1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE ADDRESS
2	
3	In re: Examining Attorney General Kathleen Kane's ability to perform the duties of her office with a suspended law
4	license.
5	* * * *
6	VOLUME TIT - Dagge 112-197
7	VOLUME III - Pages 112-187
8	Stenographic report of hearing held
9	in Hearing Room 1, North Office Building, Capitol Complex, Harrisburg, PA
10	Wednesday
11	November 18, 2015 1:00 p.m.
12	
13	SEN. JOHN GORDNER, CHAIRMAN
14	
15	MEMBERS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE ADDRESS
16	Sen. Lisa Baker Sen. Sean Wiley Sen. Art Haywood Sen. Gene Yaw
17	Sen. Judy Schwank Sen. Joe Scarnati, ex officio
- 1	
18	
19	Also Present:
20	Joshua Funk, Esquire, Majority Counsel
21	Shannon Sargent, Esquire, Minority Counsel
22	
23	Poportod by.
24	Reported by: Ann-Marie P. Sweeney
25	Chief Official Reporter
- 1	

INDEX TO WITNESSES WITNESS: PAGE Bruce R. Beemer, First Deputy Attorney General Lawrence Cherba, Executive Deputy Attorney General, Criminal Law Division James A. Donahue III, Executive Deputy Attorney General, Public Protection Division Robert A. Mulle, Executive Deputy Attorney General, Director of the Civil Law Division

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Good afternoon. I'd like to call to order the 1 p.m. hearing of the Special Committee on Senate Address. I have some opening remarks.

Gentlemen, on behalf of the committee, I would like to thank you for appearing here today on this important issue. Although your appearances were commanded by subpoena, everyone on the committee recognizes the difficulty that this testimony creates. We understand that all of you are practicing lawyers who must honor attorney-client privilege, and in your unique positions this may include certain interactions with Kathleen Kane. No one on this panel shall in any way require or even suggest that you violate this privilege.

We also recognize that being a member of the Bar of Pennsylvania and an employee of the Office of Attorney General, you are all charged with enforcing the laws of the Commonwealth, both civil and criminal, for and on behalf of the citizens of Pennsylvania, the Governor, and the various Commonwealth agencies you represent as clients. We understand that in that role you may be privy to confidential investigations or litigation matters. This committee obviously recognizes the need for such confidentiality over these matters, and we'll respect that.

Given this unique nature of your testimony, we will open with brief introductions by each of you.

Thereafter, the committee will pose questions to Mr. Beemer, who will either respond or designate the appropriate person to do so. We also understand that the nature of this inquiry may require you to confer before responding. Please feel free to do so.

We will also honor your request to not be asked the ultimate question of whether Attorney General Kane remains competent to act as Attorney General since her law license has been suspended. That issue is ultimately one for this committee.

Lastly, without your cooperation and candor, the task of the committee would be much more difficult. We thank you in advance for that cooperation and candor.

Senator Wiley for brief remarks.

SENATOR WILEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To echo Senator Gordner, thank you. Thank you to the panel for their time and testimony today, and I, too, can understand and appreciate the sensitivity of this matter and extend our gratitude to you on behalf of the committee. One question drives this committee and all of our actions, and that is, can the Attorney General fulfill the duties of this office with a suspended law license? A seemingly simple statement, but obviously one that is complex in its own right.

We've heard testimony from others specific to the issue at hand, and we are especially interested in what will

1 be presented today in regard to the inner-workings of the 2 Office of the Attorney General. Hopefully, the information 3 that you provide today, coupled with previous testimony and 4 information, will allow the committee to produce a final product that is fair, impartial, and transparent. 5 Thank you 6 again. 7 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you. Would you stand to be sworn in? 8 (Whereupon, BRUCE R. BEEMER, JAMES A. DONAHUE, 9 ROBERT A. MULLE, and LAWRENCE CHERBA, were duly sworn.) 10 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you. You may be seated. 11 As I mentioned in my opening remarks, I think it 12 would be helpful for us as a panel, for those folks that are 13 here, the viewing public, if you would first state your name 14 15 for the record, state your position, and state your experience with the Attorney General's Office. 16 17 And we'll start with you, Mr. Beemer. MR. BEEMER: Thank you, Senator Gordner. 18 19 My name is Bruce Beemer. I am currently the First 20 Deputy Attorney General in the Pennsylvania Attorney General's 21 Office. I have approximately 17 years of prosecutorial experience. I worked for 14 years in the Allegheny County 22

District Attorney's Office primarily prosecuting homicide and

violent crime. I joined the Attorney General's Office in 2011

as the Chief of Staff to then Attorney General Linda Kelly.

23

24

25

When there was a change of administration in January of 2013, I stayed on with Attorney General Kane in the capacity of senior counsel to the Attorney General, as well as Chief of the Criminal Prosecution Section.

In June of 2014, Attorney General Kane asked me to assume the role of First Deputy Attorney General, where I remained till this day, and have the honor and privilege of working with these three gentlemen here who directly report to me in my role as First Deputy Attorney General as the Executive Deputies of each of the three major legal divisions within the office.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you.

Mr. Cherba.

MR. CHERBA: Thank you, Senator.

Senator, my name is Lawrence Cherba, C-H-E-R-B-A. It's my 43rd year in law enforcement. I started in 1972 as a police officer in Bucks County, and in 1986 I began my career as a prosecutor in Bucks County. And then transferred to the Office of Attorney General, and it's my pleasure to be here for 19 1/2 years. Attorney General Kane promoted me at the beginning of her tenure to Executive Deputy Attorney General for the Criminal Law Division, where I presently have 13 sections, 71 attorneys, and 274 agents under my control. And I report directly to Mr. Beemer.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you.

Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Thank you, Senator.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: If you could turn the mike on, please.

MR. DONAHUE: Thank you, Senator. My name is

James Donahue. I'm the Executive Deputy Attorney General in

charge of the Public Protection Division. My division

includes the antitrust, charitable trust organizations, civil

rights and special litigation, health care and tobacco

sections, and the Bureau of Consumer Protection. To use a law

firm analogy, the Public Protection Division is the

plaintiff's law firm within the Office of Attorney General.

The division has 118 employees, 41 of those are attorneys. All of them are dedicated public servants and who are very proud to serve the people of Pennsylvania. I've been with the office since 1985. I started as a Deputy Attorney General I. I was appointed Chief of the Antitrust Section in 1997, and was appointed to lead the National Association of Attorneys General Multistate Antitrust Task Force from the years 2009-2012. In January 2013, I was asked by Attorney General Kane to take over and lead the Public Protection Division, and that's what I've been doing since then. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you.

And Mr. Mulle.

MR. MULLE: Good afternoon. My name is Bob Mulle, and I have the honor to serve as Executive Deputy Attorney General and Director of the Civil Law Division, as well as Right to Know Officer for the Attorney General's Office. I have approximately 30-plus years in State government, 17 years with the State System of Higher Education, 8 years as chief counsel for that agency. I joined the Attorney General's Office in 2003 as Chief of the Legal Review Section. At that point, it was called Legal Review and Advice, which primarily dealt with the transactional side of the law affecting State Government. I was appointed approximately a year ago as Executive Director of the Civil Division, where I currently serve.

Our division is primarily focused on the civil law activities of State government. You can divide it pretty much between litigation and transactional work. The litigation comprises appellate matters; civil law, which includes constitutional and civil rights issues; tort litigation; tax litigation; and debt collection in bankruptcy court and other venues on behalf of the Commonwealth. On the transactional side, we review, by law, all contracts, deeds, leases, and bonds that are entered into by the Commonwealth, we review them for legality and form. We also review all regulations under the Regulatory Review Act, and our approval must be secured before those regulations are promulgated. We issue

formal legal opinions when the Attorney General is so requested by the head of an agency. We do the Right to Know work for the agency, and a number of other issues which I won't go into detail now.

It is a privilege to be here today, and I thank you for the opportunity to testify.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you, gentlemen, for that background information, and thank you for your many years, collectively, of being involved in criminal enforcement and prosecution, as well as civil.

This will be a little different than the two previous hearings. There will be a lot more questions that will be asked. I will give more time to each of the Members. We are now going to go in reverse order from yesterday. I'm going to take the Chair's privilege of asking a number of questions first sort of to set the framework, and I'll be followed by Senator Wiley, and then Senator Scarnati.

Last Friday, in response to a subpoena duces tecum served by this Special Committee, the Attorney General produced an October 22, 2015, memorandum signed by each of you regarding certain restrictions that you believe are appropriate to implement as a result of the suspension of the Attorney General's law license. I guess the first question I have, maybe a simple answer, is, am I correct that Kathleen Kane did not request this memo?

MR. BEEMER: That is correct, Senator.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Therefore, then, the memo was prepared by the four of you, it was dated October 22, which I believe was the day that her license effectively became suspended. Can you provide an overview and context of the memo for the hearing? And I would like to have Mr. Beemer describe the rationale behind the group's decision to prepare the memo, and any other detail that you feel necessary in regard to that memo. Mr. Beemer.

MR. BEEMER: Thank you, Senator.

I'll first start by saying that this was a process that not only the four of us, but many of the other really outstanding attorneys in the office, had been contemplating ever since the Supreme Court issued their order on September 21 of this year, which was, how will this, when it takes operation, affect the office, and what will the office need to do?

It became clear on October 21 that when we were one day away from the suspension taking effect that, I think, the collective judgment of the four of us was that there had not been sufficient information disseminated and dealt with to handle some of the issues that were going to come up relative to Rule 217 of the Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement and how we were going to make that practically work inside of the office. As a result of that, we felt it was imperative on the

first day of the suspension that we outline a plan moving forward for the office.

