

[00:00:00] **Liz Farrell:** Guys, this has been a crazy 24 hours for all of us. Just nuts. We had Dick and Jim's filing. We had Johnny Parker and Palmetto State Bank's filings. Eric, you have some news for us. But let's first talk about Brian Walshe real quick here because — I know this isn't our thing but he is sort of Alex Murdaugh adjacent. We were talking earlier I think in the last episode a little bit about what his Google searches were, but they were far more extensive than what we knew last week. And I could not believe what some of them were, especially in this day and age.

[00:00:42] **Eric Bland:** To put on your son's iPad, you know, how to dispose of 115-pound woman, how long does it take to inherit property, how long does it take for a body to decompose. I mean, that's the first thing that people do. They go to your computer to see what your searches are, depending on what crime you're being accused of. And, you know, we talked about how difficult it is to commit the perfect crime today because there's always the watchful eye in the sky or you have your phone with you that can record. We were saying unless you can walk someplace at the dark of night and there's no cameras anywhere and maybe hold the knife yourself and the gun, you could do something. But then you still gotta get away with the body. It creates noise. The gun creates noise. I just don't think you could get away with crime anymore.

[00:01:29] Liz Farrell: Unless you live on Moselle.

[00:01:31] **Eric Bland:** Unless you live on Moselle.

[00:01:32] **Liz Farrell:** But Mandy was telling me earlier today about — what is it, Mandy? It's like a technology that you can plug into a car and it will tell you everywhere the car's been but also your text messages and stuff. Something like that.

[00:01:44] **Eric Bland:** Wow.



[00:01:44] **Mandy Matney:** So, a couple things I learned today from a really good source of mine who's been dead on accurate this entire time. There's a computer program that law firms can access apparently; that they can download all of your car data and all of the cameras that are on your car, even if a car has —

[00:02:05] Eric Bland: Yeah, I've done that.

[00:02:07] Mandy Matney: But they can also erase it.

[00:02:09] **Eric Bland:** Didn't know that. So, in products liability cases, we always do the download, which will tell you how fast the car was going at the wreck or on average, what their average speed limit has been the previous 12 hours, did they brake. It has stuff like that. But I didn't realize you can erase.

[00:02:25] **Mandy Matney:** I guess it's a super special program, a super expensive special program. So, I know for a fact that — getting right into the Alex Murdaugh situation — that SLED was having trouble accessing the GPS of his vehicle and I don't know if they ever actually got it. I hope they did.

[00:02:48] **Eric Bland:** Are you suggesting that there's lawyers then that would delete things off their client's car to possibly help their client? Are lawyers doing that? That's stunning to me and I'm, I mean, I am saying that I have not heard that.

[00:03:00] Liz Farrell: Maybe not their client.

[00:03:01] **Mandy Matney:** I just know that a law, a certain law firm has the ability to do that.

[00:03:05] Eric Bland: I haven't heard of that but wow.

[00:03:07] Mandy Matney: Yeah.

[00:03:08] **Eric Bland:** Oh, is it a law firm we all know? Do they do a lot of projects liability work?



[00:03:12] **Mandy Matney:** I think we all would be very familiar with this law firm if I said the name, so that's something that's concerning. And like Liz said, it really is, this could be a real how to get away with murder case. But the question that I keep asking is Alex didn't cover all this up alone.

[00:03:34] Liz Farrell: If he did it, can I just throw that in there?

[00:03:36] Mandy Matney: The Brian Walshe case and the Idaho case, I kind of feel like I keep talking about this over and over but it's just been stunning to me. In the Brian Walshe case, too, the public has gotten a nice few pages as to why the state has probable cause to arrest him and what led them to the arrest of murder. And here we are, seven months after he was arrested, after Alex Murdaugh was arrested with murder, and we've gotten more with the motions but we haven't gotten that condensed here's the evidence, the public can rest now, we got the guy.

[00:04:19] **Eric Bland:** I've always been critical 'cause Alan Wilson has never gotten in front of the microphone one time to my knowledge on this Murdaugh case. And it's a completely different way of doing law enforcement I guess.

[00:04:31] Mandy Matney: It just doesn't put the public at ease in the way that I feel like we deserve. I just had a moment watching I think it was the prosecutor in the Brian Walshe case. He didn't have a press conference but at least he had a video saying, we got him, here's the deal, blah, blah, blah. And they had several press conferences in that case I believe. We haven't gotten a single one in a year and a half. There's not been one opportunity for the press to ask any questions openly about this case. There has not been — it has just been done very weirdly and differently. And Alan Wilson does do press conferences. I've seen him do it for other things.

[00:05:24] Liz Farrell: Eric, how was your day?

[00:05:26] **Eric Bland:** It started well. I went to the doctor, you know, I've had COVID and I wanted to see where I am with everything and my blood work was great, best cholesterol I ever had. So, I kind of came home, I was smiling. And then I turned on my computer. And lo and behold, another grievance



came in where I got notice from the ODC that somebody had filed a grievance in connection with my exchange that I had with Parker's attorney in May of 2022 that they were interfering with the approval of us getting the \$4.3 million confession to judgment from Alex in favor of the Satterfield family. And I took a deep breath and I said to myself, are they starting to weaponize the ODC? Are people using it as a tool to stand people down instead of trying to get resolution of real ethical issues? Why would somebody wait nine months to file a grievance against me? Or if it was filed in May, why did the ODC wait until February of 2023 right before the trial? Right before the trial when they know that I'm on a podcast, they know that I go on TV, they know I'm gonna be an analyst next week together with you guys. And, you know, the timing of all this just really is suspect. Parker, who isn't even a party to our lawsuit that we had pending at the time against Alex Murdaugh, seems to indicate that he's going to object to the confession of judgment but doesn't copy me on that objection. Mark Tinsley actually provided it to me and then I got a phone call from the receiver. And so, I merely said, look — to this person — you're not a party to our case and I'm tired of Mr. Parker exerting his influence over all these cases. I just think it's a disgrace. Plus, it was a lawyer from out of state that hadn't been admitted pro hac vice in the case, which is to be admitted so he could practice in South Carolina. And I just voiced my objection pretty forcefully, which I think I had a First Amendment right to do, and I wasn't doing to the press in a pending case because the Murdaugh case was over. I already had gotten the confession of judgment. But somebody filed a grievance against me. I don't know who filed that grievance against me but now, I have to answer it. And it's the second grievance and there's still another grievance that's up there at the ODC, which is when Dick Harpootlian reported me for some of the statements that I made about Alex when we were going toe to toe in the press. Dick would make some statements that I felt I had a right to respond to under the rules of professional conduct. But Dick thought that I was engaging in what's called pretrial publicity where I was trying to influence the proceedings.

[00:08:25] Liz Farrell: That's absolutely rich coming from him, by the way.

[00:08:28] **Eric Bland:** Right. A guy who's a 44-calibers quote machine that'll get in front of any microphone that you stuff in front of his face. But be that as it may, there was no trial on the horizon for Alex Murdaugh and the



Satterfields. There was no jury to influence. I had a right to correct a narrative that Dick was putting out there. And so, he filed a motion to gag me, as you recall. But that got resolved when the case got done.

[00:08:55] **Liz Farrell:** But then weeks later, Eric, so they filed the grievance against you?

[00:08:59] Eric Bland: Never withdrew it. Never withdrew it, by the way.

[00:09:01] **Liz Farrell:** And it's weeks later that Alex is like, I'm going to confess judgment in the Satterfield case, he tells the judge overseeing his bond hearing. Obviously, they were using that as sort of a, look, judge. I'm a good man. I'm trying to make right.

