

[00:00:00] Mandy Matney: I don't know what happened to Gloria Satterfield. But now that Alex is admitting that he lied about the circumstances that led to her death, now that two of the three people who knew what happened to Gloria before she died have been murdered and the third is their murderer, we have more questions than ever about this case. My name is Mandy Matney. I have been investigating the Murdaugh family for more than four years now. This is the Murdaugh Murders podcast produced by my husband David Moses and written with journalist Liz Farrell.

[00:00:54] Well, here we are — May 3rd, 2023 on episode 91 of the Murdaugh Murders Podcast. I wanna start with an exciting announcement about an event that is so on point with our mission here at Luna Shark Productions. On Tuesday, May 9th, Sandy Smith and I will be speaking among several special guests at the Victims Matter Rally at the State House in Columbia, South Carolina. Last year, the Victims Matter Rally was first created in response to the Bowen Turner case as an effort to focus the attention surrounding the tragedy as a positive force to uplift victims and make change in South Carolina. And as we've said time and time again, our justice system too often prioritize those who are privileged and fails victims of violent crime, and too many of our lawmakers are working for the bad guys. As we are working to expand our reach at Luna Shark to focus on cases across the nation and maybe eventually the world where crime meets corruption, we also want to ensure that the pressure continues right here at home in South Carolina until real change happens. And we will continue to fight for Stephen Smith. And we will be doing everything that we can to keep his story alive until his case is solved and justice is served. So join us at the State House on Tuesday at 9:00 AM, and we will be streaming the rally live for MMP Premium members. And speaking of cases where the system tramples all over victims' rights, I wanna talk about the Jeroid Price case for a minute. And before we get into it, I just wanna say that Beth Braden, Callie Lyons, and Ali Pavlich of the Luna Shark team made an incredibly insightful graphic for our Premium members to better understand the Price case. Members can check it out at mmp.supercast.com.

[00:02:56] So it has been a week since the South Carolina Supreme Court ruled to void Judge Casey Manning's order in releasing convicted killer Jeroid Price 15 years early. And surprise, surprise. Price is apparently on the run and



nowhere to be found. Sheriff Leon Lott, the sheriff of Richland County where Price was convicted of murder, announced last week that the sheriff's office AKA the taxpayers are offering a \$5,000 reward for information leading to his return. The following day, Price's attorney, State Rep. Todd Rutherford, held a press conference where he asked Price to turn himself in. But he didn't stop there. Among the absurd things that Rutherford said in this press conference, he actually apologized to Price, not the people of South Carolina who he serves. Quote, I'm sorry, Mr. Price, who has done nothing but help the citizens of South Carolina, saving the lives of correctional officers, and somehow that lands him back in the South Carolina Department of Corrections, Rutherford said. Again, he said that Mr. Price has done nothing but help the citizens of South Carolina. Speaking of lawmakers having no concerns about victims whatsoever, there is a clear example for you. Rutherford knows that Price attempted to appeal his conviction multiple times and failed. He knows that in the eyes of the law, his client is a murderer and his client's release certainly hurts the Smalls family. Rutherford also knows that the evidence he offered to back up those claims that his client was a hero to SCDC employees was not at all credible and essentially hearsay. And Rutherford, who works for us by the way, also knows just how costly his client has been to the state of South Carolina. Taxpayers are now having to pay for the reward money to get Price back into custody. Taxpayers are now having to pay for all of the overtime hours and manpower in the search for Price. Taxpayers have been forced to clean up this mess that was made by elected officials. All three of these elected officials — Rutherford, Solicitor Byron Gipson, and Judge Casey Manning — failed the taxpayers when they agreed to the secret order. They failed to stop and think about the potential damage of their actions. They failed to look out for the people who pay their salaries.

[00:05:31] And now that the dust has settled and the Supreme Court has officially ruled that yes, what they did was in fact wrong, the investigation must continue. Not only do they need to find Price, but like Alex Murdaugh, Price is just another branch of a corrupt tree. The branches are just showing us that the problem exists at the roots. We're never going to fix anything until we address the roots, and that is the system itself and those in charge of it. We need to not only find out how they did this, but why they did this. What could have possibly incentivized three elected officials to care more about a murderer's early release than they do about public safety and following the law?



[00:06:25] Liz Farrell: We are now less than three and a half months away from trial in the case that started it all. The case that led Alex Murdaugh down that very dark path to murdering his own wife and son: the boat crash case. Over the past four years, this case grew from one case in April 2019 to two cases at the time of the murders to seven cases total, including a civil conspiracy case involving the release of confidential court documents and photos of Mallory Beach's body to the media. In November 2021, this case was behind the court decision that froze Alex's assets and led to the appointment of a receivership to do a full accounting of every last penny they could find in Alex's literal and figurative wallets. From that, the receivership brought with it some of the more interesting findings in the Murdaugh investigations thus far, including the millions of dollars in checks that Alex wrote to Curtis Eddie Smith so that Eddie could cash them for him as well as the money Alex gave to Yemassee police chief Greg Alexander before and after the murders. Needless to say, this case has never been short on drama. Remember this guy?

[00:07:41] Mark Tinsley: I think so. I think the judge ultimately agreed to give it to me.

[00:07:46] **Phil Barber:** He agreed to give it to you.

[00:07:47] **Mark Tinsley:** Sure.

[00:07:48] **Phil Barber:** But I thought the hearing didn't happen.

[00:07:50] **Mark Tinsley:** Well, you thought wrong. There's a lot of papers that maybe you got confused.

[00:07:54] **Phil Barber:** He granted this motion?

[00:07:55] Mark Tinsley: I think so. You wanna see the order?