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

And it's important to note that the memorandum was not intended to be completely comprehensive. From the standpoint of, as you probably have all figured out, trying to address every single issue that could come up in an agency of our size, complexity, and scope would be virtually impossible. So it was intended to be a starting point, if you will, where we felt no reasonable minds could differ in terms of what could be construed as the function of an attorney. Because it's pretty clear that there are many issues that are what we call hybrid issues or that sort of mix in between the practice of law and others. And, so, we tried to focus in the memo on those things that we felt could not be open or subject to dispute that would -- that simply the rules would not allow an individual with a temporarily suspended law license to have a hand in or have involvement in, both for the protection of the office, for the attorneys and other employees working in the office, and for the Attorney General herself.

So that was essentially the rationale behind putting that memorandum together, when it was put together, and the substance of what was contained in it.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: As part of the subpoena that we delivered to Kathleen Kane, we had asked a number of questions. And one of the questions was for her to provide to

us, "Any and all communications from the Attorney General to the employees of the Office of Attorney General related to the suspension of the Attorney General's law license." Her response was that "No document exists."

Am I correct that prior to October 22, that there was no document issued by Kathleen Kane indicating how the office would operate?

MR. BEEMER: We have absolutely no reason to believe that that answer to the subpoena is inaccurate and are unaware of any such communication.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: You're not aware of any document?

MR. BEEMER: No.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: We had a bunch of legal experts here yesterday and a constitutional expert, and they talked about when an attorney has a suspended license, that they can still do -- nothing as an attorney, but they can still do some things, I guess prepare briefs and do research and that sort of thing, but they need a supervisory attorney in order to do that. And if that designation is done, then the Supreme Court and the Disciplinary Board needs to have a document indicating that. Are you aware of any document that exists in which anyone is designated as the supervisory attorney for Kathleen Kane?

MR. BEEMER: I am not. And I'll -- if any of the

other members of the panel are, they can certainly feel free to chime in in that regard. But I would note that my understanding, and I'm not by any means an expert in the Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement, is that that would be problematic anyway because it would require not being supervised by an attorney where the conduct would have taken place that led to the suspension. It's probably typically meant to or contemplates a law firm or other type of private practice scenario, but I don't know that it would be practically feasible, in any event, to deal with it in that regard within the Office of Attorney General.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you. On page 4 of the memorandum, towards the bottom, there is a section called "Process During Suspension." And in that it says, "Recognizing your role as Attorney General, but the fact that that [sic] your license is suspended, you should be informed of all actions that will be taken by the office as you normally would. However the ultimate decision on legal matters must lie with the First Deputy. The types of decision that should ultimately be decided by the First Deputy should include:"-- and there is a list of six items. Number 1 is "a decision on whether to bring a civil or criminal action."

Since October 22, is that, in fact, your role, or whose role is it on whether to bring a civil or criminal action?

MR. BEEMER: That is a role within the office that

the ultimate decision has rested with myself. 1 2 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. And were you delegated 3 by Kathleen Kane to do that, or have you assumed that 4 responsibility? MR. BEEMER: That responsibility has been 5 6 undertaken as based on the reading and management of both the 7 Pennsylvania Constitution and the Commonwealth Attorneys Act. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. And I think we'll get 8 9 into some questions more on that, probably Senator Yaw, 10 because I think there's certain provisions that talk about a 11 vacancy. 12 The second thing is "decision on whether to settle 13 civil actions." Who is taking on that responsibility? MR. BEEMER: I have. 14 15 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right. And have you been designated or delegated to do that? 16 17 MR. BEEMER: Bob, do you want to address any of this? 18 19 MR. MULLE: Senator, we have, as the First Deputy indicated, as lawyers looked at the controlling statutes that 20 21 govern the operation of the Office of Attorney General and have, in light of the suspension, put together a protocol that 22 23 we follow which goes to the First Deputy as currently the ultimate legal authority for legal decisions within the 24

office. That is being followed very strictly. It's being

25

followed for all civil matters.

So, for instance, and just to clarify, on the civil side of the house we rarely institute legal actions.

Our main chore is to defend Commonwealth agencies when sued.

And that decision, however, is still an important one because we routinely review a case when it comes in and determine whether to represent the agency or to delegate that authority back to that agency, and that's based on a number of factors I'd be happy to go into later, if you'd like, but primarily it's on capability and conflict. That decision, as an example, would ultimately go from the chief of the section to myself, and then upon my recommendation to the First Deputy, who would then make the ultimate decision and we would proceed from there.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Prior to October 22, were those decisions made by the Attorney General?

MR. MULLE: In most cases. Not every case, because some matters are fairly routine and would be handled at a lower level.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Number 3 is "decisions on whether to offer or accept a plea bargain." Who is making those decisions?

MR. BEEMER: I am.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right. And prior to October 22, who was making those decisions? Would the

Attorney General have had ultimate say, or were they on a 1 2 routine basis being made by you? MR. BEEMER: Well, there's two areas. Prior to 3 September 21, the Attorney General on any, you know, matter 4 that was not routine would make those decisions. We had them 5 carve out a caveat because of the way the Rules of 6 7 Disciplinary Enforcement operate, that although the suspension 8 did not take effect for 30 days, she was not to engage in any new legal matters during that period of time. So if there was 9 10 something that we -- that came up during that period that we deemed to be a new legal matter in that time period between 11 September 21 and October 22, we had protocols in place to deal 12 13 with that as if the suspension had taken effect. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Number 4, "any decision 14 15 involving the grand juries." Who is making decisions as 16 relates to grand juries? 17 MR. BEEMER: That is, we believe, within a legal 18 function, so that would be with the First Deputy. 19 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. And prior to September 21, who was making those decisions? 20 21 MR. BEEMER: The Attorney General Kane. 22 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right. Number 5--and I am almost to 6--5, "decisions on whether to join amicus briefs." 23 And I'm not sure whether you necessarily had that pop up since 24 25 September 21 or not, but who will be making those decisions?

MR. BEEMER: The First Deputy. Myself.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And number 6, "decisions on whether to use particular defenses in the cases the office is defending." Is that also your responsibility?

MR. BEEMER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And prior to that, would it ultimately have been the Attorney General's?

MR. BEEMER: Ultimately, other than what Mr. Mulle referred to. There are a number of things, a number of matters within the office that oftentimes would not leave the section for decisionmaking, just by sheer fact of volume and the number of, you know, issues that come up within the sections. They might often make decisions on a lot of those matters before they would actually reach the Attorney General's desk.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right. There's one more sentence right after that, and somebody may have some follow-ups in regard to this particular sentence, but you indicated right after that, "The Press Office should not say that you approved, initiated or decided to take action in a legal matter." What was your rationale behind that?

MR. BEEMER: Several things. The first is, if the -- a press statement goes out on behalf of our office and it indicates that the action was initiated by Kathleen Kane, it opens the door potentially to several lines of attack which we

were hoping to avoid, and why it was contained within this 1 2 document. The first could be that an individual might claim, based on the press release, that she in fact did have a hand 3 4 or have a decisionmaking role in a particular matter that could then be litigated in court. And the second is to 5 6 protect against the idea that the Attorney General would be 7 somehow putting herself out there as making decisions on other 8 types of matters, what consumer protection issues to deal 9 with, what types of civil cases to settle. All of those 10 things we felt would be potentially problematic, and that the safer course of action with this issue sort of largely 11 unsettled would be that press statements, press releases, 12 should indicate that it's the Office of Attorney General that 13 is undertaking a particular action. And that was the genesis 14 15 of including that in the memo.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Thank you.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm going to ask now a series of questions as relates to the Commonwealth Attorneys Act. I'll go through a number of sections, and then I will move on with the remaining Members of the committee.

The Commonwealth Attorneys Act obviously set up your office. And there are different sections, there are different provisions for the Attorney General. One of those sections is Section 204, which talks about legal advice in civil matters, says, "Upon the request of the Governor or the

head of any Commonwealth agency, the Attorney General shall furnish legal advice concerning any matter or issue arising in connection with the exercise of the official powers or the performance of the official duties of the Governor or agency." Given that the Attorney General's law license is suspended, can she perform her duty under this section?

MR. MULLE: This provision of the act and this function of the office is, as obviously your intent of asking the question, identifies a very important function under the State Constitution. However, the actual instances where it occurs have become rare. In the very beginning of the existence of the independent Attorney General's Office, there were quite a few requests for formal written legal opinions which are binding on the agency that asks. And those are all, by the way, I'll put a little commercial in, they're all published and they're all on our Web site. For some reason, people sometimes have trouble finding those, and they are available through our Web site for any lawyers or citizens who wish to get ahold of them.

Of late, however, of late I mean the last 15
years, the instances where we've received requests from the
Governor or head of an agency have become very few and far
between. I would say if we get one a year, that's eventful.
So that brings us to the present, and under the present
situation, were we to receive a request for a formal legal

opinion, we would follow the practice we have been following since October 22 of draft -- as we did before, drafting, researching, writing the opinion at the section level, reviewing it at the divisional level, and then ultimately it would go to the First Deputy for approval and signature, as it is clearly a legal document.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. And expect some further questions on that, because this is one section where it says "the" Attorney General. I'll let another committee Member ask that question.

"It shall be the duty of the Attorney General to uphold and defend the constitutionality of all statutes so as to prevent their suspension or abrogation..." Can an Attorney General with a suspended law license defend the constitutionality of all statutes before a court of competent jurisdiction?

