduct on the part of a trial advocate in a case in which you were presiding, how would you handle it? Do you believe judges should be required to report attorney misconduct?
A. As I recall the Canons, sir, judges are charged with reporting misconduct. It says "shall" not may. Until that's changed that's what we should do.

I -- I cannot think of a single episode where I've had to do that except -- well, let me -- let me change that. I did have to report a lawyer one time -- two lawyers regarding contempt matters, sir. One was direct contempt in front of me in court one day; I had to act, I couldn't let it get
away. The Canons said I shall report that and I did.

Another was an attorney, although it was a private matter, had failed to pay child support a long time, he was held in contempt and I had to report him also. Nothing I took pleasure in, sir, but I had to.
Q. Thank you. Judge McFaddin, the Commission received 187 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 40 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. "Judge McFaddin has an excellent judicial temperament. He is a competent, understanding, fair, and impartial jurist."

Four of the written comments address concerns over the length of time in issuing some of your rulings. Would you like to offer a response to these comments?
A. Sir, I take that up greatly; I owned my mistakes before about that. If they could be called mistakes, I'm sure they could probably be called that. My approach to issuing a ruling sometimes was that $I$ was most mindful when I'm affecting lives of adults and children. Some of those opinions address novel issues; some of them require
substantial research. As I often said, my role comes on pleading instructions, not knowledge or wisdom.

And -- but I can tell you today that I am -- I am current -- I hope that by speeding up my rulings I'm not going to be reversed; I hope not, of course, sir.
Q. Thank you, Judge McFaddin.

MR. COHL: Mr. Chairman, I would request
that we now go into executive session.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay.
MR. HITCHCOCK: So moved.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have a motion for executive session by Mr. Hitchcock.

Mr. SAFRAN: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Second, by Mr. Safran.
All in favor indicate by saying aye.
BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it.
All right. Everyone turn off their microphones.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We are back on the
record. We've lifted -- come out of executive session. No votes were taken and no decisions made.

MR. COHL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
(By Mr. Cohl)
Q. Now just a few housekeeping issues. Since submitting your letter of intent have you sought or received a pledge of any legislator either prior to this date or pending the outcome of your screening?
A. No, sir. I -- I'm even afraid to look at a legislator.
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, very much so.
Q. Thank you, Judge McFaddin.

MR. COHL: I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Judge McFaddin 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.

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

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any questions by members of the Commission?

Representative Smith.
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

EXAMINATION
(By Representative Smith)
Q. Judge McFaddin, you alluded to this earlier and I
think it's important for the members to know is when you tell them what you' ve done with adoption days and Family Court and the -- from adoption days and -- and foster children in the Family Court and the accolades you've received as a result of that.
A. Did you say -- do you want me to --
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Oh, I'm sorry. Sorry. Well, I would assume there were good comments from the -- from the public. I don't want to sound as if I'm -- as if I'm boasting, but $I$ was told that it was a good thing to do for a lot of children. We started this and I say we because I didn't do it myself -- by myself, court reporter is there, my assistant, the clerk of court and DSS. DSS helps prep these children for adoptions. We've done it twice a year since 2008, almost nine years, probably close to 450 children adopted now and removed from long-term placement or multiple placement episodes.

It was good for them, the children, good for the families, but $I$ can tell you it was good for me too because at least twice a day or two -- two days out of every year, almost everybody that is in the courtroom liking me instead of hating me. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Thank you. Any
other questions? Senator Malloy.
SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Senator Malloy)
Q. How you doing, Judge?
A. Fine, sir.
Q. Judge, I notice you mentioned the transition from the Family Court to a -- to the Circuit Court -you've been on the Family Court bench for how many years?
A. Fourteen years, sir.
Q. Fourteen years. But before that you practiced law extensively?
A. Yes, sir. Now, I was a Magistrate before -- for four years before that. I practiced law from 1986, after I left Judge Peeples, to --
Q. That Judge Rodney Peeples?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Get a good experience there?
A. Yes, sir. I learned a lot.
Q. You survived it?
A. Yes, sir. I did learn a lot. It was a good experience. There are -- I will admit there might be concerns about "Well, McFaddin, what are you going to do, you haven't touched heavy duty
criminal law in 14 or 18 years?" I haven't. I haven't done a lot of civil work either. Obviously, I could not. But a lot of the principles, I think, transfer from one court to the other by due process, treating people decently. Giving everybody or everyone his or her day in court.

I often said that you can be the smartest judge in the world, but if you don't treat people well you -- you have failed. So I would hope that I can -- may not be the smartest, but can at least treat people well and decently in court.
Q. And you were a sole practitioner for a period of time?
A. Yes, sir, from 1990 until 1998, sir.
Q. Okay. And so as a sole practitioner you ran your own law office?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. With a staff?
A. One and a half, yes, sir.
Q. One and half staff and maintained trusts and --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- other accounts?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Right. And made payroll?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And during that time you were in a small county, you had to try cases?
A. Yes, sir, I did.
Q. And you -- were you one of those lawyers that take every case that came -- well, a lot of cases that came in -- in the door, not every case, but a lot of different kinds of cases?
A. Correct, sir. Not every case, you know, some cases I probably regret that I took sometimes. But I did a lot -- a good bit of trial work in Family Court. I was the public defender for adult court. A General Sessions Court for approximately two years. Seemed like everything I touched went to trial. I guess I -- being the new man on the block I tried a lot in court -- or tried cases a lot in court.
Q. Okay.
A. And towards the end, around 1996, 7 and 8, had begun to do more and more civil trial work because my civil trial caseload increased and I had to go to court -- ended up in court.
Q. Now, you know, besides being a judge you know you have a reputation for being a animal lover?
A. Yes, sir, I am.
Q. With that, do you work with adoption services with
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A. No, sir. I -- I haven't done that yet. That's a good idea, but I haven't thought about that yet. I haven't -- I know this may sound silly, but I haven't gotten over the loss of my -- my little dog a year ago yet.
Q. Okay.
A. It's a tough thing.

SENATOR MALLOY: All right. That's all the questions I have. JUDGE MCFADDIN: Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Judge McFaddin, thank you. 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 MCFADDIN: Yes, sir. And may I say one thing before I leave, sir? CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Yes, sir.

JUDGE MCFADDIN: I've been sitting in a room with a lot of people -- or several other people who seek this same position and they are all to me a fine group of people, sir.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: All right. Good. Thank you.

JUDGE MCFADDIN: Thank you all.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Five minute recess.
(Off the record.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have reconvened from our recess. And we can have the next candidate. Welcome, Mr. Meetze.

MR. MEETZE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you have someone with you you'd like to introduce?

MR. MEETZE: I do. Thank you very much. I'd like to introduce my wife, Anna Meetze.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome, Anna. Thank you for being here.

Please raise your right hand, Mr. Meetze.
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MR. MEETZE: I have.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MR. MEETZE: They are.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

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

MR. MEETZE: Not at all.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: And that will happen at this time during the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 7, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WILLIAM VICKERY MEETZE, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 8, SWORN STATEMENT FOR WILLIAM VICKERY MEETZE, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Meetze, 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, thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, search of
newspaper articles in which you name appears, study of previous screenings, check for economic conflicts of interest. We have received no affidavits filed in opposition to your election. No witnesses are present to testify.

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

MR. MEETZE: I would. Thank you very much. And -- and -- and I will make it brief, but essentially I would just like to thank you all for this opportunity. It's certainly, I think, a wonderful opportunity that's presented to myself and the other candidates. I think that the way that our state elects judges, I truly can't imagine it being done any other way and that's coming from somebody who has been through this process before and not been successful, but I -- I certainly will stand by that statement and -- and certainly am grateful for the opportunity to stand here today.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Please answer counsel's questions.

MR. HINSON: 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. Meetze meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.

EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Hinson)
Q. Mr. Meetze, why do you want to serve as a Circuit Court Judge?
A. You know that's a question that I -- I have an opportunity to think about a good bit and sometimes it's hard to articulate your feelings on that, maybe just the way you want to.

It -- I will say that since $I$ was in law school I guess the seed was planted by my grandfather. He always -- when $I$ was in law school and I would come to Columbia to visit with him we'd usually go to breakfast at the Lizards Thicket. He knew a lot of folks and he would always introduce me to folks and say "This is my grandson Vick, he's going to be my judge. He's going to be my judge." And that sort of planted a seed sort of, I guess, and that sort $I$ guess gives you sentimental reasons
for this.
But as I got out of law school my first job was clerking for a circuit judge, Judge Brogdon from my home town of Marion and we -- that year I spent with him really showed me -- I was very fortunate to be able to see really a judge's judge at work for that year and seeing -- just seeing him and being able to spend that time with him was invaluable and really got me thinking that this is what I would like to do and I felt like I was well suited for that.

My first interview for a job after clerking for him was with then Solicitor Pope up in York County. During that interview he even asked me what $I$ saw myself doing in the future and I told him during that interview that $I$ wanted to be a Circuit Court Judge one day and he -- he remembered that throughout my time working there and things like that.

As far as practical work experience that I've done, obviously, I've been in public service my whole career. I've been a trial lawyer. I -- I think that protecting our Constitution and the rights of litigants and victims and defendants in criminal cases is very important. And as I judge,

I can think of no higher honor to be able to -- to exercise all that. And -- and for all of those reasons I would very much like to be a Circuit Court Judge.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Meetze. How do you feel your legal and professional experience this far will assist you to be an effective Circuit Court Judge?
A. I think legal experience, professional experience, my whole career I've been a trial lawyer. I've been an assistant solicitor for almost three years. And since 2002, I've worked in a public defender's office. And always been a trial lawyer. Doing that as a law clerk, Judge Brogdon was the Chief Administrative Judge in both Florence, 12th Circuit as well as the 3rd Circuit during the time that $I$ worked for him. We did a lot of civil, common pleas work during that time. He was assigned during that time two complex civil litigation cases that I worked -- was able to work on with him. And got -- even though that was a number of years ago, got a good bit of experience in civil matters clerking for Judge Brogdon.

I do work at Palmeto Boys State every year which includes the law school which I'm a co-dean of the law school for Boys State which includes
teaching law school class and that includes instructing the Boy State lawyers on civil litigation and common pleas, civil law.

I've certainly always had a good demeanor with others and -- and been able to work well with others. I've recently taken some civil court CLEs to make up for any, I guess, lack of practical experience working in Common Pleas Court as an attorney. I've taken CLE on E-discovery as well as -- as tort law and things like that, as well as gone over the judicial website as tutorial videos sort of on the E-filing system that is spreading throughout the state. I've looked at all of those to try to get some background.

I've always done my own research, I think that's certainly helpful and -- and -- and have always been able to read and interpret law and case law and -- and I think all of that makes me well suited for presiding over court in either branch of -- of the Circuit Court.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Meetze, what do you perceive as the most important issues facing state courts today?
A. I think, you know, the most important issues facing state court today and criminal court, there's always a backlog so to speak. Different circuits
have different degrees of backlog, but I -- I think that the most important issue with courts is making sure that our justice system runs properly and that the folks that come before the court, and that work in the court, are all treated with respect, treated the way they should be.

I think you should treat people by the golden rule wherever you are and that includes the courtroom. And I think that that's the most important thing that -- that needs to -- to be done in court. Cases can get old, but if they' re getting old for the right reasons, it's fine. If they're getting old because that's the way they need to get, then that's the way it should be, and I think that's good.

