

Mandy Matney 00:03

Hello and Happy Tuesday. First, I want to say thank you to everyone who joined the Talk Shop live virtual event on Monday, Jenny Fisher and I sold out signed copies. But don't worry if you missed it. We are adding a few more for anyone who could not make the live broadcast on the horizon. I hope that you consider attending our University of South Carolina event in Columbia, South Carolina on Monday, November 13. Our book signing launch day at Barnes and Noble on Hilton Head November 14, or our special Premium Members Only event in Bluffton, South Carolina on November 16. Check lunasharkmedia.com/events for the most current schedule. We have a really great episode for you today. We are angry, we are disgusted. And though we disagree on some of the finer points on the effect of what's happening, Liz, Eric and I review Dick and Jim's latest attempt to blow up the system on behalf of Alex Murdaugh. You know the murder liar and thief. We are going to be talking about their judicial terrorism on true sunlight this week before today we discussed the core effect of the writ of prohibition they filed last week with the Supreme Court in their attempt to have judge Clifton Newman removed from all of Alex Murdaugh's cases moving forward. Team Murdaugh has one solitary goal right now and that is to lay Elyx November 27 state trial on financial charges. Even though he has already admitted to those crimes, they need to get him over the finish line and Federal Court where they seem to have successfully manipulated the US Attorney's Office into doing their bidding so that Ellie can get out of state prison. Dick and Jim are taking no prisoners with this latest filing to the detriment of Judge Newman's well earned



reputation as America's judge and we are not having it. Also, today we talk about a very important hearing this week. The hearing to qualify prosecutor David Miller as a candidate for Circuit Court Judge David Miller is who cut that sweet deal for accused rapist Bo and Turner. That hearing is set for Wednesday at 3:45pm. However, we will not be able to live broadcast it. We will tell you all about why on True Sunlight this week. This hearing is not only important because it gives Bo and Turner's victims of voice. It also puts the spotlight on the judicial merit selection commission and its members specifically lawyer legislators Todd Rutherford, who got David Miller to help get a client sentence reduced and Senator Luke Rankin and Representative Merle Smith, you might recognize their names as two of the powerful lawyer legislators who nine of our 16 solicitors wrote an open letter to calling for Rutherford and all other lawyer legislator members of the JMSC to be removed. This is where the change needs to happen. Starting right here. Everything about David Miller's quest to become a state judge is emblematic of the backdoor dealings that allowed someone like Alex Murdaugh to thrive. It's important that every member of the JMSC know that we are watching. Let's get into it

Eric Bland 03:42 Cups up guys.

Liz Farrell 03:43 Cups up Eric. How you doing?



Eric Bland 03:45 I'm doing great. Liz. Good Mandy busy week

Mandy Matney 03:48 last week again. Yeah. And Halloween.

Eric Bland 03:52

We had a great Halloween. It was fun. We gave out candy and the dogs were big hits. The new dog, I don't think it's been around a lot of people. So when they came up in costume, she would run and hide behind the chair and bark and just look but Estelle is an old pro at it and we gave out good candy. We gave out Heath bars and some bigger Reese's cups and licorice. I like strawberry licorice. So we gave that out. That's half the stuff. And I have neighborhood little neighborhood kids. No, I like Milk Duds and tootsie rolls so they go out and get them and then they bring them back to my house and give me the Milk Duds and Tootsie Rolls.

Liz Farrell 04:27 That's really cute.

Mandy Matney 04:28 You have a deal going?

Eric Bland 04:29 Yeah. So a lot of kids go to you, Liz.



Liz Farrell 04:34

Yeah, there's a lot I live in a really good trick or treating neighborhoods. So that was one of the first things I noticed before I bought the house was that it kind of reminded me of the neighborhood in et and then also Stranger Things like that. You see a lot of kids on their bikes. Yeah, so I knew it was going to be crazy. And I could see on Next Door that people were talking about how much they spent on candy and like how much like how much candy they got. So I had to pack it up. Early even though I went to the store three times to make sure I had enough candy I mean I had what I thought was a lot of candy but I don't know they just about wiped me out

Eric Bland 05:08

so you turn the lights off and you hit your kitchen and it makes your no lights I think

Liz Farrell 05:15

things are different these days there because one I don't Well first of all, I don't know how to turn off the light in front of my house because it's a smart light and it goes on by itself and I haven't that's on my list of things to figure out is how to turn that off. Because it goes on at certain times. Right it's already programmed and then the other thing is because we all have this is a very heavily camera area now I don't know if it's true in your neighborhood as well but I have cameras all around my house and in my doorbell as do most of my neighbors so kids these days and I don't know if you noticed on tick tock guys where it was like



the take one thing like you know, here's a bunch of candy take one and the kids are caught on the doorbell camera like not taking one or coming to an empty bowl and putting their own candy in the bowl. So I don't think kids I didn't get like doorbell kids like I sat outside for a lot of it and just met them at the driveway and gave out candy that way because

Eric Bland 06:07

you dressed up? No. How about you Mandy?

Mandy Matney 06:10

Our whole family dressed up? We decided to be the judicial system. And David was a detective who failed up. But he was just like a sketchy mustache, like a sketchy detective. And it was funny because our next door neighbor is a police officer. And he came over just laughing so hard and I was dressed up as a judge. And our dogs were dressed up as a lawyer and an inmate. And yeah, our next door neighbor who is a police officer came over and was laughing so hard. And David explained to him what his costume was and he got a kick out of it. And yeah, we had a great time. We have a big Halloween street too. But everybody in our neighborhood puts tables at the end of their driveways and kind of all the adults mingle between everybody and everybody comes over and it's really fun. I met several not met but like I don't really hang out with my neighbors a whole lot. I hung out actually hung out with them on Tuesday and it was a good time. Yeah, it's good to have good neighbors.



Eric Bland 07:19

I was telling the kids in the neighborhood where we grew up north leading into Halloween night you had soaked night and you had toilet paper night and then you had Mischief Night and they don't have that down south. Did you have that up in Boston list? So nightmares? Sure. Yeah,

Liz Farrell 07:34

heck yeah. Yeah, I got into some trouble.

Eric Bland 07:37

How about you Mandy in Kansas before Halloween?

Mandy Matney 07:41

Specifically? Yeah, the

Eric Bland 07:42

four days before it starts off with soap nights. Some nights it's egg night. Toilet paper. You know when you go out and you the neighbors trees are all with toilet paper. It's it must be a northern thing. And it's

Liz Farrell 07:54

just night is Halloween night though. I mean, for me it was

Eric Bland 07:57 I thought Mischief Night was the night before



Liz Farrell 08:00

I don't know we did it on Halloween but you dress up in costumes when you do it right. And

Eric Bland 08:03

miss shift I did get in a dog poop light and on fire and you know, in a brown bag and then ring the doorbell and then they come out and they stamp the poop bag, you know stuff like that.