MR. MULLE: Our view on this provision, which is far more routine than the prior one--and by routine, I don't mean unimportant; I mean it happens very frequently, it's one of our major functions--we routinely defend independent and executive agencies on constitutional challenges and other challenges in all of the courts, Federal and State, in the Commonwealth. And as a matter of process and practice, since October 22, we again, if there's a need to look for legal approval, we would look to the First Deputy. I believe the

First Deputy has that authority, as the very nature of his position as set out in the Commonwealth Attorneys Act would call for.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Under another section it says, "The Attorney General shall review for form and legality, all proposed rules and regulations of Commonwealth agencies..." Can an Attorney General with a suspended law license review for form and legality those rules and regulations?

MR. MULLE: Again, personally, if I haven't made that clear up to now, I apologize. Personally, obviously, she could not, but the agency, acting under its authority existing both before and after the suspension, routinely reviews such regulations. They're reviewed at the section level. In the past it was rare that an Attorney General would get involved with that review unless there were a significant issue that arose. And it would be the practice now to review and approve such with the appropriate review at the divisional level and there would not be review higher up.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Just a few more. I apologize. "The Attorney General shall represent the Commonwealth and all Commonwealth agencies...." Is she able to do that with a suspended law license?

MR. MULLE: Again, not personally, but I believe the office can.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right. There's a provision for reviewing for deeds, leases, contracts, and fidelity bonds, those for form and legality. Who is taking on that responsibility?

MR. MULLE: That responsibility, as before, was done on a daily basis by the Legal Review Section under my supervision. Any significant issues, I would look at and approve. I would still do that now. It would be rare, extremely rare, for a contract issue to go to the Attorney General for input.

Now, that does raise one interesting question.

One of the types of documents we review are bonds. And as you know, the Commonwealth does a significant amount of transactions with bonds. It's one of the major activities of State government - bonds, and loans, and grants. And we see most, if not all of those. Generally, I do not believe the Attorney General has to be personally involved in that review, as the delegations go back 30 years for all that sort of thing. However, one issue that has not arisen yet, and may arise, would be in the event that we have the issuance of a general obligation bond this year. Because, as you may know, general obligation bonds, which are a significant funding source for Commonwealth operations, require the major State officers to sign them. And, in the past, the Attorney General has, in most cases, done that himself or herself. So what

would happen if that were to come up during the General's suspension? I, quite frankly, at this point, don't know. But we would certainly have to look at that.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. As part of the budget framework, if there's a multibillion dollar bond that would affect school districts, that's certainly being considered and contemplated, so you may end up having to face that issue sooner rather than later.

MR. MULLE: And, in which case, we will research it and come up with an appropriate approach.

Week ago, and part of the Attorney General's responsibility sometimes is getting involved in county prosecutions. It may be when there's a conflict or whether the expertise of the Attorney General's Office is better than maybe a small DA's office who may need some help. Under this act, there are provisions for the Attorney General to exercise their power to prosecute in those things, take jurisdiction. Could you tell me what the process was prior to September 21 and what the process is now as it relates to that?

MR. BEEMER: Larry, you want to?

MR. CHERBA: Senator, the specific process of approving criminal complaints, is that your question, before the 21st?

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Yes.

1 2

MR. CHERBA: That was delegated to the line attorneys and to anyone under my jurisdiction by the Attorney General when she took office. She gave us -- she delegated powers to us.

as an authority versus ability. When she took office she had the authority to delegate certain duties to her attorneys, which she did. And that gave them the ability to use their license to practice law on her behalf. After September 21, her ability to personally practice law became encumbered, but she still, in my opinion, held the authority to delegate that authority and/or remove that authority from a particular attorney. The ability to practice law now lies with a specific attorney on a specific case. If they become encumbered for some reason, they would have to be taken off the case and they would not be able to practice law either.

Maybe I'm getting too far in my explanation here, but at some point it comes down to the individual attorneys. There are certain statutes that provide for the Attorney General or her designee to do certain things, such as the wiretap law, and then there's other statutes that are not that specific. My research, I feel confident in, that the Commonwealth's Statutory Interpretation Act under Title 1, specifically Section 1922, there's a presumption in ascertaining legislative intent "That the General Assembly

does not intend a result that is absurd, impossible of 1 2 execution or unreasonable." So, I think, when -- if you would 3 look at all of the different statutes that pertain to the Attorney General's Office, just because it doesn't say "the 4 5 Attorney General or her designee, " that doesn't mean that we can't act. Just as an aside, besides the Commonwealth 6 7 Attorneys Act, there's 30 specific statutes in Pennsylvania that the legislature has given us original jurisdiction, along 9 with the district attorney's office. 10 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: You said something in regard to 11 -- you have a belief that she can, even with a suspended law 12 license, you have a belief that she can continue to delegate 13 on new matters since September 21? MR. CHERBA: Yes, I believe that, due to something 14 15 that occurred that I cannot discuss here in public. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. 16 17 MR. CHERBA: But I could possibly later. 18 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right. Thank you. 19 Senator Wiley, followed by Senator Scarnati. SENATOR WILEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 20 21 I'm not sure if there's any other questions to 22 ask, now that Senator Gordner went through. 23 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Lots. There's lots. 24 SENATOR WILEY: I thank you guys, and I'm going to 25 be very direct in some of my questioning. First and foremost,

in follow-up to Senator Gordner's questioning in relation to the language in the Commonwealth Attorneys Act relating to "the Attorney General shall," is it your interpretation that when language states "the Attorney General," does that mean the Attorney General the person, or does that mean the Attorney General's Office? MR. MULLE: That is an excellent question, and in

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

some ways cuts--

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: I'm not sure if your microphone -- you may have turned it off.

MR. MULLE: No, I turned it on.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: The green light is on? Okay. Thank you.

MR. MULLE: No, it's my fault. I'll lean over further.

I said, that's an excellent question because that cuts to the rub of a lot of the things we've been wrestling with. As I read both the State Constitution and the Commonwealth Attorneys Act, where references are made to "the Attorney General shall, " and then particular power, duty, or authority is invoked, it, of course, would depend on the In regard to the Commonwealth Attorneys Act, it is our understanding that when referencing the Attorney General, it references the authority of the office that serves the Attorney General, and that as long as the appropriate

jurisdiction and authority exists, that the -- following that process as called for in the statute would be legal.

Unfortunately, the statute doesn't clearly distinguish and the matter must be left to interpretation. But based on experience and what we've encountered in the law, we believe that absent a specific irrefutable indication of personal authority, that personal or delegated authority would be the appropriate interpretation.

SENATOR WILEY: Thank you.

MR. BEEMER: Senator, could I add one thing to that?

SENATOR WILEY: Sure, please.

MR. BEEMER: And that is, it does -- it underscores a problem that we have to deal with that's unique to the Attorney General's Office. Other law enforcement agencies, particularly local district attorney's offices, work in a very confined jurisdictional area, often have a very limited bench of judges under which they will deal. The Attorney General's Office, by its very makeup and its very nature, we go to 67 counties across this Commonwealth and deal with hundreds and hundreds of trial judges. And particularly as it relates to criminal matters, for example, we have to deal with and anticipate the inevitable array of challenges that are going to come from, let's say, criminal defendants, as an example. Anybody that during the process of the

suspension, of the temporary license suspension, was investigated, prosecuted, charged, sentenced, are going to potentially raise issues. And when those issues get raised, and we deal with, unfortunately a lot of very dangerous, very bad people - drug dealers, violent offenders - we are going to have to deal with creative defense attorneys making arguments to a vast array of judges. And if something happens at the trial court level, it only takes one to create a real problem within the office.

So what Mr. Mulle says is absolutely correct and we believe we are on very solid, firm footing. It doesn't alleviate the potential problems that could come up over and over and over again that we have to face and litigate in the courts to address and deal with this issue. And until it would ultimately be decided by a court of final jurisdiction in the appellate courts, it does leave open a measure of uncertainty. So I just think that's -- I just wanted the panel to have that in context why it can be so difficult for the Attorney General's Office because of how broad we are, statewide, and all of the things that we do not just in criminal, but in civil and public protection.

SENATOR WILEY: Thank you. To the best of your knowledge, has the Attorney General currently, or has the Attorney General since October 22, engaged in any practice of law?

MR. BEEMER: To our knowledge, in dealing directly with the four of us--and if anybody disagrees, please speak up--we have not encountered any incident where she has directly inserted herself into the decisionmaking process of the types of matters that we are discussing today.

The caveat to that is, we just don't know about certain issues. And I raise, because of the unprecedented nature of this and how reasonable minds can differ as to what the practice of law means, and I saw with and watched with some interest part of what was testified to yesterday, I can even refer to communications with this panel as to -- and none of the four of us were consulted on that matter where the Attorney General responded to all of you in terms of the subpoena and other aspects of what the committee is doing. Somebody might say that writing on the Attorney General letterhead and issuing what could be construed as legal opinions or legal advice constitutes the practice of law-
SENATOR WILEY: Mr. Beemer, if I may.

MR. BEEMER: Sure.

SENATOR WILEY: Pertaining to your responsibilities in the Attorney General's Office, in your, and to the best of your knowledge, has the Attorney General practiced law since October 22?

MR. BEEMER: It's open to -- I mean, not with respect to direct dealings with cases.