I think that just being able to treat people with respect and -- and make sure that all the litigants and all the parties to any action get their day in court and get fair and -- and hopefully just results throughout our justice system.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Meetze, if you became aware of unethical conduct on the part of a 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. Well, I think that there is an obligation to -- to report any misconduct to the proper authority, whatever -- whatever that may be. And -- and I've certainly been fortunate where I've worked I haven't ever personally had to -- to deal with -with an issue like that where I've -- I've felt like I've been in a position to where I needed to do that. But I -- I do think that -- that it's important for everybody. And if -- if there is some kind of improper action is taking place, I do think that -- that should be reported to the proper authority.
Q. Mr. Meetze, the Commission received 68 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 9 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. "Excellent judicial candidate who would be a great addition to the bench." Another stated that despite your caseload, it's very demanding, and you -- they' ve never seen you change your demeanor under pressure which make him a -- make you an excellent Circuit Court Judge. None of the ballot box surveys expressed any concern.

I have 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. 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. I have not. I have not made -- asked anyone and I'm not aware of anyone making such contact.
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. Okay. 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 am aware.
Q. Okay. I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens Committee reported that Mr . Meetze is qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and moral
stability. The Committee found him well qualified in the criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. The committee stated in summary, while Mr. Meetze experience is heavily weighed in the criminal arena, no members of this Committee spoke -- voiced any concerns about his ability to handle both criminal and civil matters in an exemplary fashion.

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

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any questions by members?
(No response.)
EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Campsen)
Q. Mr. Meetze, I have a question. It appears that your practice has been pretty much all criminal -A. Yes, Your Honor.
Q. -- in recent years. And how would you make up for the lack of criminal experience in the Court of Common Pleas?
A. Well, I believe, like I said, you know --
Q. I mean civil -- excuse me civil --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- experience in common pleas.
A. Yes, sir, I appreciate that. I understand. I -- I think that certainly I've been a trial lawyer my whole career which the rules of evidence are -- are the same for both -- both areas. I don't think I would have any issues with regard to that.

I think any -- any issues of law that came up, I -- I would do what most judges, really all judges that $I^{\prime} v e$ been in front of do regardless of their experience background, which is look up the law in order to make -- make a decision. I've always been able -- somebody that was able to make a decision and I wouldn't have any -- don't believe I would have any issues in Common Pleas Court doing that. But I -- I'm able to read the law and understand the law and interpret the law, I think, very well regardless of whether it's civil -- whether it's civil or -- or criminal.

Certainly I've kept up with advance sheets on both. I've -- like I said, have done a CLE to try to bone up on civil law, so to speak, but I do think that as a Circuit Court Judge I would welcome
the assignment of as many common pleas terms as possible because my work history and my work ethic shows that any -- however much I may be behind on common pleas, I would certainly catch up very quick and that would -- if there is any kind of perceived deficiency in regards to that it would be made up quickly by the amount of work I would do and how hard I would work.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Representative Bannister.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Thank you. EXAMINATION
(By Representative Bannister)
Q. Mr. Meetze --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- on -- number six on your sworn statement, the question was about your philosophy on recusal and it asks you about lawyer legislators. And you said you would not disqualify yourself based exclusively on that. Then you went on to say "However, if the other party believes that my impartiality may reasonably be called into question, then that attorney would have an opportunity to be heard on the matter. And if that party felt that recusal
would be appropriate, then I would disqualify myself to avoid the appearance of impropriety." So if the lawyer asking for recusal insisted you would do it? I'm trying to make sure I understood what you meant by that.
A. I guess I was sort of taking a standpoint of better to be safe than sorry. I can't, standing here today and even in answering that question on the PDQ, I can't think of any reason why a lawyer or legislator being in front of me would create any conflict. But I do think that the Judicial Canons do say that if a party believes that there could be or would be a conflict of interest that -- that we could recuse ourself on that basis.

So I guess it's just more of a better to be safe than sorry, but $I$-- I can't think of -- of a reason why a lawyer or legislator appearing in front of me would -- would generate any kind of a conflict that would necessitate recusal. But I think the Canons say even if $I$, myself, don't believe there's a conflict, if one party does and asks me to recuse myself then -- then that may be the proper thing to do. I guess that is what I was sort of saying, but I -- I can't imagine me personally feeling like there would be any kind of
a conflict of interest.
Q. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Senator Malloy?
SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you, sir.
EXAMINATION
(By Senator Malloy)
Q. Mr. Meetze, how you doing today?
A. I'm doing find, thank you, sir.
Q. I know you got the best part of you from Hartsville is here?
A. I sure do.
Q. I your grandfather served in this Senate for many years as our chaplain, over 50 some odd years, right?
A. That's correct, I believe it was 56.
Q. Fifty-six years. Whenever you were working you also -- you did PCRs, didn't you?
A. I did and I appreciate you bringing that up.
Q. PCRs are civil, aren't they?
A. They are and I appreciate you bringing that up.
Q. Did you do bond forfeitures?
A. I --
Q. I mean -- I'm sorry, civil forfeitures?
A. I -- we do not. I do not do civil forfeitures as part as our work as public defender. Those matters
are private attorneys that get hired to do that.
Q. As you say, the law is the law so you can end up transferring. How long have you been practicing now?
A. I've been practicing since '98, is when I was licensed and I started as an Assistant Solicitor in August of '99, so about 18 years.
Q. So you've been in the Solicitor's Office and Public Defender Office back --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- back and forth.

MR. SMITH: Ask him what college he went to.
Q. He knows the answer to this question, which every good lawyer does, he said what college did you go to?
A. I went to Wofford College.
Q. Wofford College, good.

MR. SMITH: Now you know he's a smart man.
Q. Smart man.

MR. MALLOY: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Mr. Meetze, thank you for being with us. This -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 time if the need arises.

I thank you for offering and we greatly appreciate the service your grandfather provided to the South Carolina Senate for many decades.

MR. MEETZE: Thank you so much. I certainly appreciate that, it means a lot. Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Murphy, welcome.
MR. MURPHY: It's good to be here.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you have someone with you, you'd like to introduce?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, this is my wife Jody.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome, Jody.
MR. MURPHY: She traveled through the rain to get here today, so --

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Well, thank God for
the rain. Please raise your right hand.
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Have you had an
opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I have.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MR. MURPHY: Yes, they are.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

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

MR. MURPHY: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 9, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TIMOTHY WARD MURPHY, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 10, SWORN STATEMENT FOR TIMOTHY WARD MURPHY, ADMITTED.]

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

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

MR. MURPHY: I really don't have an opening statement. I would like to thank everyone involved in the process. Ms. Brogdon's crew and also all the individuals involved in the Citizens Committee and the -and the Bar, as well as all of you today. It's been a -- once again, a very enjoyable process to go through.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Well, thank you. Please answer counsel's questions. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Pearce)
Q. Why do you want to serve as a Circuit Judge?
A. Well, I think when -- anytime you apply for -- for a position it's a -- the fundamental reason is you think you'll -- you'll do a good job. And that's one of my motivating factors that I think have the skill set, varied experience, and I think I'd -I'd bring a level of dedication, competency, and that I have a lot of experience that would be beneficial to the bench.

I enjoy trial work. I like being in the courtroom and dealing with those kind of issues. And also, I guess, it would also -- give me an opportunity to continue serving and being of service to the state -- the people of the state. So those are my primary reasons.
Q. How do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective Circuit Court Judge?
A. Well, as I kind of alluded to before, you know, throughout my career, in the military in particular you're -- you're faced with lots of different types of issues, challenges, and pressures. And I like to think and I think that my -- my military career was -- was pretty successful and that is -- that
obviously has given me the type of experience that I think would be beneficial to the type of challenges $I$ could expect in the courtroom and -and dealing with different types of issues, different types of people, different types of lawyers on the bench. So that's pretty much what -- what I think I've -- I'd bring to the -- to the table.
Q. What do you perceive as the most important issues facing state courts today?
A. Well, $I$ think the primary, and it's been really since I've been here is, backlog. You know, particularly in -- in General Sessions there's -there's a lot of backlog. I think it's getting better, but the -- that's an important issue.

I think when individuals either file suits civilly or are involved in the criminal justice process, there is a reasonable expectation that -that things will be handled in an efficient and in a timely matter and too often I think our process fails. So I think that -- I don't think that's any big surprise. I mean, I think that's probably the primary issue facing the -- the judicial system at this point.
Q. If you became aware of unethical conduct on the
part of a trial advocate in a case in which you were presiding, how would you handle it?
A. Well, $I$ think the first thing you do is -- is make sure that the -- what I perceived to be an -- in a way of the unethical conduct is -- is a reality.

I mean, so I'd probably do a little bit of research and -- and to include advising and -- and engaging with the -- the individual who -- who's involved in the conduct. And then if it's serious enough, obviously, you address it. If it's -- if it's a context of a -- of a trial or whatever, I think you would address it there. And then, obviously, if -- if it's serious and -- and it's confirmed, you go through the appropriate channels. I think you have an obligation to report it.
Q. And again, you're probably addressing the second question, but could you just clarify that you believe judges should be required to report attorney misconduct?
A. I do, sure.

MR. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman, I would note for the record and for members of the Commission that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with the
candidate's consent, Timothy Ward Murphy meets the constitutional and/or statutory
requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. On the ballot box quesitons, Mr. Murphy, the Commission received 45 ballot box surveys regarding you with 15 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. "An experienced attorney who works well with other members of the bar, would make an exceptionally fine judge, extraordinary tact and communication skills. He is highly intelligent and would have no difficulty serving in a judicial capacity."

One of the written comments expressed a concern. The concern was stated as, "I have concerns that his time as a Public Defender may have made him jaded at times to the concerns and difficulties of indigent clients."

The same participant though went on to say, "however, I do think he would follow the law and be as fair as possible when conducting court." Do you have anything in response to this concern to share with the Commission this afternoon.
A. Sure. Well, first of $I^{\prime} d$ like -- I don't -- I'm
not jaded. I -- when I retired from the -- from the Air Force I -- I chose to be a Public Defender, you know, I certainly had other opportunities. I enjoy being a Public Defender. Nothing I've experienced in my time there as a Public Defender has -- has caused me problems or -- or -- or made me any -- any less committed to -- to that type of service than $I$ was when $I$-- when I became one.

So I -- I think people that know me and, you know, obviously, I don't know who this individual is, but I -- I think people that know me will attest that $I^{\prime} m$ kind of a positive guy and I take folks as they come and that I try to do the best for everyone involved.

Now, I -- I don't think it's a shock to anybody in the room that periodically, on occasion, there may be a client who's -- might be a bit difficult, but, you know, you -- again, that's part of the job. I enjoy the job, I always have. And so, no, I -- I really enjoy being a Public Defender. I -- I like it a lot and I think I'm good at it.
Q. I do have 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, 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, 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 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. Uh-huh.
Q. Those penalties are -- is a misdemeanor and upon conviction the violator must be fined not more than $\$ 1,000$ or imprisoned not more than 90 days?
A. I'm aware of that.

MR. PEARCE: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, on the Citizens Committee Report, I would note that the Pee Dee Citizens

Committee reported that Mr. Murphy is qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The Committee found him well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament.

I would note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate, were incorporated into the questioning of him today. And, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any further questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any members have any questions?

EXAMINATION
(By Chairman Campsen)
Q. Mr. Murphy, I do have -- I have question just -I'm interested. I noticed that you have a B.A. in Political Science and a Master's in Political Science?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Could you share with us the science associated with politics, $I^{\prime}$ ve never been able to figure that out?
A. There are -- there are those who say that you can predict politics and I was told that in my Master's classes. Somehow I don't, you know, I -- I think it's telling that not long after $I$ left Duquesne, they stopped offering that degree --
Q. Okay. I am very -- I am interested, I noticed you are currently enrolled in LLM. What is that LLM in?
A. International law.
Q. All right. Just interested.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Any other questions? Any questions? Okay.

SENATOR MALLOY: I have a few.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Senator Malloy. EXAMINATION
(By Senator Malloy)
Q. Good to see you, Mr. Murphy. I know you are across the street from Mr. Smith -- Representative Smith here.
A. Yes, sir.