[00:07:57] **Phil Barber:** Yeah.

[00:07:58] **Liz Farrell:** That was obviously Mark Tinsley from the February 6th, 2021 in-camera hearing to determine whether the jury would get to hear



about Alex's financial situation at the time of the murders, as well as the mounting pressures he was facing due to his years of alleged financial crimes. As you know, Tinsley represents the Beach family as well as boat crash victims Morgan Doughty and Miley Altman. It's safe to assume we'll be hearing a whole lot more from him in the lead-up to the boat crash trial, which is set to start August 14th and is expected to take about two weeks.

[00:08:30] Motions in limine, meaning the issues that lawyers would like to have decided before the start of the trial and outside the presence of the jury, are already being filed in the case. This afternoon, in fact, Tinsley and company appeared before Judge Daniel Hall in Lexington County to respond to the latest motions made by the defendants in the Beach case. So let's start by talking about those because they're good ones, especially if you like tone-deaf absurdity from rich white men who will never get it.

[00:09:00] Mandy Matney: Speaking of Alex Murdaugh's attorneys, you might recall that on March 21st, Dick and Jim filed a motion on Alex's behalf asking the court to give them more money to appeal the case that they just lost. We recorded this episode before the hearing started Wednesday afternoon, so we'll update you on how it turned out on the next Cup of Justice episode. As it stands right now on Wednesday afternoon, we are really curious about whether Dick and Jim will even show up to the hearing or if they'll send their associates, Margaret Fox and Phil Barber, or if no one will be there to arque their motion. Because that could be really awkward for them, right, if they did show up. Why? Because they didn't bother to appear at Judge Clifton Newman's scheduling hearing on April 21st, citing Dick Harpootlian's legislative immunity. Dick, being a state senator, gets to push off his legal work until the legislative session ends each year. This year, it ends on May 11th, but Dick waived his rights for Alex's trial. Wasn't that nice of him? We'll talk about this another time, but legislative immunity is something liberally used by legislator-lawyers as a way to endlessly extend their client's cases something that can be particularly damaging to victims and criminal matters. At the scheduling hearing, prosecutor Creighton Waters rightfully pointed out that neither Jim, Maggie, nor Phil were legislators. So guess they were all too busy to get that Satterfield case on the old schedule. Our big guestion is will they be too busy to stand in front of Judge Hall and beg for the victims' money. Should we take a bet on that one?



[00:10:51] There are a couple of interesting things we wanna point out about Dick and Jim's money-grubbing motion. The first is how dare they do that with a straight face. Dick and Jim are lawyers, yes. But they're also business owners, right?

[00:11:08] Liz Farrell: Their motion is like inviting an orangutan into your restaurant, letting the orangutan order whatever it wants off the menu for 20 months, working yourself silly in the kitchen to cook the orangutan's meals to his liking and with his feedback, cleaning up the orangutans mess after he predictably joins you in the kitchen to show you how it's done, then finally asking him, "Are you ready for the check, sir?" Then, going to court when he's inevitably like, "What money? I'm an orangutan!" And then, asking the judge if it's okay for you to raid the World Wildlife Fund to pay the orangutan's debt. Dick and Jim and their staff worked their tails off for Alex Murdaugh. No one is begrudging them that. They gave that man every ounce of their abilities, and they should be paid for it. If I were them, I'd be up at McCormick every 30 days until the debt was paid off, shaving Alex's head and selling locks of his hair to his Facebook fans because they would pay for that. But taking money from the victims? No, sir. That is when I'd be like, "Why did I give that orangutan a perfectly cooked porterhouse steak every night when he clearly had no money?"

[00:12:22] That Alex's case was going to be a long and tedious log was foreseeable. It was fully predictable that it was going to cost a lot of money. And yet, Dick and Jim are all, "Judge, we've already lost conservatively \$700,000 on this guy in attorney's fees alone. Could we please get a measly \$160,000 from his 401(k) for his appeal? Remember the 401(k)? Remember when Dick and Jim convinced the receivership and the court that if Alex were allowed to cash in his \$2 million retirement fund, which would obviously incur penalties and taxes, then they'd only take \$600,000 of that and leave the rest, which was about \$425,000 for his future creditors, which includes his victims? Remember that deal? We just need the \$600,000 to hire some experts, and you guys can have the rest. I'll give them the benefit of the doubt and say, okay, fine. At that point in time, Dick and Jim did not know they were going to lose Alex's case. In fact, Dick was telling anyone who would listen that the state had a pathetic case, and therefore the case was super winnable. However, their deal covered an appeal. That \$600,000 was inclusive of the trial and its appeal.



[00:13:40] That brings me to point two. The nerve of these guys losing a Murdaugh case in Colleton County and then expecting the court to give them a booster shot of money for it. They had every advantage going into this trial and throughout it. The blood spatter did not get brought up. They effectively had people questioning SLED about the integrity of the crime scene. They lost the case because of arrogance — theirs, Alex's, and the Murdaugh family's. And here we are again with that arrogance.

[00:14:10] The third point I wanna mention is this: in arguing for the court to grant their motion, Dick and Jim have taken the position that the state is wrongfully holding on to Alex's money. Here is David with their main argument.

[00:14:27] **David Moses:** The restraint of legitimate untainted assets needed by a defendant to retain counsel of choice violates the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution. A defendant's right to counsel of his choice whom the defendant can afford to hire with, quote, innocent property is a fundamental constitutional right.

