

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

Eden Rogers et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	Civil Action No. 6:19-cv-01567-JD
	)	
v.	)	<b><u>GOVERNOR HENRY MCMASTER'S</u></b>
	)	<b><u>REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION</u></b>
United States Department of Health and Human Services, et al.,	)	<b><u>TO THE GOVERNOR'S MOTION FOR A</u></b>
	)	<b><u>PROTECTIVE ORDER</u></b>
Defendants.	)	

---

Governor McMaster, in his official capacity as Governor of South Carolina, submits this Reply to Plaintiffs' Memorandum Opposing Governor McMaster's Motion for a Protective Order (ECF No. 149) (cited herein as Pls.' Resp. Mem.). In addition to the arguments and authorities set forth in Governor McMaster's Motion, Plaintiffs' Response fails for four reasons:

- 1) Plaintiffs fail to identify or even allege any unique, relevant, personal knowledge that Governor McMaster might have that could be obtained solely by deposing him, and thus they have not carried their burden under the apex doctrine to show they are entitled to subject him to the burden of preparing for and sitting for a deposition.
- 2) Plaintiffs' Response expressly admits that, in any deposition of the Governor, Plaintiffs intend to explore the policy rationales and processes behind the Governor's Executive Order and waiver request—an exploration that is clearly prohibited by the deliberative-process privilege.
- 3) As noted in the Governor's Motion, even apart from the protections of the apex and deliberative-process doctrines, the information that Plaintiffs say they would seek in a deposition would not advance their theories of relief under the Equal Protection Clause and Establishment Clause.
- 4) Plaintiffs are also precluded from conflating Governor McMaster and the Office of the Governor because they are distinct legal entities.

Therefore, Governor McMaster asks this Court to grant his Motion for a Protective Order, prohibiting Plaintiffs from attempting to subject him to the burdens of an unnecessary and improper deposition in connection with this suit.

**I. Governor McMaster does not possess any unique, relevant, personal knowledge that can be obtained solely from his deposition.**

Plaintiffs' Response fails to identify any relevant information that can be ascertained solely by deposing Governor McMaster. Therefore, the apex doctrine protects Governor McMaster from being deposed in this case. *See* Gov. McMaster's Mot. for a Protective Order at 7–17 (ECF No. 138). Indeed, Plaintiffs admit in their Response that most of the topics and questions about which they wish to ask the Governor could be answered by discovery on other parties or on third parties—discovery that Plaintiffs acknowledge they plan to conduct. *See* Pls.' Resp. Mem. at 9 (ECF No. 149). For example, Plaintiffs can discover the facts involving Governor McMaster's involvement and communications with the South Carolina Department of Social Services ("SCDSS"), *see id.*, through discovery served on SCDSS and deposing a representative from SCDSS and employees of SCDSS, which Plaintiffs admit they plan to do. *Id.* at 12 n.3; *see also id.* at 20 (noting that "no other fact depositions have yet occurred in this case").

Likewise, Plaintiffs say they seek information on "why, after DSS made plain its intent to require Miracle Hill to comply with relevant policies and regulations, less than a month later, DSS about faced, and instead began working with the Governor's Office to obtain a waiver from HHS." *Id.* at 14. Again, this question relates to a supposed change in SCDSS's position, and thus it would be better posed to a Rule 30(b)(6) witness testifying on behalf of SCDSS. Furthermore, SCDSS's compliance with the Executive Order and its cooperation with the Governor is hardly a mystery that requires a deposition to resolve. SCDSS is a Cabinet-level agency whose Director is appointed by the Governor. It is unsurprising that the agency took action to comply with and align itself with an Executive Order.

In addition to discovery from other parties that can answer these questions, Governor McMaster has already provided ample document production and written responses relating to these

topics. Plaintiffs complain there are “numerous obvious holes” in Governor McMaster’s production, *see id.*, but this is just hyperbole disguised as a reason for deposing the Governor. For example, Plaintiffs complain about a lack of documents regarding Governor McMaster’s communications with federal HHS. *See id.* But all communications (and documents memorializing such communications) between the Governor and HHS can be found both in Governor McMaster’s document production and in the Administrative Record produced by the Federal Defendants. If Plaintiffs are really so concerned that Governor McMaster has not produced responsive documents, it is odd that they have not cited documents that they received from other parties and nonparties, through discovery, which they would also expect to receive from Governor McMaster. This confirms that Governor McMaster has responded faithfully in accord with his duties under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.<sup>1</sup>