Liz Farrell 08:17

Well, my friend actually got maced during Mischief Night when I was I think I was 14 or 15 and it was the son of one of the mafia guys so there was nothing she killed that's not good to do now. It wasn't good. So she couldn't she couldn't really there's no recourse for what

Eric Bland 08:33

you remember Mandy they would soap to your your parents windows in the car and they come out in the morning and you couldn't see you'd have to wash it off and all that stuff. No, they like our western who's Midwesterners? Don't do anything fun. Well, shaving cream did

Liz Farrell 08:47

you do shaving cream Mandy where you put the pin and the barber saw and you'd melt that and then Yeah,



Mandy Matney 08:51

and like we TPT each other's homes and like when you were on a sports team in Kansas City like the moms there was always like a mom of the sports team and you would like I was on cross country and it was like a tradition when you do cross country. The girls all TP all the boys' houses but like a mom drives you okay? And I look back on that. And I'm like, I can't believe like parents actually participated in this. I would be so angry as an adult if I got TPWD and like my house was color covered and toilet paper eggs are the worst thing. They are for sure eggs, that's just that is straight up vandalism. You're actually ruining things. But in my neighborhood, we had like fountains and I remember teenagers used to always come and soak them and then the whole neighborhood would look like suds and my parents would get all angry.

Liz Farrell 09:48

Yeah, it's crazy to think of the things that we were allowed to do as kids now it's completely different. But like I said, more cameras the better. Can't get away with anything. So I'm all about that right? Yeah, especially in a world like the one we've been dealing with for the last four years, when everyone's trying to get away with everything at all times, it seems you

Eric Bland 10:06

Remember in the summers, like, we'd leave the house at like 9:30 in the morning and maybe not come home until five, the parents wouldn't know where you're, you're somewhere in the neighborhood. Somebody



said, Oh, I saw you at the Langhorne house. He was at the NFL house. And you know, you never see your parents, you eat lunch somewhere at somebody's house, and you just you're playing whatever, right? Can't do that my kids never would let them just go roam the neighborhood like we did.

Liz Farrell 10:31

I was taking the tea at 12 years old. So by myself. So when you think about that, it's kind of like, I would never let a 12 year old do that. But it's just how it was. Yeah, big day sometimes, for sure. So we should probably get into what we want to talk about today, because it's a pretty big deal. You know, it's huge and huge. One of the things I think there's a couple of things I want to touch on. So I just wanted to tell you guys up front, because there's just so much but one of the things I want to talk about is a is this the worst thing Dick and Jim have done thus far. And then the second thing is whether this is going to delay the trial, because obviously this is not this is like a multipurpose tool for Dick and Jim, this writ of prohibition that they filed last week. It also you know, it serves the purpose of getting Judge Newman removed from their case, but it also delays things I believe. And then the other thing I guess, let's just start with this. Eric, did you see this coming? This rate of prohibition? The prohibition really no, no,

Eric Bland 11:25

I saw we talked about it since September, since the guilty plea. And then, you know, Judge Newman scheduling the trial in Beaufort for



November 27. We said that, you know, Dick was going to make the motion to disgualify Judge Newman, or he was going to cut off his foot if he made the motion to judge Newman and it wasn't granted what I didn't see is them forum shopping. And most of the time 99% of the time, in fact, I've never seen this. It's always done in front of the judge. First, you give the judge the respect to put on record, why they're not in conflict, why that's not the appearance of impropriety. That's the standard if the judges presiding over the case and continues to preside over the case, does it represent an appearance of impropriety on the judges part? And most of the time the judges don't recuse themselves. They give reasons why they shouldn't recuse themselves. They evidently sent a letter to judge Newman, but he didn't respond. I think he was waiting for them to make a motion because he wanted it to be in open court and part of the record. They formed shops the same way they did with Judge Gergle on the issue of having the federal government commandeer the receivers funds. And we know how that ended. You know, again, we talked about this last week that appellate courts aren't really set up for evidentiary hearings and things like that. But the Supreme Court does have original jurisdiction in certain things. And this is an archaic motion called a writ of prohibition, which basically asked them to bypass Judge Newman and look at the objective facts. And we were talking about it before we came on the air, some of the comments that he made and some of his appearances at Cleveland State and different places. And supposedly, you know, they didn't fault him for doing that. But they suggested that well, he thought he was going to be retiring, and therefore, you know, he probably let his guard down.



Well, I didn't. I never expected that just because he was retiring, that he was going to run away from the murder cases. I think he was going to take senior status the way justice told senior status and a lot of other judges, and he was going to stay in on the Murdaugh cases. And I think, you know, it's going to be an uphill battle because Judge Beatty was the one who appointed Judge Newman, an uphill battle for who Deke Dick and Jim, I think, Okay, I think it you know, it's it. I don't think they want to have the lasting last act of Judge Newman be a public record that he acted in a way that made him in conflict with presiding over the case. We all know how it ended for Judge Manning with the Jeroid Price. It was not a great send off, and I would be really surprised if the Supreme Court given that it's Judge Kittredge. And there's some other conservative justices up there that they would say that Judge Newman is in conflict. I think that they may remand it for an evidentiary hearing, although, you know, are they going to bring judge Newman in? Is he going to give an affidavit? Is he going to explain that he still can be objective and fair and impartial notwithstanding some of the allegations? Look, I don't I think it was a bad argument to say just because he said those things at sentencing, that that makes him prejudicial, because when anybody pleads guilty, or anybody is found guilty, and a judge sentences them, they say really harsh things, you know, the things that Judge Gergel said, and that didn't preclude judge Gergel from hearing other things from Russell Laffitte and different things like that. But the bigger issue is going to be the Cleveland State speech in today's show that I think that's where the rubber is going to hit the road.



Liz Farrell 14:58

Let's talk about that because Mandy You know, a couple of episodes ago on True Sunlight podcast, we broke down some of what Judge Newman said to his alma mater, Cleveland State and to the Today Show. And obviously, there's so basically the core argument here that Dick and Jim are making is that you can have something as judicial bias, but you can't have personal bias. And there's obviously a fine line, I guess, between the two for them, and what they're saying Judge Newman said at Cleveland State, and on the Today Show, they're saying it's personal bias. But I, I'm gonna tell you, I read this, this is a 265 page document, I read it and I underlined every misleading statement or mis characterization with a blue line. And this document now looks like a piece of notebook paper, like, you know, the ones with like the blue lines, because it's a lot. So one of the things that they're doing is mischaracterizing I believe these statements that he made, because a lot of what he said was said in the sentencing, it's just a different way of saying, and beyond that, I think we have to also stress that like the jury was not the jury anymore, at the point that Judge Newman said these things, meaning that he wasn't congratulating the jury. So basically, they're accusing Judge Newman of congratulating the jury for reaching the correct verdict. Mandy was there any part of this that had you worried that this could be a problem?

Mandy Matney 16:18

No, and actually reading it again and reading it once last week. And then for the second time, I just got more angry the second time I read



it, because I feel for Judge Newman that he's now in this position where he, it looks like he's going to have to defend himself one way or another unless I don't I don't know what's going to happen. But I also just don't like, again, the way that the press has handled this as just like this legitimate person is asking for something very legitimate. And and then this actually very much in which I'm saying, Alex Murdaugh is not a legitimate person. That's insane into put judge Newman's career in the crossfire and his legacy in the crossfire, and like Liz was saying earlier, before we started the show, we were talking about how, like, they kind of sugarcoat it a little bit with Newman like they don't go all the way is they're not going for throats in it. But it's still bad. And it's still to

Eric Bland 17:24

headshot Don't kid yourself. Yes.

Mandy Matney 17:27 It's horrible.

