BRIEF IN OPPOSITION APPENDIX

Judge: Clary

State

State's Attorneys: Gowdy; Barnette; Willingham

Defendant: Richard Bernard Moore B/M

Court Reporter: Linda D. Moffitt Defense Attorneys: Morin, Kelly, Johnson

•		•			Strikes		
Juror No.	Name	Sex	Race	Court		Defense	Accept
251	Joyce B. Smythe	F	W		N	•	N
166	Jason B. Lyda	M	w.	. ;	Y	X	N
231	Pamela Robinson	F	W		Y	Υ	Y
29	Jeffrey A. Blanchard	M	Ŵ		Y	Y	Ÿ
191	Joyce Morrow	F.	В		\mathbf{N}		N
116	Susan Hardison	F	W		Y	Y	Ÿ
2 `	Douglas Alexander	\mathbf{M}^{\cdot}	В		N		N
230	Doris M. Robertson	F	W.		Y	Y	Y
28	Don S. Blair	M	W	· .	Y	N	N
213	Debra P. Perkins	F	W		N		N
194(F)	Karen E. Nave	F	W		Y	Y	Y
· 53¹	Jennifer M. Caston	F	W ³	•	\mathbf{Y} :	Y	Y
19	Walter M. Ballard, Jr.	M	W		Y	. Y	Y
4	Lanie M. Allen	F	W		Y	N	N
227	Larry W. Ridings	M	W		Y	Y	\mathbf{Y}_{th}
197	Gary L. New	M	W		Y	N	N
205	Ronda B. Parks	F	W		Y	N	N
288	Kelly S. West	F	W		Y	N	N
220	Tammy P. Hayes	F	W		Y	N	N
145	Charles L. Kent	M	W		N	, ,	N
192	David M. Mosley	M	W		Y	N	N
.95	Michael S. Garner	M	W		Y	Y	Y
157	Debra M. Ledford	F	W		Y	Y	Y
170	Benjamin L. Martinez	M	H		Y	Y	Y
295	Michael J. Willingham	M	W		Y	N	N
85	Jeff L. Fortner	M	W		Y	N	N
265	Sandra S. Taylor	F	W		Y	Y	Y
132	Edward T. Huffman	M	w		N		N
290	Malcolm S. White	M	W		Y	N	N
94(A)	Stacy Gantt	F	W		Y	Y	Y
92	Patricia P. Gallman	F	W		Y	N	N
160(A)	Deborah J. Lindsay	F	W		Y	Y	Y

a motion under Batson at this time.

<u>"</u> ... 2

9.

10.

THE COURT: All right, Solicitor.

MR. GOWDY: Your Honor, if it please the Court, I would just initially want to say for the record that the fact that two African-Americans were struck, I don't believe, makes out a prima facie case.

I would like to go on and give the race neutral reasons.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. GOWDY: On Ms. Morrow, Your Honor, as the Court I am sure will remember, she was one of the first jurors.

Deputy Willingham questioned her at some length about her criminal record.

There was some withholding on her behalf, and but for the fact that I think I dropped the ball in terms of understanding how the Court qualified jurors early on, on Tuesday morning, we would, of course, move to have her disqualified, because her answers were, frankly, closer, I thought, to Mr. Rookard's who was disqualified than they were any of the other people who had an innocent misrecollection.

She also said, Your Honor, that she thought guns were used improperly. Now, there were other jurors who expressed some reluctance about guns, but nobody used the word guns are used in properly. That's obviously going to be an issue

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23.

24

25

in this case, if the victim was armed.

Jury qualification -- Number 132

And, in addition, Your Honor, she wanted to switch to another term. She is a school teacher, as I recall, and, obviously, we only want jurors who want to be here. And only when she was confronted with the fact that she would miss her vacation did she opt to stay.

But the primary reason, Your Honor, is the withholding of the convictions, and only when confronted with the fact that she had an alias did we begin to get any truthful responses.

All right. Let's go on to the other. THE COURT:

MR. GOWDY: Your Honor, Mr. Alexander, the same rationale for him would exist for him, for Mr. Huffman. course he was a white juror that we struck. Mr. Alexander has a son who was prosecuted by the Seventh Circuit Solicitor's Office for murder.

Mr. Huffman, although it wasn't his son, had a close family member that was also prosecuted for murder. a murder case.

And Mr. Moore is also somebody's son. And we did not want a juror who had recently had a son sent to prison, although I cannot tell you for how long, for the charge of That is the primary reason that we struck him, murder. because he is the only juror from my recollection that actually has a child that is in prison for murder.

I also had a notation from Monday, Your Honor, that he misunderstood one of the Court's questions, and he was the only juror that I had a notation that misunderstood that question.

But the primary reason is the fact that he has a son that has been convicted of murder by the Seventh Circuit Solicitor's Office.

THE COURT: I will be glad to hear from you in regards to the opposition to the strike showing that it's mere pretext.

MR. KELLY: Could we have just one second, Your Honor?
THE COURT: All right.

(Pause.)

.2

7.