SENATOR WILEY: That's the question--1 2 MR. BEEMER: Yes. 3 SENATOR WILEY: --correct? MR. BEEMER: No. 4 Thank you. Now, to the best of 5 SENATOR WILEY: 6 your knowledge, has anyone, have any of you or anyone in the 7 AG's office received any notices of correspondence from the 8 Disciplinary Board that ethics violations may be occurring 9 currently in the AG's office as a result of the Attorney 10 General's suspension? I don't believe -- we could not speak 11 MR. BEEMER: to that under our understanding of the Rules of Disciplinary 12 Enforcement. 13 SENATOR WILEY: Getting back to -- we were talking 14 15 about the day-to-day operations of the Attorney General's 16 Office, and this was very important to us, and in a prior 17 hearing we heard from the three district attorneys from around 18 the State on the impact that this suspension has had on their 19 But I'm interested to hear, since the suspension of 20 the Attorney General's law license, has there been an adverse impact on the day-to-day operations of the AG's office? 21 22 MR. DONAHUE: Senator Wiley, we've had a couple experiences so far. One is in a case that's under seal, we've 23 24 received a motion challenging our authority to proceed in that

case basically on the grounds that the Commonwealth Attorneys

25

Act requires the Attorney General to make a lot of the decisions personally. And we're in the process of briefing that. So generally, in a civil case, depending on which court you're in, a motion is filed, you have 10, 14, or 30 days to respond, and then you get a reply 10, 14, or 30 days later, and then a judge is faced with making a decision. Obviously, you know, as we all know here, the decisions involved in this matter are novel. Nobody has decided anything under this situation before. We're not aware of this happening anywhere else in the country.

So it's not clear that a decision from a judge would be prompt. I'm not criticizing the judiciary, it's a hard issue. So is there an impact? Yeah, there's an impact that cases, especially complex cases, get further dragged out because of this. We've had a second case where potential action has been verbally threatened. It hasn't been -- it's not in the form of a motion yet, but we do have that verbal threat out there. You know, it's in the context of other communications we're having with opposing counsel, and I don't know what they're going to do. But, you know, I think we have done some research here, as everybody has identified. And the Supreme Court issued the order. The order said the Attorney General's license is suspended, but she's not removed from office. We can't believe that the Supreme Court intended that the entire work of the Attorney General's Office would stop

for every section here that says the Attorney General shall 1 2 review bonds, commence litigation, bring any antitrust cases, 3 or, you know, all of the other provisions. That would be a difficult result and a result with really drastic consequences 4 5 for the people of Pennsylvania. 6 And, so, but that doesn't stop -- so we think we 7 ultimately will be successful in saying we've got the authority to move forward. But that doesn't stop people from 8 9 making motions, you know, and in some cases, they may have the 10 ethical obligation to test us and to make motions to stop us 11 on the basis that the AG's license has been suspended. that just takes time. 12 13 SENATOR WILEY: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 15 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you. 16 Senator Scarnati, followed by Senator Schwank. 17 SENATOR SCARNATI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 Just some clarifications for me. Mr. Beemer, it's 19 clear that none of you are the supervising attorney for the 20 Attorney General presently as under the Rules of Professional Conduct. Is that correct? 21 22 MR. BEEMER: I believe -- that's correct, yes. 23 SENATOR SCARNATI: But do you know if she has a supervising attorney? 24

I do not.

MR. BEEMER:

25

SENATOR SCARNATI: Nobody knows if she has a 1 2 supervising attorney? 3 MR. MULLE: I do not. MR. DONAHUE: I do not either. 4 5 MR. CHERBA: I do not. 6 SENATOR SCARNATI: Is it fair to say that the 7 memo, the October 22 memo, you said that there could be more 8 issues with the operations of the Attorney General that are 9 outlined in that memo, that you outlined some, but there still 10 could be more that could come up? 11 MR. BEEMER: Absolutely. 12 SENATOR SCARNATI: And since you've issued that 13 memo, have you found more issues? MR. BEEMER: There have been other issues that 14 15 have been identified, some of which I don't know that we can discuss here. 16 17 SENATOR SCARNATI: But there are other issues? 18 MR. BEEMER: Yes. 19 SENATOR SCARNATI: Is the Attorney General coming 20 to work? Let me ask the question, is she coming to work in your office? 21 22 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: I think, Mr. Beemer, to be fair, I believe even some of you work in different offices and 23 24 stuff, so, I mean, answer the question to the best of your 25 ability. Or if you can't answer it, it's up to you.

Let me ask, is she coming to 1 SENATOR SCARNATI: 2 work in any of your offices? 3 MR. BEEMER: Well, it depends on the day, 4 certainly, but yes. SENATOR SCARNATI: So how often does the Attorney 5 6 General come to work in any offices? 7 MR. BEEMER: I can't answer that question. 8 has an office in Scranton where she may often be and where we 9 don't know. 10 SENATOR SCARNATI: So she could be going to the 11 office in Scranton, but none of the four of you know that? 12 MR. BEEMER: I don't want to speak for the other people of the panel. 13 14 SENATOR SCARNATI: Okay. 15 MR. DONAHUE: I don't know. SENATOR SCARNATI: Just for the record, maybe I'll 16 17 have everybody answer that. Is the Attorney General coming to work in any of the offices that you work in? 18 19 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And, Senator Scarnati, I may, as the Chair, I mean, you can answer if you're comfortable 20 21 with answering, but I'm assuming that she has worked maybe at different offices, out of the house, I don't know, that sort 22 23 of thing. If that's the answer, you can certainly give that 24 answer. 25 MR. MULLE: Well, the interesting thing about it

is in this age we live in, a lot of work is done from remote location through electronic and other sources of communication. So -- and we have quite a few offices scattered around the State, as you know. East, west, north, south, central. So on any given day, we're all in Harrisburg. The fact that we may not physically encounter the Attorney General, we would not necessarily know that she was not at another site unless we had occasion to interact with her. And, obviously, because her license is suspended and she can't practice law, there is not as much communication with her as there would be with an Attorney General under normal circumstances. So I think that's the reason you get the hesitation. We really just don't know. We can't say where she would be at any given moment with any kind of certainty.

SENATOR SCARNATI: Thank you. Yesterday, I raised an issue, I'm not an attorney, but I've been in the business world all my life, and I recognize that Pennsylvania takes great pride in licensure. As I said yesterday, we license, of course, attorneys, we license barbers, we license bus drivers, doctors, all of us that have a driver's license. We lose that license, that privilege, we no longer can practice. Is it your opinion we have two different classes of licensure, or do we have one class of licensure? Do attorneys have a different level of privilege than the rest of us? As I look at this, I have to ask the question, you know, it appears that under Rule

217 there's severe consequences and issues that have to be complied with. Have all the issues under Rule 217 been complied with by the Attorney General with operations of the office?

MR. BEEMER: I'll answer it in reverse. Clearly, and I don't think any of us up here are experts in the disciplinary rules or the types of things that are normally within the purview of the Disciplinary Board, but I do think that there is clearly a delineation that is made between a formerly admitted attorney who has a suspended law license and one who is disbarred. And there is a recognition that there is a difference between the two. Where that line goes, that's really, I think, a difficult question for us, and probably we're not the appropriate ones to answer.

With regard to, I'll answer the same answer I had for Senator Wiley. All we can tell you is to our knowledge what has transpired within the office. I cannot speak to other things that the Attorney General may or may not be doing because we just -- there are things that have happened that, for example, the correspondence with your office, that we're just not, or with your panel, that we're just not -- we weren't made aware of. And I'm not saying that there was anything wrong with it. That's not for us to say. But it raises questions, and would raise questions with, I think, people as to whether or not certain things constitute the

practice of law. Cannot say one way or the other whether 1 2 there is other things transpiring. That, we just don't know. 3 SENATOR SCARNATI: Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Schwank, followed by 5 Senator Baker. 6 SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 7 I want to go back to the memo that you sent to the 8 Attorney General and kind of get a context of how that was 9 It sounded to me, and tell me if I'm wrong, that you 10 had a conversation with the AG maybe a day or two prior to 11 writing this memo. Is that correct? 12 MR. DONAHUE: That's one -- that's a difficult 13 issue for us to discuss because we think that communication 14 was privileged. I can tell you that there was a statement 15 made in the press, I guess on the 21st, where our press officer said that 98 percent of the Attorney General's duties 16 17 were unaffected. We thought that was a gross overstatement of the implication of this license suspension, and that was one 18 19 of the reasons that prompted us to write the memo. 20 SENATOR SCHWANK: Okay. MR. DONAHUE: It was to deal with what had been 21 22 said publicly. I don't feel that we can describe what she said, you know, privately. 23 24 SENATOR SCHWANK: What was the reaction to the 25 How -- you know, it sounds like you have delegated --

duties have been delegated. Did she agree with the items that you outlined in the memo?

MR. DONAHUE: According to her press statement the other day, she agrees with the memo.

SENATOR SCHWANK: In terms of working, is that what is happening?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes. I think as Mr. Beemer has said, we are -- you know, we have been forwarding these legal decisions through to Mr. Beemer, and there has been no effort by the Attorney General to interfere with that process.

SENATOR SCHWANK: So she hasn't obstructed that at all, and you're continuing to do your work?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes.

MR. CHERBA: That's correct.

MR. BEEMER: And one of the other things, Senator, that was important, and that we wanted to get out there on October 22 as the earliest possible time was, you know, the protection of everyone in the office so that nobody could ever be placed -- what we're trying to avoid is anyone ever being placed in the incredibly awkward position of having to report a violation of the rules to someone that supervises you or is your boss. And the only way that we could think of to do that was to address it in this way and begin, you know, on that day to implement the procedures that were outlined in the memo in order to not place any of -- we have more than 200 attorneys

in our office, over 200 agents, all of whom in some way--and wonderful support staff--all of whom could be potentially placed in an incredibly awkward situation and a difficult one that we were trying to avoid at all costs, and that was really the genesis behind the memo and why we've put in place what Mr. Mulle and Mr. Donahue and Mr. Cherba have already described, you know, sort of the procedures to avoid that.