[00:14:52] Mandy Matney: They're not wrong. The US Supreme Court in 2016 decided in favor of a woman who was charged in a healthcare fraud case. The woman contended that she should be able to use property unrelated to her crimes to pay for an attorney of her choice. The government had frozen, quote, property that is untainted by the crime and that belongs fully to the defendant, end quote. But last time I checked, the receivers are not government agents. Let's go over the history real quick. Alex's 401(k) was not touchable, meaning the receivers couldn't consider that an asset for the victims. Alex made it touchable by asking to cash it in. In other words, he converted an untouchable asset to a touchable one, and in doing so, made a deal with the receivers that he could make that asset touchable, i.e., make it so it could go to the victims only if he could make a substantial portion to pay for experts in his murder case, and that is what he did. Here's David again, reading more of Dick and Jim's whining.

[00:16:02] **David Moses:** Murdaugh has sufficient innocent property to pay the undersigned. These funds are legitimate untainted funds. Furthermore, the undersigned is informed and believes that there are additional funds that



have been deposited into the receiver's escrow account that do not represent the proceeds from illegal activities.

[00:16:25] Mandy Matney: Oh, really? So A) How exactly are we determining that Alex's substantial 401(k) was funded with untainted money? Are they using a marker on every dollar that went in there and holding it up to the light? B) What is this so-called legitimate money, and again, how do they determine it to be legitimate? C) The court already let you have some of that 401(k) money. You made a deal. You got what you asked for. You should have planned for the appeal. Oh, wait. You did. Or I don't know. Maybe you should have stayed at a comfort inn and not a luxury compound that is made for wedding guests where your chef serves you Bourbon and the catch of the day every night. And D) It is not the victim's fault that you spent the money on a leftover boat guy from when you represented Paul as a gunshot expert who apparently only had one shooting case before this one, and it was a hunting accident. Oh, and the blood spatter expert who believed two child-sized shooters had killed Maggie and Paul. How could I forget that guy? I mean, Dick and Jim practically paid for Alex's one-way ticket to prison or Alex did with his 401(k) money.

[00:17:46] Okay. Final point about Dick and Jim's little Oliver Twist act. In addition to claiming that this untainted money wrongfully was being held by the state, Dick and Jim say that if they don't get this appeal money, then Alex will — gasp! — Have to hire a public defender. Did you just hear that? Alex having to face the justice system like everybody else? Oh, no! Here is David again.

[00:18:16] **David Moses:** In South Carolina, the Division of Appellate Defense of the South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense handles approximately 1,000 indigent appeals annually. Currently, there are 10 appellate attorneys. If this court denies Murdaugh's request, his appeal will fall upon the overworked attorneys and staff, costing taxpayer money and diluting the limited resources from defendants who are truly indigent.

[00:18:45] **Mandy Matney:** Fair enough. Maybe Alex should get that money for his appeal and donate to a person who cannot afford an attorney. Jim did say that Alex wants to help people while in general population at his new prison home. So go ahead. Help people. And we'll be right back.



[00:19:08] Liz Farrell: Okay. That was the motion for payment from untainted funds. Now, let's talk about Parker's and what they're trying to do. In March, attorneys for Parker's Kitchen and Tajeeha Cohen, the clerk who sold the alcohol to 19-year-old Paul Murdaugh, filed a motion for summary judgment asking the court for all intents and purposes to release them from the case. On Monday, they filed a 40-page memo in support of their motion laying out their arguments, which if past is prologue is exactly what they plan to say at Wednesday's hearing, possibly even word for word. So there's really nothing new in the sense that Parker's Kitchen thinks it didn't do anything wrong here. Remember this case is bigger than it appears to be, and that's saying something since the pressures Alex was feeling from it seemed to make him a murderous maniac.

[00:19:55] The thing to know here is this: this case is about the future and not just for Parker's Kitchen. Businesses like Parker's Kitchen, which is to say gas stations that have robust convenience stores attached to them, generally rely heavily on alcohol sales. At the heart of the boat crash case is a simple transaction: the moment when Tajeeha Cohen scanned the ID that Paul Murdaugh handed her, but did no further inquiry before selling him alcohol. Parker's maintains that Paul tricked Tajeeha about giving her Buster's ID; that their cashier did not knowingly sell Paul alcohol.

[00:20:30] But in South Carolina, it doesn't matter legally whether someone knew a minor was of age before selling them alcohol. It is the act of giving a minor alcohol that is the problem. It's been described to us like this. If you're speeding and you're pulled over, legally it does not matter if you didn't realize you were speeding. You were speeding — full stop. Obviously, the punishment for speeding is left to the discretion of the officer who witnessed the infraction, meaning whether or not you get that ticket, you broke the law whether or not you intended to break it. The same goes for businesses selling alcohol. If you sell to a minor, you have a problem, regardless of whatever Wile E. Coyote tricks were being played on you. This law is that simple. In South Carolina, it is unlawful for a person to sell beer, ale, —, wine, or other similar malt or fermented beverage to a person under 21 years of age. Notice that it does not say "knowingly sell" because guess what? People under the age of 21 are sneaky. Maybe you weren't sneaky at that age. Maybe you did everything right. But I promise you it's a thing, and that's why people selling alcohol need to be wary. That's why sellers of alcohol, whether they're bars or liquor stores



or convenience stores, have training, and it's why they have policies in place that help them prevent the sale of alcohols to minors. It's that important.

[00:21:53] In March 2018, *The State* newspaper published a series about the proliferation of underage drinking in Five Points, which is an area of bars and clubs where University of South Carolina students generally tend to party. In that series, *The State* reported on how underage drinkers were now getting their IDs from overseas, and these IDs were very convincing — so convincing that they could pass the blacklight test performed by bouncers at bars and pass the scanner test, where someone scans the barcode of the license and the information on their license is supposed to be displayed on the screen.