MR. MORIN: Your Honor, we can't argue with the state.

THE COURT: All right. Given the fact that the state has presented the reasons that they have, and that in accordance with our case law of the State vs. Adams, 322 South Carolina 114, 470 S. E. 2d., 366, a 1996 case, wherein a motion is made to hold a Batson hearing where members of a cognizable racial group or gender is struck and the opposing party requests a hearing, that was done by the defendant.

The second step of the analysis requires only a race neutral explanation by the proponent of the strike.

Mr. Morin and Mr. Kelly, it's my understanding that you have accepted those reasons. I do find, by the way, that

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24.

25

Jury qualification -- Number 132

they are race neutral reasons, and, as such, there is -these strikes were not just pretext. And, as such, the
motion is denied.

All right. Insofar as the manner in which we are going to do this, I am going to go ahead and bring the jury panel around here, and we will then call the names of the ones that have been seated. They will take their place in the jury box, and then we will deal with the rest of them.

All right. Let's bring them around.

(Whereupon, all qualified jurors were returned to the courtroom.)

THE COURT: All members present, Mr. Bailiff?

THE BAILIFF: Yes, sir, they are.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. It's good to see you again this afternoon.

Before we actually seat the jury in this case, has there been any change in any juror's circumstance?

Yes, ma'am. Come forward, please. Lawyers may approach.

(Bench conference held off the record with juror.

Statement presented to the Court.)

THE COURT: Okay. Resume your seat. Thank you, ma'am.

All right. Madam clerk, please call the jurors names
that will be seated.

(Whereupon, a jury was impanelled.)

. THE COURT: All right. Anything further from the state 1 2 before the jury is sworn? MR. GOWDY: No, sir, Your Honor. 3 , 4 THE COURT: From the defendant? .5 MR. MORIN: No, sir. THE COURT: All right. Madam clerk, let's swear this 6 jury. Well, just one moment, please. .7. Ms. Nave, I'm going to ask that you take the first 8 chair here and swap seats with this lady and serve as the 9 foreperson of our jury, please, ma'am. 10 And, madam foreperson, if you and Ms. Ganta and 11 Ms. Lindsay would continue to occupy the chairs that you 12 presently sit in throughout the course of this trial, the 13 remainder of the jury may sit in any other seat that's 14 available other than the foreperson and the alternate 15 chairs. 16 So, please understand that, that the foreperson will 17 sit in that chair throughout the course of the trial, and. 18 the alternates will sit in their chairs throughout the 19 course of the trial. 20 You may swear the jury. 21 (Whereupon, the jury was duly sworn.) 22 THE COURT: And, if we could, have the jury custodians 23 come in, please. 24 (Whereupon, the jury custodians were presented before 25

191.

. 9

MR. WILLINGHAM: Your Honor, 191, Mrs. Morrow, there is facts in here. She is a teacher at Cleveland Elementary School. This would also be a conflict for her.

.....

Pursuant to that statute, I believe she would be eligible to be transferred.

THE COURT: Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: Judge, again, I understand the Court's position, but I would submit to the Court that in her facts, which are very brief, unlike Mrs. Brewton's, she did not indicate that she is the only teacher teaching a specified subject.

We would ask the Court to entertain asking her to come and be with us.

THE COURT: I am going to have her come in, because she didn't give me a specific reason why. Maybe I can convince her to remain with us, given those facts and circumstances.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: So, if she seeks to use her rights under 14-7-845, I will honor those though.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. 250.

MR. BARNETTE: Your Honor, the same or similar situation. Mr. Smith works for the University School, School District six; and also got a letter faxed in. I

2

3

4

5

6.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

Jury qualification

drivers, anyone employed as a school employee, as a certified personnel at the building level who, as a result of your participation here, that it would interfere with your school duties or responsibilities?

While I cannot excuse you, I could transfer you to another term of court if this particular term of court presents a particular problem to you in your official duties as a teacher, bus driver or other certified personnel at the building level.

Are these those who seek that at this time? Come forward, please.

(The following takes place at the bench with Juror Number 191.)

THE COURT: I think you are Ms. Morrow. Is that correct?

JUROR NUMBER 191: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

JUROR NUMBER 191: I am a school teacher.

THE COURT: Where do you teach, Ms. Morrow?

JUROR NUMBER 191: I travel between two schools,

Cleveland Elementary and Madden Elementary.

THE COURT: And what do you teach?

JUROR NUMBER 191: Physical education.

THE COURT: And if you are not there do they -- is there something going on that would interfere with your

duties this week?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUROR NUMBER 191: Well, I would have to get a substitute, and they would have to travel.

THE COURT: I will transfer you to one of your vacation times, whether it be spring vacation, Christmas vacation, Thanksgiving vacation, summer vacation. I will let you pick a time, or you can stay with us.

JUROR NUMBER 191: Vacation time?

THE COURT: That's not a very good deal, is it?

JUROR NUMBER 191: No, sir.

THE COURT: I will give you the option. You can transfer to a time that will not conflict with your school responsibility or stay with us.

JUROR NUMBER 191: I might get dismissed.