MR. SMITH: Don't hold that against him.
Q. Hope he pays you money from time to time. You get a chance to try many cases over there now in the Sumter area?
A. Well, as the Public Defender I do. I've had -- in

Magistrate Court I have. And in Common Pleas my -I guess I'm a good negotiator because I've settled the Common Pleas cases I've had. But I -- I -- I do -- certainly the Public Defender I'm in court quite a bit.
Q. And do you do PCRs as well?
A. No, I -- I do not. Not as a -- not as an attorney.
Q. Right. And I think that -- did -- did we talk about when you -- were you ever in private practice?
A. Well, I'm pretty -- I'm in private practice now with -- with my partner Wade Kolb. I mean and what -- what happened was when I retired I -- Wade and I got together and at that time I simultaneously applied for a -- for the Public Defender position which at that time was under -- was a contract scenario. And I just -- over time I just stayed with it so it -- it's -- what I -- the only thing I'm limited on as far as my private practice goes is, obviously, I can't represent private criminal clients in General Sessions Court. I do -- I do represent individuals in District Court on criminal matters both in Florence and Columbia. And I've represented some military folks in disciplinary actions and court-martials.

I have a pretty robust, I would say, VA practice where I represent individuals before the Board of Veterans Appeals. And I've also appeared before the Administrative Judge in Social Security cases. So it certainly keeps me -- keeps me busy.

## Q. Okay. Mr. Howle is your Public Defender?

A. Yes.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Murphy, thank you. 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 your offering and thank you for your service to this country and the Armed Forces.

MR. MURPHY: You're welcome. Thank you, sir.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. And our next candidate will be Judge Bentley Price. Judge Price, welcome.

JUDGE PRICE: Thank you very much, sir.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: You have a guest with you?

JUDGE PRICE: Yes, this is my wife Melissa Price.

MRS. PRICE: Hi.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mrs. Price, welcome.
MRS. PRICE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Please raise your right hand.
(The Judge is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

JUDGE PRICE: Yes, I have.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
JUDGE PRICE: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

JUDGE PRICE: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you object to our making these documents and any documents, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

JUDGE PRICE: No, sir. No objection. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: It will be done at
this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 11, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE HONORABLE BENTLEY D. PRICE, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 12, SWORN STATEMENT FOR THE HONORABLE BENTLEY D. PRICE, ADMITTED.]

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

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

JUDGE PRICE: Just briefly. Just wanted to thank everyone for having us here today and just again $I$ want to recognize my wife for
being so supportive throughout this. And I'd be happy to ask -- answer any question that you may have.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. And counsel has some questions for you now, if you would please answer them.

JUDGE PRICE: Yes, sir.
EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Goldin)
Q. Afternoon, Judge Price.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Why do you now want to serve as a Circuit Court Judge?
A. You know that question gets asked a lot throughout this process and my answer stays the same. I've -enjoy doing it. I actually love doing it and I've found over the years that I look forward more to doing that part of my practice than any other. I enjoy it more so for the challenges that it -- that you face. I enjoy doing the daily challenges that come before me. I -- I enjoy helping the litigants. I enjoy pretty much all aspects of it. It's a sacrifice to do it and I look forward to hopefully being able to do it in a larger capacity as a Circuit Court Judge.
Q. Thank you.

MR. GOLDIN: Mr. Chairman, I want to note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record, Judge Price meets the statutory and constitutional requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Judge Price, how do you feel your legal and professional experience so far will assist you in being an effective Circuit Court Judge?
A. I think what sets me apart from most is basically my past practices. I've done just about everything. I've been a former solicitor. I've been in the prosecutorial side of the practice. I obviously have done a lot of defense work with a former practice for about ten years and I've had my own practice for going on three years now. And I do criminal and I do civil, which means that I obviously have an extraordinarily large base of practice which I think in this day and age is fairly unique. And also $I$ have been a judge for almost going on ten years.

And so what I think sets me up for the Circuit Court is -- is that there's not a whole lot in

Circuit Court that I haven't either been involved in or have not had some situation arise in participating in that manner in Circuit Court and obviously I have extreme amount of judicial experience as well.
Q. What do you perceive as the most important issues that are facing the state courts today?
A. I would say issues of time would be my number one concern. I think that a lot of times a lot of the cases get held up based on the fact that some Circuit Court Judges don't want to make decisions and they are putting things off and obviously just taking in to consideration and just the overall time it's taking to review civil cases, criminal cases, being able to utilize and move the docket. I think that's the biggest concern that I would -I would see right now in the Circuit Court, it's just the utilization of the attorney's times and being able to move the docket and the cases themselves.
Q. If you became aware of unethical conduct on the part of a trial advocate in a case in which you were presiding, how would you handle it?
A. I've had that situation arise. I allowed the attorney to come in and tell their position as to
what transpired. By the -- obviously through the Canons you have a ethical duty and obligation to investigate. I did and $I$ found at that point in time there was another issue that may have arisen with another judge. He became involved and we discussed the situation. And ultimately the other judge made the determination to turn him into the ODC per the rules.
Q. Okay.
A. But I would conduct my own independent investigation and give them ample and the opportunity to discuss the issue.
Q. Do you believe judges should be required to report attorney misconduct?
A. The law says they have to currently. So if you're going to abide by and follow the law the answer to that questions would be "yes." Do I think that they do it as often as they may potentially should, I don't believe so, but yes it's the law and I would abide by it.
Q. Thank you. Judge Price, the Commission received 158 ballot box surveys regarding you, with 16 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments. "I cannot think of a better candidate for this
position." "Judge Price is a consummate professional." And they mostly remark on your experience as a Municipal Court Judge.

Two of the written comments did express concerns. One comment indicated that you actively interfered in a Circuit Court case in which this attorney was involved and that you made implied threats of retaliation based on your authority as a sitting Municipal Court Judge. He further went on -- this comment further went on to say that you were also dismissed for cause from the Solicitor's Office and urged us to look into that. How would you respond to, I guess, that comment?
A. Well, as with any of these comments, they're obviously anonymous and so $I$ would not be able to respond to that specific comment if I didn't have anymore information, but $I$ would like to state that -- that for almost going on ten years as a judge it's evidenced that I have never had any complaint lodged against me whatsoever. So I would vehemently deny that that ever transpired.

They obviously would have any recourse if they would -- would want to have chosen, i.e., you know, turn me in or whatever they want -- wish to do at that time and obviously that did not transpire.

And no, I resigned from the Solicitor's Office and began employment in a large practice in Charleston.
Q. Thank you. The other concern, and you touched on this a little bit earlier in my questioning, the critique that you -- you might lack civil experience. Do you want to further answer that question?
A. You know I -- as we discussed, I think that the practice of law has become so specialized that certain people get pigeon holed into being a defense attorney, being a criminal attorney, being a civil attorney. Fortunately the person does recognize the fact that $I$ do have civil experience. That I do practice in the civil courts and I do undertake those type of cases and I do have that wide base of -- of practice.

So with that being said, do I practice a little bit more in the criminal courts and has that been kind of my past? Yes. But do I have civil experience and continue to do that? Absolutely.
Q. 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?
A. No, sir.
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, 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 that of the penalties for violating the pledging rules?
A. Yes, sir, I'm aware of the rules.
Q. Okay. I would note that the Lowcountry Citizens Committee reported that Judge Price is 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 that this incorporates any concerns that were raised during the investigation
of Judge Price.
And Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Do any members have questions? Any questions? Okay. Senator Malloy. SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you.

EXAMINATION
(By Senator Malloy)
Q. How are you doing, Mr. Price?
A. Just fine, Senator. Thank you, sir.
Q. I guess most of the Committee members would look at your background. I know that you've been here before. Tell us what has changed since then. Tell me what has changed as far as doing other cases and any improvements and those kind of things since you were here last?
A. Basically, what you just touched on, more experience. I've taken on -- what's been unique now is that once I opened up my own practice I had the opportunity to really get more involved in all of my cases. Whenever I was with the other practice we shared responsibilities. So you weren't always kind of up on what the case was actually doing. When I say that, I speak mostly of the civil cases.

But in this situation -- or in the situation I'm currently in, running my own practice, has kind of given me more experience and participating in everything. Obviously, because they're my -- my cases and their my clients and I'm the only one that answers to them.

And so with that being said, just more experience. Obviously, more judicial experience. Not sure how long ago I became the Chief Judge, but there's some -- a little bit more responsibilities with being the Chief Judge and I've had to kind of undertake some of those responsibilities.

But fortunately the answer to that is I've gotten more experience and the good news to that is nothing detrimental or negative has actually transpired.
Q. You have a solo practice now?
A. I do, yes, sir.
Q. And you have a staff?
A. No, sir.
Q. Just you practicing?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you're getting some trial experience trying some cases?
A. I have. I actually recently just tried a two week
federal trial in a Federal Court for a -- it was estate and obviously went federal and so I've -I've just stayed as busy as I've always have.
Q. Right. And so you are -- so you have to end up maintaining your accounts and all that kind of stuff that you do in a private practice? So you have had management from the private side and from -- as a Chief Judge now?
A. Yes, sir, I do it all.
Q. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Judge Price, thank you for appearing before 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.

JUDGE PRICE: Yes, sir. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you for offering and thank you for your service to Folly Beach and South Carolina.

JUDGE PRICE: Thank you very much, I
appreciate it.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Reibold, welcome.
MR. REIBOLD: Good afternoon.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you have anyone you'd like to introduce to the Commission, with you?

MR. REIBOLD: I do. My wife is with me, Shealy Reibold.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Welcome. Thank you for coming.

MRS. REIBOLD: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Please raise your right hand.
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MR. REIBOLD: Yes, I have.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MR. REIBOLD: They are.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

MR. REIBOLD: No further amendments.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you object to our making these documents and any amendments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

MR. REIBOLD: I do not.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: It will be done at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 13, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ROBERT L. REIBOLD, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 14, SWORN STATEMENT FOR ROBERT L. REIBOLD, ADMITTED.]

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Reibold, the Judicial Merit Selection Commission has thoroughly investigated your qualifications for the bench. Out inquiry has focused on nine evaluative criteria and has included a ballot box survey, thorough study of your application materials, verification of your compliance with state ethics laws, search of newspaper articles in which you name appears, study of previous screenings, check for economic conflicts of interest. We have no affidavits filed in opposition to your election. No witnesses are present to
testify.
Do you have a brief opening statement you would like to make at this time?

MR. REIBOLD: Yes, sir. I realize that all the members of this Commission have taken time away from their livelihood and their families to be here today for what I consider to be an important civic duty. I also realize that you have many more people to talk to after I leave today. So out of respect for your time, I want to keep this short.

What I want to say is that I have been here before. Last Fall, I was honored to receive this Commission's recommendation for a Circuit Court seat. And I've returned. And I hope the fact that $I^{\prime} v e ~ r e t u r n e d ~ d e m o n s t r a t e s$ both my perseverance and that my desire to be a Circuit Court Judge is real. Service on the bench is not a stepping stone. It is not the career choice of the moment or the flavor of the month. It's not a way to cap off my career. It's a destination. I believe in the work and I want to do the job. And I hope that by the end of this hearing I will demonstrate that I'm once again worthy of your
recommendation.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Please answer counsel's questions.