[00:09:16] **Eric Bland:** Yeah. But don't forget three weeks before that, Dick was saying to the press, Eric Bland needs to look at other people. He's already been made whole. He needs to look at Cory Fleming and his law firm and other people. Alex's doesn't have to pay. Then all of a sudden, three weeks later, Alex gives us the confession of judgment. So, it was a real whipsaw.

[00:09:36] **Liz Farrell:** And then nothing comes of it from you. I mean, Dick doesn't do the right thing and get rid — because he wants to hold the grievance over you most likely. I would assume.

[00:09:44] Eric Bland: Yeah. And the grievance is still sitting up there.

[00:09:47] **Liz Farrell:** But I mean, the ODC should be able to see right through that and do something about it, you would think.

[00:09:52] **Eric Bland:** I have a grievance now in connection with the confession of judgment that I got that the Bar ODC used to disbar Alex Murdaugh two days later.

[00:10:03] Mandy Matney: The timing, too. Alex got disbarred. What was it, like a couple days before he was charged with murder? It was very boom, boom,



boom. But it seemed like the Bar also got word that Alex was getting charged with murder and they didn't want South Carolina lawyer.

[00:10:21] Liz Farrell: Good point.

[00:10:22] **Eric Bland:** Hey, somebody just sent me a text and said, Dick's birthday's on Monday. How funny. I just got it on my new Apple watch.

[00:10:29] Liz Farrell: Are you gonna get him a laptop?

[00:10:31] **Eric Bland:** No, I'm not buying him anything. I'll buy him a bag of coal is what I'll buy him. So, I wonder how old he's gonna be on Monday. I don't know.

[00:10:38] **Liz Farrell:** 74. He's gonna be 74.

[00:10:39] Eric Bland: 74, okay.

[00:10:40] **Liz Farrell:** Yeah. So, happy birthday to him. I'm sure Alex got him something.

[00:10:44] **Mandy Matney:** There was a big, I don't know, a love story, I would call it in the *Post and Courier* about Dick and Jim and how wonderful of attorneys they are and they're good.

[00:10:59] Eric Bland: They're good. Don't underestimate them.

[00:11:01] **Liz Farrell:** Yeah, okay. But they're good. Fine. I agree. I totally agree. After reading that latest motion, I totally agree. 100%.

[00:11:07] **Mandy Matney:** I think they're crafty. I think they're smart. I don't — but I also think that they've made a lot of big mistakes in this case.

[00:11:13] Eric Bland: They have. Dick has, no question.



[00:11:14] **Mandy Matney:** And the article does not mention that. Specifically, I think the biggest one that was the most shocking to lawyers specifically was when Dick went on the *Today* show and admitted that his client committed crime. That's like lawyering, defense lawyering 101. You don't do that.

[00:11:33] **Eric Bland:** And also in our bond hearing when he said, our client knows that he's gonna go to jail for a long time by what he did to the clients. That just —

[00:11:42] **Liz Farrell:** All before you said anything. Like that's the thing that's funny. It's, I guess it's okay when they say it but not okay when anyone else weighs in.

[00:11:49] **Eric Bland:** But I think you guys are gonna be surprised when Dick dials it in and gets ready for a trial and assuming that he still has that skill set, which I think he does. He's really good and I think you're gonna be surprised at how good he is.

[00:12:02] **Liz Farrell:** Yeah, I don't know how we could be surprised though because I feel like every, every bro in South Carolina has told us.

[00:12:07] Mandy Matney: Yeah, he's amazing.

[00:12:08] Liz Farrell: How great Dick is so.

[00:12:11] **Eric Bland:** I didn't, this is a guy that's tried a hundred murder cases, okay?

[00:12:15] Mandy Matney: Sure.

[00:12:16] **Eric Bland:** So, he's — I'm just saying, I'm just saying you got a guy that — with Jim Griffin, who has a lot of experience — that knows how to sow reasonable doubt and where to start those fires. And Creighton is like a first round draft pick who's now being thrown into the NFL to go quarterback his first game. Now, I'm not saying he's not good 'cause he is, but there is a wealth of experience on the other side of that courtroom that you should not



discount and especially in a circumstantial evidence case where you can create that reasonable doubt. It would be really much harder for Dick and Jim if there was a recording or a video or something like that.

[00:12:53] **Mandy Matney:** But it's like Brett Favre in his later years, like quarterbacks deteriorate with time and —

[00:13:01] **Eric Bland:** LeBron James is averaging 38 points a game at 38 years old right now.

[00:13:05] **Liz Farrell:** Okay. Sports analogies are a little over my head, so we'll use *The Office* analogies. I think Creighton is Dwight Schrute. I think that he is, I think that he is gonna come on strong. He does not put up with anything from anyone and he sticks to the rules. So, I'm pulling for Dwight. But going back to what you guys said or what Eric said about the timing of this now, I mean, this was based on an article that I wrote in April of 2022 and that was based on the filing that they had put in. So, I guess what would be the benefit of them doing this to you right now?

[00:13:42] **Eric Bland:** I guess to somehow chill what I may talk about next week. You know, the other thing that really, they assumed in their motion that I called you on the phone and told you this and that you don't have any other sources other than Eric Bland in April of 2022; that you weren't talking to anybody else other than Eric, which is so far from the case. Yes, I talked to you the next day in the newspaper. But you talked to many people in that case, many of the lawyers involved. And for them to just assume that I have a direct pipeline to you and I could call you on the phone and you'd write an article. You knew about the Parker case. I did not. I was not involved in the Mallory Beach Parker case at all. So, I didn't follow it. I would, whatever I read in the paper. Yes. For them to say, well, I called you on the phone at 11 o'clock at night and you wrote the article, that's just not true. It's —

[00:14:39] **Liz Farrell:** Well, if they knew anything about me, they would know I'm in bed at 8:30, so that's ridiculous.

[00:14:43] **Eric Bland:** But it's insinuating that you don't have any other source other than Eric Bland, which is just poppycock.



[00:14:48] **Liz Farrell:** Well, of course, they don't want — yeah. And then, I mean, that's the thing how sourcing works, too, is it's not just, you know, it's not the people you always think it is. And going back again to the timing, it's — I think this might have to, let's just say, pretend that the timing is an issue and that this was done very, very purposely. I don't know that it has as much to do with the murder case as it might do with the other people standing in line — Palmetto State Bank and Johnny Parker trying to get money from Maggie's estate because you represent another source of money with that confession of judgment, right?

[00:15:22] **Eric Bland:** Right. And I also represent the Plyler girls that are currently suing Palmetto State Bank, too. And that's, it's more money out of their coffers as well.

[00:15:29] **Liz Farrell:** Yeah. So, I hope that the ODC isn't — because this is the thing. We have how much, like what percent of faith do you have in the ODC, Mandy?

[00:15:37] Mandy Matney: Point — I'll give them 5%.

[00:15:42] **Liz Farrell:** Point.

[00:15:43] Mandy Matney: Out of a hundred.

[00:15:45] Liz Farrell: Okay. Eric, I'm not gonna put you on the spot. Yeah.

[00:15:48] Eric Bland: I have no comment.

[00:15:49] **Mandy Matney:** I just don't. The Carmen Mullen thing was very depressing for me. And I'm sure, I can't imagine what it was for you, Eric.

[00:15:59] **Eric Bland:** Yeah, she popped up on a motion that we have in the Plyler case for February 8th on a motion for summary judgment that we filed against the bank as a result of the testimony and the conviction of Russ Laffitte. And we had to write the Circuit, the court, as well as the clerk of all



the clerks, and said, Judge Mullen is recused from hearing anything having to do with Bland Richter because we reported her twice.