SENATOR SCHWANK: And, again, to the best of your knowledge, that has been accepted by the Attorney General, and that's the way you are proceeding in terms of how your office is operating?

MR. BEEMER: She's not indicated to any of the four of us or attempted to contravene directly to us anything that is in the memo. That is correct.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Okay. Another question I wanted to ask in regard to protecting the work of the office as well as the attorneys and staff. You know, considering that there might be potential challenges to some of the work that you have done, have you considered whether an advisory ruling could be sought in the interest of preserving, you know, public and judicial resources and insuring that the work that you've done is valid?

MR. MULLE: That, at some point, might be an option. We have not pursued that to date, in part because it would be largely speculative.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Um-hum.

MR. MULLE: This, again, as we're all acutely aware, this is a unique situation, and as you've heard this afternoon, we're doing our best to navigate through troubled waters. We don't want to stir up trouble where it doesn't exist. At the same time, we want to be as faithful as we can be to the spirit and letter of the law and in the interests of our clients, who are the citizens of the Commonwealth. We have a number of very, a number -- all of our employees are dedicated professionals who are very proud of the work they do, and the last thing we want is for them to have to walk into a problem.

Now, we did, early on, request, through a letter to the Disciplinary Board, that they give us guidance, because this is, again, a unique situation. As Mr. Donahue alluded to, the Supreme Court, in taking their action, suspended the General's license, but at the same time said she's still the Attorney General.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Right.

MR. MULLE: So that creates a little ambiguity.

And we are, again, attempting to deal with it. So we wrote to the board. We set out some specific scenarios and questions, and we have yet to hear back.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Haven't had any response from them yet? How long ago was that?

MR. MULLE: Month. About a month.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Okay. I'll defer to make some questions later. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Baker, followed by Senator Haywood.

SENATOR BAKER: Good afternoon. Thank you for being here.

I realize you're here under subpoena, and I just want to ask a very general question. Do any of you have any reason to believe that your career potentially could be in jeopardy because of appearing before our committee or because of the communications that you have offered as a result of working under an Attorney General with a suspended law license?

MR. MULLE: We're all -- we have all spent a lifetime in public service, and I think we've done that because we believe in what public service stands for. So, as you noted, your subpoena was accepted, it wasn't resisted. We are happy to do what we can do today to serve the citizens of Pennsylvania, as we do and as our good people do every day. And if there's any negative fallout from this then, you know, it will come as it may.

MR. BEEMER: And we recognize we have, as even was, I believe, highlighted in the memo, we have, as attorneys who have the privilege of serving in government, have

heightened obligations.

SENATOR BAKER: You're held to a higher standard than--

MR. BEEMER: We're held to a higher standard, as we should be, and we don't -- I don't think any of the four of us -- that was never a consideration. The only consideration was making sure that the office continued to function and function properly, and when we received the subpoena, we recognized the authority of this panel and our obligation to provide the information that was sought, you know, as long as it didn't, you know, cross over a privilege line or something in that regard.

SENATOR BAKER: Sure. Have you asked for or received any opinions from the Bar Association's Ethics Committee regarding your abilities to act as deputies in an agency under a lawyer with a suspended license, or at any point do you believe or are concerned that your law license could be in jeopardy or that you're in violation of any ethical code?

MR. BEEMER: We -- I think I can speak uniformly for the four of us that we do not believe that based on the actions that we have taken, the actions that the other attorneys in the office have taken, that we are in any way in violation of any ethical provisions. That's not to say that part of the basis of your question -- we expect challenges to

the authority of the office to act in various regards, but we feel we have clearly a good faith legal basis that we will be successful on, and I think that's all the ethical rules require of us, is that we're acting appropriately and in good faith.

SENATOR BAKER: I was going to ask, and you answered my question about did you help draft or prepare the responses to our committee, and you indicated that you had not. Do you have any reason or concern -- yesterday an expert who appeared before us and raised some concerns about it being problematic that the Attorney General used letterhead. Do you have any reason to be concerned about that?

MR. BEEMER: Yes. I mean, we have reason to be concerned because so many issues that are raised are issues of first impression in this regard, and I think we're all concerned that we're trying to do everything appropriately. When something like that occurs and senior attorneys in the office are not aware of it, all we can do is if we have a concern is raise it in the appropriate forum. But, you know, that's clearly an issue that reasonable people might differ on, and that's one of those areas that are -- it's going to be difficult, I think, to figure out because there's so many different little hybrid areas within our office, what constitutes the practice of law. It's also important to note, it's not just the practice of law, it's engaged in law-related

activities, which is actually an even broader spectrum of things than the practice of law. And so we're very, very mindful of that. And, you know, that's something that as I mentioned earlier with press releases and things, we're trying very hard to make sure that the office is operating in a way that it does not -- that the Attorney General isn't adversely affected, that the attorneys aren't adversely affected, and that the function of the office is not adversely affected.

SENATOR BAKER: Historically, we know that the Attorney General has access to privileged documents and privileged communications. And so I raise the question, are you concerned about the loss of privilege or who's entitled to waive privilege for those kinds of communications, and do you have any concern about that as you operate?

MR. BEEMER: When you say privilege, are you referring to attorney-client privilege?

SENATOR BAKER: Or privileged documents that you have coming between you and others that you're engaging in settlements with, and others. Do you have any concern about that?

MR. MULLE: The issue is very important, which is obviously why you asked the question. And we have, as part of the restriction of the role of the Attorney General in legal matters, settlements are a good example, settlements which before October 22 would have, given the dollar amount, gone to

the Attorney General for personal sign-off, do not go to the Attorney General any longer, they go to the First Deputy.

Likewise, because the Attorney General is not practicing law, to the best of my knowledge, we have not been sharing legal files or legal correspondence or legal memos or court documents other than what's public because it's been filed in a court, et cetera. So we are acutely concerned always about ethics and about client privilege, particularly in all the litigation that we do. And trust me, our clients, the agencies, would also, I'm sure, are taking a close look and they would remind us if we ever strayed off of the mark. But we have not, and we have been, and will continue to be, diligent on that point, as we're obligated to do.

SENATOR BAKER: How many attorneys are in the complement and how many, as I think of your office as really our chief law firm for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, how many are lawyers and how many are investigators and who has the role and function of supervising, evaluating, disciplining, and the like? Is that something that has fallen onto you, Mr. Beemer, or is that something that the Attorney General has continued to do in any way?

Mr. BEEMER: To answer your question, it's not exact, but it's about a third of the office is attorneys. We have slightly over 800 people as a complement right now, about a third are attorneys, about a third, slightly more than a

third are agents, and about a third are support staff or other 1 individuals. The issue of personnel is a very tricky one with 2 3 regard to who controls hiring, firing, and other matters. mean, I do think that we have, particularly as it relates to attorneys in the office, it creates enormous problems if that 5 control continues to be vested with the Attorney General 6 7 because it opens up to the appearance that --8 SENATOR BAKER: Is that control still in her 9 purview? That control is -- we are still 10 MR. BEEMER: 11 working through that issue, the matter of personnel. 12 SENATOR BAKER: Thank you. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Haywood, followed by 13 14 Senator Yaw. 15 SENATOR HAYWOOD: Thank you. And thank you for your testimony, and especially for your service as well. 16 17 Attorney General, I'm assuming, has some responsibilities beyond those which have historically been the category of 18 19 practicing law. It's a large operation. Would you share with 20 me what the role of the Attorney General is beyond the practice of law functions that have been delegated or 21 22 designated to others? MR. BEEMER: Jim, do you want to answer that? 23 The Attorney General is the chief 24 MR. DONAHUE: 25 law enforcement officer, so most of what the Attorney General

does is ultimately make decisions about cases, whether we're going to bring a criminal case, whether we're going to bring a case that might arise in the Public Protection Division, or how we're going to handle the many cases that are brought against the State that are handled by the Civil Law Division. So the vast majority of work that she does is legal work.

There are, of course, other things the Attorney General does. She does public appearances, she does speeches. We run a contest every year among schools to have students draw anti-drug messages for a calendar. There are a lot of those public functions, but the vast majority of the work of the Attorney General is legal work.

One of the things that caused us a great deal of anxiety was that 98 percent/2 percent number that was put out there in the press because, actually, I don't think there's any number you can put there. So don't ask me to say what's the real number if it's not 98 percent. But the vast majority of the work is to make legal decisions. We present the Attorney General with information about a case, sometimes a very complex case, or sometimes a case that has a lot of policy issues. And, you know, that's what her job is, to make those decisions. Now those decisions are stopping at Mr. Beemer.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: This might be a little bit outside of your expertise, but the order that the Supreme

1 Court issued to temporarily suspend the license of the 2 Attorney General, is it your understanding that the Supreme 3 Court retains jurisdiction on matters related to the suspension of her license? 4 5 MR. BEEMER: It's my -- I mean, I think it's 6 probably our collective understanding that any matter related 7 to the suspension of her license is a matter vested with the authority of the Disciplinary Board, and then ultimately the 8 9 Pennsylvania Supreme Court. The attendant issues that flow 10 out of the fact that the license is suspended may not

necessarily be -- fall within that purview, but certainly the issue regarding the license suspension, you know, the length, whether it's temporary, whether it's indefinite, whether it's -- all of those things fall, I think, directly under the Court's umbrella.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: And would that include compliance with the order? And by compliance, I mean, would be if the person was temporarily suspended from practice--

MR. BEEMER: Correct.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR HAYWOOD: --but they continue to do so, would that then be under the authority of either the Disciplinary Board or the Supreme Court?