Plaintiffs claim they need to depose the Governor to explore his “awareness of Miracle Hill’s history of discriminating,” and they argue that other methods of discovery (*e.g.*, interrogatories) are incapable of discovering this information. *Id.* at 9, 15. These claims ring hollow, however, because Plaintiffs never even attempted to ask that question in an interrogatory. Had they done so—as did the Plaintiff in a related action—they could have (and still can) learn the information they seek. *See Gov. McMaster’s Resp. to Pl.’s Interrogatories* (Jan. 21, 2021) in

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs’ implication to the contrary rests on an erroneous factual premise. *See Pls.’ Resp. Mem.* at 3 (ECF No. 149) (stating incorrectly that the Governor’s initial document production was mostly “duplicative of materials Plaintiffs had already received through FOIA requests”); *see also id.* at 13–14. Incorrect. Before this lawsuit was filed, Plaintiffs’ counsel submitted two FOIA requests to the Governor. The first, submitted on May 1, 2018, yielded 15 pages of responsive materials, and the second, submitted on July 24, 2018, yielded 14 pages. *See letter from M. Coleman to P. Barbur* at 1–2 (Sept. 22, 2020) (ECF No. 107-11). In total, then, the Governor produced 29 pages in response to FOIA requests from Plaintiffs’ counsel. In contrast, the Governor’s initial document production in discovery was more than *thirteen times* that amount, and his completed document production was more than *twenty-nine times* larger.

*Maddonna v. HHS et al.*, C/A No. 6:19-cv-03551-JD (D.S.C.) at 4 (responding to the plaintiff’s interrogatories number 5 and 6 seeking information regarding the Governor’s knowledge of any CPA alleged to engage in religious discrimination or having a policy or practice of “turning away” prospective foster parents on the basis of their religious beliefs or practices), attached as **Exhibit A**.

Similarly, Plaintiffs in this suit claim they need to depose the Governor to inquire about the justifications for his challenged actions and whether he “considered the impact of the waiver.” Pls.’ Resp. Mem. at 10, 21–22 (ECF No. 149). And, yet again, they claim that they cannot do so by pursuing less intrusive means of discovery such as interrogatories. *Id.* at 15. In fact, however, they could ask those questions in interrogatory form—as did the Plaintiff in *Maddonna*—and learn the information they seek. *See* Gov. McMaster’s Resp. to Pl.’s Interrogatories (Jan. 21, 2021) in *Maddonna v. HHS et al.*, C/A No. 6:19-cv-03551-JD (D.S.C.) at 5–9 (listing twenty secular governmental purposes advanced by the Governor’s actions and specifically identifying the reasons and bases supporting the Governor’s belief that forcing faith-based CPA’s to violate their sincerely held religious beliefs would ultimately result in fewer foster-care placements and would otherwise harm children in foster care, CPAs, and the State’s foster-care system), attached as **Exhibit A**.

Plaintiffs’ other arguments on this point fare no better. For example, in a footnote they criticize Governor McMaster’s reliance on “out-of-circuit cases” in his Motion. *See* Pls.’ Resp. Mot. at 18 n.8 (ECF No. 149). But Governor McMaster’s citation to those—in addition to cases from within the Fourth Circuit—is warranted, since those cases applied the apex doctrine in the context of deposing a governor or other high-ranking government official, whereas most of the cases in the Fourth Circuit focus on the apex doctrine as it applies to high-level corporate executives. Plaintiffs, in contrast, do not want the Court to consider the most on-point case law

because it does not support their position. Of course, as Governor McMaster made clear in his Motion, the Fourth Circuit has consistently recognized that high-ranking government officials are also protected by the doctrine, even if it has yet to set out a formulaic test for applying the doctrine to government officials. *See* Gov. McMaster's Mot. for a Protective Order at 7–8 (ECF No. 138).