[00:22:29] This is what Tajeeha Cohen did. She took Paul's ID, which was Buster's legitimate license, and she scanned it. According to surveillance footage, she did not look at the license or what came up on the scanner. She did not do anything else to mitigate the potential of this baby-faced, five-foot seven-inch guy in front of her who was lying to her to get alcohol by using his brother's license, which listed him as six-foot two-inches tall and more than 200 pounds. That is what the issue really is, and it's the reason Parker's Kitchen's attorneys keep going to the lengths that they've been going to.

[00:23:04] If Greg Parker's business is found to have been negligent in this particular case, then where does it end for them? It'll mean convenience stores everywhere in the state will have to put more effort into hiring employees, more effort into training their employees, and more effort into retaining employees. Effort means more money. They might not be able to get away with having education requirements that end at the eighth grade, and therefore get away with paying the absolute minimum wages to a transient and short-term workforce. It will also mean that businesses will lose sales when further inquiry leads to the revelation that the customer is using a fake ID. Again, that means money. It also means that more lawsuits will inevitably follow — money, money, money. Which is likely why Greg Parker has put so much of it into fighting this lawsuit. Also, we think he's driven by his personal hatred of Mark Tinsley and has become so blinded by that that he'd rather flush money down his attorney's toilets than humble himself and take responsibility, which if that's true it's pathetic. Behind the scenes, though, Parker has also been trying to get the laws changed to prevent this kind of liability in the future.



[00:24:16] In the meantime, he's fighting the Beach case in such a strange way that to some, his lawyer's latest motion appeared to have been written by a group of Facebookers. The motion makes four major points. The first is that Parker's Kitchen and Tajeeha Cohen did not knowingly sell a minor the alcohol because Paul used Buster's license. The second is that because SLED didn't issue them a citation or prosecute them for the sale, that shows that what they did was legal, and the word they used to describe that is they have been exonerated.

[00:24:47] Let's talk about that real quick. So there was an alcohol investigation into Parker's sale of alcohol, which was at least philosophically linked to Buster's alleged awareness of Paul using his ID to buy alcohol illegally. Now, as you'll remember, Buster recently settled out of this case. In doing so, he was not admitting guilt, but there is testimony in the depositions that shows that there were witnesses to Buster not only being aware that Paul was using his license, but being frustrated by it because it meant that Buster had to use his passport at bars. At the time of the crash, Buster was in his second semester at University of South Carolina School of Law, which he reportedly was booted from for alleged plagiarism. Law students cannot be breaking the law. So this lawsuit naming Buster as a party would have been a stressor on the family. Beyond that, it could have presented a problem for Buster as a law student or as a man trying to reenter law school, as it were.

[00:25:47] So back to SLED. Remember this is 2019. Alex Murdaugh was still a man of the law then and generally seen as a man of considerable power and influence. If Parker's was cited for their sale of alcohol, then what would've happened next? What would that have meant for Buster's alleged part in this? Remember, too, that Greg Parker admitted to *The Wall Street Journal* that he had hired private investigators Henry Rosado and Max Fratoddi — the two men who allegedly went to Sandy Smith to get Stephen Smith's iPad — Stephen Smith, who was rumored for years to have been intimately involved with Buster. Also working for the Parker's team was private investigator Sara Capelli, who has said she was following Paul to get photos of him being rowdy and drinking and following Buster to get proof that he was gay. I wanna note that, to our knowledge, Sara did not find anything on Buster. And I also wanna note that we find this disgusting and shameful on Greg Parker's part. But why would Greg Parker want proof that Buster was gay? Why would he care?



[00:26:48] That's it. Neither Buster — whose father was Alex Murdaugh and grandfather was Randolph Murdaugh and great-grandfather was Randolph Murdaugh — nor Parker's — whose political influence in South Carolina is also notable — were cited for their alleged roles in Paul getting alcohol that night. But does it matter? Parker says yes. Obviously, it does matter. But if it mattered then, why are we here? Why are we still talking about this, and why did Parker's include more points in their motion for summary judgment? Why wasn't this fact alone strong enough? We didn't get in trouble, so we didn't do anything wrong. Well, O. J. was found not guilty for killing Nicole Brown Simpson and Ron Goldman, but he was found very guilty in the civil suits. The legal threshold for guilt are different.

[00:27:36] Still in awe, on April 27th, Connor Cook's attorney Joe McCulloch, the white-haired attorney who somehow had enough free time to sit in the courtroom for most if not all of Alex's trial, filed a motion asking the court to issue two orders — one barring Parker's from submitting testimony and/or evidence at trial related to SLED's decision not to ticket them, and one prohibiting Parker's from making further public announcements about the untrue notion that SLED has exonerated them. Here's David with a passage from McCulloch's filing.

[00:28:09] **David Moses:** Whether SLED conducted a competent review of the circumstances of the underage sale by defendant Parker's to Paul Murdaugh, failing to discover the other underage sale as noted above, and whether SLED reached a correct decision in its no charge determination is irrelevant, highly prejudicial, and confuses the jury. Additionally, it will result in a mini-trial, not only as to SLED's investigation into the underage sale, but its involvement in the boat crash as a whole.

[00:28:46] Mandy Matney: Additionally, in Connor's case, McCulloch filed a stipulation of dismissal releasing Buster from the lawsuit. And the third point Parker's makes is that the boat crash victims, all of whom were under the legal age for drinking alcohol, quote unquote, hatched a plan to drink illegally and knowingly got on the boat with a reckless drunk. But that point isn't likely going to fly. In 2005, the South Carolina Supreme Court in Marcum versus Bowden wrote that, quote, a reason for imposing a duty to protect underage persons from the effects of alcohol is that minors as a class are



incompetent by reason of their youth and inexperienced to deal responsibly with the effects of alcohol. Even though someone under the age of 21 might be considered an adult in other settings and circumstances, the General Assembly of South Carolina finds them to be minor when it comes to the sale and dispensing of alcohol. So even though Parker's attorneys probably patted themselves in the back for repeatedly referring to the boat crash passengers and Paul as adults, they simply were not in this case.