THE COURT: Quite possible. You never know.

JUROR NUMBER 191: Okay.

(End of proceedings at the bench.)

THE COURT: Ms. Morrow is going to remain with us -Number 91. She didn't like me offering her some time in her
vacation time, and I don't blame her.

(The following takes place at the bench with Juror Number 284.)

JUROR NUMBER 284: 284.

THE COURT: Okay. You told me that you teach. We called it industrial arts when I was coming along, but you

Jury qualification

anything like that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24.

25

JUROR NUMBER 20: Well, they served time for it.

THE COURT: Well, the fact that you had a family member, your daughter-in-law, involved in such a situation, would that in any way interfere with your ability to render a fair and impartial verdict for the state or the defendant in this case with basing that solely upon the testimony and evidence you would hear produced in this courtroom?

JUROR NUMBER 20: No, sir.

THE COURT: Are you in any way biased or prejudiced as a result of that?

JUROR NUMBER 20: No, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. You may resume your seat, Ms. Barnette.

(The following takes place at the bench with Juror Number Two.)

THE COURT: You are Mr. Douglas Alexander?

JUROR NUMBER TWO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

JUROR NUMBER TWO: My son is incarcerated. He's been in jail now for about four years. His name is John Alexander.

THE COURT: What's he incarcerated for?

JUROR NUMBER TWO: "Murder.

THE COURT: Was that here in Spartanburg?

3

4.

, 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Jury qualification

JUROR NUMBER 20: Yes, Spartanburg.

THE COURT: And was he tried by the solicitor's office in this circuit?

JUROR NUMBER TWO: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Would the fact that you have a son involved in such a situation, Mr. Alexander, would that fact in any way interfere with your ability to render a fair and impartial verdict for the state or the defendant in this case?

JUROR NUMBER TWO: No, sir.

THE COURT: Are you in any way biased or prejudiced as a result of that?

JUROR NUMBER TWO: No.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You can resume your seat.

I appreciate you coming forward.

(The following takes place at the bench with Juror Number 45.)

THE COURT: Ms. Joyce Smith.

JUROR NUMBER 45: Joann Burnside.

THE COURT: This is Number 45, gentlemen.

All right.

JUROR NUMBER 45: I have a first cousin that is doing time now on a murder charge.

THE COURT: And that murder charge, what's that person's name?

```
. 1
         JUROR NUMBER 29: It was somewhere in the mid 70's.
 2
         THE COURT: Was that in Spartanburg?
         JUROR NUMBER 29: In Hammond, Indiana.
 3
 4
         THE COURT: And was it involving your work?
         JUROR NUMBER 29: Yes, sir.
 5
        THE COURT: What type of work were you doing?
 6
 7
         JUROR NUMBER 29: I was working nights in a grocery
 8
    store while I was going to college.
         THE COURT: And the fact that you have been involved in
 9
    such a situation, would that in any way interfere with your
10
11
    ability to render a fair and impartial verdict for the state
    or the defendant based solely on the testimony and evidence
12
13
    you would hear produced in this courtroom?
         JUROR NUMBER 29: I don't believe so.
14
         THE COURT: Are you in any way biased or prejudiced as
15
    a result of that?
16
         JUROR NUMBER 29: No, sir.
17
         THE COURT: Was there a prosecution involved in that
18.
19
    case?
         JUROR NUMBER 29:
                           Insufficient evidence.
20
         THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir. You can resume your
21
    seat.
22
         (The following takes place at the bench with Juror
23
    Number 132.)
24
         THE COURT: You are Mr. Huffman.
25
```

1	JUROR NUMBER 132: My brother-in-law. He was the one
2	that dropped the barbell off the bridge about, what, eight
3	years ago and killed that truck driver.
4	THE COURT: The fact that you had a brother-in-law
5	involved in such a situation, would that in any way
6	interfere with your ability to render a fair and impartial
7	verdict for either the state or the defendant in this case
8	based solely upon the testimony and evidence you would hear
9	produced in this courtroom? You need to answer out loud.
10	JUROR NUMBER 132: No.
11	THE COURT: Are you in any way biased or prejudiced as
12	a result of that?
13 [.]	JUROR NUMBER 132: No.
14	THE COURT: Thank you sir. You can resume your seat.
15	(The following takes place at the bench with Juror
16	Number 83.)
17	THE COURT: Ms. Fernandez.
18	JUROR NUMBER 83: Uh-huh.
19	THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
20	JUROR NUMBER 83: My sister-in-law was killed this
21	year.
22	THE COURT: What was her name?
23	JUROR NUMBER 83: Jeannie Kilgore.
24	THE COURT: Kilgore. Is that here in Spartanburg?
25	JUROR NUMBER 83: No, sir. Greenville.

2

3

5

6

7

8.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

Jury qualification -- Number 191

refrained from referring to the decedent as the victim.

THE COURT: Yes, sir. There is no sense in introducing everyone involved in this case. Either they know you or they are going to know you.

We are here to determine whether or not these folks are qualified as jurors. We are not here to educate them as to any of the facts of the case.