Similarly, Plaintiffs chide the Governor—again in a footnote—for not submitting his affidavit in support of his Motion. *See* Pls.' Resp. Mem. at 18 n.7 (ECF No. 149). This is inconsequential. Governor McMaster explained his lack of knowledge in his Motion, *see* Mot. for Protective Order at 9–12 (ECF No. 138), and thus did not need to provide an affidavit stating the same. The two cases cited by Plaintiffs in support of a supposedly contrary position, *see* Pls.' Resp. Mem. at 18 n.7 (ECF No. 149), do not require an affidavit. Rather, they merely note that one of the ways an apex official could show that a deposition would place an undue burden on him is by submitting an affidavit. Further, those cases were in the context of a deposition of a corporate official, not the chief executive of a State. Corporations vary widely in size, scope, structure, and organization, and it makes sense that a corporate official might provide additional detail through an affidavit regarding the burden of a deposition. In the instant proceeding, however, it is unnecessary for Governor McMaster to expound upon the demands and burdens of his position more so than he did already in his Motion. Here, although Plaintiffs' arguments set aside common knowledge and common sense, the apex doctrine does not require an affidavit stating the obvious.

In sum, Plaintiffs have failed to bear their burden under the apex doctrine to show they are entitled to depose the Governor. The information they allegedly seek is not unique and personal to the Governor. Rather, it is available from other parties to this case, from third parties, or through less intrusive and burdensome means of discovery, which Plaintiffs repeatedly acknowledge they

have either not pursued or not exhausted. Accordingly, Governor McMaster requests that this Court grant his Motion for a Protective Order.

**II. The information Plaintiffs seek from Governor McMaster is protected as it relates to his mental processes underlying his decision to issue his Executive Order and request a waiver.**

Even if Governor McMaster had unique, personal knowledge of his deliberations and rationales behind the Executive Order and his waiver request, the deliberative-process privilege protects that knowledge from discovery. Plaintiffs admit as much, but they claim the deposition they seek would not invade the deliberative process but, rather, would explore only “factual information” and not any “mental processes.” Pls.’ Resp. Mem. at 23–24 (ECF No. 149). Plaintiffs’ assurances, however, are expressly contradicted elsewhere in their Response, which argues the Governor’s deposition is needed to explore the “process” behind the Executive Order and waiver request, the policy rationales he “considered” in relation to those documents, and the “sincerity” of the his motivations. *Id.* at 10, 14. These are precisely the deliberative decision-making information that is shielded from discovery by the deliberative-process privilege.

Plaintiffs seek, for example, to inquire about “the sincerity of Governor McMaster’s proffered justifications for his actions,” *i.e.*, what Governor McMaster’s supposedly *real* purpose was behind issuing his Executive Order and request for a waiver. *See* Pls.’ Resp. Mem. at 14 (ECF No. 149). However, Governor McMaster’s purposes underlying his actions necessarily involves “matters [Governor McMaster] considered before making up [his] mind[.]” *City of Virginia Beach, Va. v. U.S. Dep’t of Commerce*, 995 F.2d 1247, 1252–53 (4th Cir. 1993) (citation omitted). Plaintiffs’ enumerated topics that they supposedly need to explore fall precisely within that category. *See* Pls.’ Resp. Mem. at 9–10 (bullet point list) (ECF No. 149). The deposition they seek

is exactly what the privilege is intended to “insulate[] against.” *City of Virginia Beach*, 995 F.2d at 1253. The topics Plaintiffs claim they are entitled to explore include the following:

- Governor McMaster’s process in drafting and submitting/issuing his Executive Order and waiver request;
- What possible effects and policy rationales Governor McMaster considered when issuing his Executive Order and requesting the waiver;
- Governor McMaster’s awareness of Miracle Hill’s history of providing foster-care services and its policy to refer certain couples to other child-placing agencies;
- Communications between the Governor and a cabinet agency regarding Miracle Hill’s license and the Governor’s intent to request a waiver; and
- Communications between the Governor and federal HHS regarding the application of the federal nondiscrimination requirements to faith-based CPAs in South Carolina as part of the analysis leading to the Executive Order and waiver request.

*Id.* Each of these topics is clearly aimed at probing what Governor McMaster considered before issuing his Executive Order and requesting a waiver from HHS—in a word, his deliberations.

The only topic that would not examine Governor McMaster’s mental processes underlying his Executive Order and waiver request relates to his efforts to search for, collect, and produce documents and communications in response to Plaintiffs’ requests for production and interrogatories. *See id.* at 10. That topic, however, has already been extensively discussed and described in the Governor’s prior filings and in correspondence between counsel. *See* Gov. McMaster’s Resp. to the Mot. to Compel at 4–5 (Oct. 19, 2020) (ECF No. 108); Letter from M. Coleman to P. Barbur (Dec. 18, 2020), attached as **Exhibit B**; Letter from M. Coleman to P. Barbur (Nov. 20, 2020) (ECF No. 153-3); Letter from M. Coleman to P. Barbur (Nov. 9, 2020) (ECF No. 153-2). The Governor has no unique, personal knowledge of this topic to add.