[00:29:54] The final point that Parker's made in the motion was this: no other adult at the oyster roast stopped the boaters from getting on the boat, and it's not Parker's fault that these people didn't do the right thing. It's like, sure. We sold that 10-year-old fireworks. But why did his parents let him go outside into their backyard where he lit the fireworks and hurt someone? Well, because guess what? The word "knowingly" now actually matters. In South Carolina, again affirmed in Marcum versus Bowden, social hosts, i.e., the adults at the oyster roast, are liable if they knowingly or intentionally served or caused to be served an alcoholic beverage to a person he knows or reasonably should know is between the ages of 18 and 20. There is no liability in South Carolina for not stopping an impaired person from operating a motor vehicle. Bars and stores can't sell alcoholic beverages to someone who appears to be drunk, but stopping them from getting behind the wheel is another thing.

[00:30:56] So like we said, it doesn't seem like there's any legal basis for any of this. It'll be interesting to see how Wednesday's hearing goes. And again, we will update you on Twitter and in the next episode of Cup of Justice.

[00:31:16] It's been a really long time since we've done a deep dive into the Gloria Satterfield case. Actually, since the time we last really talked about the case, Alex Murdaugh has been convicted of murdering his wife and son — the two people who might have known the truth about what happened at Moselle on February 2nd, 2018 when Gloria allegedly fell. This is important because in the eyes of the law, Alex Murdaugh is now seen as a cold-blooded killer who murdered his family to avoid getting exposed for the mountain of crimes that he was sitting on. And honestly, the latest move by Team Murdaugh makes Gloria Satterfield's death even more suspicious.



[00:32:03] So on Monday, Alex's defense team, including Jim Griffin, Dick Harpootlian, Phil Barber, and Margaret Fox, filed a shocking but not-so-shocking answer in the federal lawsuit against Alex's former insurance company, Nautilus, for the fraud that occurred in the Satterfield case. In the motion, Alex Murdaugh is finally admitting to lying about the fall that led to Satterfield's death. Specifically, they said that he, quote, invented Ms. Satterfield's purported statement, "The dogs caused her to fall," to force his insurers to make a settlement payment. So my question is: why admit to lying about her death now? We know how cruel Alex Murdaugh can be. But his lawyers? To open up a whole new set of wounds about Brian and Tony's mother's death after all of this time; for Alex to say, "I lied about the dog's tripping Gloria, but I'm not saying what actually happened" is, in the words of Taylor Swift, so casually cruel in the name of being honest. It's inhumane. It is continuing to treat Gloria as means to an end rather than as a person. It is continuing to disrespect her years after her mysterious death. And it's causing another layer of worry and heartbreak for a family who has endured so much grief, betrayal, and trauma in the past five years. At the end of the day, the Satterfield family deserves the truth. This is something Team Murdaugh has never even pretended to care about, but we do.

[00:33:41] So now knowing what we know about Alex Murdaugh, knowing what he is capable of and how he problem-solves, let's take another look at the Satterfield case and clean up some questions that have been buzzing online. The worst part about Gloria Satterfield's death is that it's really hard to piece together what happened that day because two of the people who were there after she fell are now dead, and the other person who was there is a habitual liar and a murderer. For a settlement this large, there is very little paperwork to back up the reasoning for why two insurance companies, Lloyd's of London and Nautilus, would pay millions for a trip-and-fall death without putting up much of a fight at all. We took another look at one report, which was written by Lloyd's of London attorney Scott Wallinger, who as a reminder was technically working for Alex at the time as his insurance company's attorney. So first of all, before we get into February 2nd, this report says that Gloria Satterfield was in a car accident on February 1st, 2018, the day before she allegedly fell. According to the report, Satterfield's vehicle struck a parked car. I'll have David read this part of the report.



[00:35:03] **David Moses:** We do not have details about that event yet, and Mr. Murdaugh was not aware of it until I mentioned it. He believes that would've been a low-impact accident, else Ms. Satterfield would've mentioned it to him and would have called him for legal guidance.

[00:35:20] Liz Farrell: Why wasn't that mentioned before? And again, why is he asking Alex about it instead of finding out for himself? You would think that an insurance company would want to investigate this car accident further to see exactly what happened. You would think the insurance company, which is trying to get out of paying millions of dollars, wouldn't just mention that casually and move on. I mentioned this again because, gosh, if people just would've done their jobs all of those years ago, maybe we would have answers as to what happened to Gloria by now.

[00:35:53] So according to Wallinger's report, which relies heavily on Alex's word, Alex claims he left the house at 7:45 in the morning to go to work. But guess what? Maggie and Paul were sleeping at that time. The only other people on the property were workers Ronnie Freeman and Travis Martin. And according to the report, Wallinger apparently didn't bother to ask either of them if they remembered seeing Alex Murdaugh leaving that morning. according to the report. So we don't know if Alex was on the property or not when Gloria arrived at Moselle that morning, likely around 9:00 AM. Gloria was apparently there to pick up a check either for her work or for someone else. which is another conflicting thing about these insurance documents. According to the report, Maggie said she suddenly heard the dogs barking, quote, in an unusual tone that morning, which alerted her to go outside. She said she went out the front door and found Gloria lying on her back toward the bottom of the steps with a bleeding head wound. Gloria's eyes were open, she was conscious, and she was mumbling, quote, gibberish, according to the report. Gloria did not know what happened and Maggie apparently shouted, "Oh my God." That's when Paul allegedly came outside. I wanna play a few parts of the 911 call. Maggie Murdaugh called nine one one around 9:24 AM on Friday, February 2nd, 2018.