They were given the name of the victim yesterday.

Everything else in that regard is superfluous at this point in time. So let's just -- if you want to introduce your cohorts, fine. But what we are here about is to determine their qualifications.

MR. BARNETTE: Okay, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Joyce Morrow, Number 191.

JUROR NUMBER 191, JOYCE

MORROW, having been first duly sworn, was voir dired

17 | as follows:

EXAMINATION BY THE COURT

- 19 Q Good morning. You are Joyce Morrow, correct?
- 20 A Yes, sir.
- 21 Q Ms. Morrow, do you understand that you have been placed
- 22 under oath for these proceedings?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- 24 Q And you also recall that when I excused you and your
- 25 colleagues yesterday that I gave you some instructions that

Jury qualification -- Number 191

Α

you were not to discuss this case among yourselves or with anyone else that you come in contact with; and that if anyone attempted to contact you that you were to report that to me upon your return to the courthouse; and that also you were not to read, watch or listen to any news accounts concerning this case.

Have there been any violations of my instructions?
No, sir.

Q Now, over the next few minutes, Ms. Morrow, I am going to be asking you some questions. Then one of the defense lawyers and one of the state's lawyers will ask you some questions.

Please keep in mind that we are not in any way attempting to invade your privacy, but due to the nature of the proceedings that we are about this week, it is extremely important that certain questions are asked and answered.

Now, I know that you are a teacher, and so please keep in mind that there are absolutely no right or wrong answers to these question. As opposed to where you come from where you have got right and wrong answers, we don't necessarily have right and wrong answers here.

So keep in mind that no one is challenging your view.

We just need to know what your views are. And answer these
questions openly and honestly and fully.

Also, I want you to pay very close attention to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Jury qualification -- Number 191

questions as they are presented to you, because over the next few minutes we're probably going to ask you some questions that you maybe have never even considered before today.

Also, I would tell you that the lawyers and I have copies of your juror questionnaire, because that was extremely important to us in preparing for today.

Now, among the things that we are going to be talking about during the next few moments will be a reference or references to the word penalty, but the mere fact that I even mention that word or use that word does not in any way indicate anything about the defendant, Mr. Moore. He is presumed in the law to be innocent. Do you understand that?

- 14 A Yes, sir.
- 15 Q Now, let's assume for a few moments that you were a

 16 juror in a criminal case. Could you listen to the law,

 17 accept and apply that law as I would instruct you as the

 18 judge of this court even though you may disagree with that

 19 law or think that it should be some other way?
- 20 A Yes, sir.
- Q Could you decide this case based solely on the evidence presented here in this courtroom and disregard anything that you may have heard, read or seen about the case?
- 24 A Yes, sir.
- 25 Q Now, Ms. Morrow, in a criminal case the state has the

burden of proving guilt. And the burden of proof that the state must meet is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. And a defendant has absolutely no burden, absolutely no responsibility to prove himself innocent. Do you understand that?

A Yes, sir.

- Q Could you, depending upon the facts and evidence and the law as I will instruct you in a particular case, find a defendant either guilty or not guilty?
- A Yes, sir.
- Now, as you know from being here yesterday and hearing me address the entire jury panel, this is a case in which the State of South Carolina is seeking the death penalty. And death penalty cases are what we call bifurcated trials or proceedings.

As you know, that's kind of a ten-dollar word that means that it's split into two parts, guilt phase and sentencing phase.

Now, if you were a juror in such a case, a death penalty case, and if the jury had found the defendant not guilty of murder in the guilt phase, do you understand that the case would end then and there would be no necessity to have that second or sentencing phase of the trial?

- 24 A Yes, sir.
 - Q However, if you were a juror in such a case and the

Jury qualification -- Number 191

1 jury had found the defendant guilty of murder, do you then understand that you would move to the second or sentencing phase of the trial?

Yes, sir.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, in that phase of the trial, Mr. Morrow, evidence would be presented to the jury in the form of what we call aggravating circumstances, as well as mitigating circumstances.

Now, aggravating circumstances are facts, incidents, details or occurrences which the general assembly of our state has declared by law, by statute, would make worse, that is to aggravate, the crime or the offense of murder.

In other words, when an aggravating circumstance accompanies a murder, it increases the enormity or adds to the injury of that crime of murder. It's a murder that's committed in the commission of or in connection with another crime or incident.

Do you understand what I am talking about when I refer to an aggravating circumstance?

Yes, sir. A

Now, mitigating circumstances are also incidents, details or occurrences which the general assembly of our state has, once again, declared by law reduces the severity of the offense of murder and may be considered as extenuating or as reducing the degree of moral culpability

or responsibility for the crime of murder.

2

mitigating circumstance?

3

Yes, sir.

5

4

A

Now, Ms. Morrow, let's assume that you were a juror in the situation of the sentencing phase of a death penalty

Could you, depending upon the particular facts and

Do you understand what I mean when I speak of a

7

6

case, that's the second phase.