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

EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Simpson)
Q. Mr. Reibold, why do you want to serve as a Circuit Court Judge?
A. That's a very good question. I've been here before. This is a -- a goal I've had for quite some time. And what I tell people when they ask this question is that after over 20 years of practice I'm no longer naive. I see how the sausage of the legal system works and how it gets made. But I'm still idealistic. I'm fool enough to believe in the way the system is supposed to work. And what I see in my everyday life and my practice in the courtroom is that that doesn't
always turn out to be the case.
There is a vast majority -- not majority, but a -- a large segment of people who believe that when they walk into the courtroom in Circuit Court here in South Carolina, that the deck is stacked against them. And a lot of the business clients is -- clients that I represent, they feel the same way on the civil side. And right or wrong, there's an appearance out there or a perception out there. And that -- to me that undermines the system.

What I want and it's -- I feel it's my sense of personal responsibility, is to get in there and fix that problem. There's only one way to do it and that's to work from the inside. I tried to make some changes as a lawyer on the outside that it's -- it's tilting at windmills. The only way to make it happen and to make sure it's fair for everybody, which is the goal, is to get in there and do the work.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Reibold, how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective Circuit Court Judge?
A. Well, the very first job I had out of law school was as a -- as a law clerk for a Circuit Court Judge. I was lucky enough to clerk for the
recently deceased Judge Kinard and that experience was invaluable. I can't imagine a better training ground for being a judge than to be a law clerk. You see what happens in the every day. You assist in drafting orders. You assist in making decisions. You assist in dealing with counsel. You see how the administrative side, the not so fun side of the job, works. I can't imagine better training than that.

Since that time, I've had over 20 years experience, predominantly civil, but I have been fortunate enough to handle all kinds of cases. The very first case I tried was a little car wreck case in front of then, Circuit Court Judge, Costa Pleicones. A little $\$ 2,000.00$ wreck case, that's how I -- we all get our start.

But since that time, I've had the good fortune to try and handle all sorts of matters. If it can be filed in Common Pleas, I basically handle it. I've done employment discrimination. I've done trip and falls. I've done a partition action. I've done car accident, personal injury cases. I've tried a multimillion dollar class action case in Common Pleas Court. I've also appeared in Appellate Courts. I've argued cases at the Court
of Appeals and at the South Carolina Supreme Court. And I've even argued a patent appeal in front of the United States Court of Appeals from the Federal Circuit.

I've had a wide variety of experience. I'm AV rated by Martindale-Hubbell. And I've been found well qualified by the -- by the Bar Association. And I feel that I do have the experience, education to be a Circuit Court Judge.
Q. Mr. Reibold, what do you perceive as the most important issues facing state courts today?
A. Well, there are a lot of things that could be the answer to this question. I'm sure many people would say the funding of the -- of the court system is a -- is a top issue.

But from my mind, from my personal opinion, I'm going to go back to what I started with when I opened. I believe there is a crisis of credibility. I believe if you -- the public perception of the court system is not where it needs to be. As I said, there's a segment of population, especially on the criminal side, who believes that when you walk into the courtroom it's stacked against you. You don't -- you do not have a fair shot. And -- and there's many reasons for
that. Here in Columbia we've had a problem with the crime lab that cast doubt on some criminal convictions. That same issues has even happened with the FBI to cast doubt on criminal convictions.

We -- you know, I've had a business client who after a particularly bad experience in Allendale County decided to pull out of South Carolina because they believe that the system was not fair to them. The civil system didn't work for them. And these observations, they' re not untrue. I mean this is what people believe and I think there's a serious crisis.

If you look at -- one of the things that scares me the most is this recent Oregon standoff Bundy verdict. The only way that can be rationalized is if the 12 people in the jury box decided to nullify the law. That's -- that's what appears to have happened. And that means that they said, court we don't respect your authority. We don't respect your ability to prosecute these people, to put these people in jail. We -- we don't believe in the law.

To me that's frightening. If somebody who does believe in the system and does believe in the way it's supposed to work, that kind of result is
frightening to me. I think this is a real crisis. I -- to me that's -- that is the biggest issue facing the state courts today.
Q. Thank you. If you become aware of unethical conduct on the part of a trial advocate in a case in which you were presiding, how would you handle it?
A. I think the starting point there is to refer to the Canons Judicial Ethics. They're -- they' re pretty clear on this and -- and the people that wrote them took a lot -- took a lot of thought and time to figure out where the balance should be struck. And under the Canons, you're not required -- as a judge you're not required to report every ethical violation. But if it does impact -- if you believe it impacts on the lawyers fitness to practice law, it does rise to the level of a mandatory report.

I think -- my own personal opinion is that judges shouldn't be required to report everything. I think there has to be some discretion, some sort of sliding scale. And I see this in practice. The Frivolous Proceedings Act, it doesn't work the way it's suppose to work. And one of the primary things that $I$ hear about it is that because there is a mandatory report feature, judges are reluctant
to find things frivolous. They know if they grant a Frivolous Proceedings Motion they have to turn somebody into ODC. As a result, that person, they temporarily lose their job, could permanently lose their job. Their -- their wife, their children, their -- their husband, their associates could be damaged by it. And they know these people. They appeared in front of them and they're reluctant to make that determination.

Because of the consequences about it I think there needs to be some sort of sliding scale. Obviously, once it rises to a certain point where you believe it does impact their fitness to practice law, that's a mandatory report.
Q. Mr. Reibold, you answered, that judges should be required to report attorney misconduct. If you became aware of unethical conduct, how would you handle it?
A. Well, I think that would have to -- would be a very fact specific scenario and it would depend upon what the unethical conduct I became aware of was. If it was conduct that I believed impacted fitness to practice law, then I'm required to report discretions.

If it's conduct that $I$ don't believe rises to
that level, there are other appropriate actions which could be taken which can include counseling, depending upon what the specific issue is. Or, you know, a stern reprimand in chambers. If you begin to see as -- as a judge if you begin to see repeated violations, even moderate violations, then I think that takes it to a different level as well where we determine -- where reporting is a more feasible option.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Reibold, the Commission received 109 ballot box surveys regarding you, with ten additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contain the following positive comments. "Good guy. Very balanced point of view and demonstrates a very keen and serious approach to legal issues. Excellent temperament and patience. Well qualified in all respects."

Four of the written comments express concerns. One comment indicated that you do not have the experience to be a judge. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, we've already talked about that to some extent. One of the prior questions is what -- how does my experience and background qualify me to be a Circuit Court Judge.

And -- and I've been through my service as a Circuit Court Law Clerk. My years of practice and types of cases I've handled, I do believe that I have the experience to be a Circuit Court Judge. Many judges get on the bench having predominantly practiced on one side or the other and so my situation is not unusual.
Q. There are also concerns about poor temperament. What response would you offer to this concern regarding your temperament?
A. Well, I first want to point out that the majority of the respondents found me well qualified in temperament. And so I think that's a minority response. I'm somewhat surprised by it. I've always been the, you know, typical nice guy. I'm sure at some point I've lost a girlfriend because of it.

But I'm also not upset to hear that. What we do is adversarial and we're -- we're up against somebody. There's an opponent in the case and if I hadn't annoyed an opposing counsel at some point in my career, then I'm not doing a very good job of representing my clients. So I think the vast majority of the times that's not an issue. If I have to get stern to protect my clients rights,
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then I -- I do it.
Q. Okay. I just have 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. 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. I have not asked anybody to do so. I have not authorized anyone to do so. No one has done anything on my behalf.
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, but in the interest of full disclosure I did send a three sentence announcement letter to Senator Hembree before he was on the Commission. I -- since he was appointed to the Commission I have had no contact whatsoever with him.
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 am. You all are very clear about that.

MS. SIMPSON: I would also like to note that the Midlands Citizens Committee Report reported that Mr. Reibold is qualified in the evaluative criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, mental stability and experience. The Committee found him well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, and judicial temperament. The Committee stated in summary, Mr. Reibold is qualified, but more criminal law experience would be helpful. I would just note for the record that any concerns raised during the investigation regarding the candidate were incorporated into the questioning of the candidate today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Members, any questions? Representative Smith.

EXAMINATION
(By Representative Smith)
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Reibold. Can you help me -- I noticed that you were Judge Kinard's Law Clerk and I've always wondered this for years is when he did like this (demonstrating) when -- when he ruled upon an objection, can you tell us what that meant?
A. Well, you know, to be on the receiving end I'm sure that wasn't too fun. That was a dismissive gesture. He made it usually jokingly. One of the things about Judge Kinard was he had an extremely dry sense of humor. If you didn't know him well, you couldn't tell when he was joking.
Q. We always loved it as lawyers, because nobody could figure out whether he was sustaining or over -overruling the objection, he just kept on going.
A. Yep (laughter), move on.
Q. Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Any other questions that don't have to do with gestures?
(Laughter.)
MR. SMITH: Have some gestures for you, Mr. Chairman (laughter).

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Those have to be taken up in executive session, I'm afraid.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Mr. Safran.
MR. SAFRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## EXAMINATION

(By Mr. Safran)
Q. Just one quick question. I know that you have gone through this process, as you mentioned, several times. And I understand that looking at the report from the Citizens Committee and I think probably from here in the past, there's been some question about lack of criminal experience; you're aware of that?
A. Certainly, I'm aware of that.
Q. And, I guess, if in fact, this is kind of something you've had as a goal, calling, something that you want to do, have you done anything really to try to enhance the criminal experience if that's been found to be kind of a short spot?
A. I have. I've gone out and I have, you know, as dry as it is, I've read Criminal Law Hornbooks. And I'm sure much to my partner's chargin, I have periodically been going to criminal law CLEs, even though that doesn't involve my practice. I went to a symposium, criminal law symposium, put on by the Riley Institute at Furman.

So I have been taking some steps to -- to bone up on that area. And the Commission has my commitment that if I were to be on the bench I
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would do everything possible to -- to be competent.
Q. I apologize, just one follow-up. I mean the reason I ask it is this. I -- I personally don't get to Circuit Court a lot anymore. What at least I understand is in the way things have gone with the advent of mediation and all spectrums is that basically what you're seeing is a judge often in Circuit Court is discovery motions and things of that type on the civil side and a heck of a lot of criminal. And so if a good bit of your time is going to be spent doing General Sessions, do you think maybe more than what comes out of a book is probably going to be, I guess, beneficial?
A. First of all, I'm not sure I would agree with your assessment of what goes on in Common Pleas. PCRs, for example, are civil in terms. Those all involve criminal law, I've handled those as a practitioner as well. There is a lot of motions practiced. The discovery issues, judges don't like to hear those. Usually they make you work them out. That's not a large part of what you do.

But I think the last statistics I saw and I don't know if it's the most recent year, there were about 115,000 new cases filed in Circuit Court on the civil side. Pretty -- my experience is that
about 90 percent of those settle. The mediation process has been successful in weeding as out -weeding those out, but that's still leaves you with 5, 6,000 new cases a year that are going to be tried. That's a lot of trial work. So I -- I don't -- I -- I think if you look at -- if you look at the terms of the court that are scheduled by the Court Administration, I think you see a slight edge to civil terms, not including -- that's not even including the PCRs which are technically classified as civil, but technically kind of criminal.

So I -- I don't think that it's fair to say that the -- that the predominant work is going to be on -- on the criminal side. I think there's just as much work on the civil side.
Q. And you may be right, but I guess my question is, there's still going to be a substantial amount of criminal work?
A. I -- I would think probably at least -- at least half of your time will be in the criminal field --
Q. Right.
A. -- whether it's guilty pleas or trials.
Q. Okay. And I guess it all goes back that -- at least what I'm hearing from you, is the fact that you've kind of gone into these other areas to try
to more or less further acquaint yourself with the criminal law in general, that's something you feel like it's kind of remedied some of the concerns that were here in the past?
A. I -- I believe so. I've taken steps -- I -- I -you know, short of changing my entire practice there's very little I could do. And I -- I'm not sure that -- that trying a DUI case at this point in my career when I -- I would be doing it for the first time is the best use of my time --
Q. No --
A. -- because I've got responsibilities to other people as well.
Q. No, I get that and I appreciate your answer. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Mr. Reibold, thank you for being with us. This concludes the portion of your 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 willingness to serve South Carolina.