Eric Bland 17:28

You're going against the judge? No, no, no, no, no, no, no, that's not

Liz Farrell 17:32

Yeah, it was more that it was manipulative. So I think what I was saying was that it's throughout it, what they do is that thing that you do when you're trying to win an argument that, you know, you don't have the facts on your side about like with so for instance, like they'll say, like



Judge Newman knew he was retiring. So you know, perhaps in his mind, this is why he went on the Today Show, they'll say, you know, Judge Newman, this is what his defense would be, and it's understandable, but you know, they're there. It's actually we're gonna take it this way instead. So it's manipulative throughout but where it is not a headshot Eric is at the very end, when they talk about how ordinarily, when you make these kinds of accusations there would be an investigation into judicial misconduct, but they don't want that. Alex believes that Judge Newman is a great judge. They don't want him to get in trouble for it. They just want him off the case. That's all you know, and it's just a very manipulatively written brief. I guess this is what we call a brief. I'm not even sure it's just very manipulative. One of the things though the mischaracterizations like, what has me worried, I'll be honest, is the part where they say that he congratulated the jury, because he said to them, I applaud you on the decision that you made. Eric, I've talked to a few people about this now, and they're not

Eric Bland 18:53

worried. They mean that he didn't mean that right. Okay.

Liz Farrell 18:57

Can you talk about that, then? Because what this is one of the main arguments they're making, and perhaps I think, in my opinion, one of the strongest, which is that he congratulated the jury and there's it seems pretty explicit that it says you cannot give any sort of congratulations to the jury. I forgot what it says specifically, but what



Eric Bland 19:12

he meant was the 12 people with differing backgrounds and different life experiences and being away from their family and being in a tense situation of six and a half weeks could collectively come together and freely and with expression, state what they saw and they believed and reach a unanimous verdict. That is something to be congratulated. You have 12 Different people who may look at something totally different than the way that the person next to him would look like and all he was doing was saying I congratulate you for doing what your O said you would do which was look at this be objective and then reach a unanimous verdict if you could, he didn't have to Alan charge them. He didn't have to die. under my charge them and they they followed his instructions and reached a unanimous verdict.

Liz Farrell 20:06

Well, let me read to you what he said. So first, what the Canon three B 10 says a judge shall not commend or criticize jurors for their verdict other than an A court order or opinion in a proceeding, but may express appreciation to jurors for their service to the judicial system and the community. But he said, So I applaud you all for as a group and as a unit and individually evaluating the evidence and coming to a proper conclusion. This is according to the writ of prohibition. Right. Yeah, that's

Mandy Matney 20:33

the process that's congratulating them on process was



Liz Farrell 20:37

so what do you make of proper conclusion, a proper conclusion

Eric Bland 20:40 of unanimity? That could have been unanimity of of not guilty?

Mandy Matney 20:44

I think proper is just any conclusion that they would all agree on. Okay.

Liz Farrell 20:49

Well, good. I mean, that's the part that has me a little bit worried, but I've been told not to worry. Okay.

Eric Bland 20:53

You know, sometimes you're in, you're in extemporaneously speaking, okay. And you choose a word, it may have been the B minus words instead of the a plus word, but it's got to be in context. This it's not easy. Most murder cases have a dynamite charge. Okay. Except criminal cases, except Sam Backman free. They came back in the same four hours a jury and they held him guilty of all the charges. But most of the time, there are differing opinions, especially when you have a Sikh six and a half week trial, and the judge has to Alan charge them or dynamite charge and try to convince people to listen to each other and be cooperative and let people speak. Evidently, that took place in the in the jury room, and he congratulated him



Liz Farrell 21:35

for it. Yeah. And there was no Allen charge in the right. Yeah, there was no Allen charge in the rustle of HR trial. Right.

Mandy Matney 21:40

No, but they obviously the judge, I think the judge had to go back there twice. What was it somebody needed a medicine, there was like a bunch of issues going on? And

Eric Bland 21:52

yeah, it wasn't, wasn't that they couldn't reach out? Yeah, I

Mandy Matney 21:55

mean, I reached that point key that you guys came together swiftly and efficiently. And I congratulate you. And I congratulate you for making it through the process, because this whole thing has been absolutely crazy. And it was it was insane. Very, it was six weeks of insanity.

Eric Bland 22:15

There was a bomb scare, there was COVID.

Mandy Matney 22:17

Yeah, and I don't blame Judge Newman at all for saying congratulations to them. Because it was an amazing thing that like, Oh, my God, and this world of everybody is taking everybody's words apart constantly. And you cannot get anybody to agree on anything that 12 jurors were



able to come together so quickly and make that conclusion. I do think that that's an amazing thing. And again, going back to like they're accusing him of personal bias, personal bias in the the definition of bias is coming to a conclusion and an unfair way there has to be an it typically, usually in an unfair way is like the definition. So Nudelman coming to the conclusion based on the facts of Alex Murdaugh being guilty, I think is different than he thinks that they're they're trying to make it like a personal vendetta that Newman always had. But Newman sat back and we watched him and we watched him kind of get more and more intolerant of Dick and Jim and their shenanigans throughout the trial. He was very, very patient with him at the beginning. And I mean, he really did hear out everything that everybody had to say, and guilty as guilty. And I don't I again, I feel horrible that Judge Newman now has to defend his legacy that was also so good. And the reason why it was so good. It's why he was picked in the first place. And I think we have to talk about that, like the South Carolina Supreme Court said, this is our guy, this is our guy that will be completely unbiased. This is our guy who will sit back and show the world that he that the South Carolina judicial system can be fair, and for them to now have to go back on that and feel pressure to reverse that decision. It just makes the entire thing so chaotic.

Liz Farrell 24:10

And what's funny about that, Mandy is that I think Dick celebrated the choice of Judge Newman to be honest with you, like because of Judge Newman's history in sentencing and maybe like a pro defendant,



maybe he's seen a little bit more as like he's definitely seen as somebody who's fair, but certainly I think as maybe generally in his career a little bit more pro defendant when it came to criminal cases are a little bit more open to hearing that somebody wasn't guilty and that they were being set up. So I think when Dec went into this when Justice Beatty Chief Justice Beatty assigned a judge named to the case, I honestly think Dick and Jim saw that as a win. And I would even question whether that's something that was on their wish list was to get Judge Newman. It wasn't until judge Newman started ruling against them that they had the problem right. And then they tried to get they had Judge Lee come in because on a technicality that she was at the time the judge who oversaw the grand jury and statements. So technically, she could hear his volunteering. Now it was odd, but they did it. And they tried to explain away like it was nothing like no big problem, when when Judge Newman started rolling against them, it's when they had the problem, which brings us to Eric's point, which is that like, clearly their judge shopping here, what I want to talk about, though, is whether this is going to delay the trial, because like you said, Eric, Dick would cut off his feet to delay the trial. And I want to know, that effectively has happened now. So we'll talk about that we will be right back.