8

circumstances of that case, once again, including the

9 10

consideration of any aggravating and mitigating

11

circumstances and the law that I would instruct you that

12.

applies to that case, return a verdict or a sentence of life

13

in prison? Do you need for me to repeat that?

14

Yes, sir.

15

penalty case could you, depending upon the particular facts

If you were a juror in the sentencing phase of a death

16 17

and circumstances of that case, including the consideration

18.

of aggravating, as well as mitigating, circumstances and the

19

law that I would instruct you that applied to that case,

20

return a sentence of life in prison?

21

Yes, sir. Α

22

If you were a juror in that situation could you,

23.

depending upon the particular facts and circumstances of that case, once again, including the consideration of

24 25

aggravating and mitigating circumstances and the law that I

Jury qualification -- Number 191

- would instruct you that applied to that case, return a sentence of death?
 - A Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q Now, Ms. Marrow, you understand that there are two sentencing options that are always available to the jury during the sentencing phase of a death penalty trial, that being life imprisonment or death.
- 8 A Yes, sir.
- 9 Q Now, Ms. Morrow, if you were chosen for service on this
 10 jury, during the course of the trial you would be
 11 sequestered, which, once again, is kind of a fancy word
 12 meaning you would be housed in a motel for the duration of
 13 the trial.
 - Now, I have no way of knowing how long this case would last. I would say somewhere, seven to ten days. It may be less than that. I don't think it would be any more than that once we got it started.
 - Except for the personal inconvenience that you would suffer, would this pose a serious danger to the health or well-being of those dependent upon you or yourself?
- 21 A No, sir.
- Q Thank you for responding to my questions. Would you please answer any questions that Mr. Morin might have at this time?
- 25 EXAMINATION BY MR. MORIN

Jury qualification -- Number 191

- Q Ms. Morrow, my name is Michael Morin, and seated over here is Keith Kelly and Jennifer Johnson. We represent Mr. Moore in this case.
 - I noticed from the questionnaire that you list your religion as Baptist. Is that correct?
- 6 A Yes, sir.

4

5

- 7 Q Do you know if your church or pastor has a position 8 regarding the death penalty?
- 9 A No, sir.
- 10 Q Okay. Have you in the past had occasion to think about
- 11 whether you were for or against the death penalty?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
- 13 Q Could you tell me about that?
- 14 A Do you mean like a particular --
- 15 Q No, ma'am. Just you have in the past thought about the
- 16 death penalty. And I am just asking you in general what
- 17 your thoughts were. We just want to sort of understand how
- 18 you think about it if you could.
- 19 A Well, it has a lot to do with the circumstance --
- 20 Q Okay.
- 21 A -- of the situation as to my feelings.
- 22 Q Okay. So it would be each case, you would have to hear
- 23 the evidence to make your decision.
- 24 A Yes, sir.
- 25 Q Okay. Have you had a view on the death penalty for a

- long time?
- 2 A Had a view on it?
- 3 Q Yeah. Have you felt like that would depend on the
- 4 circumstances? That's what your answer is.
- 5 A Yes, sir.
- 6 Q That's something you have held for a long time?
- 7 A Yes, sir.

12

13

14

15

16

17

22

23

24

25,

- 8 Q Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.
- 9 MR. WILLINGHAM: May it please the Court, Your Honor.

10 EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLINGHAM

- Q Ms. Morrow, my name is Donnie Willingham. This is Barry Barnette and this is Solicitor Trey Gowdy.
 - I just want to ask you a few questions about your background and about your opinion on the death penalty. The judge, I believe, gave you or the Court gave you a list of three different types of jurors back in the jury room for you to decide what type you were.
- 18 A Yes, sir.
- One type was given the choice in the penalty phase, given the choice of death or life, they would always vote for life given they had the choice.
 - The second type of juror or another type of juror was given the same choice, they would always vote for death.
 - Then the third juror would be depending on the facts and circumstances, they may vote for life, they may vote for

death.

1

. 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

How would you classify yourself in this category, which one?

- A As juror three.
- Q And you understand that you always have a choice in sentencing. It is not required of you to do. It is not mandatory to vote for the death penalty. Do you understand that?
- 9 A Yes, sir.
- 10 Q It is not mandatory to impose a life sentence, do you understand that?
- 12 A Yes, sir.
 - If in the penalty phase after hearing all of the facts and circumstances you decide in your mind that the death penalty is the appropriate punishment in this case, you would be required to sign a verdict form. You and all of the other jurors would have to sign their name and say, yes, I believe that the death penalty is the proper punishment.

Do you believe that you could actually write your name on a line saying that death is the appropriate punishment?

- A If that was the verdict or the situation.
- Q If that's your verdict, you would be required to sign your name to a verdict form. Do you believe you could actually physically sign your name to that?
- 25 A Yes, sir.

Jury qualification -- Number 191

O Do you believe you could come back into the courtroom if that's your verdict, depending on the circumstances and evidence -- you've not heard any evidence. Once you do, if you believe that's the proper verdict, could you come back in this courtroom and announce out loud that you are voting for the death penalty?

A Yes, sir.