Because Plaintiffs concede that the deposition they seek would invade and explore the mental processes, deliberations, and considerations underlying the Executive Order and waiver

request, the deposition is forbidden by the deliberative-process privilege. Accordingly, Governor McMaster requests that this Court grant his Motion for a Protective Order.

**III. The testimony Plaintiffs seek from Governor McMaster is not relevant to their Equal Protection or Establishment Clause claims.**

Even if Governor McMaster and his mental processes behind his actions in this suit were not protected by the deliberate-process privilege and apex doctrine, the testimony that Plaintiffs claim they would seek from him would not further their claims. Plaintiffs contend that Governor McMaster “intentionally . . . discriminated and continue[s] to discriminate against prospective foster parents, like [Plaintiffs], who are same-sex couples.” Compl. ¶ 130 (ECF No. 1) (May 30, 2019). In an effort to prove their Equal Protection claim, Plaintiffs seek to demonstrate that Governor McMaster acted with a discriminatory intent or purpose. Contrary to Plaintiffs’ claims, the intent and purpose behind Governor McMaster’s actions were legitimate governmental purposes unrelated to sexual orientation or the establishment of a State religion. Rather, Governor McMaster sought to uphold the United States and South Carolina Constitutions, the best interests of children in foster care, the interests of current and prospective foster parents, and the State’s foster care system by protecting the exercise of sincerely held religious beliefs and by ensuring that critically necessary CPAs could continue providing needed services to children in foster care in South Carolina while *also* ensuring avenues were available for *any* qualified foster parent to serve. *See* Letter from McMaster to Wagner (ECF No. 138-1); Executive Order 2018-12 (ECF No. 138-2); Def. Henry McMaster’s Mot. to Dismiss at 26 (ECF No. 57) (August 30, 2019). Again, the intent and purpose of the Governor’s actions are obvious from, and expressly stated in, the very documents with which Plaintiffs take issue.

Plaintiffs seek to depose Governor McMaster because they have failed to discover any documents or other evidence that would even suggest that Governor McMaster acted with

invidious discriminatory intent. Such supposed subjective intentions, however, are not relevant to the claims in this case. *See* Gov. McMaster’s Mot. for Protective Order at 9–12 (ECF No. 138).<sup>2</sup>

The cases Plaintiffs cite for the contrary proposition—implying that discovery into the subjective motivations for the Governor’s actions is relevant to Plaintiffs’ remaining Equal Protection claim—do not support that position. In *Willis v. Town of Marshall, N.C.*, 426 F.3d 251 (4th Cir. 2005), for example, the Fourth Circuit merely held that it was premature to grant summary judgment on an Equal Protection claim before “*any* discovery” had occurred. *Willis*, 426 F.3d at 263–64 (“Because the district court granted summary judgment before allowing *any* discovery, *Willis* had no opportunity to demonstrate that others situated similarly in this regard were not treated similarly.”) (citation omitted) (emphasis added). The procedural posture of *Willis* is, therefore, clearly distinguishable from the posture of the instant lawsuit. Further, the holding in *Willis* had nothing to do with discerning the “sincerity” or legitimacy of the proffered public purpose underlying the challenged governmental action. *Willis* is thus irrelevant to the question of whether Plaintiffs should be allowed to depose Governor McMaster in this suit.

Likewise, the case of *Clayland Farm Enters. v. Talbot Cnty., Md.*, No. GLR-14-03412, 2018 WL 1609623, at \*2-3 (D. Md. Apr. 3, 2018), fails to support Plaintiffs’ position. In fact, it bolsters Governor McMaster’s position by noting that a court must analyze a discovery dispute with an eye toward the substantive law and must consider whether the information sought is

---

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs erroneously state that the Governor’s argument on this point is relevant only to the dismissed Equal Protection claim relating to alleged *religious* discrimination and not to the alleged Equal Protection claim relating to *sexual orientation* discrimination. *See* Pls.’ Resp. Mem. at 22 (ECF No. 149). Not so. This Court has already ruled that Plaintiffs’ Equal Protection claim relating to alleged sexual orientation discrimination “is governed by rational basis review and will be presumed valid and sustained if it is rationally related to a legitimate state interest.” Order at 46 (ECF No. 81). Under that standard and controlling case law, the Governor’s subjective motivations are irrelevant. *See* Gov. Henry McMaster’s Mot. for Protective Order at 9–12 (ECF No. 138) (collecting cases).