MR. BEEMER: Absolutely. Yes.

SENATOR HAYWOOD: You also mentioned that you all sent a letter to the Disciplinary Board. Could we get a copy

1	of that?
2	MR. BEEMER: Yes.
3	SENATOR HAYWOOD: Are we getting two rounds or
4	only one?
5	CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Sure.
6	SENATOR HAYWOOD: Okay, thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN GORDNER: You'll get two.
8	Senator Yaw.
9	SENATOR YAW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
10	I understand all of you have tried to do the best
11	in a bad situation. You didn't create it. I understand that.
12	I didn't create it either, but nevertheless, I am concerned
13	about the impact on the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Nobody
14	has asked this: I assume all of you are members of the Bar?
15	Active members?
16	MR. BEEMER: Yes.
17	MR. DONAHUE: Yes.
18	MR. CHERBA: Yes.
19	MR. MULLE: (Indicating in the affirmative.)
20	SENATOR YAW: Do all of you go to court? Mr.
21	Cherba?
22	MR. CHERBA: Yes, I do.
23	MR. DONAHUE: Yes, I do.
24	MR. BEEMER: Yes.
25	MR. MULLE: No, I don't.

SENATOR YAW: So, we have a mix. We have some who go to court, some don't; you're still attorneys. Now I ask you this question: Could any of you do your job as currently assigned to you if you had a suspended law license?

Mr. Cherba?

MR. CHERBA: As I currently perform my duties?

MR. DONAHUE: No.

No.

MR. BEEMER: No.

MR. MULLE: As my job is currently structured, it would be impossible.

SENATOR YAW: All right. Thank you.

There's been some question about, and Mr. Mulle, I think that you indicated that the First Deputy has the authority and basically is acting as the Attorney General for Pennsylvania as a result of the Commonwealth Attorneys Act, or provisions in it. I have some serious questions about the act, and maybe it's the way the legislature wrote it back when, but nevertheless, Section 202 is very specific. It says, "Whenever there shall be a vacancy in the position of Attorney General, the first deputy shall exercise the powers and perform the duties of the Attorney General until the vacancy is filled." I don't know of any other provision in the Commonwealth Attorneys Act or anywhere related in the Constitution that gives the First Deputy authority to act in

any circumstance other than when there's a vacancy, do you?

Any of you?

MR. MULLE: You're correct. The Commonwealth

Attorneys Act speaks to vacancy. It does not define vacancy.

It does not speak to incapacity or disability or use any other term or set forth any other scenario. That's problematic.

However, if you read the act within the context of the history and the normal operating procedures and delegations of the Office of Attorney General, we believe that the First Deputy has the inherent authority, within limits, to exercise the legal authority he is exercising, which is not radically different than the authority that First Deputies may have exercised in certain situations in the past.

Now, if I had my preference and could write the perfect law, if that's possible, then I would have a whole section in the Administrative Code of 1929 and in the Commonwealth Attorneys Act and any other part of the State legislative corpus which deals with office holders that would set out all these scenarios. A former client of mine, President of Shippensburg University, used to like to talk about teachable moments. This may be a teachable moment for all of us, that perhaps we need to take a look at the Commonwealth Attorneys Act eventually when this is all over and look and see if there's a need to make some revisions to it.

Well, respectfully, I might disagree SENATOR YAW: 1 2 with you, that I think that the act is very clear that in the 3 way that it's written and it specifically refers to the 4 Attorney General taking action throughout, and I'm going to talk about that in a minute, is the act contemplates that the 5 6 Attorney General will be a person in office qualified to hold 7 that office in all respects. And as a result of that, I don't 8 disagree with you that in a normal course of events the person 9 can decide, you know, to whatever all of you, appointed whatever deputies, because they have the power to hire the 10 11 necessary people to help them do the job. But I also think 12 that the way that the act is written, it's written to some extent assuming that there is not one other employee, not 13 anybody other than the Attorney General, that person must be 14 15 able to act in all respects, and that's my concern about this. In this case, we have a situation where the person at the top 16 17 can't act in the full capacity that's required of that job. mean, quite honestly, three of the four of you in your job as 18 19 First Deputy, you go to court. Well, the Attorney General, in 20 this particular situation that we find ourselves in, cannot go 21 to court and can't represent the various agencies involved. 22 23

I know that there's a couple of other provisions that talk about "the" Attorney General, and you mentioned there's distinctions between Attorney General and the Office of Attorney General. My feeling is, I think it's very clear

24

25

when the act says "the Attorney General," they mean "the"

Attorney General, not "the Office of." And I can tell you -you can look this up or take my word for it, there are many,
many places in the act in, for example, in Section 204, where
it talks about -- one section says "Before the Attorney

General shall render any opinion interpreting any
appropriation act, or any act authorizing the expenditure of
money, he shall notify the Departments of the Auditor

General..." and so forth. Now that specifically-
MR. MULLE: Right.

SENATOR YAW: --and this legislation was written at a time when perhaps a better term rather than "he" should have been used, but nevertheless, it specifically refers to that person. And there are other places in that same section that says, "The Commonwealth agency may revise a rule or regulation to meet the objections of the Attorney General and submit the revised version for his review." I mean, it doesn't say "the Office review," or "the Office of."

Now, I fully agree that the Attorney General cannot look into all these things personally. They delegate it. It's the same way as a senior partner in a law firm would do. I assume that you have people that do research and writing for you and they do all kinds of things. But something goes out from your division, it goes out under your name. And that's the way I interpret the Commonwealth

Attorneys Act when it says "the Attorney General." A lot of other people could be involved, but the person who is signing their name to the bottom line is the Attorney General.

There's one other provision too under the

Commonwealth Attorneys Act. This causes me some concern.

It's membership on agencies, Section 207. It says, "The

Attorney General shall serve as a member of the Board of

Pardons and he, or his designated deputy, shall serve as a

member of the Joint Committee on Documents, the Hazardous

Substances Transportation Board," and other ones. I think

it's significant, here it says the Attorney General shall

serve as a member of the Board of Pardons, and designees can

serve in the other capacities. I mean, who is serving on the

Board of Pardons now? Anybody?

MR. CHERBA: The Attorney General is.

SENATOR YAW: So, the Attorney General is still serving on the Board of Pardons?

MR. BEEMER: (Indicating in the affirmative.)

SENATOR YAW: Okay. I would like to talk about your memo, and I fully understand the last part of your memo you talked about press releases, giving the implication that somehow the Attorney General was involved in them. I have a press release here that was issued yesterday. Are you aware of it?

MR. BEEMER: I don't know if I'm aware of the

specific press release. 1 SENATOR YAW: Well, it's from the Office of 2 3 Attorney General, and it starts off, "Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane today announced a settlement with a 4 5 for-profit education company accused of using high-pressured 6 recruitment practices and misrepresenting the numbers of its 7 graduates who obtained employment in their field of study." You didn't know about that? 8 9 MR. DONAHUE: Yes, I did. It's one of my cases. Yes. 10 It's one of your cases? 11 SENATOR YAW: 12 aware of this press release? 13 MR. DONAHUE: Yes. SENATOR YAW: Because it appears to say exactly 14 15 what you were concerned about. 16 Well, it says she announces. MR. DONAHUE: Ιt doesn't say that she approved or initiated. That's 17 18 specifically--19 SENATOR YAW: Well, you were concerned in your 20 memo, it said about the implication that arises out of the Attorney General doing anything in the process. 21 22 MR. CHERBA: Got to be careful, right. SENATOR YAW: Now, I mean, and that was yesterday. 23 There was one on the 16th which also said, the Attorney 24 25 General "today announced the filing of a legal action against

a midstate home improvement contractor..." Once again, I mean, that didn't concern you?

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

MR. BEEMER: As I stated earlier, I believe it absolutely did and does concern us, primarily because it opens the door to people externally claiming that she had a role in the decisionmaking or other process that she may not have had. And so that was the purpose behind putting it in the memo. You know, one of the difficulties in -- may not necessarily have authority over the communication section of the office, because that is not necessarily an inherently legal function, and so therefore there might be a disconnect, which is why, you know, with Senator Wiley's question I put the caveat on it, direct legal actions we have not had -- Kathleen Kane has not inserted herself, to our knowledge, in direct legal actions, but that type of thing that you've just described creates at least the appearance of a potential issue that we're concerned about and, you know, we feel that we may have to address at some point when it gets raised by, you know, parties to these actions.

SENATOR YAW: Yes. And as you said, I mean, you face, I understand that, a number of, probably -- how many active cases does the Attorney General's Office have?

MR. MULLE: Thousands.

MR. BEEMER: Thousands and thousands.

SENATOR YAW: Thousands and thousands of cases,

and you probably have, is it fair to say, thousands of investigations also?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes.

MR. BEEMER: I think that's fair, yes, at any one time.

SENATOR YAW: So, I mean, of those thousands of people that are out there, you've got thousands of creative defense attorneys, and I venture to say you're probably going to hear about some of these things, if you haven't already.

My understanding is some of these issues have already been raised in court actions. I'm not sure. Can you confirm that?

MR. BEEMER: I can confirm that Mr. Donahue has already spoken to a couple. I know there are several times in the Criminal Division--

MR. CHERBA: Correct.