[00:16:24] Mandy Matney: All I'm asking for here is a suspension. There's enough for a suspension there. I just want it to be fully investigated, all of the allegations, because there are many and we keep finding out how she was more and more involved with these other cases. Like she signed the search warrant for Eddie Smith. Well, that's problematic. If the ODC cares about the justice system, they really, really need to care about those at the top of it. And that starts with Carmen Mullen, and them not doing anything speaks volumes in my opinion.

[00:17:02] Liz Farrell: Yeah. How do they want us to trust them?

[00:17:05] Mandy Matney: They won't even admit to like, we're doing an investigation, guys. Chill out. They won't say that.

[00:17:12] **Liz Farrell:** No. It's ridiculous. And that secrecy is what causes what's happening right now to Eric, which is using it as a weapon. Because the more secret you are about it, the more you can do that stuff and get away with it. I don't wanna beat this to death but the fact that they haven't dropped the first grievance is ridiculous. And the fact that they accepted the second grievance is also ridiculous.

[00:17:42] Mandy Matney: And we'll be right back.

[00:17:48] **Liz Farrell:** Do you guys wanna talk about the motion, the 63-page motion that Dick and Jim filed yesterday?

[00:17:55] **Mandy Matney:** I have a question that somebody asked me on Discord today, to start this one out. What is — can attorneys lie in motions and is there repercussions for that?

[00:18:09] **Eric Bland:** We have a Rule 11 that says that we have to swear or affirm that what we put in a motion is a good faith basis and argument. We have a good faith basis to do it. Attorneys puff. We're like car salesman. We



can puff a little bit. So, we could take a fact and maybe puff it up a little bit. But no, we cannot lie. We have rules of professional conduct, which says under Rule 3.3 that we have a duty of candor to the court and we have a duty of candor to the opposing counsel and we have a duty of candor to the public. We cannot outright lie. So, when we file a motion, we have to have a good faith basis to do it. However, in that motion, we can turn an anthill into a mountain and it's called puffing.

[00:19:01] Mandy Matney: Yeah, like —

[00:19:03] **Eric Bland:** Now, if you guys did that, your journalistic integrity would be immediately questioned.

[00:19:06] **Mandy Matney:** Well, it reminded me of when we were at McClatchy, Liz. And for headlines, they trained us on the most aggressive form of the truth should go in your headline. So, like.

[00:19:20] Liz Farrell: Yeah. Yeah.

[00:19:20] Eric Bland: That's a nice way to put it.

[00:19:22] Mandy Matney: The most aggressive form of the truth.

[00:19:24] Eric Bland: That's really interesting.

[00:19:26] **Liz Farrell:** I have to say if we're talking about enjoyable motions, if there ever is such a thing, I enjoyed reading the latest one though. It has me a little terrified. I don't know that there's —

[00:19:37] Eric Bland: Terrified from what?

[00:19:38] **Liz Farrell:** Because one, it was super thorough. But again, going with the most aggressive form of the truth, I think that's exactly what they did. As far as the lying, it's not that I could say that they were lying in it. I think it's more that they are, first of all, they're super slanderous. Very defamatory. I



don't know how they can just call the blood spatter expert a liar and that he

[00:20:03] **Eric Bland:** Fantasy land or something. Fantasy playground or something.

[00:20:06] Mandy Matney: Science project. Science fair.

[00:20:07] Eric Bland: Science project. Science fair project. There you go.

[00:20:09] Liz Farrell: Yeah. The science fair project. That in and of itself is like the least of the insults that they said. I mean, they outright call, say this guy is conspiring with SLED or SLED agents, specific SLED agents, to fabricate the evidence in this case. And now, let's first talk about, there was a question about the blood spatter obviously a while back. And it was: how does this blood spatter expert come from — he has this one opinion that there is nothing on the shirt that shows what's called back spatter, I guess, showing that he was the shooter; that that was what the shooter was wearing. But then he comes back a few months later and Dick and Jim want us to believe it's after he got visited by two SLED agents and given the shakedown or something. He finds more than a hundred spatters, I guess you could say, that indicate that he was in fact there in close proximity when they were shot one or both of them. So, this blood pattern expert is saying that the reason he had, there's a discrepancy in these two opinions is because he got new information in between, which is obvious. Like we knew that was gonna be the answer, right? So, the new information is these photos, this set of photos. It's the raw file of the photos of the shirt. Now, this is a normal way of determining whether there's spatter on something, by the way. You look at the photos. This happens all the time. So, he gets the higher resolution versions of these pictures and now, he can see better what's on the shirt. Now, Dick and Jim are saying that the blood spatter expert and the state, which includes obviously the AG's office and SLED, are defying an order to give them all the information. And we've seen in the past, like Mandy has said this over and over again, starting with when Jim Griffin swore that Alex got shot in the head and was in Charleston. Just once you like, fool me once, fool me twice, kind of thing. Dick and Jim have done this before where they have taken, again, the most aggressive form of the truth, which is that, yeah — the night



before they tell Creighton, hey, we're gonna want this stuff. And Creighton's like, yeah, yeah. That's cool. Well, we'll get that to you. And then the next day, they're filing a motion that's like the state won't give us the evidence, so you need to order them. And now, the judge has to have a hearing. They have the hearing and then they're like, we had to go and have a hearing to get you to give us the evidence. So, it's all a bunch of dramatics but this was so tight and so well-written and so inflammatory that I'm worried that they're gonna lose the blood spatter evidence being able, like the ability to be able to present that to the jury.

[00:22:57] Eric Bland: No, they won't.

[00:22:58] Liz Farrell: You don't think so? Oh, this is good. Okay.

[00:23:00] Eric Bland: No, they won't. So, let me kind of educate everybody on what an expert witness is. An expert witness is somebody that comes in that can educate the jury on an ultimate issue and based on their scientific credentials and subject to peer review. The test used to be you'll hear in the court the Frye test, but it's now the Kumho Tire test. And that is if what that expert is gonna testify is subject to peer review, where people who have studied blood spatter evidenc, they can testify to it. Now, under our rules of evidence, believe it or not, expert witnesses can formulate their opinions from many different sources — scientific books, from their own study, from looking at other tests, from taking information from people. They can even take hearsay information. Under our rules, an expert witness can take hearsay and use it and formulate it and come up with an expert opinion, even though hearsay can't come into court usually unless it's by a dying declarant, somebody who's dying and their dying words are usually before they're gonna meet their maker true words, or it's an admission by somebody who's a party. But they can take hearsay and put it into their opinions. So, I think what Creighton's gonna argue is these were preliminary opinions. This guy looked at the shirt; didn't do the entire testing. Experts change their opinions based on new information and that is perfectly fine. Because in the depositions, when I depose an expert, I will say to him, "Have I given you an opportunity to formulate your entire opinion? Is there anything else you want to add?" And a good expert says, "As of today, Mr. Bland, you have my opinion. But it is subject to change if I'm provided additional information or



documents." And that's all that happened here. Now, I love what you said, Mandy. It's taking the most aggressive form of the truth. That's what Dick's doing. So, an expert doesn't have to make an opinion in June and it stays the same. Let's give this expert a chance. Now, the judge is gonna let him give us an opinion and he's gonna turn it over to Dick and it's Dick's job to attack the credibility of that opinion. But as far as admissibility of that opinion, it's going to come in.