[00:37:15] 911 Dispatcher: 911. What is your emergency?

[00:37:22] Maggie Murdaugh: 4147 Moselle Road.



[00:37:28] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay. Can you give me the address one time. Make sure I got it right?

[00:37:31] Maggie Murdaugh: Yes. 4147 Moselle Road.

[00:37:36] 911 Dispatcher: Okay. What's going on out there?

[00:37:39] Maggie Murdaugh: I'm sorry?

[00:37:40] 911 Dispatcher: What's going on out there?

[00:37:41] Maggie Murdaugh: My housekeeper has fallen and her head is bleeding. I cannot get her up.

[00:37:46] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay. And you said she fell on — she's bleeding from the head?

[00:37:49] Maggie Murdaugh: Yes.

[00:37:51] 911 Dispatcher: Okay. How old is she?

[00:37:54] Maggie Murdaugh: I'm not sure. Like 58 maybe.

[00:37:57] **911 Dispatcher:** Do you know if she fell from standing or not?

[00:38:00] Maggie Murdaugh: No. No.

[00:38:01] **911 Dispatcher:** Where she fall from?

[00:38:05] **Maggie Murdaugh:** From the — she fell going up the steps, up the brick steps.

[00:38:08] 911 Dispatcher: Okay, so she at bed or inside?

[00:38:11] Maggie Murdaugh: Outside.



[00:38:12] 911 Dispatcher: Okay. How many steps is there?

[00:38:17] Maggie Murdaugh: Eight.

[00:38:21] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay. Is she on the ground or is she up, you know, the top?

[00:38:23] **Maggie Murdaugh:** She's on the ground. She's on the ground.

[00:38:25] 911 Dispatcher: Is she conscious?

[00:38:27] Maggie Murdaugh: No, not really.

[00:38:29] 911 Dispatcher: Is she awake at all?

[00:38:31] Maggie Murdaugh: Yes.

[00:38:32] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay.

[00:38:34] **Mandy Matney:** Remember in Maggie's interview with Wallinger, she said that Gloria's eyes were open, that she was conscious and she was mumbling gibberish, which also matches up with the 911 call.

[00:38:45] **911 Dispatcher:** Is she just not like responding appropriately but she is awake?

[00:38:52] Maggie Murdaugh: Ma'am, she's not — no, she's not responding.

[00:38:55] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay. I just — I've already got them on the way. Me asking questions does not slow them down, ma'am. Knowing if she's conscious is one of the things that the medic needs to know. She's responding at all to you?

[00:39:09] Maggie Murdaugh: No.



[00:39:10] 911 Dispatcher: Okay. So she's not responsive at all?

[00:39:13] Maggie Murdaugh: Well, I mean, she's mumbling.

[00:39:15] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay. So she is somewhat conscious. Is she breathing okay?

[00:39:20] Maggie Murdaugh: Yes.

[00:39:22] 911 Dispatcher: Is she bleeding from anywhere?

[00:39:24] Maggie Murdaugh: Yes. Her head.

[00:39:26] 911 Dispatcher: Okay. Are you guys able to control the bleeding?

[00:39:28] Mandy Matney: Maggie said that no one rendered first aid before EMS arrived, which also lines up with the 911 call. And another thing: no mention of dogs in the 911 call, which isn't surprising at all. But again, why didn't the insurance companies notice this during the 2018 call? Remember Maggie says that Gloria fell back down after she initially fell.

[00:39:56] 911 Dispatcher: What happened?

[00:39:57] **Maggie Murdaugh:** She just — she just fell back down. Can I get off this phone so I can go down there?

[00:40:00] **911 Dispatcher:** Can I have your name and phone number or are you able to bring the phone down by her?

[00:40:05] Maggie Murdaugh: What?

[00:40:06] **911 Dispatcher:** Are you on a cell phone where you can walk down there and talk?

[00:40:09] Maggie Murdaugh: I'm on a cell phone. No.



[00:40:09] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay. Can you bring it with you so we can ask her some questions about what kind of pain she's having?

[00:40:14] **Mandy Matney:** Gloria's feet were on the second or third step from the bottom as she was lying on her back. She was bleeding from a head wound, and blood was on the brick landing area. Gloria was awake but not making any sense.

[00:40:28] Paul Murdaugh: Hello?

[00:40:29] 911 Dispatcher: Yeah, can you ask the patient what kind of pain she's having?

[00:40:33] Paul Murdaugh: Ma'am, she can't talk.

[00:40:34] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay. Do you know —

[00:40:36] Paul Murdaugh: She's cracked her head and there's blood on the concrete and she's bleeding out of her left ear.

[00:40:40] 911 Dispatcher: Okay. She's bleeding out of her ear.

[00:40:43] Paul Murdaugh: And out of her head. She's cracked her skull.

[00:40:45] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay. Alright. The other lady said that she had tried to stand up and fell down again.

[00:40:51] Paul Murdaugh: No. She — I was holding her up and —

[00:40:54] **911 Dispatcher:** Okay.

[00:40:55] **Paul Murdaugh:** She told me to turn her and she was trying to get her arm but then she fell back over.