Eric Bland 25:38

So what we don't know is how Judge Newman is going to defend himself. So the Attorney General is obviously going to have to be one of his defenders and say that he's not in conflict, and they're going to have



to file a response to the bread of prohibition, I would think I don't think they're going to agree that he is in conflict, but judge Newman himself has a voice. And is he going to, in essence, represent himself? Or is he going to get a lawyer who's going to come in and represent judge Newman? That's going to be the interesting thing? Again, we were waiting to see what was the process going to be on the motion for a new trial? Are they going to, you know, interview all these jurors, and they're going to bring them in? We don't know. We were waiting for a status conference. Now that's pushed to the background. And so what is this Supreme Court hearing gonna look like? Are they going to take it on? Or are they going to say we want this to be deferred back to judge Newman, and we want a full record on court why you think he's in conflict? And he has the right to rule and say, Yes, I agree. I'm going to step aside. And some judges do sometimes I have, you know, when I wrote to Judge Carmen Manuel, she agreed that she can no longer and ever again, hear anything from Bland Rector, given the fact that that I filed a grievance against her. So she agreed that it would be improper for her to, to preside over maybe Judge Newman will say, okay, you know what, I think you're right. I don't think he's going to say that, because, again, it's his lasting legacy, as Mandy said, and he may he may get a Dennis cannon or somebody who's a really good Rodney cop from Kingstree to represent him or a really good lawyer like Gedney house or somebody else to come forward and make the arguments on his behalf that he's just doing what a normal judge does. I mean, think about what Judge gurgle has said. And nobody's ever said, Hey, Judge Gergle you can't hear anything more after what you've said about Alex



Murdaugh and what you know, he called Alex Murdaugh a liar and a fraud before Alex Murdaugh ever pled guilty. He did that in Russell Laffitte's motion. So you know, we have to wait and see how this plays out. But to answer your question, I don't believe that the Satterfield trial now is going to go forward on November 27.

Liz Farrell 27:52

So would one strategy from the state be to have judge Newman recuse himself and then immediately replace them with another judge so that November 27, can't go forward? Because that wouldn't work out, you know, necessarily work out to their advantage, right. So could that be one of the things that happens that maybe, you know, they say, don't throw the baby out with the bathwater, maybe the state just decides, like, we'll kill it, you know, like, you have somebody that's being held hostage, maybe you just kill the hostage, so maybe, you know, Judge Newman recuses himself, and then that case can go on November 27. And then the core issue becomes whether he can hear cases moving forward. Can the Supreme Court do something like that? What's

Eric Bland 28:31

the bigger case? Is it the Satterfield criminal case? Or it's preserving the myrtle double murder verdict? Because

Liz Farrell 28:38

if you push them, isn't that the same thing? No,



Eric Bland 28:40

it's not. Because if you push them off the effectively, yeah, you now push them off the murder case, as well. And we haven't had a hearing on the motion for a new trial, and you bring in a new judge. And, you know, I think Judge Newman deserves the right to defend himself. And I don't think he should be put on the stand, so to speak, but he has the right to say, Look, I am I have the right to have opinions. And I've expressed them in a way that is not contradiction to the justice system, I still can be fair and impartial. And I believe I will be fair and impartial. And if he says that, that's it.

Liz Farrell 29:17

I agree. I totally think that Judge Newman should do all of that. I'm not saying that that shouldn't happen. And I don't I think he's being completely and unfairly maligned here. And I don't even know frankly, I don't even think he's being maligned. Because when you read this, you're just like this is this is literally them taking one thing that they can say and saying it in the largest loudest way they can say it, but I do think that there is the question of do we allow a state allow a defense attorney, a legislator, lawyer like Deckard, portly and somebody with power, who has used this court system to essentially he's exploited it in every way possible. And this is another exploitation This is the exploitation of it. Number one goal is to get that delay right? Because



Eric Bland 29:57

he doesn't want to have to face the act a well, even a first year judge can try the Satterfield fraud case. Right. It doesn't take somebody of a judge Newman, exactly

Liz Farrell 30:07

what I'm saying. So as he recused himself from this upcoming case, the show goes on for that case, they deal with this later. That's my recommendation. Do you

Eric Bland 30:16

think he can recuse himself from this case and then get back in on the murder case, or once he's recused? He's done?

Liz Farrell 30:22

I think that it can be I don't know how the I mean, obviously, you guys would know better, legally, like what he can possibly do. I think that yeah, he probably does open himself like, Well, why did you recuse your self in this case? Well, because this matter wasn't settled. How about I recused myself until this matter is settled? Not I agree with you. I mean, that's the I think that's what I would write because it's I think that we should drag Dick Harpootlian into the courtroom on November 27. One way or the other. I agree.



Mandy Matney 30:48

Because it seems like if it's delayed, that he wins, and if it's delayed, it shows every other lawyer in the state that like you could pull this nonsense and attack a judge based on nothing. And that's just not right. I mean, I think that the Supreme Court needs to say something and do something immediately. I think that that would be okay if he recused himself, but that again, would kind of the slippery slope of how you crossed the line, I guess he could make he may be able to say like, well, it was an emergency situation, and had I not recused myself, then maybe he doesn't

Liz Farrell 31:29

recuse himself. Maybe the case just gets reassigned. You know, it was two separate maybe he maybe he calls in sick?

Eric Bland 31:35

Well, there was two separate motions, guys. The first one was the writ of prohibition, which is to prevent him from hearing the motion for a new trial. The second motion was a motion to delay and postpone the Satterfield criminal trial. The main thing is they don't want him hearing the motion for a new trial. It's not that they don't want him to preside over the Satterfield case, the real gravy for them is the big thing is the big show is that motion for a new trial if he recuses himself, so



Liz Farrell 32:01

let's make that other thing happen. Let's make that case that trial he can't

Eric Bland 32:05

he won't be able to do all a cart and say, I mean, here, turn off the spigot turn it back on.

Liz Farrell 32:09

What if he doesn't say anything, though? What if they just reassign it the way they did with the bond, they had no problem with the bond going from Judge Newman to Judge Lee and then back again, to judge Newman. It's a

Eric Bland 32:20

slap in the face to judge him. And guys, I'm just telling you, he's retiring on December 31. If you reassigned it away from him, you have just slapped him in the face on it as a going away gift?

Liz Farrell 32:31

I don't think so. Because and maybe this is just like you're you're speaking to Paul at the political structure of the legal community or something. Because from my perspective, it looks like the smart thing to do to not allow this bullying to happen. I don't think it says anything about Judge Newman, what his abilities are and what he did or did not do. I think it says we're not letting you use this to delay that. So we'll give



you a new judge for that you guys are babies. This is a bunch of nonsense. You know, it's nonsense. You've put one of our own now on the chopping block our best our best one of our best Americans judge, you have now put on the chopping like you have done right,

Mandy Matney 33:07

like we put him there, and now you're putting them there on the chopping block. And that's why they should be offended, they should be angry, they should be horrified because again, I was thinking about this today, like a huge part of this case is about the judicial system as a whole and about how broken it is and and how the Murdaughs participated in that brokenness of the system and how it's a new day in South Carolina. And there's people like Judge Newman and Creighton Waters coming in to do things fair and right and showing the nation that we can have a fair judicial system here in South Carolina. And then for Dick and Jim on top of that triumph that we saw to just spit and stomp all over it by dragging the best that we have drug judge Newman and his name down into the cesspool of all he was wrong too. And he it's just a really despicable and horrible thing specifically because he is the best that we have. And if they put the best that we have in South Carolina on the line all on behalf of Alex Murdaugh, the murderer, liar, fraudster thief, etc. A horrible, horrible human being and it's like, why it makes me very angry.