MR. REIBOLD: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. I would entertain a motion to go into executive session.

MR. HITCHCOCK: So moved.
MR. HOWARD: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Motion by Mr.
Hitchcock and second by Mr. Howard. Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: No discussion. Move immediately to a vote. All in favor indicate by saying aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it.
We're now in executive session.
(Off-the-Record Executive Session.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We've risen from executive session and we're now back on the record. No votes were taken. No decisions made. And we will now cast ballots for

Circuit Court, At-Large, Seat 1.
Is there a motion that all the candidates be found qualified?

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Yes.
SENATOR HEMBREE: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have a motion from Representative Bannister, second from Senator Hembree. Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Being no discussion we'll move immediately to a vote. All those in favor indicate by saying aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it.
And now when it comes to those who are
nominated we need to draw some columns in the blocks for qualified and nominated and then record the vote you take in each round like we did last time. Ms. Brogdon.

MS. BROGDON: Just to run through those voting procedures again. I'll call the name of each candidate in alphebetical order and everybody will get three votes in total. Once
a candidate -- if any candidate who receives six or more votes will be found qualified and nominated at the end of that vote. Any candidate that receives zero votes will not be in any subsequent rounds of voting unless there is a tie of six. And if there's a tie of six then those candidates would not move forward into being nominated.

And then on the sheet if you'll just draw vertical lines under nominated to keep track of each round of voting in the event we have more than one. Does anybody have any questions about the voting? Everybody has three.

Okay. By a show of hands please raise your hand if you want to find Mr. Jeffrey P. Bloom nominated.
(Board members vote.)
REPRESENTATIVE RUTHERFORD: And as housekeeping, so I mark my form.

MS. BROGDON: Yes. Like right here. That's 1 vote for Mr. Bloom.

MS. BROGDON: Ms. Meliah Bowers Jefferson, please your hand if you want to find her nominated.
(Board members vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's 10 votes so she will be found qualified and nominated.

Next is the Honorable George Marion McFaddin, Jr. Please raise your hands if you want to find him nominated.
(Board members vote.)
MS. BROGDON: All right. That's 10 votes for Judge McFaddin so he will also be found qualified and nominated.

Next is Mr. William Vickery, he goes by Vick Meetze. Please raise your hands if you want to find him nominated.
(Board members vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's 1 vote for Mr. Meetze.

Next is Mr. Timothy Ward Murphy. Please raise your hands if you want to find him nominated.
(Board members vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's 7 votes for Mr. Murphy so he will also be found qualified and nominated.

All right. So next is the Honorable Bentley D. Price. Please raise your hands if
you want to find him nominated.
(Board members vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's no votes for Mr. Price.

And last is Mr. Robert L. Reibold. Please raise your hands if you want to find him nominated.
(Board members vote.)
MS. BROGDON: That's 1 vote for Mr.
Reibold.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Please recap.
MRS. BROGDON: So to go back over, Mr.
Bloom received 1 vote; Ms. Jefferson received 10; Judge McFaddin received 10; Mr. Meetze received 1; Mr. Murphy received 7; Mr. Price received 0; Mr. Reibold received 1.

So that means that Ms. Jefferson, Judge McFaddin, and Mr. Murphy are found qualified and nominated.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Next we have two candidates for Family Court, 8th Circuit, Seat 2. Ms. Zimmerman, welcome.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you have someone with you that you would like to introduce?

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, sir, my husband Don Zimmerman is here with me.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Zimmerman, thank you for being with us.

Mrs. Zimmerman, please raise your right hand.
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, I have.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Does anything need to be changed?

MS. ZIMMERMAN: No, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you object to our making these documents and any amendments, if applicable, a part of the record of your sworn testimony?

MS. ZIMMERMAN: No, sir, I do not.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: They will be done at this point in the transcript.
[EXHIBIT 15, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

MINDY WESTBROOK ZIMMERMAN, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 16, SWORN STATEMENT FOR MINDY WESTBROOK ZIMMERMAN, ADMITTED.]

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

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

MS. ZIMMERMAN: I appreciate the opportunity to be here and I appreciate the effort that you all put into considering us. And I -- I believe that I'm a good fit for this and I hope you'll continue to consider me as we go through this process.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Please answer counsel's questions at this time. MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, sir. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Hinson)
Q. Ms. Zimmerman, please state for the record the city and circuit in which you reside?
A. I live in Newberry, South Carolina, which is the 8th Judicial Circuit.
Q. Thank you.

MR. HINSON: I note for the record that based on the testimony contained in the candidate's PDQ, which has been included in the record with candidate's consent, Ms. Zimmerman meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Ms. Zimmerman, why do you now want to serve as a Family Court Judge and how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you in -- to be an effective judge?
A. I believe that I'm qualified for this because of the sort of various areas that I've practiced. I have experience representing the Department of

Social Services. I have experience representing parents going through that process. Experience in the juvenile system as well as representing parties in private actions.

And I -- I believe that this is something that's kind of the -- the next step for me. I -- I believe that I have something to offer the bench. I think that $I$ maybe come from a little bit different background than what a lot of members of the judiciary have.

I -- I come from working class parents. My parents divorced when I was young and I believe that the experience that I have to offer and the insights that $I$ can give to, particularly the children that go through the Family Court system, is -- is something unique and I think I would be a good fit for that.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Zimmerman, are there any areas of the law for which you would need additional preparation if you were to serve as a Family Court Judge and how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. Well, I believe that I am prepared, however, I -- I don't think we ever stop learning. I -- I think that, you know, the law is -- is kind of a
continuous pursuit. But I do have experience in the three different areas that come before the Family Court.
Q. Ms. Zimmerman, please briefly describe your experience in handling complex contested family court matters and specifically discuss your experience with the financial aspects of family court work.
A. I have represented parties that, you know, through the divorce process. Most recently, I did a case where we had over a million dollars in financial accounts. We had to do draft QDRO's and things of that nature. So I have a good bit of experience with that, helping clients prepare financial declarations. Several different cases where we've had to hire forensic accountants and -- and bring them and work with the financials. And -- and I've also represented several people that have gone through divorce who own businesses which can be a whole extra area of complexity to that process.
Q. Thank you. And, Ms. Zimmerman, what role could judges play in improving outcomes for youth involved in the juvenile justice system?
A. I believe that it's very important for judges to look to what's causing the problem that brings the
juvenile in. I know from my experience when $I$ was prosecuting as well as when I've represented juveniles, often times the home environment is not really conducive to what that juvenile needs to get back on the right path. And I believe that if the court kind of investigates a little further and -and makes sure that that child has the resources available to them to reach the reform, which is what we hope from that process, that that's the best outcome for each child.
Q. Thank you. Ms. Zimmerman, the Commission received 146 ballot box surveys regarding you with 18 additional comments. The ballot box survey, for example, contained the following positive comments: "Ms. Zimmerman would be a great addition to the bench." Another said you would have great judicial temperament.

Four of the written comments express concerns. Those comments indicated that you lack the experience and qualifications necessary to be a judge. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. I've been practicing law ten years. I understand that, you know, there may be plenty of candidates that come before this Committee that have more
experience than that. But $I$ think that it's more than just the years with a law license. It's what I've done in that time.

I -- I have, you know, worked in various different areas of family law and I believe all of that, you know, will really serve me well. I believe that I have a lot of experience compacted in that ten years.

I also would point out that we have had other judges that have done wonderful jobs. We -- we have Justice Hearn and Justice Kittredge who had nine years experience when they first took the bench. So I don't think there's any magic number of years in practice. I think it has to do with overall qualifications and experience in that area.
Q. Thank you for that. One of the four who raised concerns regarding your experience and qualifications also raised concerns regarding your attitude and demeanor towards them. What response would you offer to this concern?
A. I -- that one $I$ find very unfortunate. I -- I try very hard to get along with people, you know, those comments are difficult to respond to when you don't know the exact context. If $I$ was having a bad day or an off day, you know, I -- I hate that they had
that image of me because I do try very hard to work with other counsel. We actually have a very congenial bar in Newberry that gets along well. So I -- I would continue to try to make sure that I consider my demeanor if $I$ was allowed to be on the bench.
Q. Thank you for that. A few housekeeping issues. Since submitting your letter of intent, have you sought or received a 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 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, sir.

MR. HINSON: I would note that the Piedmont Citizens Committee found Ms. Zimmerman qualified in the evaluative area -criteria of constitutional qualifications, physical health, and mental stability. The Committee found her well qualified in the evaluative criteria of ethical fitness, professional and academic ability, character, reputation, experience, and judicial temperament. The Committee stated, in summary, the Committee was very impressed by the high level of energy and ability that Ms. Zimmerman obviously brings to her job as an experienced Family Court lawyer and we are confident that she would bring these same qualities to the position of Family Court Judge. She is well regarded by her peers and has a wide range of relevant experience. 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.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any members have any questions for Ms. Zimmerman? Okay. Senator Malloy.

SENATOR MALLOY: Thank you.
EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Malloy)
Q. How you doing Ms. Zimmerman?
A. Good. How are you?
Q. I'm doing well. So you've been practicing law about --
A. Ten years.
Q. -- ten years?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you've been in -- in those ten years you' ve been in private practice?
A. I originally started with the 8th Circuit Solicitor's Office --
Q. Right, prosecuting cases.
A. Yes, sir. And then in 2009, I opened my office.
Q. So you were a solicitor for three years?
A. Full time for three years. I did keep a contract and prosecuted exclusively juvenile cases for another year when I left. So for the first year that $I$ was in private practice $I$ didn't do defense work.
Q. So when you were in the Solicitor's Office your line of practice was primarily with -- from juveniles?
A. When I first started with the Solicitor's Office, I was handling narcotic cases for Laurens and Newberry counties, I went back and forth. But after a year of doing that, $I$ was actually assigned full time to Newberry and I handled both General Sessions and juvenile cases at that point.
Q. And in your job as a solicitor of juvenile cases, tell me how that would work, I mean, did $\mathrm{y}^{\prime}$ all try to explore ways to have some sentencing and alternative measures? In other words, I'm trying to see your philosophy as it relates to children.
A. I --
Q. Because one of things that has been, if there was one, one of the things that we have here in our state is we get concerned a lot of times underlying with how many children are behind the fence --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- so to speak. Because we do know that children a lot of times are subject of their home environment and those kinds of things. Help me understand your approach whenever you were a solicitor in prosecuting juvenile cases.
A. Yes, sir. When $I$ actually first went into the juvenile prosecution, we had previously had somewhat of a contract doing it and I don't think that there was a lot of involvement. That individual kind of just showed up for court and saw the cases as -- as they came there. And that's part of the reason that we brought it back in-house just some -- some individuals that had other prosecutorial experience.

I did try very hard to look behind what was going on with this child. One specific thing that always struck me is when we had criminal sexual conduct within the home. Certainly that's something that's very serious that needs to be dealt with, but we also need to look at why that child is acting out in that way because it's not natural behavior for children to act that way towards siblings.