[00:25:40] **Liz Farrell:** So, do you think though the state might be a little timid because they really tried to paint the picture in this motion that Creighton was embarrassed? Like even Creighton was embarrassed by how the work of this blood spatter expert in Oklahoma.

[00:25:52] Eric Bland: Sure. We never want an expert to not do the right test from the start or not have all the information before they render an opinion. And I'm sure it's gonna be a preliminary opinion that this guy Bevel — is that his name? — that he rendered. But it just goes to credibility. It goes to the same thing that Dick's gonna put up an expert to say it's not spatter. And Creighton's gonna say, well, did you do this test, this test, this test? Did you know this information, this information? And the expert's gonna say, well, no. I only had this, this, and this. A battle of the experts, they usually cancel each other out. It comes down to jurors like to hear from witnesses. Witnesses mean more because experts are paid. You know, Bevel's gonna be paid for his testimony to come here. Dick's experts are paid. So, jurors want to hear from normal people, not, you know, yes, they like lawyers, but lawyers, you're gonna hear this jury charge in the beginning of the trial and at the end. What the lawyers say is not evidence. It can't be considered by you as evidence. Only what comes from the witness stand or would I admit. So, I think the most important thing in this trial is gonna be Judge Newman. The same way in Russell Laffitte's trial it was Judge Gergel. I think Judge Newman is not gonna be Judge Ito and I think Judge Newman is gonna keep this thing moving. He's gonna stick to the rules of evidence. He's gonna permit experts to testify. And he's gonna say, "Dick, go have at it on cross-examination. You want to cut this guy to shreds and say that he's Bozo the Clown? Go do it, but do it on cross-examination.



[00:27:40] Liz Farrell: They're asking for sanctions against Creighton Waters and they're asking for sanctions against Tom Bevel, who is the blood spatter expert. And basically, they're saying that they didn't turn over all the evidence. And it is, this is 63 pages because it includes a timeline. It includes a very labyrinthine sort of way at I guess that aggressive form of the truth. So, it's not that it's difficult to follow.but there's a lot to consider and there's nuance there. So, essentially, we know that they had a problem with the shirt and we know they had a problem with the way the blood spatter expert came to his opinion, which again, like I said, there was the first opinion, which was there's nothing and the second opinion is there's something. You throw into that this all other issue, which is that, and I don't wanna get into like the chemicals mainly because I can't remember them right off the top of my head, but there's the first test that SLED did on the shirt, which was like the regular test to detect for blood. The second test they did was a Hema — I think it's called hemaChrome, something like that — and it came up with no blood. And you've heard Dick say you can't have spatter without blood, right? But what this expert is now saying — and this is what the science fair experiment that they were referring to in the headlines is — he's saving that there are times when if you've used this first chemical and then you use the second one, it'll test negative for blood because of the testing that previously happened. So, there's two things that are going through my mind right now. One is hopefully — I live in South Carolina. I work on a podcast that questions the system itself repeatedly. So, I do have that piece in my mind that is like, this better not be some Good Ole Boy in SLED that did some nonsense. The second thing that's going through my head is will Creighton be able to be —

[00:29:38] Eric Bland: Nimble enough on his feet.

[00:29:39] **Liz Farrell:** Nimble. That's a great word. Nimble enough to be able to untie this knot for Judge Newman. And then if it, if they are, will they be able to do it for the jury later? Because — so, the sanction, sorry, that they want is they want to prevent the testimony of Tom Bevel. They want that to be the sanction that the judge decides on. They want the costs. They want Alex to get the money that it costs to write this 63-page motion, etc. And the third thing that they want is that anyone who has written a derivative opinion of Tom Bevel's report also to be disincluded. Because there is another man who is out of Orangeburg. He is the chief deputy of the Orangeburg County



Sheriff's Office. And he has a PhD, which how often are you seeing a PhD these days in South Carolina sheriff's offices? So, bravo to him. He wrote a very interesting report. Now, when they say "derivative of Tom Bevel's report," yes. That was one thing he considered. And Eric, you explained all that; that they're allowed to consider all these things. It is one of, 50th of what he considered in writing his report. And his report they said was just a beat for beat reproduction of Tom Bevel's. It absolutely was not. It was a different report. Now, I wanna note in this motion they have called SLED. They've called — SLED is corrupt. SLED is fabricating evidence. Tom Bevel's fabricating he's a liar, essentially. I don't know why they're allowed to say that. They put a picture of his house with his driveway and his car in it. They did fuzz out his license plate. They put a picture of his partner, his partner's house. And I don't know that there was a reason, there's a debate online about whether that was called for or not. And then additionally, they've included some pictures from the crime scene itself, specifically the dog kennel closet that Paul died near and in it is a manneguin that I guess stood in for Paul and to sort of recreate what happened. So, there's some graphic elements to this, too, which wasn't entirely clear why they included those graphic — why they needed those pictures to me anyway, and then a fuzzy photo of Alex from the body camera wearing his dumb shirt. Now, the bottom third of the shirt has transfer blood on it. So, that is off, like nobody cares about what the bottom third is. But on the top of the shirt are specks that aren't necessarily visible to the naked eye. So, going back to what we've said I think previously, Mandy, this is where I think Alex got caught up. He didn't see the blood on his shirt, so maybe he didn't take that off. And it looks like it's like something that you might wear as an undershirt. So, is it possible that he had another shirt or a jacket on over that prior to — if he did it — prior to the police arriving? Took that thing off. looked at himself, and he was like, oh, you're good, Alex. Wiped his face off, did whatever, and didn't realize that those microscopic not visible to the human eye, the naked eye rather, those things were on there. So, the way these guys are fighting this, obviously, I think this is going to be very, very damning and important evidence. And Eric, you're saying that it's going in. Mandy, what was your impression of the motion itself after you read it?

[00:32:55] **Mandy Matney:** Well, I have a question after reading the motion. Like why would, what is the point of Dick and Jim doing this before trial versus just destroying Bevel on cross if he's so — if the evidence is so bad? And like, why don't you just do that?



[00:33:15] Eric Bland: Because he's trying to seed the jury pool. Remember jurors still listen to the TV. They still read the newspaper. We're not gonna get 12 jurors that are under a rock that haven't read anything. We're gonna get 12 jurors that are going to swear that they can be fair and reasonable. He's also trying to salt Judge Newman and soften him up to say to him, you should have some reasonable doubt. This is all — it's all building up to a cake. And it's just another ingredient that goes in that Dick is doing this. He's not gonna leave it for trial. This is a court of public and opinion. The more journalists now are starting — I got a call from a journalist who said, wow, you know, this is starting to look like it's gonna be a difficult trial. It's made, do you think that it is possible that Alex didn't do this? was a question that I got. That tells me that Dick and Jim are effective in their strategy of hearts and minds swaying a little bit of the hearts and minds of people to get them open. Remember up until, you know, months ago, everybody, if you said Alex Murdaugh, we're not gonna give him any benefit of the doubt. Now, all of a sudden, people are trying to see, well, now, we want to hear the whole story. The point of this is that we don't know how close Alex was when he shot, if he shot, Paul, God forbid. Could he have been 12 feet away so that that spatter is mist spatter? It's not a magic marker spatter but it's misted spatter. Do I question whether he should have tested the whole shirt or if he saw a spatter, should they have cut it out? That's subject to debate that Bevel, could he have done something not to destroy the whole shirt? We'll hear that. We'll hear the testimony. But like you said, Liz, so much goes into these opinions, not just the initial test. But what, where were the markings on the ground? Where are the footprints? This testing? So, we just don't know yet. Look, I applaud Dick and Jim for creating a lot of sound and fury. And that's a good thing if you're a defense attorney, to create sound and fury. The question is: does it signify anything or is he gonna be the proverbial idiot from Steinbeck?