Liz Farrell 34:36

It's manufactured to I think we need to we cannot stress this enough, but like this drama, these accusations they're very much manufactured they have taken it's like Bugs Bunny taking off his hand and blowing up his glove to punch somebody with it's all air. It's not you know, it's not a boxing glove. It is this balloon. Basically, they have created a balloon of a writ of press admission, and it's filled with nothing.

Eric Bland 35:02

But what I'm saying to you is that it's a serious motion. It's extremely rare lawyers make all the time motions to disgualify the opposing counsel, they'll say they're in conflict that the guy's got to have to be a witness, he sat in on a meeting, or he represented one party, and now he's taken an adverse possession that's done all the time. Lawyers going after judges is a really, really rare thing like this. It's it's a full blown headshot. And this isn't happening in some dark courtroom in Orange County on a, you know, case involving, you know, Smith versus Smith in a family court, or Smith versus Jones or an auto accident. This is the highest profile case that our state has had in, you know, since arguably since sue the Susan Smith or the Emanuel nine or Dylann. roof and to go after this judge. At this time, remember, they're taking things that this judge has said over a compendium of time, you know, a year and a half worth of presiding over bond hearings and motions hearings and different stuff. And I think it's, I think it's a last gasp effort, and it's a desperate act. And if it fails there in shitsville,



Liz Farrell 36:11

I think they're going to be because you say headshot, and I totally agree with you. I think that's what they were aiming for. But they're taking a headshot like they are in Dallas, and they are trying to shoot JFK with a shotgun, they are not going to get there. And I think that they have tried for that. But I think that they're failing just by the I think this is a very weak motion that they've made generally when you go through it, but they're in great company, because other people have tried to have their judges removed. Like Harvey Weinstein tried that Meek Mill, the rapper tried to do that. And in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court was like, No, we're not. And that was over a judge making comments outside of the courtroom. So I don't think history is on their side when it comes to success of this. And that's why I go back to regardless, yes, they don't want him rolling on a new trial. They don't want that. But they do want this trial not to go forward. And for the financial case, right now.

Eric Bland 37:02

Well, they don't because they don't want a second conviction. And they don't want to have a new trial scheduled a month and a half later. Look, there's a lot at play here. You know, we still have judge gurgles sentencing coming up sometime probably in January. And they want him to, you know, if you ask Dick off the record, he'd say, you know, load him up as much as you want Judge Gergle, I'm sure if he gives him a long sentence stick will say, Oh, that's too long a sentence. But he'll say it tongue in cheek, there's a lot of strategy that's being played here to



see if they can game it out. To get Alex into that federal system. I just feel bad for Judge Newman, you know, it's a lonely life. When you become a judge, you just lose a lot of friends. Immediately. I go to lunch with a judge. And, you know, people look at me when I'm with the judge out in the restaurant, like, what are you doing with the judge? And then they look at the judge, what are you doing with a lawyer and, you know, it's a lonely, lonely life. And this guy just lost his son three weeks before this trial. And he gave it his all. And he did it well, and they've done nothing but to criticize this guy six ways and Sunday since the verdict by saying, oh, you can't sit on it. Because you're going to be a witness. Oh, you can't hear the motion. Because you know, you've made so many damn statements. Oh, you can hear this because you know, you're six feet one inches tall, whatever. I mean, it's just so many different reasons. And where are they going to stop? When will they stop? And it appears that they'll never stop,

Mandy Matney 38:27

right? Well, until something is done. This is like psychology 101. Like, if you let somebody get away with the exact same thing over and over and over again, they're just going to keep doing it because why not? And this is where Supreme Court is got to do something. Otherwise, they're going to look like idiots. We're all going to look like idiots. And we will, they will deserve it. Especially because they pick this guy. And of course Dick Harpootlian does his dizzle, as you say, and places tricks and now the best that they could come up with Judge Newman, who is the best in our state, his reputation is now being destroyed unless they



do something and all on behalf of Alex Murdaugh, the murderer, horrible person, and they claim that they're not getting any money for any of this. And that's just insane. Right?

Liz Farrell 39:21

For 265 page document. I actually disagree with both of you on this. I disagree with you

Eric Bland 39:27

as you're right in this. You're right in the sense that the only way that this could go forward on the 27th is if they transferred to another judge. And I think they said because if you look at the calendar, the state will have 10 days to respond from the date that they filed their their read, the Supreme Court is going to set a briefing schedule, then the state gives their response. Dick and Jim are then going to have a reply. So now we're almost at like November, what 19th and November 20. Then they're going to say well, is there going to be oral arguments on this? I don't think the Supreme Court is going to do this. Just don't In the papers, you know, they got to get a filing from Judge Newman himself is judging him, we're going to get a lawyer. And so once they entertain this process of is Judge Newman in conflict or not, and they go down that road to trials all the only way the trial can not be off is if they say we're taking judge Newman off the case. Yeah,



Liz Farrell 40:18

we'll just, you know, judge me, you're in the hostage. But what I was gonna say is, I disagree with both of you on one thing, we say that this is hurting his reputation, Judge Newman's reputation? I don't think so. Because the things that they're accusing him of are laughable when you actually dig in and read them. So I don't think that they're effective. I think we have to look at the bigger picture here, which is that you have two clowns who have done clownish things for the last two years in defense of this man, they have lost just about every single motion that they have made. They have said ridiculous things they're

Eric Bland 40:54

winning in the court of public opinion. They are Liz, Liz, listen to me. I think so I don't think so. But they are that motion they made last week people are starting, maybe there was juror interference. And that's not fair. He should get a new Trump and now that they raised this against judge Newman, you think that the arguments that they make inside their motion are bad I do too, and that they're to the general public that serious, they're saying themselves, maybe that Judge shouldn't have gone on the Today Show, maybe that Judge shouldn't have gone to Cleveland State, the general

Mandy Matney 41:24

public isn't looking like we are looking at this, like that's wrong. Let's look this up and see why they are just seeing the hot points that media is pushing out. And the hot points do look bad, like, oh, he was on the



Today Show, oh, blah, blah, blah, unless you actually know what was going on. And no have said no other context. But like, I've seen enough on Twitter to realize, yeah, to get worried and to get get defensive about Judge Newman's reputation, because it wouldn't it would be enough to crush me if I was in his position, like, I would be extremely angry and disappointed. And just I feel

Liz Farrell 42:04

like if this were said about me, it would not be enough for me to feel like my reputation was harmed. And maybe I'm delusional or diluted. But in my mind, my record is strong enough. As a journalist, my record is I know what I'm capable of, I know what I've done and what I'm good at. And I feel like Judge Newman must know that as well about himself that the only thing that matters at the end of the day is knowing that they're lying. Who cares what somebody who spends all day on Twitter, talking about the Murdaughs thinks, who cares what somebody on Facebook, honest to God, I mean, like when it comes to ultimately his reputation as a jurist, it only existed in South Carolina up until this past year, he knows what his he knows who he is. So what what bothers me is that I don't want to acknowledge that this in any way is hurting his reputation. When I see it, it's like, it's like the whole thing about lions don't concern themselves with the opinions of sheep. I think that Dick and Jim are sheep. And I think that Judge Newman is the lion here. I think it's our job as journalists and your job as a public figure, Eric, to call this out in a way that people understand. They knew that Judge Newman was on The Today Show before all this would I mean, do we



not all see that? I mean, that was all like, how many hundreds of 1000s of people saw that it's the way that they're characterizing it now is only going to take them so far, in my opinion. And again, maybe I'm naive, I but for me, I will not recognize that two men can Bugs Bunny their way and I keep using that example, can Bugs Bunny their way through this que Rayman three men can Bugs Bunny their way through this case, and it gets taken seriously at all by us anyway, you know, I don't think that this, we can only do so

Eric Bland 43:46

much LIS we're doing it. We're doing it. We're doing it.