MR. BEEMER: --some of which we can't discuss publicly here. But there are also, I mean, I can tell you that, without getting into specifics, we were made aware of the fact that in a county in western Pennsylvania in a criminal matter a judge from the bench asked the defense attorney if he was going to challenge the authority of the Attorney General to act. And I don't expect that to be something that doesn't occur regularly coming down the road because this whole situation is additive in the sense that there may not have been a whole lot of problems on October 22

because it was the first day, but as we get further and further into this, we're going to be faced with dealing with more and more actions where we're going to be litigating these issues until -- if and until it ultimately gets decided definitively by a court of last jurisdiction.

SENATOR YAW: And quite honestly, there was a sitting district attorney who sat here the other day, and you may have seen that, and said that they understood why defense attorneys were probably going to raise as many of these issues as possible, and that is because otherwise, somewhere you're going to face it again because they're going to be accused of being ineffective counsel.

MR. CHERBA: Correct.

MR. DONAHUE: Right.

SENATOR YAW: So, I mean, this whole thing has a snowballing and ugly effect and long term it could affect--

MR. BEEMER: It does, and we have some -- you happened to have a panel here of three of, we have a remarkably diverse and outstanding group of local district attorneys elected throughout this Commonwealth, and one of our most serious charges in the Criminal Division is to accept referrals for cases that are conflict cases. And many times the conflict cases are cases that are particularly problematic for one reason or another. Oftentimes they may even be high profile matters. And so we have, you know, we're concerned

and constantly reaching out to the District Attorneys 1 Association to try to allay them of any concerns about, boy, 2 if we refer a case to the Attorney General's Office, you know, 3 4 and we have a very serious matter here, do we want them to 5 have to address some of these things in court? So we're constantly trying to work with them and understand all of the 6 7 concerns that were raised last week by that three-member group, and I think are probably in some respects shared by a 8 lot of the other 67 elected district attorneys around the 9 10 State. And they've been nothing but wonderful and supportive 11 to us in understanding where we're at and what we have to do, and we're going to continue to try to work through that 12 13 because accepting conflict referrals is an enormous part of what our Criminal Division does. It's certainly not the only 14 15 part, because we have many matters from which we have original jurisdiction, but it's a very important aspect of what we do. 16

MR. CHERBA: Right.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR YAW: And my specific concern is what happens -- you're facing, those issues which defense counsel are going to raise, whether it's the authority to even prosecute the case, or whatever it might be, we could be looking at, it could be years down the road until some of these things are resolved, on top of everything else that you're trying to do.

MR. BEEMER: I believe that to be a fair

statement. That's correct. 1 SENATOR YAW: Thank you. 2 3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 4 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: We'll have round two. 5 me go back to something Mr. Donahue said in regard to, and I guess a couple of you said, in regard to the interaction with 6 7 Kathleen Kane with each of you in regard to matters since October 22. We have the four Deputy Attorneys General here. 8 I'm going to start with you, Mr. Cherba. You're the Executive 9 10 Deputy Attorney General for the Criminal Law Division. 11 you tell me what sort of contact you have had with Kathleen Kane on a weekly basis since October 22 in regard to the 12 matters that you deal with in the Criminal Law Division? 13 14 MR. CHERBA: Since the 22nd I've had personal 15 and--16 MR. BEEMER: Could we have just a quick 17 opportunity to discuss this? 18 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Sure. Just make sure your 19 microphones are off. 20 (Witnesses conferring.) CHAIRMAN GORDNER: 21 Yes. 22 MR. BEEMER: Chairman, if that question is to be 23 asked, if we could only respectfully request that the answers 24 be limited to not of the content of the contact. 25 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: I'm fine with that. I quess

what I'm getting at, you know, we have a certain charge here. 1 Part of it is to find out the functionality of the Attorney 2 General's Office. 3 4 MR. CHERBA: Correct. 5 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And whether Kathleen Kane can effectively operate as Attorney General with a suspended law 6 license. 7 MR. CHERBA: 8 Yes. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: She had a public statement 9 saying that 98 percent of what she does is administrative. 10 11 I've heard certainly differing opinions, so I've got three major division chairs and the First Deputy here, so I've heard 12 that she has not interfered with the divisions in regard to 13 legal matters, which is encouraging. But I guess I'm 14 interested in since October 22, what sort of interaction, and 15 I'm not asking for specific interaction, but what sort of 16 17 interaction she has had in regard to your division since 18 October 22? MR. CHERBA: I've had personal contact with her, 19 20 and telephonic contact, and e-mail contact. 21 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Mr. Donahue? 22 MR. DONAHUE: I've had one communication with her 23 assistant. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Mr. Mulle? 24 I've had very few communications with 25 MR. MULLE:

her, electronically or otherwise.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. Mr. Beemer?

MR. BEEMER: I've had limited tele -- electronic communication with her.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Mr. Wiley. Senator Wiley, sorry.

SENATOR WILEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just have one question. You spoke of the concern of the appearance from outside parties. But do you feel confident that the actions of the office remain valid?

Do you still feel that the integrity of the office is still on solid ground?

MR. BEEMER: I do. I believe this presents enormous challenges that we are dealing with, but as I believe Mr. Donahue so aptly stated earlier, all we can do is operate with the hand we've been dealt, so to speak, and we believe that to read otherwise in certain circumstances would have created a result via the Supreme Court order that would have effectively crippled the functioning of one of the most important State agencies in government. So, while we are extremely concerned about the impact that this has on our office, which is profound and extraordinary, really, because so much of what we do is tasked with, I mean, that memo is just a very small portion of what we have had to do to try to institute as many safeguards and procedures as we could to

deal with this.

So, but having said that, we feel that the actions and the authority that the office has taken since October 22 are valid and that the office will continue to operate the way that it had prior to October 22, with some obvious differences that we've discussed here today. And we almost have to believe that and push forward in that regard, and we will continue to do so.

SENATOR WILEY: Gentlemen, I not only appreciate your testimony today, but also appreciate you working under the difficult circumstances that you have been, and we appreciate your feedback and your input, and it has been very valuable for me to get the information that you have presented today, and I appreciate that. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHERBA: Thank you, Senator.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Schwank, followed by Senator Baker.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you. And I, too, understand the kind of position that you're in and I do appreciate not only your service here today, but everything that you have done for us. As a citizen of the Commonwealth, I want to express that.

A line of questioning that I've heard earlier I think went to the terms of a vacancy in the office. Do you

believe that the office is vacant?

MR. BEEMER: That, sort of, I guess, speaks to the ultimate question for all of you. I mean, I don't think there's any question that the head of the office is legally disabled from performing a variety of functions, many of which we have discussed here today. I don't think that's really a subject for debate, which is why we took the actions that we took, because I didn't think that there was any reasonable legal mind that would differ with regard that there was going to be a very dramatic impact on what had to take place in the office. As to that specific issue, I don't think -- I do not feel comfortable speaking to that. If any of the panel--

SENATOR SCHWANK: Well, based on what the action that the Supreme Court did, to me, and tell me if I'm incorrect in thinking this, they did not remove the Attorney General from the office. They suspended her law license.

Now, you have been functioning, you have continued to function as the office. So would you -- would that -- would you say that has created a vacancy in the office?

MR. BEEMER: I can't answer that question only because I think that's ultimately a legal conclusion that is not best for people in our position to draw other than to say that it has changed, certainly, the way the office functions and operates, and changed it in a way that is unprecedented. I don't think there's any -- I've been unable to locate, and I

have looked long and hard, not just in this Commonwealth, but around the United States, for anything close or similar to this, and we struck out. We were not able to find anything.

And so we're in unchartered water, and all I can tell you is that we have the benefit of 800 incredible people that do all the work and--

SENATOR SCHWANK: They're doing their job.

MR. BEEMER: --and do all the labor, doing their job every day, and they have made it, you know, for the four of us and the other people in higher positions in the office, have made it possible in, you know, circumstances that nobody whoever came to that office ever thought we would find our ourselves in.

SENATOR SCHWANK: I appreciate that answer. I understand that was a difficult one to take on. But in terms of function, what I'm hearing you say is that office is functioning. Those employees, including you, are doing your jobs. Correct?

MR. BEEMER: Absolutely.

SENATOR SCHWANK: And you're still getting cases referred from district attorneys? You're still taking on the work that you have always taken on?

MR. BEEMER: We are taking what is referred to us. I mean, I can't sit here and say there hasn't been or won't be an impact. It's not as though in three to four weeks' time we

really have any appreciable way of knowing whether or not there's going to be a dramatic drop-off or whether or not as a whole, you know, the District Attorneys Association or the individual district attorneys are going to have reluctance or reticence about sending us matters. You know, so we're, I think, doing the best in a bad situation is the best way I can put it.

MR. CHERBA: Senator, if I may, a couple of times today the panel has referred to the Supreme Court's order, and certainly the Supreme Court doesn't need me to carry their water, but I think it was clear in their order, in Justice Saylor's order, that the issue of removing the Attorney General was not properly before that court.

SENATOR SCHWANK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Baker, followed by Senator Haywood.

SENATOR BAKER: I guess I'd like to just make a couple of comments. So we've outlined today that the Attorney General can't make a legal decision. She can't review privileged documents. She can't participate in privileged conversations. She can't perform any law-related activities, even with a supervising attorney. She can't represent the Commonwealth. There is a concern that she can't discipline, hire, fire attorneys. And so what are the significant parts of the job that she can do? And is it fair to say that the

Office of Attorney General has been significantly impacted and impeded?