[00:35:37] **Mandy Matney:** But it's interesting that — and I had that same opinion, too, Eric. I thought that it's specifically for seeds of doubt, for planting seeds of doubt in your potential jury pool 'cause I don't know why else you would do this.

[00:35:51] Eric Bland: And Judge Newman, don't forget, soften up that judge.



[00:35:55] **Mandy Matney:** That is doing exactly what he's accusing SLED of doing in the motion. They again mentioned my name and mentioned my article from a long time ago today talking about the high velocity blood spatter and that he's, they're accusing SLED of trying the case in the media and —

[00:36:14] **Eric Bland:** That they leaked it to you.

[00:36:16] Mandy Matney: And they're doing the same — and by the way, they, I mean —

[00:36:20] Eric Bland: That's not where you got your source.

[00:36:21] Mandy Matney: The statements are completely false.

[00:36:22] Eric Bland: Correct.

[00:36:23] Mandy Matney: Just completely false.

[00:36:24] **Eric Bland:** That's just assuming that you just had a pipeline directly to SLED, which he has no knowledge of.

[00:36:30] Liz Farrell: I wish we did.

[00:36:30] **Mandy Matney:** Right. Right. And the other thing was the words that they used to describe what was going on at SLED at the time, like SLED frustrated with this. It's like you just made that up.

[00:36:42] **Liz Farrell:** Yeah. Again, the most aggressive form of the truth. It's just —

[00:36:46] **Mandy Matney:** I just can't. And then my main takeaway was like if I have direct knowledge of this, that, and that, and I know that that's false, how much of this is like a very, it's not even an aggressive form of the truth. It's like a warped, almost a lie but not quite.



[00:37:04] **Eric Bland:** Almost, it could be almost hyperbole without being a full-blown lie.

[00:37:09] Mandy Matney: Some of it, yeah.

[00:37:09] **Eric Bland:** Again, we have Rule 11 and we have the 3.3 candor of the court but nobody ever gets called to the carpet on it. Nobody's gonna call Dick Harpootlian on this and sanction him. The state is not gonna be sanctioned. This expert witness is not gonna be sanctioned. It's not going to happen.

[00:37:27] **Liz Farrell:** Well, that's the other thing to mention. There is no case law that addresses the situation.

[00:37:33] **Eric Bland:** It's the second time that they've done that. Remember what Judge Newman said? You're asking me to, you know, disturb a hundred years of jurisprudence and do this on a bill of particulars? No, I'm not gonna do that.

[00:37:44] Liz Farrell: Right. So, I think they're anticipating that with here because they obviously address, you know, there's nothing really out there to — no case law out there that we can really cite. The closest is this and this is the threshold for that. But I think you're right, Mandy. There, it's sort of galling when you read it, because you're — it would be a good case study for any college to take that motion and talk about how to write something that's persuasive based on the thinnest thread of the truth because even I'm aware of these techniques when I'm reading it. As a writer especially, I love — there was this one part in there where after the blood pattern expert returns his second opinion where he says, oh, actually, I found that there was a hundred-plus spatters on there. The SLED agent wrote back a short email and he was basically like, oh, cool. Thanks. Bob, you know, or whatever his name was. And he put an exclamation point after the thanks. And Dick and Jim took that exclamation point, that one exclamation point in that very short email, and I forget what word they used. It was like excited or exuberant or celebratory.



[00:39:01] **Eric Bland:** Were you listening or you're listening to me when I told you to go back and find this spatter, you know? Something like that; that there's a collusion that, you know, automatically, that means there's a collusive nature to this new opinion. Here's a red alert, guys. A little news alert for everybody. Law enforcement colludes with their experts. That's okay. They're entitled to talk to them and provide them with information and debate them and say, well, what about this? I do it all the time when I hire an expert witness and say, look. How about if you look at it from this angle, would it, would your opinion change? What about this? I mean, that's the healthy debate. You just don't in sterile provide experts with information and then never talk to them.

[00:39:52] **Liz Farrell:** Oh, no. Eric, this was like literally one of those things where you're like, hey, I got the thing. And the guy's like, cool, thanks. And then Dick and Jim have taken that one little thing and they've characterized it as like the SLED agent got up and started clicking his heels and was like whoopee!

[00:40:06] **Eric Bland:** Right. But they also said that the SLED agent bullied this guy into changing his opinion. That's not bullying. That is rightful collusion, rightful representing the state. You have a right to debate with your experts. Now, it's discoverable. And if the state did not turn over all this stuff and the expert in a subpoena did not turn it over, that's a different story.

[00:40:30] **Liz Farrell:** Well, we were talking about that. Do you think that that's — do you think there's any way that Creighton has not turned over everything that should be turned over?

[00:40:38] **Eric Bland:** I don't think he intentionally didn't turn something over, whether there's a paper that slipped through because the guy didn't ever forward that paper or a test to Creighton. It could be. But remember it has to be an intentional oversight, an intention on his part not to turn over a document. So, I don't think that's going to exist here. I think Creighton has really, he's a straight shooter. Not wild about his personality; it's prickly. But I don't find him to be a guy that's going to shave the corner to do it. I think he's gonna do it on the playing field. I don't think he's gonna try to do it in the dark.



[00:41:18] **Mandy Matney:** And I had a thought like it's, these motions are almost like the movies that are based on the, a true story, right? 'Cause it's like you watch a movie and like you Wikipedia, what really happened and there's little nuggets of truth and then the rest is just embellished and just made up and —

[00:41:42] **Liz Farrell:** So, it's basically like *The Crown* though like how people sort of look like Princess Diana, but it's not her.

[00:41:49] **Mandy Matney:** And they just made up this narrative of like, SLED was frustrated, so they called Mandy. No. Like none of it, they just, they found like, yeah, I did write a story. You know that part. But then you made up the whole part about how I got there.

[00:42:06] **Eric Bland:** And don't forget. Unlike life or unlike letters, the longer a brief is the more it must be important. So, if it was a three-page brief, you would say, God, that's just a perfunctory motion. But the fact that it's 63 pages, you're gonna snap back and say, well, there's a lot of meat in 63 pages. No, there's a lot of fluff in 63 pages. It probably could have been written in 20.

[00:42:33] **Liz Farrell:** You can also with a 63-page motion count on the fact that reporters are gonna skim for the most salacious parts or the most quotable. So, they're gonna pick up on that repeated use of the word science fair project. They're going to pick up on —

[00:42:47] Mandy Matney: Which they did.

[00:42:48] **Liz Farrell:** Which they did, of course. They're going to pick up on the frustrated, they did what Dick and Jim wanted them to do, which is good. Great.

[00:42:55] **Eric Bland:** But sometimes, you know, a murder comes down to real basic elementary facts. And to me, I think it's great we're all talking about spatter and we're talking about footprints or whatever. But to me, the most important text message is still Maggie texting her friend on the way, I think he's luring me. What is he doing? He's got, he's up to something, you know?



And then, what are those back-end text messages look like and the ones that preceded them? What is she gonna testify to? Did Maggie call her on the phone and say I'm really scared? What are the text messages between Alex and Maggie? Are there any that show tension there? You know, there's so much evidence I think we don't know about unless you guys already know that there aren't any text messages. But I got a feeling there's gonna be some deep-breath moments in there both from the state where we say, wow, that's a big fact. Just like in the Russell Laffitte trial when Emily stood up and just casually said, oh, by the way, on the morning of the murders, he was confronted by people in his law firm about missing funds. And we all were like, wow! Where did that come from? And I think Dick's gonna have some of those Aha! moments. So, everybody's holding their powder. Nothing, not everything's out on the table right now is what I'm saying.