Liz Farrell 43:48

We've done a lot though, Eric. I mean, we've done a lot of this doing true sunlight. We

Eric Bland 43:52

do it by our Twitter, but Mandy is writing to the general population who isn't in the weeds like we are and they hear some of these things. And they hear that every defendant is entitled to a fair, impartial judge and fair, impartial trial and a fair, impartial jury. They start to think right now, if the clerk of court interfered with this jury, and these jurors are coming out and now you have a judge who's made these statements outside of court, maybe it's not fair that he actually hears the motion and it takes on a life of its own. And yes, I know that Judge Newman's honorable and his reputations intact, but when Judge Newman goes to the



grocery store, he goes into Costco and everybody sees them. They don't know what you and I and Manti know, and they start to read this stuff and they hear it being parroted, it takes a life of its own and I feel so bad for Judge Newman. Right.

Mandy Matney 44:46

I agree. I think that I just seen enough. I've seen enough in comments and I've seen enough from people to know that yeah, in a way I think at the end of the day, the worst part about it. All of it is that this is an example of media failing. And that's on my profession that's on us, not on us, because we've done our best to fight this and to actually correct the record. But I'm talking about giant news outlets with way, way, way more resources than Luna shark could ever possibly imagine. And they just pump out these headlines that and they don't have to necessarily be aggressive or anything to mess with his reputation. I think that that's something that we have to understand is that like, wait and see. It's it's just seeds of it seeds of doubt. And it was the same thing with Becky's book like nobody, none of these outlets had any way shape or form problem with Becky's book until Dec. And Jim told them to have a problem with it. And they got really aggressive about it. And I also think at this age of misinformation and social media and everything, people don't even people just read headlines, and I'm with you, Eric, like I could see judgment, I could see somebody saying something like to judge Newman at the grocery store or at a restaurant that would just be devastating, because I don't think a lot of people fully understand what's going on. And I think again, that's because of Dick and Jim and



their campaign misinformation. And that's it's not only harmed Becky Hill now, but it's back to judge Newman. And that's horrible. Remember what

Eric Bland 46:25

Dick remember, Dick 2013 lays? What does he do? I lay fires all over the courtroom, I lay a fire here, then the attention spoken there. Then I lay a fire over here two weeks ago, it was the jury interference, then it was the motion for a new trial. Now it's judge Newman. I mean, it's there's so many things in the air.

Liz Farrell 46:44

I see it. I absolutely see it. But I also know that this this is this has been their strategy from the start is using headlines to get their way or using the headlines to color public opinion. But it's still meant that Alex was found guilty. You know, it didn't I guess what I'm saying is like, the bottom line is that they might be able to grab the headline that is the only front that they have won on in my opinion. I personally, I mean, I just see them as as flies that need to be flicked off of the cow, honestly. And I think that the Supreme Court can do that. But I I don't know. I guess I just I personally just don't want to hand it to them in any way, shape, or form. I don't know how much it matters to judge Newman, whether or not people in the Costco are thinking like you shouldn't have gone on to today's show. Because at this point, there is no conclusion. Right. It's just an accusation. I know Becky Hill has been completely maligned. But I don't know I just I guess maybe I'm



Pollyanna about this. I just think that ultimately the right the good guys are going to win because this is just like I said, it's just fill of air to play

Eric Bland 47:45

this out. I'm gonna play it out with you. Let's play this out that the Supreme Court puts it back on Judge Newman, Judge Newman says I'm not in conflict. Judge Newman, here's the motion for a new trial and says, no new trial. Judge Newman goes forward and tries the Satterfield case, at the end of the day. Is the public gonna say maybe Alex didn't get a fair trial under those circumstances. I'm afraid that if that all plays out if Judge Newman, if if he hears it says I'm not in conflict. He hears the new Trump motion for neutral, no neutral. And then he goes forward. And he lays the woods to Alex all the way down the line on all these financial crime cases is the public going to be satisfied? Remember that Supreme Courts trying to thread the needle they want to get this right. They want to make sure it's right that there's no arguments that Dick or Jim or Alex or all there sycophants can say it got rigged. And that's the that's the scary part for me, Dick and Jim are setting this up. Let's table it until we get back. And we'll be right back. They want to thread the needle, they want to get it right. All right. And it could give an argument to Dick and Jim that it was, you know, a railroad system here. Did they Alex got railroaded without really getting a fair hold on it. Right.



Mandy Matney 49:09

I just have to say this, like, it's just absolutely insane. These talk about like, did Alex get a fair shake did when the upcoming trial that we are talking about he has already admitted to the crimes. And that is an insane scenario to begin with. And I don't think that and I think that that's another thing that the media has been ignoring and downplaying the absurdity of that. Like it is an absurd trial, that it's crazy that we're all like gearing up for something that Dick has admitted to Jim has admitted to and Alex has pled guilty to and there's like a room of papers of evidence that just show what it is. So I would just love for somebody to put it into a lot of This because we're in crazy land, talking about a trial and debating whether or not like somebody's going to get a fair shake when this man admitted to these crimes, and he should be in prison for the rest of his life just on the financial crimes alone. And of course, on top of that, the murders like, it is just so crazy how much we are wasting an expense. We're wasting in time, people's money, people's resources. It's just It all makes me very angry. And it's just a circus that I, you know, South Carolina kind of deserves it because they have let DIC and Jim get to this point. And that's very unfortunate, not the people of South Carolina, but the leaders of South Carolina have let DIC and Jim get this far and somebody has got to put an end to it.

Eric Bland 50:54

Well said what you've said is we've gotten far afield from where we should be that somehow Dick and Jim had pulled us out of the infield



and out of the outfield. And now we're somewhere outside the ballpark. But

Liz Farrell 51:07

what could have been done to stop them at this point, like what can you do,

Eric Bland 51:12

man? He's right, they should have sanctioned him. I mean, look, you know, any other lawyer like Jim Griffin violated the judge's order and went to the press in the middle of the trial. And he got admonished, but he didn't get sanctioned. And they have thrown bombs. They're not just throwing, but that would stop them with it. No, but I'm saying all along the way. There should be softly, you know, they've been thrown not softballs. They're throwing bombs, and nobody stopped them.

Mandy Matney 51:37

Even if there was a sanction, you start with one sanction. And yeah, keep going with others. And I mean, we can list other things that they've done. And I, I would just like to see one sanction like just one point where the system is like, stop it. We have had enough. But

Liz Farrell 51:53

can they do that? Can this system say too little to defense attorneys, Judge Newman



Eric Bland 51:58

could have done it to Dick Harpootlian in the court in the quarry Fleming sentencing when Dick said, it's the podcasters that are, you know, that are hurting him and his partners a podcaster. Dick, they could have sanctioned and when Dick gave a contradictory statement when he said the government's the one that made the motion for a speedy trial. No, it was thick, who made the motion for speedy trial, he could have put a gag order on deck and said, Hey, you're making statements about jury interference from a microphone? How about making the court? Sure. But

Liz Farrell 52:29

how does that stop them from filing a writ of prohibition?