And so often, if you dug a little deeper you would find out that that child themself was a victim. And -- and so there's more treatment that's needed aside from just what they may have perpetrated, but also what they experienced. And to me I think that that's something very important to look into those things. What -- what brought
this juvenile to this place.
Q. Sure. And I'm always interested in alternative sentencing and I understand the adjudication of delinquency as it relates to a child and the things that we've talked about before this Committee before is -- is that I'm not so interested in the pipeline from the Family Court to the facilities.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And so I just want to make certain that when and if you ascend to the bench that you -- that it's not just through the eyes of a prosecutor.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And so I guess have you defended some of those cases as well?
A. Yes, sir, I have. I was on -- when they were still doing appointments to us before they went to the contract system, I got a lot of appointments. I also have represented people that their parents have came in and retained us. And -- and I've also represented a lot of children through school board actions. So I have -- certainly have experience representing the child side of things, not just the states.
Q. Okay. And in this past year we raised the age as it relates to the adjudication, as it relates to
below 17 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and we where one of the last states to do it. There is about eight or nine states that have not, we're probably 42 or 43. And so I just wanted to make certain that there is no particular judicial philosophy as it relates to these children because I think that this is very sensitive when we get to the Family Court standpoint and the hardest thing that you're going to have to do is to handle these children --
A. Absolutely.
Q. -- and they are our children here in this state and it's a problem. We've had some issues with juvenile justice and probably need to do some reform on our end, but $I$ just want to make sure that the people that get on the bench have a sensitivity to children because I know that this is a very difficult job and in handling the matters as it relates to children is probably one of the hardest things that we do.

So I'm delighted to know that you have worked on both sides and I saw -- I read your bio, I saw that you were going to a technical school when you were in high school getting credits. And that's
commendable too because we -- lot of times we got to end up having folks with that kind of experience that will end up teaching our children that there are ways to get educated. It looks like you went to technical school and then you went to a college and spread it out. And then did really well when you were in college.
A. Yes, sir. Thank you. And I -- I will tell you, I sat through the Senate and the House, some of those subcommittee hearings on what was going on at the Department of Juvenile Justice just to kind of educate myself. So I -- I know that -- that you guys are doing a lot of work there and they're having a lot of issues.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Zimmerman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Anybody else? (No response.)

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Ms. Zimmerman, thank you so much for offering. 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 time if the need arises.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you for your offering and thank you for willing to serve South Carolina.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you, sir.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Price, welcome.
MR. PRICE: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Please raise your right hand.
(The candidate is sworn in.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Have you had an opportunity to review your personal data questionnaire and sworn statement?

MR. PRICE: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are they correct?
MR. PRICE: There is one matter that I need to correct that was brought to my attention by Dustin. I believe that's question number 35, it could be question number 34 about if $I$ have ever been a defendant in a civil action.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Have you made that correction? Do you have it written?

MR. PRICE: I'm going to make it orally. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay.

MR. PRICE: Dustin told me the oral would be fine.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay.
MR. PRICE: There are three cases and in those cases I'm going to give you the -- the site. One is Case No. 2013-CP-36-617, which is Equity Trust Company versus Mary E. Henry Holmes, et al. This was an action to quiet a title and I had represented the defendant -personal representative in an estate. The -there was several pieces of real estate in that estate. One of them got sold for taxes. I had gotten out of the estate and left a bill in the estate file for $\$ 1,518.26$. So when the quiet title action was bought by the purchaser at the tax sale, $I$ was named as a defendant.

Second one was Case 2011-CP-36-234, which is Open Mill Development Corporations versus Steven H. Rushing and others. That too was an action to quiet title. I represented Steven Rushing, he was personal representative in his mother's estate. There were 30 pieces of real estate in that estate. There was an 80 acre tract in Florida that we needed to deal with and he couldn't come up
with the money necessary to associate a lawyer in Florida. So I asked to be relieved, submitted a bill of $\$ 4,323.50$. So when property was sold for taxes the second time I was named as a -- a defendant.

And the final one was a 2001 case, 2001-CP-36-435, Associate Home Equity versus and L. P. Miller, IV, and me. I had earlier gotten a judgment against Mr. Miller for $\$ 1,550.00$. He had borrowed money before that time from

Associate Home Equity, it was a mere foreclosure. And -- and I will tell you that one reason $I$ didn't mention those is because I had forgotten all about them. Had Dustin not brought them to my attention and I didn't pull the cases and looked at them, I would never had thought about it.

And -- and the best illustration I can give is if you have an adult child that is getting ready to buy a house and they borrow money from the bank, and before the closing they come up and say, you know, we need an extra 10 or 15 or $\$ 20,000$ for the down payment or to fix up the house, you get them to sign a note and mortgage. You record your mortgage
after the bank's mortgage.
Soon there is trouble in paradise, whether it's a layoff or an illness or some other problem that causes your son or daughter to be behind on their payments, by the time the foreclosure goes down you're -- you know you're going to lose whatever money you have. It's a matter of you've already worked through that in your mind. And when asked if I've ever been the defendant, $I$ think in terms of if somebody is suing me for malpractice if $I$ cross the center line running someone -that's what I think of in terms of have I ever been the defendant.

These sort of things once -- I mean, obviously I get served, but typically don't answer them because $I$ know there is no money to be had.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Thank you.
Let's see where are we. Okay. So your documents and that will now be submitted into the transcript at this point in time, your personal data questionnaire.
[EXHIBIT 17, JUDICIAL MERIT SELECTION COMMISSION PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE FOR

SAMUEL M. PRICE, ADMITTED.]
[EXHIBIT 18, SWORN STATEMENT FOR SAMUEL M. PRICE, ADMITTED.]

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

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

MR. PRICE: Well, I think the -- there are two things that the Commission will -will have to address. One is my age, that I can't do anything about. I am 67 years old, turned 67 on November the 6th. That means I will not be able to serve a full six year term
before I am 72, but I would point out that it is not unprecedented. Judge Rucker, whose position we are interested in, was elected the last time and this -- his term started July 1st, 2016, he turned 72 on October 22 nd of this year. So it is not unprecedented to elect a judge who can't serve the full six years.

The other thing of concern of mine is when I was notified what I scored on the test, I was stunned. I -- I was a -- I have typically been in the top third of my high school class, my college class, my law school class. I went through the process about four years ago and I forget what I scored, but it was somewhere between 85 and 88. And I just want to point out to the Commission that that is not indicative of my academic or intellectual performance. I don't know what happened that day.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Thank you.
Please answer counsel's questions, Mr. Price. MR. PRICE: Sure. EXAMINATION
(By. Mr. Stimson)
Q. Mr. Price, please state for the record the city and circuit in which you reside?
A. I reside in Newberry and also the 8th Judicial Circuit.

MR. STIMSON: 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. Price meets the constitutional and/or statutory requirements for this position regarding age, residence, and years of practice.
Q. Mr. Price, why do you now want to serve as a Family Court Judge and how do you feel your legal and professional experience thus far will assist you to be an effective judge?
A. I have been practicing law since December of 1974. Most all that time $I^{\prime}$ ve been a sole practitioner. I've done a variety of type of work. I think the last time $I$ filled out the application for malpractice insurance it was something like my domestic work is maybe 17 percent of my fees, but 40 percent of my time. I think that because of my experience, my involvement in civic affairs, my experience in Family Court, and knowledge as to not
only the law, but people in general, that I have the experience to be a good, if not excellent, Family Court Judge.
Q. Thank you, sir. Mr. Price, are there any areas of the law for which you would need additional
preparation in order to serve as a Family Court Judge and how would you handle that additional preparation?
A. I think that based on my experience and the routine way I read cases and read the matters that -- when the rules are adjusted and such, you know, I think that would be the additional that I would need and I don't see that $I$ would need to go off to a school or to a seminar for training.
Q. Mr. Price, what do you perceive as the cause of the backlog of cases on the Family Court docket and what do you believe individual Family Court Judges can do to improve the backlog?
A. Well, I think the backlog is based on society. We -- we've come into a time in -- in our history that everybody thinks that their way is the right way. People don't like to compromise. Now my experience over the last several years when, you know, we've introduced mediation, I think that has very much helped that problem because so often people just
want to be heard, they want to make sure somebody is listening to their complaints. And I think the mediation helps that process plus it makes them -it forces them to understand that if they go to court they may not get anywhere near what they think they're going to get in spite of what the advice of their lawyers have been.

But in a mediation all of a sudden that becomes different. It's -- it's real to them. So I see the mediation has done a lot of good things for that backlog.
Q. Mr. Price, please briefly describe your experience in handling complex contested family court matters and specifically discuss your experience with financial aspects of family court work.
A. Well, when someone comes into your office in a domestic case and you go over the details of their facts and their finances, you begin to get an idea if this is a -- going to be a complicated case.

In terms of how we handle that, you know, we sort of -- after we get that initial information, we schedule a second appointment where I've had time to review those matters and think about them and discuss with the client, you know, what is a reasonable projection as to what this thing's going
to cost him or what it's going to cost her. And then, you know, we -- we plan from there.

I have handled some complex cases, but the truth of the matter is in my -- in my practice, in my community, we don't have a whole lot of people that have a whole lot of money, you know.

So probably in my career I've handled a dozen, you know, financially complex cases, but most of my cases are not of that nature.
Q. Mr. Price, what role can judges play in improving outcomes for youth involved in the juvenile justice system?
A. The judge controls the atmosphere of the courtroom. And the judge can make sure that Department of Social Services, Guardian Ad Litems, try to project to parents and children that the law can be stern, but the law can also be compassionate. And it is important that a judge projects that, that DSS understands that they have a incredibly important process -- and also be encouraging to that -- to that department because the burnout in DSS is just unbelievable.
Q. Mr. Price, the Commission received 119 ballot box surveys regarding you, with eight additional comments. The ballot box survey has included
positive comments such as, "Sam was an effective advocate for his client. Mr. Price is an example of how lawyers should conduct themselves. And Sam Price is an excellent lawyer in person. He would make an outstanding Family Court Judge."

Five of the written comments express concern. Three comments indicated that you lack the experience necessary to sit on the Family Court bench because that is not part of your practice in a large amount.

What response would you offer this concern?
A. I would like to know what they think a large amount is. We -- like I said earlier, probably 15 to 17 percent of my income comes from domestic work, but 40 percent of my time goes there. And part of that has to do with -- in a small town practice it's easier early in your career just to get into helping people. And, you know, if they pay you on the back-end, that's wonderful. And if they don't pay you all they owe you, don't hold grudges. In terms of -- I would -- I would submit that I certainly have adequate Family Court experience.
Q. Mr. Price, two comments express concern regarding your age and inability to serve a full term on the court bench -- on the Family Court bench. What
response would you offer this concern?
A. Well, as I've indicated in my opening remarks, I can't change my age. But if -- if elected I can certainly serve a full four and half years and as indicated Judge Rucker was recently reelected and he could only serve six months. So there is precedent for that.
Q. Mr. Price, one comment expressed concern about an event in your past bringing this individual to question your mental health during that time period.

What response would you offer to this concern?
A. Well, I'm sure the concern is an event that happened in the summer of 1984. And let me get to my notes. We had a lady who moved into our neighborhood by the name of Susie Chowlz, sir. As a background, my wife and I have been married since December of 1970. She taught my way through law school and the first several years of law practice she taught English and Spanish at the local high school in Newberry. She was very much an aggressive, independent, working lady.

And then we started having children. We had a child in 1979, had another child in 1981, had another child in 1983, and she went from a teacher
to a stay-at-home mom.
During that time, $I$ was a sole practitioner. We had the normal stresses of young children, you know, that you have in marriages. A sole practice is -- is rags to riches, sometimes you have plenty of money and you can payoff your line of credit. Sometimes you don't have any money and you borrow against your line of credit.

But at any rate this lady who moved into our neighborhood and started attending our church with her family. Basically my wife and I sort of invited her into our home and our lives and she proved to be unstable and she basically kind of emotionally overwhelmed us. And we went through about a three day period where we fell apart as individuals.

And then after that three day period, my wife and I realized this wasn't working out for us so we excused Susie Chowlz, told her to move on. We had hurt some of our family members and our neighbors and friends and comments we made to them. We apologized to them. We got -- went and got counseling for about two months. And that was the end of that.

## Q. Thank you, Mr. Price.

MR. STIMSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that we now move into executive session for further questioning.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do we have a motion for executive session from a member?