[00:44:14] **Liz Farrell:** Well, one question I have is it was my impression that in addition to the blood spatter expert that they hired, that they also were double-checking this stuff with the FBI to see if they reached the same conclusion. So, I don't think that we're going to see a situation where it's just the expert's opinion. I think that there, we're gonna find out that there were matching opinions coming from other sources as well. So, I'm excited to see how that plays out because that's important obviously with — I mean, that's why it took a year over a year, right, it's so that they could check this stuff?

[00:44:49] Mandy Matney: Yeah. I was thinking about this today and I worry about them overcomplicating things, but I also kind of want them to complicate things because I want other people to be exposed in this. And that would come with those shocking, like the moment in the Russell trial where Emily said that about PMPED. But then looking back on it, I'm not really sure why that came up, you know? And that might've confused jurors a little bit because it was kind of a distraction a little bit in the actual case. So, I think that that's gonna be one of the hardest things in this is that to keep it as simple as possible for the prosecution. Because the defense wants complication. They want distraction. They want confused jurors.

[00:45:43] **Eric Bland:** Can I ask you guys: do you agree that the motive was the financial pressures, the financial crimes all coming to roost, that that



broke him? Or is there another motive? Do you agree with the state's motive — let me ask you that — as they've expressed it so far?

[00:46:02] Mandy Matney: Yes.

[00:46:02] **Liz Farrell:** Yeah. I think it shows it's a state of mind issue. I think that there's probably other, I mean, nothing is just one thing, right? There's other benefits.

[00:46:12] **Eric Bland:** It's not as simple as I hated my wife and my son and I just decided that I'm gonna off them that day. It's not that. There's more to it than that.

[00:46:19] Mandy Matney: I think Alex cared about money more than anything else in the universe.

[00:46:23] Liz Farrell: And the name.

[00:46:24] Eric Bland: Totally agree.

[00:46:24] Liz Farrell: I think the name, too.

[00:46:25] **Mandy Matney:** So, when you think about murder in a lot of like men like murder their wives sometimes because that's the thing that they care the most about in the universe and they cheated on them or whatever. Like it, so if you think about it in that sense, 'cause a lot of people are looking for that very simple type of motive. Maggie cheated on me and so, she's dead.

[00:46:50] **Eric Bland:** I understand, but we can kill spouses. It happens every day. We read about it every day. But you really rarely read about a parent killing a child except a deranged mother killing a baby or something like that but.

[00:47:04] **Liz Farrell:** Well, if a deranged mother can do it, then a deranged father can do it, too. And when, especially when you have, you know, I would say —



[00:47:10] Eric Bland: Paul wrecked his idyllic life, is that what you're saying?

[00:47:13] **Liz Farrell:** Well, Paul, I think was very infuriating and — so, I think if we're looking at crimes of passion where you lose your temper and you're — look. This was a hunting lodge for a family that was very gun happy and just —

[00:47:28] Eric Bland: Very aggressive. Very aggressive family.

[00:47:31] **Liz Farrell:** Very — I would say they played fast and loose with their guns. I would say that. It seems, right, Mandy? Like it feels like they were very casual about them. So, you know —

[00:47:40] Mandy Matney: Super casual.

[00:47:41] **Liz Farrell:** Are we talking about a guy who had a shotgun in his hand and lost his temper and used the thing that's in his hand? Did he mean to kill him? That's another thing. Was he even aiming at him? Did he hit him the one time and figure I'll have to finish him off because it was worse than I thought it would be? Alex has been shot before, like before the Salkehatchie, the Old Salkehatchie Road situation.

[00:48:05] **Eric Bland:** What?

[00:48:06] **Liz Farrell:** From what we've heard, this is like, this is a thing out there, like they have like minor accidents with guns.

[00:48:12] **Eric Bland:** What? He got buckshot? He was shot with buckshot hunting in the field?

[00:48:15] **Liz Farrell:** Something like that. Do you remember that story, Mandy?

[00:48:19] Mandy Matney: Barely. Yeah, it's ringing a lot of bells.



[00:48:21] Liz Farrell: It's something, I mean, it's just —

[00:48:22] Mandy Matney: Yeah, I've heard that several times though. Yeah.

[00:48:24] Eric Bland: Like a Dick Cheney kind of got shot?

[00:48:26] Mandy Matney: Yeah, like a nick.

[00:48:27] Liz Farrell: Exactly. Exactly.

[00:48:29] Mandy Matney: Yeah. But yeah, they played fast and loose and then the other with their guns. And I think it'll be very interesting to see what narrative the state comes up for motive for killing Paul specifically if Paul was onto the finances. Paul depended on his parents financially and we know his credit cards were getting canceled or were getting denied at bars and things. And if it was as simple as like Paul being like, what's going on dad? Like where's the money? What's —? And Maggie may be asking, too. What's going on with the money? Like and him being on his last string. I mean, I think it's possible. But I don't think a lot of people are misunderstanding the motive in a lot of ways. And I think it's just because they don't understand Alex.

[00:49:18] Eric Bland: What do you mean?

[00:49:19] **Mandy Matney:** They just want it to be a lot more simple. They're looking for a motive that's like any other crime story and this isn't.

[00:49:26] **Liz Farrell:** But it's kind of like I think they're misunderstanding again. Like it's again, going with that word sympathy. I think that sounds, like you sound crazy, like if you're saying somebody would kill somebody to get sympathy. But it's not about the sympathy, it's about the — he got, he eliminated two problems in his life and he got deference. He got time to clean up the situation with Chris Wilson. And that really was the name of the game where it's not just one thing. So, I hope the jury is able to see sort of the well-roundedness of these motives. I wouldn't say it's one motive.



[00:50:01] **Eric Bland:** Listen. I have, I've talked to a lot of people, including Dick and Jim early on, people that are on their defense teams, people that know them. And they honestly to a person every single one of them in that orbit believes that he's not guilty. And I'm stunned about that. And it causes me to pause that, you know, oftentimes somebody says, oh, my client's not guilty. They honestly believe that Alex is innocent. Is it possible? I don't know. I don't know. That's why I'm gonna wait till the trial, you know? I'm gonna wait till the trial. But they really do. And I'm telling you, if you put them on a lie detector, everyone to a person on that defense team, all the way down to the paralegals.

[00:50:50] Mandy Matney: Well, then, they'd done a very bad job of convincing the public of his innocence because I think my big takeaway is that like it's gonna be really hard to convince a jury that — I don't know. The whole alibi thing has never made any sense to me and it's just been as simple as if he didn't do it, why can't he tell us a simple here's what happened in my day, here's where I was? Instead, it's like changed a hundred times. And that has been, again, a bad I think a mistake on the defense's part. They should have said nothing.

[00:51:28] **Liz Farrell:** Well, like Brian Walshe, I think that Alex Murdaugh is going to get the shock of his life if he hasn't gotten it already in going through the discovery of what story technology can tell about you counter to the story you want people to think about yourself. So, I'm actually — that if I'm gonna say I'm excited about the trial because I'm not, then I, that's the only thing I'm excited about really is that.