[00:40:59] **Mandy Matney:** In the Lloyd's of London report, Alex claimed that Maggie had called him around 9:45 at work, and he said that he left work



immediately and was able to get there before EMS. But there are two issues with that. The EMS report says that they arrived at Moselle at 9:41. And just doing a quick Google search, if Alex was at PMPED when he allegedly got this call, it would've taken him about 20 minutes to reach Moselle. In the meantime, the EMTs, according to the dispatcher, were coming from the —, which is about 15 minutes away at normal speed. How was Alex able to get there before EMS? Great question. Another question might be: was he already there? Given the inconsistencies and the nature of this case, we have to ask that. And also, this is Alex Murdaugh we are talking about. If we have learned anything during the murder trial, it's that he is really bad at alibis. So why didn't the insurance company question this?

[00:42:05] Another thing that we found is that Alex and Paul have different accounts of how Gloria was positioned when Alex arrived, which could be important in the bigger puzzle here. According to his interview with Wallinger, Paul said that Gloria started throwing up, and so Alex and Paul sat her up while they waited for EMS to arrive. But according to Alex, he arrived at Moselle and found Gloria sitting on the brick landing at the base of the steps. Maybe this is nothing. But remember during the 911 call when Paul said that he sat Gloria up and that's when she fell back down? Is it possible that Alex was actually there at the time that the 911 call was placed, and did anyone attempt to figure that out before handing over millions of dollars for a settlement that was based on a theory from a sketchy homeowner?

[00:42:56] And where did this dog theory come from exactly? Well, Alex, of course. Reading this report again and seeing the same phrasing used and knowing what we know happened to Maggie and Paul, I honestly wonder if Alex told Maggie and Paul to lie to the insurance company. Why? Because this is the phrase that Wallinger wrote in two different sections of the report. He wrote:

[00:43:24] **David Moses:** Alex told me that he had heard from one or more of Satterfield's relatives — he cannot really recall — was that Satterfield had reported that the dogs tripped her up. Maggie said that the Satterfield's relatives told Maggie that the dogs tripped Gloria up.

[00:43:41] **Mandy Matney:** So a couple things to note here. Notice that neither of them could say which relative actually said that. Notice that Wallinger



never bothered to interview any member of Gloria's family. But instead, he wrote a summary of Tony Satterfield's Facebook post. It's almost like maybe just maybe Alex Murdaugh told Maggie to tell the insurance company that Gloria's family believes this is how she died as a way to apply pressure and get them to settle faster — and it worked.

[00:44:17] Further, in Wallinger's report, it says:

[00:44:21] **David Moses:** I asked Maggie what she thinks happened in the incident, and she believes one or more of the dogs got in Satterfield's way as Satterfield was coming up the steps. Paul remembers that his father Alex arrived and asked what happened and that Satterfield said something about dogs.

[00:44:44] Mandy Matney: And now, those two people who said that are dead, and the third person who said that has been convicted in their murders as well as dozens of other crimes. Satterfield died after several weeks of ups and downs in the hospital. She was never able to communicate what caused the fall that led to her death. And literally just over a week after Gloria died, Alex's best friend Cory Fleming sent Alex a letter of intent to sue, which immediately kicked the insurance companies into action.

[00:45:18] Now, a lot has happened since then. In 2019, Mallory Beach was killed in a boat crash that pulled Liz and I into a four-year investigation into the Murdaugh family. During this investigation, I found a \$500,000 settlement in the Satterfield case with Lloyd's of London, the company that Wallinger worked for. The Satterfield family didn't know about this settlement until they stumbled on an article that I wrote. That article made them start asking questions and adding to his mountain of pressure. Alex murdered Maggie and Paul, the two main witnesses in the Satterfield insurance case, on June 7th, 2021 — the same day that he was confronted by a PMPED employee about stolen money. Alex believed that the double homicide would get everyone off his back. But we made this podcast in June 2021 to ensure that a harsh spotlight didn't leave him until we got answers.

[00:46:21] In the summer of 2021, Tony Satterfield contacted Eric Bland and soon found out that Alex not only stole every penny of the \$500,000 settlement, but he stole an additional \$4.3 million settlement that was signed



in secret by Judge Carmen Mullen. All of this time, we were pesky. Tony Satterfield was pesky, and Eric Bland was especially pesky. And in September of 2021, a pesky Hampton County coroner named Angela Topper requested that SLED open an investigation into the death of Gloria Satterfield due to inconsistencies surrounding her death. SLED opened that investigation, and it is still ongoing. To our knowledge, investigators have not exhumed her body, but SLED has asked for the family's permission, and they agreed to it.

[00:47:12] Again, the most frustrating part of all of this is this: if just one person with a little authority would've been pesky back then back in 2018 and asked very basic questions about Gloria's death, then maybe — maybe it wouldn't be such a mystery to solve five years later. Her death was not reported to the coroner at the time nor did officials perform an autopsy, according to her death certificate. According to her death certificate, which was full of problems that should have been caught. Her cause of death was listed as acute subdural hemorrhage, which is essentially a brain bleed. The manner of death was listed as natural. From what we know about Gloria's death, her brain bleed appeared to have been caused by her injuries at Moselle, which seemed to be far from natural. According to documents, during her fall, Gloria sustained a right-sided head laceration, a right-sided subdural hematoma, a traumatic brain injury, multiple left-side posterior rib fractures, a partially collapsed lung, and a pulmonary contusion. How does someone have rib fractures on the left side and head injuries on the other from a single fall backwards down a few stairs? How? And how is someone's death ruled as natural when it is caused by a brain bleed and surrounded by suspicious circumstances? Why wasn't anyone asking these questions before they handed Alex millions of dollars? We'll be right back.