SENATOR HEMBREE: So moved.
MR. SAFRAN: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have a motion from Senator Hembree. We have a second. Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: No discussion. We'll move immediately to a vote. All in favor indicate by saying aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it. Okay. We're now in executive session.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. We're back on the record. No votes were taken. Okay.

MR. STIMSON: Thank you, Mr. Price.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Any other questions of counsel?

MR. STIMSON: Well, we just have a few housekeeping issues for you now, Mr. Price.
(By Mr. Stimson)
Q. Since submitting your letter of intent have you sought or received a 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 the process on your behalf?
A. I have not asked anyone, nor am I aware of anyone that has contacted any members of the General Assembly on my behalf.
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 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 am aware that until January 17, I can make
no such contact with anyone and I am -- I have read what the statutory penalties are.

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

The Committee stated in summary, Mr. Price has a wide range of experience in family court matters. He well appreciates the sensitive dynamics of that court and will bring insight and compassion to the job. He has a strong reputation among his peers and a balanced temperament well suited for the role.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Any questions from Committee members?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. There being none, Mr. Price, 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 I thank you for your service and your offering to serve South Carolina.

MR. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, if I may make just one other comment.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. PRICE: This is my second time going through the process. The first time, you know, you -- you kind of stumble through the process. But the second time you get -- have a greater grasp of how tough a job this is to do for the Commission.

And $I$ know that $y^{\prime}$ all do a very good job, it's incredibly time consuming for you and all the various panels that you go through. But
it is such a better way to find competent judges than popular elections. I don't know how those other states do it, but I too thank you for your service and -- and it's just a wonderful thing to keep public elections out of the judiciary, but thank you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do I have a motion to go into executive session?

MR. HITCHCOCK: So moved.
MR. BANNISTER: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have a motion and Representative Bannister enthusiastically seconds. Do we have a discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: No discussion. We
will move immediately to a vote. All in favor indicate by saying aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it.
Okay. We are in executive session.
(Off-the-record executive session.)

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: No votes were taken. No decisions made. Back on the record. And now we move to a vote. And Ms. Brogdon if you want to give instructions of where the ballots are and how we are going to vote.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Representative Bannister.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Since there are only two candidates, I would move that we find them both qualified and nominated, elected by accumulation.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have a motion because there are two candidates to find both of them qualified and nominated by accumulation.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: He wants to elect them by accumulation.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Elected by --
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: I think the General Assembly has to that.

REPRESENTATIVE BANNISTER: Nominated. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: So a motion for qualified and nominated both candidates.

MR. HITCHCOCK: Second.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: A second by Mr.
Hitchcock. Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: There being no discussion we will move immediately to a vote. All in favor indicate by raising your hand.
(Board members vote.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: All opposed.
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. That is
unanimous. You need to fill out your ballot. Do we have a motion from Mr. Hitchcock to go into executive session?

MR. HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do we have a second?
REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: All those in favor
indicate by saying aye.
BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it. We are now in executive session.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: We have come out of
executive session. No votes were taken. No decisions made. Judge Anderson, thank you for appearing before the Commission again. Ms. Brogdon is going to ask you some questions regarding an event, a Democratic Caucus event that allegedly or supposedly you attended on November the 17th -- Thursday, November 17th. So if you could please answer her questions. JUDGE ANDERSON: Yes, sir. EXAMINATION
(By Ms. Brogdon)
Q. Good evening, Judge Anderson.
A. Good evening.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Judge Anderson, just reminding you that you are still under oath from the previous oath. JUDGE ANDERSON: Yes, sir.
(By Ms. Brogdon)
Q. Judge Anderson, because of the concern that your attendance at the reception may form the basis for violation of the South Carolina Code of Judicial Conduct, have you or do you wish to consult with counsel or do you have counsel present?
A. Well, I have consulted with counsel about this. Two of the people I have consulted with are
present, but they are not representing me. They are just here to observe.
Q. Thank you, Judge Anderson. You have in front of you an invitation to the South Carolina Senate Democratic Caucus Fall/End of the Year Members Reception. It was held on Thursday, November 17th, 2016, from 5:30 to 7:30 at Defender Industries. Is that invitation to the event that you attended?
A. I wouldn't know. I've never seen the invitation.
Q. Okay.

MS. BROGDON: I would like to enter the invitation as an exhibit.
[EXHIBIT NO. 19, DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS MEMBERS RECEPTION INVITATION.]
Q. Judge Anderson, could you explain to the Commission the circumstances surrounding your attendance at the event on Thursday, November 17th?
A. If I could start by just thanking y'all for the opportunity to speak to you and I will tell you that in hindsight my actions in visiting Senator Jackson while attending the Caucus -- I am sorry for the concern that $I$ have caused this Committee. I apologize to you. As far as the factual background, I called Antjuan Seawright, who is the individual I always call to get in touch with

Senator Jackson. I told him I just wanted to meet with Senator Jackson about my candidacy.

He told me to come out to the Democratic Caucus Reception at Defender Industries. When he told me that it was at Defender Industries, I called Nicky McCarter who owns Defender Industries and confirmed or asked him if I could come. He says I could definitely come. I asked him if it was a fundraiser just to be sure. He said it wasn't. And even before attending, I also confirmed through Annie Wilson. She also confirmed that wasn't a fundraiser.

I am very familiar with the rules and I wanted to make sure I didn't violate the rules. I went out to the event to speak to Senator Jackson. Antjuan told me that is what $I$ should do. Again, I was there less than 15 minutes. I worked my way through the room and I spoke to people. I pretty well knew everybody in the room. A few Senators, but mostly lobbyists. I worked my way to Senator Jackson speaking to some people and spoke to him. And then worked my way back out. I didn't eat or drink anything.

I didn't talk to anybody about anything political at all. And got this invitation in front
of me -- I didn't purchase anything. I wasn't even told that it was anything involving tickets. Antjuan just told me that is what I should do to meet Senator Jackson. And Nicky McCarter, owner of the place, told me it was fine.

But I understand that my actions have caused concern for the Committee. And again, I sincerely apologize. I've never had trouble like this in all my years of being a judge. I was the counsel for the Ethics Commission. This is the last thing I would like -- I would want to do is be in front of $y^{\prime}$ all concerning ethical concerns.

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

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Okay. Any questions by Commission Members. Mr. Hitchcock. EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Hitchcock)
Q. Judge Anderson, you are familiar with the Judicial Canons, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you're familiar with Canon 5 which talks about -- or which prohibits judges and judicial
candidates -- that says they shall refrain from inappropriate political activity, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And part of one of the Canon A (1) and I believe it is subsection (d) says that a judge or a candidate for election or appointment shall not attend a political gathering.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. That's what it says, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. It doesn't say that they won't attend a fundraiser. It says that they won't attend a political gathering.
A. That's correct.
Q. And as you indicated it was your understanding that this was the Democratic Caucus Reception.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can you explain to me why you would think that that's not a political gathering that would be prohibited by the Judicial Canons for you to attend?
A. Well, I don't want -- I'm here to apologize. But if you ask what I understood at the time, I attend Democratic Caucus meetings at the House and the Senate on a regular basis and so do all the other judicial candidates. Those are called Caucus meetings, more narrowly defined than are
receptions, a meeting for which there is a specific purpose. Whereas a reception is a social gathering. And I also attend receptions. We are not specifically invited, judicial candidates. At the time, I perceived as Democratic Caucus Reception. I was aware of no political angle to it. A reception is a social gathering. If there was concern about me attending it, I misconstrued.
Q. Well, by its very nature it's called the Democratic Caucus Reception. So by virtue of what it's called give you some concern that it is a political event. It's not a -- I don't think it would necessarily matter if it was a Democratic or Republican, the fact that it's the Democratic Caucus Reception shows -- it seems to me that it would demonstrate that there is a partisan, a politically partisan element to it. So my concern is that you not recognizing that without not giving you red flags as to why or sending up red flags as to why you shouldn't attend.
A. Well, as I said it is called a Democratic Caucus meeting that we attend in the mornings at the House. It is a similar phraseology. And a political event was not a reception it was -- I'm looking for the definition of a political
organization which I'm familiar with that definition. It referred to a political party or group which exists to further the candidacy -- the appointment or election of a candidate to a political office.
Q. And you don't think that one of the Houses in the General Assembly that their Caucuses are political organizations, I mean, their activities are regulated by the campaign finance laws. There is limits on the amounts that can be contributed to them, there is amounts that -- that they can contribute to other candidates within their Caucus, I mean, so --
A. In hindsight, I wouldn't have gone to this. You know, I wish I hadn't. And I apologize. The same concepts that you give for this particular Democratic Caucus Reception applies to other Caucus events. The receptions that we go to at night are put on by special interest groups.
Q. But that's not prohibited by Judicial Canons. It says political gatherings. During the legislative session, if you were a judicial candidate, would you think it would be permissible to attend a Republican Party reception or a Democratic Caucus reception that would be held at the Palmetto Club
or various other places in town where they have those receptions?
A. I wouldn't now, but $I$ think a proper way of analyzing any of this is determining the purpose of the meeting and the purpose is to promote a political agenda that judges shouldn't attend.
Q. You said you talked to people when you where there. What did you talk to them about?
A. It was "hello" and "how are you doing."
Q. Did you talk to anyone about candidacy?
A. The only person $I$ talked to about my candidacy was Senator Jackson. The Senator from Orangeburg, I might have talked to him about that I was nominated. With Senator Jackson, I didn't talk in depth about my candidacy. I let him know that I had been nominated. I'm from Richland County. And if he had any questions that $I$ would be glad to talk to him about it. He told me he would let me know.
Q. And before you went, the people that you talked to about whether or not you could go was the -- I can't remember the gentleman's name, the person who owns Defender Corporation.
A. Nicky McCarter.
Q. Okay. And Annie Wilson who is a lobbyist.
A. Annie I -- Jana Shealy was going to talk to Annie. And so she had asked Annie for me if it was a fundraiser. And Annie told her no and she relayed that back to me.

MR. HITCHCOCK: I have nothing further at this time. CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you. Representative Rutherford.

REP. RUTHERFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## EXAMINATION

(By Rep. Rutherford)
Q. Judge, did you call staff? Who was your staff lawyer?
A. Ms. Brogdon.
Q. Did you call Ms. Brogdon and asked whether it was okay to attend the event since you called Nicky McCarter and Annie?
A. No, sir.
Q. Because you have been a judge for 20 years, you said this has never happened before and you have come to Democratic and Republican Caucus meetings but you -- have you ever been to a Democratic or Republican Caucus retreat?
A. No, sir.
Q. So because this was an unusual event in your 20 years, if you've never been, did it occur to you to call Ms. Brogdon -- when did you know that you were going? Was it he called you last minute and said to come, is that --
A. I called him up and he recommended that I come -- I really wasn't going to do it. I called him up the day of and asked him about it again. He said that would be fine.
Q. So how far in advance did you talk to him when he said you need to come to this event?
A. I don't remember specifically. I think it was about two or three days. It was long enough in advance to have called Ms. Brogdon, if I thought I should have. When you say "attended the event" my purpose was simply to go out there and speak to Senator Jackson. Attending the event, I was there but I didn't stay there very long at all. I fulfilled what $I$-- the purpose for which $I$ went. Because I go to many receptions and I stay there for a lot longer than 15 minutes.
Q. And Antjuan Seawright, you know him in what capacity?
A. As Senator Jackson's right-hand man.
Q. Do you know that he is also the political director

## for the Senate Democratic Caucus?

A. No, sir.
Q. Do you know how to reach Senator Jackson on his cell phone?
A. If I had it, I would, but I don't have it.

REP. RUTHERFORD: No further questions.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Representative Bannister.