Q Ms. Morrow, I don't mean to pry too much, but I do need to know a few more things about your past.

I noticed on your juror information card there was a question have you ever been convicted of a crime other than a minor traffic violation. And you indicated that you had. And then you followed up on your questionnaire that it was

THE COURT: Solicitor, I think that's you or any family member, now.

MR. WILLINGHAM: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I think you left the family-member part out. I want you to make sure.

MR. WILLINGHAM: I apologize, Your Honor.

And then on the questionnaire it does say have you or any other family member been arrested, charged with a crime other than minor traffic offenses, and you indicated yes. And in parenthesis you put gambling or drugs. Who was that convicted of those?

- 1 A Can I put what?
- 2 Q Let me show you what I believe is your questionnaire.
- 3 | Question number 23, "Have you or any family member been
- 4 arrested or charged with a crime other than a minor traffic
- 5 offense?" You put yes. "If so, please explain." Who was
- 6 charged with what crime, gambling and drugs? Is that your
- 7 | questionnaire?
- 8 A Yes, sir.
- 9 Q Okay. I am just trying to find out who was charged.
- 10 A Oh, my brother.
- 11 Q Your brother. Okay. So you have never been charged
- 12 with anything.
- 13 A Yes, sir.
- 14 Q What have you been charged with?
- 15 A With gambling.
- 16 Q Okay. When was that?
- 17 A It was in '85.
- 18 Q And --
- 19 A It was expunged.
- 20 Q Expunged?
- 21 A Yeah.
- 22 Q Okay. No other prior convictions that you are aware
- 23 of?
- 24 A No, sir.
- 25 Q What happened? I know you said it's already been

Jury qualification -- Number 191

- 1 expunged. But before it was expunged, what happened to the
- 2 trial? Was it a trial or did you plead guilty?
- 3 A No, sir.
- 4 Q What happened?
- 5 A It was tickets, ball tickets.
- 6 Q Okay. Forfeited, is that what happened?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Do you think because you have had this prior dealing
- 9 | with the criminal justice system that would in any way
- 10 effect your ability to be fair and impartial to the state or
- 11 | to the defense?
- 12 A No, sir.
- 13 Q Ms. Morrow, is your maiden name or prior name Atchison?
- 14 A Yes, sir.
- 15 Q Okay. And, again, I don't mean to pry more than I have
- 16 to, but in 1982 did you have an arrest for simple possession
- 17 of marijuana?
- 18 A In 82? Yes, sir.
- 19 Q And what happened to that charge?
- 20 A It was expunged.
- 21 Q But before -- you say it was expunged. What happened?
- 22 A It was a fine.
- 23 Q And you didn't have a jury trial or anything?
- 24 A No, sir.
- 25 Q You just again forfeited the bail bond?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q And then at the same time you had the ball tickets did
- 3 you have another possession of marijuana charge?
- 4 A No, sir.
- 5 Q You didn't have that?
- 6 A I did not.
- 7 Q Okay. Again, would that have any bearing at all on
- 8 your ability to be a juror?
- 9 A No, sir.
- 10 Q Those were back in 1983.
- 11 A Yes, sir.
- 12 Q Almost ten, well, almost 20 years ago. Indicated too
- 13 during your qualification yesterday when we asked about
- 14 anyone related to anybody, law, at the courthouse, you were
- 15 | related to Judge Beatty.
- 16 A Yes, sir.
- 17 | Q What's your relationship to Judge Beatty?
- 18 A His grandmother and my grandmother were sisters.
- 19 Q So y'all are second cousins or something like that?
- 20 A Yes, sir.
- 21 Q And I understand before Judge Beatty went on the bench
- 22 he was a defense lawyer.
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- 24 Q Would the fact that he was a defense lawyer before he
- 25 took the bench, would that have any bearing upon your

Jury qualification -- Number 191

- 1 ability to be a fair and impartial juror?
- 2 A No, sir.
- 3 Q One last set of questions, Ms. Morrow. Yesterday
- 4 during qualification it was my understanding that you had a
- 5 stepson who was killed by a fire.
- 6 A Killed by a fire? He was killed.
- 7 Q Tell me about that if you would. We didn't have any
- 8 knowledge of that.
- 9 A He was in the State of Ohio.
- 10 Q And what happened in that particular case? How was he
- 11 | killed?
- 12 A He was with a group of guys, and someone shot in the
- 13 group, and he was killed.
- 14 Q Was it an accidental type of shooting or was it
- 15 criminal? Was any charges brought?
- 16 A There was no charges brought.
- 17 Q Was there a criminal investigation? Did the police
- 18 come out and investigate?
- 19 A Yes, sir.
- 20 Q How did that make you feel, the fact that you had a
- 21 | stepson being killed?
- 22 A Well, I mean, guns, you know, used inappropriately
- 23 can -- wrong things can happen. And that's my feeling that,
- 24 you know, everyone shouldn't be allowed to carry a gun.
- 25 Q Okay. That's fair enough. Thank you, ma'am. I have

no other questions.

23.

THE COURT: Anything further from the defense?