[00:49:03] **Liz Farrell:** Now, let's put all of this into context. In his testimony in Alex's murder trial, attorney Mark Tinsley talked about the pressures Alex would've felt from the boat crash lawsuit because ultimately, the lawsuit would've led to Alex's alleged financial crimes being discovered. In December 2020, Mark had offered Alex a way out of the lawsuit and a way to protect Maggie and Paul. Mark was wary of Alex's ability to fix juries in Hampton County, so he held onto the possibility of later suing Maggie and Paul in Beaufort County, where there is limited Murdaugh influence over the jury pool, if he had gotten any sense that Alex was up to no good. But Alex didn't take that offer. Mark testified that he found this strange, especially because



Alex was an attorney, and he would've understood how valuable that deal was. Tinsley believes that this is when Alex began toying with the idea of killing Maggie and Paul. This isn't that crazy of a theory because what we learned in trial is that Alex routinely sat on his alleged thefts. He would allegedly have a check made out from client funds and then wait months and months before depositing them. That is a sign of someone who plans these things out.

[00:50:15] Now, knowing what we know about Alex, we have to ask the question: was Gloria's fall planned? Alex appears to have been in financial crisis around the time of Gloria's death. In 2017, he reported the lowest income he had earned in a decade. When you include both legitimately earned money and stolen money, his gross income was around \$316,000. 2017 was also the year when Alex was desperate enough to steal from his own brother when he took a \$120,000 check from PMPED that was supposed to have gone to Randy. At that time, Alex owed more than \$2 million on the Moselle property. He couldn't borrow money like he used to from Palmetto State Bank after they acquired the troubled Allendale Bank in 2015 because federal regulators were involved in that sale. Alex's options for quick cash were limited. Just two months before Gloria's fall, the Nautilus umbrella policy, which ended up paying millions of the settlement, went into effect in January 2018. It's hard to tell if this policy was something that Alex already had in place and it was just renewing annually or if it was something he had just purchased. Alex was more than comfortable with his scheming by 2018 though, and he had fooled dozens of clients by then. Oh, and let's not forget — fooled his own law firm. In 2018, Alex was also long familiar with a rumor that had been haunting him and his sons, which is that they had something to do with Stephen Smith's death. In other words, Alex could have been feeling some sort of heat at that time. Now that Alex is admitting to lying about the circumstances of Gloria's death, it's fair to demand answers about what really did happen. Alex Murdaugh owes that to the Satterfield family at the very least.

[00:52:00] Now, let's talk about the response Alex filed to Nautilus' lawsuit and the online buzz that's been surrounding it this week. The idea that the Satterfields would have to give back money has no merit. First: Nautilus did not pay a dime to the Satterfield family, not now and not back then. Eric Bland and Ronnie Richter are legal malpractice attorneys. Their case against



Alex, PMPED, Palmetto State Bank, Cory Fleming, and others was based on Alex and Cory's alleged conspiracy to steal from clients. It was about bad lawyering and about all the people and agencies who Eric and Ronnie believed contributed to that conspiracy, whether knowingly or not. It was not about how Gloria died. So for anyone out there saying that the Satterfields and Bland-Richter need Gloria to have been killed by a fall, they are profoundly and fundamentally incorrect. And to anyone saying Eric has pivoted on this, going from saying that the dogs had nothing to do with it to now insisting that the dogs did it, check your facts. That does not at all represent reality. The question we have is: why are people saying this? Why is it so important to some people to drag the Satterfields through the mud? What did the Satterfields do to deserve any of this vitriol? They are not the bad guys in this. It is not their fault that Alex swindled them. But you know who might bear fault in this? Nautilus, Lloyd's of London, and the lawyers who advocated for those large settlements.

[00:53:25] Mandy Matney: We get why they would've settled with Alex Murdaugh back then because of the influence that Alex had over Hampton County juries was so widely known. It is even mentioned in the insurance report. But this is generations of that — generations of insurance companies being forced into a corner to pay out large settlements to avoid even larger jury awards. This system is rotten from inside out. How does that go on for generations? How did insurance companies and their lawyers remain complicit for so long? Had someone spoken up and put their foot down, had someone said, "It sounds like you're blackmailing us, Alex," then Nautilus would not be in this position right now. They can sue Alex all they want, but the truth is they bear responsibility for this, too. Now after reading the Lloyd's of London report again, it is very clear how the insurance company was fooled by a prominent Hampton County attorney who they wouldn't expect to be a liar or a thief and certainly wouldn't expect to be a murderer. But after Alex's mask has been lifted and the world now knows who he really is, the report that led the insurance company to pay out the maximum in the Satterfield case is almost laughable. Wallinger spent several paragraphs talking about Alex's poor dogs like they're suspects, even mentioning their obedience training, despite the fact that there was no evidence that the dog did this except for the Murdaughs' word. Nowhere was he suspicious as to why an insured homeowner would be so eager to convince an insurance company that he was liable for the death of his housekeeper. These insurance companies got played by Alex because no one was brave enough to say



something isn't right here. Bank of America got played by Alex when they let him open two fake business accounts named Forge. Palmetto State Bank got played when they gave Alex the world's most lenient overdraft policy over and over again. This is why they were sued by the Satterfields, and why they settled for so much. Their people didn't ask questions when they should have. Just like elected officials should have asked questions before signing off on Jeroid Price's release. Just like Parker's selling alcohol to Paul Murdaugh. If you don't wanna be played, you need to ask questions. Asking questions makes it a whole lot harder for bad people to get away with bad things. And wow do we have so many more questions coming their way. Stay tuned, stay pesky, and stay in the sunlight.

[00:56:45] **Outro:** The Murdaugh Murders Podcast is created and hosted by me, Mandy Matney, produced by my husband, David Moses. And Liz Farrell is our executive editor. From Luna Shark Productions.