Eric Bland 52:31

He would have paused it just gives him a pause to say, You know what, if we file this there's repercussions?

Liz Farrell 52:37

Do you think they would these are two men that don't feel shame? These are two men that are not it's about the game at this point.

Eric Bland 52:42

The point is, if it fails, there's no repercussions. They need to know if it fails, right? There is going to be Armageddon. We've given you an What



Liz Farrell 52:51

does Armageddon look like for a lawyer in South Carolina beyond pulling their license?

Mandy Matney 52:56 I mean, that would be Armageddon, right? Nothing? No, but that's

Liz Farrell 52:59 it. Right? Right. There's nothing

Eric Bland 53:01 but it's attacking their livelihood attack their license, at

Mandy Matney 53:05

least tell them no, like at least. They have told them no, but

Liz Farrell 53:11

but they have told them no, they have lost almost every single motion that they have. There's

Eric Bland 53:16

a difference between losing motions and being admonished for filing frivolous motions, like filing the frivolous motion to vacate the Satterfield confession job or getting somewhere with that like filing a motion to add the Satterfield send a nautilus case, how about sanction that Mandy's exactly right.



Liz Farrell 53:35

Okay, for that that's that makes sense to me sanction them for frivolous motions, they can do that. So they should have done that. But to somebody have to suggest that to the judge, can the judge just decide that themselves? How does that work?

Eric Bland 53:47

Yeah, the judge does. But they're never going to do it to Dick. That's the whole point. They do it to me, they would do it to somebody else, but they're not doing it to Dick Harpootlian.

Mandy Matney 53:56

And that's why this is the system that they deserve, like, right, so long as they allow this to keep going on. And we're by the US, the taxpayers are paying for it. And that's what makes me so my statement

Liz Farrell 54:09

of the case, the way it opens is Dick and Jim saying to the court that Mr. Murdaugh is a disgraced former attorney to start off from the very start just like already putting Alex in the he's a criminal position. Right. Like, right, exactly. And then that but that's that's basically all that got all that Judge Newman has said, but who I just want to ask this because let's just say that they get their way and there's a new judge and whatever. What judge in South Carolina can come on after judge Newman if we want to give the credit, you know, the public opinion. Say that that matters more than anything else to some degree. What judge in South



Carolina is going to be able to come in here and give Deckard portly and what he wants and rule the way Dick carpetland wants them to, without there being supreme backlash because at this point, I would imagine And that every judge in South Carolina must feel some bit of that target that's on Newman's back by Dick and Jim, just because of what I guess the nature of what they're accusing him of, or or the fact that they're taking a shot at a judge like this. There has to be some sort of solidarity, I would assume, from the judges or from the Supreme Court and saying that like you've gone too far. So how does it help Dick and Jim, ultimately, to get a new judge by maligning America's judge to get there? It doesn't?

Eric Bland 55:34

It would. I guess they're grasping. But we saw with Judge Bentley price, he didn't buy it. He said, No way. I'm not vacating this Satterfield thing, we saw what your child did no way. We're not giving you the \$160,000. So,

Liz Farrell 55:49

so this isn't about the new kid, this isn't about the new trial. This is this right now. And this moment is about delaying

Eric Bland 55:55

it down the road kicking that can down the road, I



Mandy Matney 55:59

watched Dick and Jim and their crime con speech. Unfortunately, I would not recommend it to anyone it was made my stomach hurt. And it was horrifying. But it was very insightful for their plan ahead. And one of the things that they said was basically that they wanted to fatigue the audience, they want to kick everything down the road, and they want to exhaust everybody dict and say, I want to fatigue the audience. But he basically said, like, I want the next trial to be really far out, and people will be sick of it and blah, blah, blah, he won't, he is beating all of us down with all these motions, and we can see it in the numbers, people are getting tired of people are getting tired of us talking about it, people are getting tired of listening about it, people are getting tired of all of this. And what Dick wants to do is he wants us to stop talking about it, and people to stop caring about it. And then so general, so he can start getting away with more and more and more. And that is his strategy. So we have to keep that in mind that this is the guy. So

Liz Farrell 57:05

do we just give up? I mean, that should we just give up because No, like

Eric Bland 57:09

Mandy says is, if we do give up in the den did devil works in the dark. That's what Dick wants, He wants us that be focused on something else. And then all of a sudden, these hearings are taking place and nobody's paying attention to them and shit happens right when it's stored. **Liz Farrell** 57:27



So if it's working, then

Mandy Matney 57:31

it isn't. And we have to keep the pressure up. Like we have to keep explaining why this is important. And we have to keep explaining to people that the the integrity of the system is on the line with us. And they can't get away with this abusing the system time and time again. And if they are going to abuse the system, then they will be called out on it and their reputations will suffer. And it will continue to do so I'm just at the point where I I'm very, very, very angry at Dick and Jim. But I'm also angry at those who have allowed this to go on and those who have been including the media, the media is a big culprit in this mess because they keep giving them the headlines that they want. And it's

Eric Bland 58:17

changing in the articles. Mandy, if you start to read some of these authors, they're starting to dig in Jim side is

Liz Farrell 58:25

starting to it's starting to to toe, this is serious than the whole time.

Eric Bland 58:31

Let me ask you guys a question. How do you think judgment will be remembered if he's kicked off this case?

Liz Farrell 58:37



I don't think okay, when we say kicked off his this case? I don't think that taking him off the November 27 trial is kicking him off the case. I think it is usurping Dick and Jim strategy or it it's it's cutting them off from what they really want

Eric Bland 58:53

sell me on that. I'm not buying. I mean, I'm not a buyer on that. Are you a buyer on that? No.

Liz Farrell 59:00

I think you'd have to put another judge on November 27. I do.

Mandy Matney 59:05

I have this crazy hope inside of me that something happens. And basically at the end of the day, what matters the most is the trial happens on November 27. Because if trial does not happen on November 27, they are doing there it is it is just giving in to their master evil little plan. That's like step one, step two, step three, that's a big checkmark on their part. It would just be a complete failure of the system if we allowed that to happen.

Eric Bland 59:38

I agree with you. That is that is one number one.

Liz Farrell 59:42



But one a that's what I'm saying though Eric is sticking

Eric Bland 59:46

up for judging me. I don't want the man to be trashed. And I you

Liz Farrell 59:51

can do both things at the same time. I don't think we have to choose one or the other. I think that we have to play hardball with this trial because that is ultimately do what they want. If you do,

Eric Bland 1:00:01

and if you take judge Newman off that trail, you've taken them off every single thing with Murdaughh going forward, and fat tarnishes the man's legacy. End of story.