[00:51:52] So, I wanna talk just real quick before we end this about while we were recording this, we got a message and I think it sort of explains going back to the beginning of the episode, Eric, why you have gotten this grievance today. Today was a hearing in the Beach case regarding the settlement between the Beach family and some of the other boat crash victims and Buster Murdaugh and the estate of Maggie Murdaugh, which we've told you guys about. And the hearing was to discuss a motion that's been put in by Johnny Parker. And then Palmetto State Bank came in late yesterday with their own objection to this settlement. And today, there was another person objecting to the settlement and that's Greg Parker. And so,



going back to what you were saying, Eric, back in April when you were quoted in that article about Greg Parker's objection to the Gloria Satterfield settlement, well, look at them here today doing the same thing.

[00:52:56] **Eric Bland:** I mean, look what he's done. He got on TV. He bragged about hiring, you know, six sets of lawyers. He, you know, he said, I'm gonna be the pioneer that changes the law and joint and several liability. I mean, he's tried to go after Mark Tinsley. I mean, this is, you know, he's a serious defense litigant that will scorch the earth and he's got the money to do it. And so, this is just a continuation of what he's done all along today. It doesn't surprise me. Surprise you? I don't think so.

[00:53:27] **Liz Farrell:** No. I mean, these guys are greedy and I've never seen such open greed. They do not care about doing the right thing.

[00:53:34] **Eric Bland:** Johnny Parker is a man in his seventies who cut his bones suing CSX railroad for accidents that happened all around the state. The law firm itself, the building is the house that CSX built is the rumor moniker that they get. He's a tremendous — was, maybe still is — a tremendous trial lawyer. Very good in front of juries. Certainly knows his locale. Certainly knows the people. Very confident. And he has been highly successful and done a lot of good for a lot of injured people. So, what we have learned about Johnny, which we never knew, is he runs a corner loan store. He, you know, loan — shop and loan. Come on in and I'll give you a loan and it's a hard money loaning lending and it's got a higher interest rate that you would pay at the bank. And he was interested in loaning money to lawyers, to bankers, to Russ Laffitte, which is surprising. He's an old schooler. Definitely an old schooler.

[00:54:37] **Liz Farrell:** So, Eric, do you think though — so talking about those loans. First, when PMPED tried to remake itself, they remade themselves into the Parker Law Group. So, he is the titular head of whatever PMPED wants to be in the future.

[00:54:51] Mandy Matney: The face.

[00:54:52] Liz Farrell: Right. He is the face of it.



[00:54:53] **Eric Bland:** And I'm not sure at 77 years old whether I would want me, if I was successful like he is and I'm not, that I want to be the face of a law firm. I think younger lawyers would say we gotta carve our own reputation. But that's the power that he still holds in that firm.

[00:55:09] **Liz Farrell:** Yeah. They don't wanna let go of that power and that they're just recycling it basically. But going back to the loans thing, do you have — what are the odds that Johnny has a formal agreement with Alex that he can refer to?

[00:55:20] **Eric Bland:** That's the thing. Did he produce a promissory note or different stuff like that? We don't know.

[00:55:25] **Liz Farrell:** Right. And does he even have standing in this case? Does he have standing to come in on the estate of Maggie Murdaugh? She didn't owe him money.

[00:55:33] **Eric Bland:** He says he holds a judgment, a confess judgment, just like I held a confession against Alex.

[00:55:41] Liz Farrell: We'll be right back.

[00:55:47] I wanna just tell you guys. If you can hear my dog in the background, he's fine. He's just, he's comforting himself with a toy and those are like the little sounds mixed. He's adorable, so I'll just let him be adorable. But I just wanna —

[00:56:01] Mandy Matney: Is your dog dying?

[00:56:04] Liz Farrell: Yeah. He's not. He just likes to sit.

[00:56:08] Mandy Matney: He's making like these sweet little noises.

[00:56:10] Liz Farrell: Like cooing noises. He sits with a little ball in his mouth and he sucks on the balls. I don't know if that's too much information.



[00:56:17] Mandy Matney: Aw. I'm just getting this straight. Since they reached a settlement at the Beach case, we've had three seems like greedy parties enter the game and say, don't give those people that have been victimized and have been like dragged through the mud through this whole, I mean, especially the Beach family. Bless them. I mean, they have held on. They've been in this for a long time and they just want peace and closure and —

[00:56:51] Eric Bland: And justice for their daughter.

[00:56:52] **Mandy Matney:** Yes. And they were so close. And now, all these greedy, selfish people are —

[00:57:03] **Eric Bland:** Sometimes, you don't do — just because you can do something doesn't mean you should do something. Just because Palmetto State Bank can object doesn't mean they should have objected. They have an image to rehab. Whether they know it or not, their image has been tarnished and justifiably so. Maybe the better course of action should have been, you know what? We need to work on getting rid of the Laffitte bad image. Rebuild ourselves. Rebrand ourselves. But all they're doing is playing the victim card again the same way that Russell tried to play the victim card, the way the bank tried to play the victim card in Russell's trial. And somebody's given him some bad advice.

[00:57:51] **Mandy Matney:** Yeah. And is it worth it? I mean, like it's weird for being, for somebody like Johnny Parker who I've been told could have retired a very long time ago and been a very, very wealthy man. It's weird for him to fight like this.

[00:58:07] **Eric Bland:** Mandy, the bank is fighting over \$49,000. They write that off in an hour. They wrote off, excuse me, they wrote off Alex two loans for \$300,000 in 2014.

[00:58:20] **Liz Farrell:** Right. They're shady loans that they gave him. So, this is what's crazy. It's they're upset about the late fees. They're trying to get in front of the victims to collect late fees on the mortgage, which they didn't charge, Russell didn't charge himself late fees. He didn't charge Alex late fees when they were taking money from Hannah Plyler on the down-low. So, it's real rich



that these board members who say they care about the community and that they're part of the community are basically saying like, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. We're gonna do this the right way. Same with Johnny Parker. I don't care. What's right is right. I understand Alex owes him money. But you are the one who loaned Alex money. And I think what we wanna see is the dates. Mandy, David, and I were looking at this. The dates that Johnny gave those loans to Alex in 2021 all line up with — one was on May 19th, which is the date that Alex was first confronted, I couldn't believe. At least when the firm first found out that there was a discrepancy in the fees. The other one was in March, which is when the Hershberger case situation happened. And the other one happened in July, which means he gave him a loan of several hundred thousand dollars after knowing that the firm had confronted him about that missing fee and that they didn't believe him when he said that that money was not taken and put somewhere else so.

[00:59:34] **Eric Bland:** That's extraordinary.

[00:59:35] **Liz Farrell:** That's — and so, let's also talk though real quick before we have to end, Greg Parker's strategy here is he does not want this settlement to go through because it removes Buster from the co-defendant list, which means that now the spotlight goes onto Greg Parker. They have no more buffer. They can't vilify Buster. They can't do anything to take less of the burden I guess off of them with the jury. So, they wanna keep Buster in this, right? They wanna keep the estate of Maggie Murdaugh in this because now without them, they are alone. It's just them and Alex and the estate of Paul.

[01:00:14] **Eric Bland:** I don't understand why Parker's doing this. I don't understand it.

[0]:00:18] **Liz Farrell:** Well, is that possible? Like, what's, tell us what you think of having Buster and the estate of Maggie Murdaugh does to Greg Parker strategically, when they're looking as a defense team at what this could mean for them in terms of the jury.

[01:00:30] **Eric Bland:** Because he's going to say that Buster knew that he has given his license to Paul. And it's a family problem; that they have alcohol and that they're the ones that are responsible. We sell alcohol. We had a clerk. She



looked at a license. These people look like they're twins. Yes, I get it that Buster's taller than Paul. But don't blame us. The real problem here is they had a family that run amok. That's what's going to be the trial from the Parker's. They're gonna blame this all on the Murdaugh. They're gonna say we have so much sympathy for Mallory Beach, but you're looking at the wrong people. The people you need to be looking at is Buster and Maggie for not doing her job as a mother and Alex as a father.