And I think it has to go on the record that all of you have demonstrated a commitment and a willingness to put the extra work in to ensuring that the operation is functioning, albeit severely wounded. And so, you know, we are looking at what effect this has for an Attorney General not to have a valid law license, for whatever period of time that may be. And I realize it's unchartered water, but clearly, you are impacted, you are impeded, and you are wounded by where we are. If you'd like to comment on that.

MR. BEEMER: I think that there's two aspects of it that are significant and profound. One is the external issues that we have to deal with, and that is, you know, as we've already discussed, having to deal with the myriad of legal challenges that come along with what could be construed as, you know, reasonable interpretations. Senator Yaw has already gone through some of the issues that we will have to face externally that takes up hours, days of resources, that we would otherwise be devoting in other ways.

Internally, we have to deal with the constant concern that we are protecting all of our employees from any claim that they are in any way engaging in or aiding someone in being involved in the unauthorized practice of law. And that's a constant, you know, it requires constant vigilance.

So when you push the two together, it's a real issue -- I mean, it's a real problem. That's different than whether or not we feel that we can carry on and be legally successful in doing so, because I think all four of us, you know, with some degree of unanimity, because of how amazing the people are underneath us, we believe that that will happen and trust that that will happen. But the confluence of the external and the internal problems is really significant. And I don't -- it's hard to overstate the issue.

SENATOR BAKER: Well, and I think it's difficult for all of us who are listening and hearing this. It's a suspended license and it's less than a month into it. Is it a suspended license for a month? Six months? A year? And clearly, what could happen moving forward are the things that we're trying to assess in terms of how we function and how this office functions without the chief law enforcement officer with a suspended license.

MR. BEEMER: And I think it's fair to say that we hope that internally, as time goes on, we will be able to refine and deal with all the issues and make it work better. But as I explained earlier, externally, this is only going to be additive. I mean, as time goes on, the volume of things that we have to deal with is going to go up, up, up like this (indicating). And, you know, none of us like to think about where that crescendo is going to top off. You know, when we

hit an apex. 1 MR. CHERBA: (Indicating in the affirmative.) 2 3 MR. MULLE: (Indicating in the affirmative.) 4 SENATOR BAKER: It could have serious consequences for the Commonwealth. 5 6 I thank you for your comments. Thank you, Mr. 7 Chairman. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Haywood, followed by 8 Senator Yaw. 9 10 SENATOR HAYWOOD: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony, and obviously more so for what you are doing and 11 12 particularly have done in the last couple of months. It seems phenomenal. 13 14 My question is limited to Mr. Mulle. I think you 15 mentioned something about past experience with First Deputies 16 having to take over responsibility, and I maybe didn't hear 17 clearly, but could you share any of your experiences where First Deputies have had to take over significant management? 18 19 I just wanted to -- I heard something about that and I just 20 wanted to see if there was more that you had to say on that topic. 21 22 I don't have personal knowledge of an MR. MULLE: extended absence where a First Deputy has had to make the kind 23 of significant commitment that our First Deputy has in this 24 25 instance, but there have been situations, and I'm sorry I

can't come up with dates off the top of my head, where the 1 Attorney General, for one reason or another, is out of the 2 3 country or unavailable and provision has been made for the First Deputy to step in and exercise a level of control. You 4 5 know, the Commonwealth Attorneys Act does provide that the structure, the form, and the operation of the office is 6 7 largely based on the Attorney General's desire, even the duties of the First Deputy in absence actually taking over. 8 So with appropriate delegations, be they oral or written, 9 10 appropriate policies, appropriate procedures and protocols, 11 provisions have been made over the years for various actions 12 at various levels that do not require direct regular input by 13 the Attorney General.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SENATOR HAYWOOD: Thank you.

Now my second question is kind of speculative, but the rising external threat, is there a way that you could share what might be a worst-case scenario in how that might be managed?

MR. BEEMER: Yes. I would view a worst-case scenario, and one that gives me personally quite a bit of heartburn, if we had a criminal case in a county involving a serious violent offender and we charged that individual, and for reasons of prior record or the nature of the offense, that person got a very high bail because they would be a danger to the community if they were released, and a defense attorney

filed a motion to dismiss the case based on the lack of 1 jurisdiction of the Attorney General's Office to investigate 2 3 and/or prosecute the matter, and one of the many hundreds of 4 Common Pleas judges we have in this Commonwealth found that that motion was valid and dismissed the case, that person 5 6 would be released, even if it was in the short term, until we 7 could address that issue. That is what I like to call -- I mean, what I would call a sort of nuclear scenario. We pray 8 that does not happen, but it's one that we have to vigilantly 9 guard against all over the Commonwealth and that we're going 10 11 to have to deal with, and we recognize that. And as we've 12 discussed before, and I, you know, we would hope that would not happen, but that's an example of a situation where we 13 would -- we could potentially have public safety adversely 14 15 affected if somebody took the position and a judge took the position that the defense's motion held water. 16 17 Thank you very much for much SENATOR HAYWOOD: more than your testimony, thank you for your service. 18 19 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Senator Yaw. 20 SENATOR YAW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 I guess this is more of a statement than anything. 22 In 1978, the citizens of Pennsylvania decided that we should 23 have an elected Attorney General. And anybody who runs for 24 elected office, including the Office of Attorney General, runs 25

on some kind of a philosophy, whether it's -- I mean, drugs or 1 child abuse or human trafficking or something, something that 2 3 they tell the voters out there that they're going to emphasize. If you elect me, I'm going to do this, this, this, 5 and this, or this is what I'm going to do. Now, what has been 6 done in light of this current situation by you guys is -- it's 7 But the difference is, you don't owe that same responsibility to the voters that the Attorney General does or 8 9 did when that person runs for office. You're committed public 10 I understand that. You're doing your job the best servants. 11 that you can see fit, but the engineer for this train is not 12 there, and that's, I think, the issue that we're all wrestling 13 with. So, but thank you for your service.

MR. BEEMER: Thank you, Senator.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Thank you.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have one or two more questions, and then I think we're done. As part of the subpoena duces tecum that we sent to Kathleen Kane that she responded to last Friday, we asked her for "A description of any duties or functions the Attorney General has delegated to other employees of the Office of Attorney General which cannot be performed or effectuated due to the suspension of the Attorney General's law license." She attached two documents, and two documents only. One was a letter to you, Mr. Cherba--

MR. CHERBA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GORDNER: --as it relates to wiretaps, 1 et 2 cetera. 3 MR. CHERBA: That's correct. 4 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: And one to you, Mr. Beemer, as 5 it relates to the same issue. MR. BEEMER: (Indicating in the affirmative.) 6 7 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Those were the only two 8 documents that she provided to us in regard to delegation. Ι 9 may have asked earlier, I just want to ask again, are you aware of any other documents that she has out there as it 10 relates to delegation of duties or responsibilities? 11 12 MR. CHERBA: Other than the initial delegation to me when she came into office, again, under the Wiretap Act and 13 some other duties that I have. 14 15 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. 16 MR. CHERBA: For instance, I sit as the administrative law judge for the office for firearms appeals 17 18 hearings. 19 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: That was a delegation that she 20 made when she assumed office? MR. CHERBA: That would have been prior to the 21 22 21st, yes. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All the other responsibilities, 23 and there's lots of them that you've described today, are ones 24 25 that you have assumed?

I believe that's--MR. BEEMER: 1 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Since October 22. 2 MR. BEEMER: I would not use the word "assumed." 3 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: What word would you use? 4 5 MR. BEEMER: Carrying out. CHAIRMAN GORDNER: Okay. 6 7 MR. MULLE: Executing. 8 MR. BEEMER: Executing. Thank you, Mr. Mulle. 9 Let the record reflect Mr. Mulle bailed me out. 10 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: I join, again, the entire 11 committee in thanking you for participating in this hearing. 12 You provided a lot of information to us. I'm going to have some concluding remarks and process. I'm going to dismiss the 13 14 panel. 15 MR. CHERBA: Thank you. 16 MR. MULLE: Thank you. 17 Thank you, Senators. MR. BEEMER: 18 CHAIRMAN GORDNER: All right, in regard to, we're 19 not going to do a press gaggle afterwards, as we've done after 20 a couple of them. What I'm going to tell you is, first of all, I personally want to thank the Members of this committee. 21 22 They have been incredibly responsible and participatory in a variety of meetings, discussions, hearings, and it really 23 speaks well of the Members of this committee. We do not have 24 25 any plans for any further hearings. As you know, the

President pro tem gave us a deadline of issuing a report by next Wednesday, which is November 25. At this point, we plan on meeting that direction from the President pro tem. I can tell you that over the next three or four days the committee will be meeting and discussing what we have learned in regard to documents that have been provided to us from the first hearing with the DAs, with the second hearing yesterday from the constitutional and legal ethics experts, and today from this panel of Deputy Attorneys General in reaching the decision that we have been tasked with. And, again, we plan at this point to meet the deadline of next Wednesday, November 25. At this point, I'll have the hearing called in recess until the call of the Chair. (Whereupon, the proceedings were recessed at 2:55 p.m.)

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

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are 1 2 contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me during the hearing of the within cause, and that this is a true and 3 correct transcript of the same. 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY Chief Official Reporter 11 Senate of Pennsylvania 12 13 14 THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY 15 16 REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR SUPERVISION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER. 17 18 19 20 ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY 21 Chief Official Reporter Senate of Pennsylvania 22 Room 644, Main Capitol Building 23 Harrisburg, PA 17120 (717)787-420524

25