MR. MORIN: Nothing.

THE COURT: The state?

MR. WILLINGHAM: No other questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Morrow, I want to thank you very much for your participation here yesterday, as well as this day.

I find that you are qualified to serve as a potential juror in this case. With that qualification comes some more instruction, as if you haven't had enough already.

I am going to remind you, number one, that you are not to discuss this case with your family, friends or anyone else that you might come into contact with, with fellow jurors or anyone else.

Also, you are not -- if anyone should attempt to contact you concerning this case, I want to report that to me immediately, because that is a very serious matter, and I would deal with the person that attempted to contact you accordingly.

I will, once again, strongly instruct you and remind you that you are not to read, watch or listen to any news accounts concerning this case. Very simply put, if you were selected as a juror in this case all I would want you to consider in this matter is what you see and hear in this courtroom, nothing more and nothing less.

12.

23.

Jury qualification -- Number 191

Now, with my qualification of you as a potential juror in this case, I'm going to tell you that you need to refer to the information that you were given here yesterday morning. There was a telephone number that you were given yesterday that has the ability to leave a recording for jurors to call and receive further instructions.

I want you to call back tomorrow night, that's Wednesday night, after six o'clock in the afternoon, that's after 6:00 p.m. There will be one of two messages left on the machine at that time. It will say jurors in the case of the State vs. Moore are to call back tomorrow, which would be Thursday at that time, for further instructions at a particular time; or jurors in the case of the State vs.

Moore are to report to the courthouse at a particular time with your bags packed.

Now, when you are instructed to report back here with your bags packed, I want you to leave your belongings in your vehicle. Do not bring them to the courthouse.

If you are not selected, we are going to send you about your daily activities and thank you very much for being here.

If you are selected as a juror, then you would remain with us for the duration of the trial, and the jury custodians would take care of you and your vehicle.

Now, you need to go home and start packing for that

14⁻

24. period of time, because when you receive the call or when you make the call and you're told to be back here, you need to be back here at that time.

I look forward to seeing you later on this week.

Please remember to call back tomorrow after six o'clock.

Thank you very much.

THE JUROR: So call back tomorrow after 6:00 and then the instructions will be --

THE COURT: Follow those instructions on the recording. Thank you, Ms. Morrow.

(Whereupon, the juror was excused from the courtroom.)

MR. WILLINGHAM: If it please the Court, Your Honor, I

understand the Court has instructed the witness to report

back, however, the state would ask --

THE COURT: I asked you if you have anything further.

If you have something further, you ask her to step out.

MR. WILLINGHAM: Yes, sir. And I understand that, and I indicated I had no further questions. But I did have the point of law about her -- the answers she gave to my questions.

THE COURT: Well, you can do it. But, once again,
Mr. Willingham, you know as well as anybody how I conduct
these things. If I ask you if you have anything else, if
you have a matter to raise about her qualifications, you ask
for her to be sent out.

1.

Jury qualification -- Number 191

MR. WILLINGHAM: Yes, sir. And I apologize.

THE COURT: What's your position?

MR. WILLINGHAM: That she did not answer my questions truthfully, Your Honor.

She has prior convictions, 1982, simple possession of marijuana, which initially she did not acknowledge.

Whenever I asked about her maiden name, she did acknowledge, but indicated it had been expunged, which it has not. She also -- I followed up --

THE COURT: Well, sir, if you would present those things to me, then I could consider it. I have qualified her.

MR. WILLINGHAM: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: So noted. But, please, if you have got something back there, I've got this list that you-all gave me, but I can't make heads or tails from half of this stuff, and I am not getting a full deck. So understand that.

If you have got something, let me have it. And let them have it if they don't have it. I have got nothing.

And then you are wanting to come in here after the barn has been locked up and the horse is gone. Mark it.

(Rap sheet of Juror Number 191 marked Court's Exhibit Number One.)

THE COURT: Ms. Morrow, Number 191, is qualified pursuant to Section 16-3-20 of the code.

Appeal: 18-4 Doc: 18-2 Filed: 10/22/2018 Pg: 350 of 516 Total Pages: (866 of 4797)



Division of Appellate Defense 1330 Lady Street, Suite 401 Columbia, South Carolina 29201-3332 Post Office Box 11589 Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1589 Telephone: (803) 734-1330 Facsimile: (803) 734-1397 Robert M. Dudek, Chief Appellate Defender Wanda H. Carter, Deputy Chief Appellate Defender

February 20, 2013

Mr. Richard Bernard Moore, # 6003 Lieber Correctional Institution PO Box 205 Ridgeville, SC 29472

Re: Your case

Dear Mr. Moore:

We received your letter dated December 28, 2012 and the enclosed pro se motion for leave to file a supplemental petition for writ of certiorari. In your letter, you ask if we intend to file any further arguments or a reply to the state's return. The answer is we do <u>not</u> intend to file any further arguments or a reply. As you are aware, the Court refused to take any action on your pro se motion by order dated January 8, 2013.