relevant to advance a party's claim. *Id.* at \*2. In fact, the magistrate judge in *Clayland Farm* noted that discovery is *not* always needed to support a claim (or to rule on a claim) brought under the rational basis standard. *Id.* at n.3. Further, the magistrate judge noted that, in *Clayland Farm*, no written discovery had occurred. *Id.* at \*2. Accordingly, the court ordered the parties to engage in written discovery, not deposition testimony. *Id.* at \*2–4 (ordering only that defendant respond to specific interrogatories and document requests). The instant suit is distinguishable from *Clayland Farm* because, unlike the local government defendant in *Clayland Farm*, Governor McMaster *has* responded to discovery requests, *has* produced documents, and *has* responded to Plaintiffs' interrogatories. *Clayland Farm* provides no support for the deposition Plaintiffs seek. If Plaintiffs now view their interrogatories as insufficient, that is on them, and they are free to pursue additional written discovery in accordance with the Court's Scheduling Order. Needlessly subjecting the Governor to a deposition would not advance Plaintiffs' claims, and, accordingly, the Motion for a Protective Order should be granted.

#### **IV. Adhering to the rules of official-capacity suits is not “gamesmanship.”**

Plaintiffs spend several pages complaining that Governor McMaster's consistent, longstanding assertion that the Office of the Governor is not a proper defendant or subject of discovery in this lawsuit is somehow “gamesmanship.” Pls.' Resp. Mem. at 11–13 (ECF No. 149). As an initial matter, it is unclear how this argument relates to their effort to depose Governor McMaster. Plaintiffs inexplicably allege “surprise[.]” and “stonewalling,” *id.* at 11–12, even though Governor McMaster has repeatedly distinguished himself, sued in his official capacity, from the Office of the Governor. For example:

- Governor McMaster's Responses to Plaintiffs' Requests for the Production of Documents at 4–5 (Aug. 4, 2020) (ECF No. 107-7) (“The Governor further objects . . . to the extent [Plaintiffs' instructions] impl[y] that the Office of the Governor of South

Carolina is a party in interest to this proceeding or is susceptible to discovery requests or demands.”);

- Letter from M. Coleman to P. Barbur at 3 (Sept. 22, 2020) (ECF No. 107-11) (noting that “the Governor simply objects to a definition in your Request for Documents to the extent that the definition implies that the Office of the Governor—a department of the State—is a party to this suit”);
- Governor McMaster’s Responses to Plaintiffs’ Interrogatories at 3 (Oct. 15, 2020) (ECF No. 149-6) (“The Governor further objects . . . that the Office of the Governor of South Carolina is a party in interest to this proceeding or is itself susceptible to discovery requests or demands. The Office of the Governor of South Carolina is an agency or department of the State and is not a party to this Case.”); *id.* at 4 (objecting to Interrogatory number 3 “to the extent it implies the Office of the Governor is a party to this litigation or is susceptible to discovery requests in this litigation”);
- Governor McMaster’s Responses to Plaintiffs’ Requests for Admission at 3 (Oct. 15, 2020) (ECF No. 149-5) (objecting to the suggestion “that the Office of the Governor of South Carolina is a party in interest to this proceeding or is itself susceptible to discovery requests or demands”);
- Governor McMaster’s Resp. to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Discovery at 2 (Oct. 19, 2020) (ECF No. 108) (noting Governor McMaster’s persistent objections to Plaintiffs’ implications that the Office of the Governor is a party to this suit);

Indeed, Plaintiffs acknowledge that they “could not have named the Office of the Governor as a defendant in this case under well-established principles of sovereign immunity.” Pls.’ Resp. Mem. at 11 n.2 (ECF No. 149). In other words, for purposes of official capacity lawsuits like this one, the Governor and the Office *are* “separate and distinct entities,” *id.* at 11, for that is the very reason such lawsuits are justiciable in federal court. *See, e.g., Virginia Off. for Prot. & Advoc. v. Stewart*, 563 U.S. 247, 255 (2011) (“[W]hen a federal court commands a state official to do nothing more than refrain from violating federal law, he is not the State for sovereign-immunity purposes.”); *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 102 (1984) (holding that a

suit challenging the constitutionality of a state official's action is not one against the State).<sup>3</sup>  
 Plaintiffs' argument is both irrelevant and meritless.