Liz Farrell 1:00:12 I don't know about that. We

Eric Bland 1:00:13

can disagree. We can disagree. I don't know, because\

Liz Farrell 1:00:16

I just don't I don't look at we all saw. Yeah, I saw what he did those six weeks, you saw what he did. The America saw what he did those six weeks, they saw that today's show. It wasn't until Deke and Jim filled this thing with nonsense. And the media decided, Oh, my God, they're



right. You know, and just like, I mean, I had that worry about well, did he commend, but I think it needs you know, did he commend the jury's out what he was doing, but no, it gets explained, obviously, the way you know what his intent was. But I also think that by wringing our hands over what they've done to to Judge Newman's reputation is to acknowledge that some sort of success on their part, and I just don't believe, because it's it almost acknowledged as failure. Like it's saying, like we failed, but you know, he did fail. Judge Newman did fail, because he they did hurt him. And I just don't think that this, I think it's such a nonsense motion. And I think that smart people think it's a nonsense motion out there. I don't see how I mean, again, maybe I'm naive. I just don't see how it affects. I don't see how we walk away from the saying that Judge Newman screwed up. I just don't maybe, you know, there's a few journalists in South Carolina who want to pretend that they're being objective by acknowledging, you know, what is the quote unquote, seriousness of these allegations? The allegations are hollow. And the fact that they're not explaining that to the public is is malpractice, as far as I'm concerned, but because a lot of this is provable, you saw that you saw some of those men that are writing this in that courtroom day after day so that they could be on camera basically. And they listened to all they saw this in person. And they saw that the things that they're accusing Judge Newman of saying to the Today Show and to his alma mater, are the same things he said in the courtroom to Dick and Jim about why he decided to lip a financial crimes in and why he what he said to him during the sentencing. So for



them to just act like I mean, they must have read this, that's the only thing I can think of, which I know and at least two cases I'm right. But

Mandy Matney 1:02:22

uh, okay, we have to move on from this. I think that no matter what we have to hope that trial goes through on November 27. Because otherwise, all of this nonsense just shows the world that they can get away with anything and they're gonna keep doing it and we're gonna keep on being terrorized. And I'm really tired of that. But speaking of terrorism in South Carolina, we have to talk about the bone Turner case and David Miller, the prosecutor who led the one Cherner get the sweetheart deal of a lifetime and agreed to with State Senator Brad Hutto that Dallas is charges were dropped the case and Dallas Sollars case were dropped. Because she was dead. David Miller is now up for judgeship in South Carolina. And on Wednesday. David Miller is supposed to have a hearing. Eric, do you know how that process goes?

Eric Bland 1:03:22

It's to determine whether he is qualified. Yeah. And

Liz Farrell 1:03:27

essentially they're contesting. They're contesting whether he's called he's already been qualified has any you



Eric Bland 1:03:33

know, it's going to be if he, you know, again, this is a case that, you know, you guys have done such a good job to put to the public forefront, and, you know, images, everything. And this would not be a good image for a guy that gave a very sweetheart agreed to give a very sweetheart recommendation of a sentence to somebody that destroyed a beautiful young girl and tormented his family tormented her family for the rest of their lives. So it wouldn't surprise me if he makes it through, to be honest with you, but it's going to be disappointing. I

Mandy Matney 1:04:08

think it's going to be a great example of how messed up this entire process is because I think the public's going to see Todd Rutherford questioning David Miller, which is like an insane that he's a part of that still, I think that because on the JMSC, I think it's, it's wild. But yeah, it's just going to be a it's going hopefully, it's going to be a display of how dysfunctional the way that we choose judges is in South Carolina and hopefully that leads to change. I think that with the amount of and last I heard Dallas Stoller's families going to be there and they're going to speak. I need to see if Chloe best is going to speak. But they're going to get a mouthful. Like If those if everybody on that committee actually okay as David Miller, then that will be a display of how absolutely dysfunctional and horrific the system is. So then



Eric Bland 1:05:15

if he gets on as a judge, and then Todd Rutherford votes for him, and then Todd appears before him, does Todd get a special anything special that I couldn't get or anybody?

Liz Farrell 1:05:26

Well, he's already gotten something special, right? He's already gotten it. He did. So that's that's the thing is that we have this letter from David Pascoe. And was it seven, eight other solicitors in which they're asking for Todd Rutherford to be taken off the jam SC, right. And one of the reasons is because of that sweetheart deal that he got with Alberto Romero Lopez. And that was the second one that we know of where he's done this behind closed doors, and David Miller apparently led them and David Miller did it without so much as apparently knowing even the bare facts of the case, it seems. So you have Todd Rutherford. So you have two people on that. JMSC. Right. Luke Rankin and Merle Smith, who all eyes are on them, right because of this letter they've been pleated with by the state solicitors in an unprecedented move to remove this person from the jam se. So spotlight is on them during this hearing, which is going to me it's just so funny, because it's going to be the score missed hearing. I think in like one of the score Mia's hearings that you've had in the history of South Carolina judicial qualification, because the two main members of the of the Commission are being pleaded with by the solicitor to the state, one of the members of the Commission, the guy in front of them just gave him a real good, did a real good favor for them. And I was just looking at this email that David



Miller sent me in 2019. And I want to read the quote at the end of his email, this is like one of the standard quotes that you have as your signature. And it says, We are lawyers on the side of people. Never let us forget that the law is never settled until it is settled. Right? It is never right until it is just and it is never just until it serves society to the fullest. And that's a Harry Philo quote. And that is irony to its ninth degree, I would say. One thing I want to note is I did have this little fear that the pressure on Rankin Smith and Rutherford as well as David Miller, would be such that they would just have like David Miller would just step aside and say, forget it. I don't want to be a judge this time, I'll wait it out. Because he's not, you know, he's not an older, I think he's in his 50s 40, something like that. And that I think that is a possibility. So I want to put it out there that David Miller should continue to try to be a judge. Because if he so believes that he deserves that position, then he should fight for it. And this should be a forum in which people can say why he shouldn't get it. He shouldn't deprive the public. I shouldn't deprive this dollar family are the best family if they so desire to say why they think you shouldn't be a judge. He shouldn't and chicken out in other words, so I hope he doesn't check it out. I hope that he goes forward with his judgeship and tries for it. And I hope that all four of those men are put on the spot in a way they've never been put on the spot before. Yeah,

Mandy Matney 1:08:35

and I hope it all explodes on them. Because they all deserve it.



Eric Bland 1:08:39

Great show. Yeah, it was that was a that was a robust this show is we've ever had gone some good disagreement, intellectually disagreeing, and I can see your side of it, Liz, and I appreciate it. And we always don't have to agree. That's the that's the beauty of a cup of justice. That's right. In the end, we want justice in the end, we all want justice. It's just a question how we're

Mandy Matney 1:09:02

gonna get there. Right? And we all want the same thing, which is like for them not to win. And I think that it would just be such a tragedy if they just that they just got it too late because that's the one thing that's a huge win on their part.

Liz Farrell 1:09:18

And finally, when because of legitimate reasons, I don't mean if they are legitimately making a legitimate argument, but that's not what they're doing.

Mandy Matney 1:09:26

Right right. But that's not what this motion is like. It's just a waste of everybody's time and it's just horrible. And on that note, I think it's time to say cups down guys. Yeah,

Liz Farrell 1:09:41

Cups down guys. It was a good show. Cups down.



Mandy Matney 1:09:51

This cup of justice episode is created and hosted by me Mandy Matney with co-host Liz Farrell, our executive editor. And Eric Bland Attorney at Law aka the jackhammer of justice from Luda Shark Productions.