Your letter and your Motion indicate concern that we did not raise your <u>Batson</u> claim in the petition for writ of certiorari. We have talked about this by phone, but this presents a good opportunity to discuss it again. In the PCR court's order denying you relief, the court addressed your <u>Batson</u> claim. The state struck two black jurors, Morrow and Alexander. Your trial attorneys made a <u>Batson</u> motion, and the trial judge inquired as to the reasons for the strikes. The state provided reasons, and your trial attorney did not pursue the motion any further. Your PCR allegation is that your trial attorney should have pursued the motion. Concerning Alexander, the prosecutor struck him because his son was prosecuted for murder. Nothing in the PCR presentation indicated this information was false or that the prosecutor struck Alexander for a race-based reason. The reason was race-neutral, and no evidence was presented to indicate the stated reason was a pretext. We see no merit to raising the exercise of a peremptory strike against Alexander as an issue in your petition.

Turning to Morrow, the prosecutor stated he struck her because she failed to disclose her criminal record and she expressed a concern about the improper use of guns. The state did not strike Stacey Gantt, a white juror, who also failed to disclose a prior arrest. The PCR order stated that the state could not have struck Gantt because it had exercised its only strike against Huffman. We went through the record to be sure this was accurate because Gantt and Morrow were arguably similarly situated (one having failed to disclose an arrest, and one having failed to disclose a conviction). On page 1765 of the Appendix, the strike sheet shows the state exercised its first strike as to alternates against Edward T. Huffman. Page 1134 of the Appendix indicates that the jury was

struck, but this process is not transcribed. Thus, we were left with only the strike sheet to indicate the order of the strikes. No evidence was presented in the PCR hearing that the order listed on the strike sheet was incorrect. Further undercutting this claim is the fact that the prosecutor moved to excuse Gantt for cause during the qualifications. This occurred on pages 907-909. Thus, the prosecutor would likely have struck Gantt with a peremptory if he had any available. Ultimately, the court found Gantt qualified. We hope this provides a clear understanding of our analysis of the issue presented.

Your letter indicates your concern that the Court will not review the record, but will rely upon the factual recitation provided by the Attorney General's office. It has been our experience that the Court reads the entire records in the cases presented.

Finally, we never intentionally fail to raise a winning issue. We want to win every case and try to do so in every brief, motion, and petition that we file. We endeavor to select winning issues from the preserved issues. Not every preserved issue is a winning issue, and it is the job of an appellate attorney to choose among the preserved issues for a winning issue. This does not mean we are perfect. We make mistakes – we are human. The United States Supreme Court recognized this recently in Martinez v. Ryan, 132 S.Ct. 1309 (2012) by providing that a federal habeas corpus petitioner may overcome procedural default of an issue by showing ineffective assistance of PCR counsel. In other words, if PCR counsel was ineffective in failing to raise an issue, then the issue is considered procedural defaulted because it was not exhausted in state court. However, the federal court will allow a petitioner to raise the issue in federal court if the failure to do so in PCR was ineffective assistance of PCR counsel.

Feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

SusauB. Hackett

Susan B. Hackett

Assistant Appellate Defender

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Richard	Bernard	Moore.	Petitioner,
---------	---------	--------	-------------

v.

Bryan P. Stirling, Commissioner, South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2020-001519

ORDER

Petitioner has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and a motion to stay his execution pending resolution of the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The State opposes the requests.

We order the parties to brief the following questions:

Was Petitioner's death sentence disproportionate to the penalty imposed in similar cases?

In determining the proportionality of the death sentence, should similar cases in which the death penalty was not imposed be considered?

The parties shall, within twenty (20) days of the date of this order, agree on the content of an appendix in this matter. Within thirty (30) days after agreement on the appendix, Petitioner shall serve his brief and the appendix on Respondent and file eleven (11) copies of the brief and eleven (11) copies of the appendix with the Clerk of this Court, with one copy of the brief and appendix filed unbound. Petitioner must also file with the Clerk proof that the brief has been served, and a certificate affirming the brief complies with Rule 211(b), SCACR. Within thirty (30) days after service of Petitioner's brief, Respondent shall serve his brief on Petitioner and file with the Clerk eleven (11) copies of the brief, one copy of which shall be filed unbound. Any reply brief must be served within ten (10) days after

service of Respondent's brief, with eleven (11) copies, one of which is unbound, filed with the Clerk. No extensions shall be granted.

Oral argument will be held on May 5, 2021. The parties will be advised of the time for oral argument.

Because Petitioner's execution was stayed by order of this Court dated November 30, 2020, we deny the motion to stay as moot.

Seath C.J.

January J.

January J.

J.

J.

J.

J.

J.

J.

J.

J.

Columbia, South Carolina January 28, 2021

cc: Lindsey Sterling Vann, Esquire
Hannah Lyon Freedman, Esquire
John H. Blume, III, Esquire
Donald J. Zelenka, Esquire
Melody Jane Brown, Esquire
W. Edgar Salter, III, Esquire
Barton Jon Vincent, Esquire
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Whitney Boykin Harrison, Esquire
Gerald Malloy, Esquire