## V. Conclusion

Because Governor McMaster is protected from being deposed by the apex doctrine and the deliberative-process privilege, and because the testimony Plaintiffs seek from Governor McMaster is not relevant to their claims, Governor McMaster requests that this Court grant his Motion for a Protective Order, thereby preventing him from being deposed.

Respectfully submitted

NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP

By: s/ Miles E. Coleman

Miles E. Coleman  
 Federal Bar No. 11594  
 E-Mail: miles.coleman@nelsonmullins.com  
 2 W. Washington St. / Fourth Floor  
 Greenville, SC 29201  
 (864) 373-2352

Jay T. Thompson  
 Federal Bar No. 09846  
 E-Mail: jay.thompson@nelsonmullins.com  
 1320 Main Street / 17th Floor  
 Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)  
 Columbia, SC 29201  
 (803) 799-2000

---

<sup>3</sup> Plaintiffs' reliance on *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 165–66 (1985) is misplaced since that case referred to “an [government] entity of which an *officer is an agent*.” Governor McMaster is not an agent of the Office of the Governor of the State of South Carolina. Rather, as the “Chief Magistrate,” he is vested with the “supreme executive authority of [the State of South Carolina].” S.C. Const. art. IV, § 1. As the Chief Magistrate, no such agency relationship arises because Governor McMaster is not an agent “subject to [any] principal’s control.” Restatement (Third) of Agency § 1.01 (2006). This distinction explains both why Governor McMaster could not produce a 30(b)(6) witness from the Office of the Governor and why, in contrast, SCDSS (which is not itself a party to the suit, but whose Director, Michael Leach, is a Defendant and an agent of the Department) was willing to comply with the subpoenas served on SCDSS and its employees. *See* Pls.’ Resp. Mem. at 12 n.3 (ECF No. 149).

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Robert D. Cook, South Carolina Solicitor General  
Federal Bar No. 285  
E-Mail: [bcook@scag.gov](mailto:bcook@scag.gov)  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3970

*Attorneys for Governor Henry McMaster*

Greenville, South Carolina  
May 20, 2021

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

Aimee Maddonna,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 6:19-cv-03551-JD
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	<b><u>DEFENDANT HENRY MCMASTER'S</u></b>
	)	<b><u>OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES</u></b>
United States Department of Health and Human Services, et al.,	)	<b><u>TO THE PLAINTIFF'S FIRST</u></b>
	)	<b><u>SET OF INTERROGATORIES</u></b>
Defendants.	)	
	)	

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33, Defendant Henry McMaster, in his official capacity as Governor of the State of South Carolina, submits the following responses and objections to Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories (the "Interrogatories"), which were served on him on December 23, 2020.

**OBJECTION APPLICABLE TO ALL INTERROGATORIES**

For the sake of brevity, and to avoid repeating the same objection in the response to each request, Governor McMaster asserts the following objection applicable to all the requests to the extent they seek information dating "to the present," *e.g.*, to December 23, 2020. (*See* Interrogatories at 6 ¶ 9.) Plaintiff's Complaint challenges the constitutionality of Defendants' specific actions and events, including two specific, identifiable, enumerated actions of Governor McMaster in 2018, namely (1) a letter sent by the Governor on February 27, 2018, and (2) an Executive Order issued by the Governor on March 13, 2018. Plaintiff also challenges a letter sent by the United States Department of Health and Human Services on January 23, 2019. Plaintiff claims *these* actions and events violated the Establishment Clause, and the Complaint claims the alleged constitutional violations arose from and occurred, if at all (which is not conceded), at the time of the challenged actions. Accordingly, Governor McMaster objects to the Interrogatories to

the extent they request information or materials post-dating the Defendants' actions challenged in this lawsuit. The challenged actions were either constitutional or unconstitutional at the time they occurred, and subsequent events cannot transform constitutional actions into unconstitutional ones.

Nevertheless, and without waiving this objection, in the interests of moving the litigation forward toward resolution, Governor McMaster's responses to the Interrogatories reflect his knowledge and information or materials from the period beginning on the date of his installation as Governor through the date the Interrogatories were served on him.