[01:01:16] **Liz Farrell:** So, does this remove that for them? Can they not do that now?

[01:01:19] **Eric Bland:** No. They'll point to an empty chair. They'll still raise that issue and say, look. Why are we the only people in the courtroom? It's amazing that the people who supplied the license and encouraged their kids to drink liquor, they put beer and let underage kids drink it from their cooler. Yeah, they're gonna put the Murdaugh family on trial. No question.

[01:01:37] **Liz Farrell:** So, what the heck are they doing now? Like what is going on? Why is Greg Parker — wait. Why are all these people coming out of the woodwork?

[0]:0]:44] **Eric Bland:** It's Mark. It's against Mark. Greg has such malice towards Mark Tinsley. He wants him not to get a victory of any kind. But I don't understand the bank. I don't know Johnny Parker, so I can't get in him, but I can advise the bank if somebody's given them some bad advice. For \$49,000, you stay a million miles away from this thing.

[01:02:09] **Liz Farrell:** I've heard that the bank believes that the victims have gotten enough money.

[01:02:14] **Eric Bland:** I find that to be repugnant. And if I ever heard that or had evidence of that, I would jam it down somebody's throat. Don't tell a victim how much money they should get when you made a fortune as a bank off Alex Murdaugh and all your dealings in that law firm over the last 40 years. Do not tarnish a victim by saying you got enough money.



[01:02:38] **Mandy Matney:** And they enabled Alex. Like he wouldn't have been able to — he had a bank of money to play with this entire time when he was committing all these crimes and because of their CEOs who has been convicted.

[01:02:54] Eric Bland: Convicted of wire fraud, bank fraud, everything.

[01:02:58] Liz Farrell: I mean, these guys are making themselves villains. They had an opportunity — I think we all in life have an opportunity to do the right thing. With Johnny Parker, I think the way I would look at it if I was him is, you know, do I need this money? I know it's, I know that it's a lot of money and I, it's something like 400 and some odd thousand dollars I believe. But like I said, I question the circumstances under which you loaned him this money. I question anyone who's constantly giving money to Alex Murdaugh. I don't believe for one second that there weren't rumors out there that Alex was constantly in overdraft. You're telling me that no bank teller at Palmetto State Bank saw that and didn't talk about it?

[01:03:34] Eric Bland: And if you're the, if you're Johnny Parker and you're trying to rebrand your law firm, you don't want your name coming up. You don't want your name coming up. You want to stay a million miles away from it. I tell my kids walk tall, don't crawl small. He's crawling small right now. He's, his name is coming up not in a good context. And so, there's a lot of people who are gonna say, nobody's learning their lesson over at that shop. And I would say to Johnny, I say it to the bank, look. You can't say anything to Parker. He's gonna do what he's gonna do. The guy's a multimillionaire and he's, you know, full of fire, piss fire and vinegar. Nobody's gonna penetrate that cap. But the bank should have somebody that's given them some good advice. And certainly, Johnny Parker's partner should say, hey, Johnny. Maybe we should stay out of this one. It's not like Mallory's family is getting a fortune from this settlement. They're not. And you're leaving Buster with \$500,000 to try to rehab his life and figure out what the kid's gonna do. He lost a mother. He lost a brother. He's losing a father. If you have any feelings towards the Murdaugh and you benefited by that name, you know, let Buster get us some money.



[01:04:55] **Liz Farrell:** Let's also talk about that cyclical economy that you just referenced, Eric, because that's part of it. We've talked about it on MMP before and on COJ but Johnny Parker and Palmetto State Bank are part of the Murdaugh economy, right? Do you guys remember when in the jailhouse calls, Mark Ball was supposed to be delivering a check to Alex and Buster? That check was for part of the firm. That was part of whether it's the building itself. It was Alex's share in the firm. They gave the firm. This is after Johnny Parker filed a lawsuit, after Randy Murdaugh filed a lawsuit. It is after the confession of judgment that Alex gave both of them. And then the firm is giving six-figure check to Alex while he's in jail. Why? Why — If this firm found that he was stealing from them and stealing from clients at the point that these calls were happening in the jailhouse is at a point when the scope of what Alex ad been doing, was known to the PMPED and why would they do that, right?

[01:05:58] **Eric Bland:** You saying that they wanted to keep him fat and happy and not talking?

[01:06:01] **Liz Farrell:** Would you give a check to a partner of yours that was found to have stolen the money? Wouldn't you hold — they're holding onto Palmetto State Bank's \$680,000 from the Arthur Badger situation.

[01:06:11] **Eric Bland:** In an escrow account, according to the testimony in court.

[01:06:13] Liz Farrell: Right. So, you're — would you give a check?

[0]:06:16] **Eric Bland:** Yeah, I would. If I was scared that he would open his mouth and take down my law firm, you're doggone right I would give him a check.

[01:06:22] Liz Farrell: There you go. And there it is.

[01:06:33] **Eric Bland:** So, we're here. I know how I felt before the Russell's trial and I felt confident. I don't feel that same confidence. I'm scared on what's gonna come out and what's gonna happen. It's really a surreal feeling that



this thing is going forward. I never expected it when Dick said, oh, we're gonna go to trial in 90 days and let's set this trial for January. I thought Dick would blink and say, well, I'm in the Senate, you know, or we don't do this. But it really looks like this thing is going forward, guys. I mean, what are your feelings about it?

[01:07:07] **Liz Farrell:** I'm ready.

[01:07:09] Mandy Matney: My feeling is that I am so ready. I'm sick of wondering what evidence they have. I'm sick of racking my brain for, could this be possible? Could this be possible? I'm ready. I'm ready to see all the witnesses that both sides call. I think that will be very interesting considering how close-lipped everybody has been with this story. I go back and forth as to how much faith I have, but I'm just ready to see everything.

[01:07:36] **Eric Bland:** So, if he gets convicted, everything, the dominoes will fall into place. They'll probably plea then on these other financial charges. Or are we gonna see — are we closer to the end of the Murdaugh story with a guilty verdict or are we further away? Do we, does the island get further away? What do you think, Liz?

[01:07:59] **Liz Farrell:** Well, I think for our purposes — because this goes beyond just Alex, it goes to the enablers as well — that even, it doesn't matter what the verdict is, but I will say if it's a not guilty verdict, I will be looking at real estate outside of South Carolina for sure.

[01:08:13] **Mandy Matney:** Agreed. And just wanna tell everybody this is the first day of the trial and if you want to check out our coverage, definitely go to mmp.supercast.com. We're going to be covering this all day every day for the next however long it lasts so.

[01:08:35] **Eric Bland:** Yes, guys. Don't forget on January 30th, we're out of the crib. We're on our own. COJ gets its own feed. We need your support. We need you to follow us. Follow us to witness rock and roll. That's all I ask.



[01:08:48] Liz Farrell: Yeah, you're gonna love to follow us. It's gonna get even better.

[01:08:51] Mandy Matney: I'm excited.

[01:08:53] **Eric Bland:** Thank you, guys. I'll see you tonight. Jury selection today was great. Let's get it on.

[01:08:58] Liz Farrell: Let's get it on.

[01:09:08] **Outro:** This Cup of Justice bonus episode of the Murdaugh Murders Podcast 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 Luna Shark Productions.