REP. BANNISTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. EXAMINATION
(By Rep. Bannister)
Q. Judge, did you know at the time that you were going out to the event that it was not open to the public?
A. No, sir. I don't even know that to this day. Annie, $I$ understand from her she wasn't there for any Caucus or anything like that; she just attended. No, I did not know that.
Q. Okay.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Hitchcock.
FURTHER EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Hitchcock)
Q. Judge Anderson, what is your understanding of why judges are prohibiting from going to political gatherings?
A. To avoid the perception that they are taking a political view regarding one side or the other.
Q. So it's to protect the perception of the impartiality and independence of the judiciary, right?
A. Yes, I would agree with that.
Q. So it is really whether you attend or not, not necessarily how long you attend or why you are there because it is the appearance, isn't it? That the Canon is trying to protect against, not -- it doesn't necessarily matter how long you are there, it's prohibiting your presence and the perception that that causes in the greater public, right?
A. I think $I$ would agree with that by in large, yes.
Q. Well, you --
A. When you say "the perception" everything that I observed when I went there -- the event had all the trappings of any other social reception. So -- and the people I saw there all knew me. I don't think any of them would have thought that I was there for anything other than going to meet this Senator. I don't think they would have perceived, but I am to avoid the appearance. I agree with you on that.
Q. Well, certainly you didn't tell everybody that was in attendance that that's why you were there, that
that's the only reason you were there?
A. No, I didn't.

MR. HITCHCOCK: No further questions.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Safran.
MR. SAFRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
EXAMINATION
(By Mr. Safran)
Q. Let me make sure $I$ understand a few things. One, is the invitation in front of you, is something at least until now you weren't aware of.
A. Absolutely, not.
Q. You didn't receive it? You didn't solicit it, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And I think basically you were trying to somehow connect with Senator Jackson before you actually went out there that day?
A. Yes.
Q. And this was something that you more or less had been speaking with Mr. Seawright about?
A. Well, I called him just one time.
Q. Okay. Well, that's --
A. Well, I called him again to make sure when the reception began.
Q. Well, I guess my question is, at least you
identified Mr. Seawright as somebody that at least from somehow your experience was the person that you needed to talk to in order to somehow meet with Senator Jackson?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And is that from prior experience, I guess, maybe in the past when you go --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. Let me ask you also as far as this purpose, was he the one that suggested that you come out there?
A. Absolutely.
Q. You didn't ask -- you weren't inviting yourself basically?
A. I wasn't my idea at all.
Q. And ultimately you at least went to some precaution to try and make sure at least in your mind that this was not something that you shouldn't do at least by contacting to find out, I think, from your standpoint you were looking kind of the linchpin was whether or not you had to -- there was some fundraising aspect of it?
A. Correct.
Q. And you were assured that wasn't the case?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. So basically, when you got out there, from what I'm hearing, you went directly to Senator Jackson to do whatever Mr. Seawright would have setting up for you?
A. Well, I can't say directly because he was on the other side of the room.
Q. Well, when I say directly, that's where you were headed to.
A. I worked my way around the room, got to him, spoke to a few people on the way out, and left.
Q. More or less spoke to him very benignly from what I'm hearing.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And then you left.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And until you heard something later, was there any concern in your mind about you having kind of broached or actually maybe gone to some level that you weren't suppose to?
A. Until then, no.
Q. Okay. You mentioned earlier that you have been to a number of different Caucus events; is that fair?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And I think you mentioned in these situations when you're dealing with a Caucus you're dealing with a
group of politicians who happen to all be of the same persuasion?
A. Everything that we go to as judicial candidates is to meet politicians.
Q. Right.
A. So in some form or another. So you say "political gathering" everything we go to is in a political arena somehow or another.
Q. And I guess you mentioned earlier that at least in your mind this was somehow akin to when you go to say the House Caucus meetings that they have?
A. Correct.
Q. Or I am assuming you have been to Republican Caucus meetings, also?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You have been to receptions, also?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And again, those are un-invited trips to
receptions, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And they are un-invited trips to the Caucus meetings?
A. Well, the -- they are open to the public.
Q. Open. All right. And I think you were asked a question earlier, did you have any idea whether or
not this function was open to the public or not open to the public? Was there any indication going in that this was not something that people from the public were able to come to?
A. I didn't know one way or the other on that. Antjuan told me to go to it and just to make sure I didn't barge in to something I wasn't suppose to, that's why I called Nicky. I asked Nicky if it was okay that I attended.
Q. Now, I think you have actually answered some questions that more or less indicate that certainly if you look at this thing in terms of the Canon, that you can see that this is something that frankly you shouldn't do? You understand that?
A. I wish I hadn't gone.
Q. All right.
A. I talked to a professor at law school who indicated that from a Canon standpoint, he didn't think it was a violation. I certainly -- my perspective on this is at the time I didn't know. When I say, talked to two different attorneys that practice law in this area, told me they didn't believe it was a violation. It doesn't matter what I believe, it matters that $y^{\prime}$ all are concerned that it's a violation then that's the issue.
Q. All right. And I guess we all understand about the whole story of hindsight. But I guess my point is when you went out there, from what I'm hearing from you, there was no indication in your mind that you were violating anything, but now in reflection you do recognize that it's not something you would want to do again?
A. Absolutely.
Q. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Anybody else? Any other questions? Senator Malloy.

EXAMINATION
(By Senator Malloy)
Q. First let me say $I^{\prime} m$ glad $I$ was not at the meeting. Judge, about what time did you arrive at the Democratic Caucus?
A. It was after 6:00. I did it on the way home.
Q. When you say "after 6:00", what time is that? Like about what time?
A. 6:15.
Q. About 6:15?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you know Mr. Seawright?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You said earlier that you thought that Mr .

Seawright was Senator Jackson's right-hand man.
A. That's my understanding.
Q. And you did not know he is the political director for the Caucus?
A. I didn't know that before. I guess Antjuan is moving up.
Q. Its been that ever since he -- for the last couple of years, several years. Had you reached out to the Senator from Richland's assistant in his office?
A. Senator, the way I always understood --
Q. I understand, just answer the question --
A. Oh, no. No, sir.
Q. Did you reach out to the assistant in his office?
A. No, sir.
Q. Do you know where his church is? Did you reach out to him at his church?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Had not reached him there?
A. Yes, sir. Or, no, sir, I didn't. I called Mr. Seawright.
Q. And how many times had you talked to Mr. Seawright beforehand?
A. Talked to him every now and then. But are you talking about for this issue?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. On this issue, $I$ called him once and that's when $I$ was told to go to the Caucus reception. And then I called him again to ask him what time.
Q. And the time that you talked to him beforehand, when was that? First time you talked to him about the reception?
A. I can't --
Q. Was it days before or a week before?
A. It was days.
Q. Days. I think -- so help me out with getting there. You said the senator from Richland was on the other side of the room?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And so when you enter, it's a clubhouse, correct? A. Yes, sir.
Q. It's a body of water on one side of it.
A. I never saw a body of water.
Q. Never saw a body of water. Okay. So you enter into the door closest to the road? Do you remember where you entered?
A. There was a path. If $I$ wasn't careful, my wheelchair would have flipped over when I was driving down it. It was night; I didn't see a whole lot. I certainly didn't see a body of water.
Q. And so when you came into contact with people before you got to the senator from Richland?
A. When $I$ came in, as I remember, there was two long tables. Senator Jackson was on the other side of the room. So I had to go around those tables to get to him. That's how I maneuvered. With my wheelchair, I had to stop and wait for not to talk over -- so a lot of times $I$ just sit there and just wait.
Q. You ultimately got a chance to talk to the senator from Richland?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How long did $y^{\prime}$ all talk?
A. Two or three minutes.
Q. Two or three minutes.
A. Not long.
Q. Okay. And you indicated you were there for about 15 minutes.
A. At most 15. I really only think it was 10.
Q. Okay.
A. I say 15 because $I^{\prime} m$ under oath and $I$ want to make sure $I$ don't mess up.
Q. I understand. I'm trying to help you get this story out because $I$ want to make certain that we get it right. I want you to be able to tell us any
and everything that you need to because this is important. How many senators and who did you talk to while you were there? What senators did you speak to?
A. I talked to Senator Matthews.
Q. Senator Matthews from Orangeburg?
A. Yes, sir. And Senator Jackson. Oh, I did speak to Senator Hutto.
Q. And did you --
A. Oh, well, when you say "speak" --
Q. Speak, talk --
A. On the way out, I saw Senator Bright and gave her a hug, but that conversation was 10 seconds at the most. I hugged her and said "hello."
Q. Did you hand out any business cards there?
A. Oh, no, sir.
Q. I'm just trying to get -- did you ask any senators that -- would you be with me at the appropriate time?
A. No, sir.
Q. Did you ask any senators to consider counting for you?
A. No, sir. I didn't ask that at all.
Q. When you say you talked to Mr. McCarter, when you asked him if it was okay for you come, were you
asking him was it okay for you to come to his facility or were you asking him if it was okay in another way to come? Tell me why you asked Mr. McCarter.
A. At the time I thought -- when Antjuan told me to come the reception at Defender Industries, as a judge I shouldn't assume things, but I just assumed that Nicky was the one putting on the reception. So I thought the proper thing to do was to call Mr. McCarter and ask him if I could come to his reception. That was my perspective.
Q. You indicated earlier -- you said that Mr .

Seawright said to come to the Democratic Caucus Reception?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So the lady Ms. Wilson, she is a lobbyist?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Do you know if she received an invitation?
A. She never said one way or another.
Q. And do know whether or not she is a member of the Caucus?
A. Well, I have since talked to her and she said "no."
Q. She said she is not a member?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Or her lobbying group is not a member?
A. She said she's not a member. I think -- I can't remember exactly how she worded it, but I think someone that they represent is maybe a member, but she's not.
Q. Okay. Is her lobbying team a member; do you know?
A. No, sir.
Q. You don't know that?
A. No.
Q. After meeting with senator from Richland, did you recognize other senators there?
A. The ones $I$ just listed.
Q. You saw no other senators?
A. I saw Senator Jackson, Senator Margie Bright Matthews and Senator Hutto.
Q. And I thought you said the other Senator Jackson, I mean, the other Senator Matthews?
A. Senator Matthews from Orangeburg.
Q. From Orangeburg, John Matthews.
A. Yes.
Q. Senator Bright Matthews. There is two of them.
A. Yes.
Q. So once you saw the senator from Richland, you made your way out. Did you talk to people after you were leaving?
A. I talked a little bit. I knew everybody in the
room. I really went there more for a purpose. I fulfilled my purpose so I just spoke to people on the way out and made my way out.

SENATOR MALLOY: That's all the questions I have at this time.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Are there any other questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: There being none. Judge Anderson, thank you for coming and answering questions. We appreciate you clarifying what happened. We don't have any further inquiry at this time.

JUDGE ANDERSON: Thank you all. I deeply apologize.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do you have a statement you want to make further at this point?

JUDGE ANDERSON: Like I said in hindsight I wouldn't even think about doing this again. I certainly will -- I have already stated to Counsel Brogdon, if there is any question at all in the future, $I$ would absolutely ask for advice. I just misconstrued the events in front of me.

CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Thank you.
(Candidate excused.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Do I have a motion for executive session?

MR. HITCHCOCK: So moved.
SENATOR HEMBREE: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Mr. Hitchcock and
second from Senator Hembree. Any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: No discussion. We will immediately vote. Everybody indicate by saying aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: Opposed.
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: The ayes have it.
(Off-the-record executive session.)
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: No action was taken. No votes were taken. We have a motion from Senator Hembree that we recede until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Second.
CHAIRMAN CAMPSEN: All those in favor indicate by saying aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: "Aye."
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