### **OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**

Governor McMaster incorporates by reference the Objections to Definitions or Instructions found in any other Defendants' Responses and Objections to the Interrogatories to the extent the definitions or instructions to which other Defendants have objected are identical to those found in the Interrogatories served on the Governor (though perhaps in some instances found in different numbered paragraphs of the Interrogatories' Definitions and Instructions), and to the extent any definitions or instructions differ from or purport to impose an obligation broader than that found in Rule 26(b)(1) or Rule 33, Fed. R. Civ. P., or any other applicable Rule of Civil Procedure.

The Governor further objects to the definition of the terms "You" and "Your" found in Definition 18 of the Interrogatories to the extent it purports to assert or implies that "the Office of the Governor of South Carolina" is a party in interest to this proceeding or is itself susceptible to discovery requests or demands. The Office of the Governor of South Carolina is an agency or department of the State and is not a party to this Case. The Governor also objects to the definition of the terms "You" and "Your" to the extent that the definition implies that any "employees, . . . offices, divisions, and departments" of the State government are parties to this suit or are themselves susceptible to discovery demands or requests despite not being named as parties to the suit. To be clear, the Governor's objections to the definition of the terms "You" and "Your" relate

specifically to the assertions or implications noted in the preceding sentences and have not altered the substance of his responses to the RFPs, *infra*, or the materials produced concurrently herewith.

**RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO THE INTERROGATORIES**

**INTERROGATORY NO. 1:** Identify all persons who assisted in creating, developing, drafting, reviewing, or approving South Carolina Executive Order No. 2018-12.

**RESPONSE:** Governor McMaster objects to this interrogatory as it attempts to invade the Executive's deliberative process. The Executive Order is a final, completed, official act, and discovery into the contents of deliberations and counsel regarding the Executive Order are a substantial intrusion into the executive's private, privileged decision making process. *See generally Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 542 U.S. 367 (2004). Accordingly, Governor McMaster asserts the deliberative process privilege and/or attorney-client privilege and declines to respond to this or other inquiries relating to the creation, development, drafting, review, and approval of Executive order No. 2018-12.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 2:** Identify all persons who assisted in creating, developing, drafting, reviewing, or approving Governor McMaster's request to HHS, as set out in his February 27, 2018, letter to the Acting Assistant Secretary of ACF, for a deviation or waiver from 45 C.F.R. § 75.300(c).

**RESPONSE:** Governor McMaster objects to this interrogatory to the extent it presages an attempt to invade the Executive's deliberative process or privileged communications. Accordingly, Governor McMaster reserves the right to assert the deliberative process privilege and/or attorney-client privilege in response to further or additional inquiries relating to the creation, development, drafting, review, and approval of his letter dated February 27, 2018. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Governor McMaster identifies the following individuals: Governor Henry McMaster, Trey Walker, and in-house counsel.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 3:** Identify all Communications with persons at Miracle Hill Ministries regarding (a) DSS's review process to renew Miracle Hill's CPA license for 2018; (b) Miracle Hill's policy of limiting its services to prospective foster parents who share its religious beliefs or satisfy its religious criteria, including its change in policy purportedly opening its foster-care services to Catholic prospective foster parents; and (c) granting Miracle Hill a waiver, exemption, or exception from state or federal antidiscrimination requirements.

**RESPONSE:** Concurrently with the service of these Objections and Responses, in response to Plaintiff's First Set of Requests for Production, Governor McMaster has produced and served documents and communications on Plaintiff that contain or memorialize any communications between Miracle Hill and the Governor's staff regarding the topics listed in this Interrogatory.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 4:** Identify all complaints, whether formal or informal, verbal or written, regarding a CPA's actual or alleged discrimination against a prospective foster parent based on the CPA's or the prospective foster parent's religious identity, beliefs, or practices. For each, please state the nature of the complaint, the date on which it was made, the person who made it, the persons to whom it was made, whether it was written or oral, and the circumstances and disposition of any inquiry, investigation, review, sanction, enforcement, or other disciplinary action against the CPA in question.

**RESPONSE:** Governor McMaster objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks information regarding CPAs other than Miracle Hill and regarding foster parents or prospective foster parents other than Plaintiff. Plaintiff has not pled any facts or claims relating to other CPAs, and she lacks standing to assert claims of discrimination on behalf of others. Accordingly, information regarding alleged discrimination by CPAs other than Miracle Hill or regarding prospective foster parents other than Plaintiff is irrelevant to the claims or defenses asserted in this suit. Notwithstanding the foregoing objection, Governor McMaster is aware of the allegations of discrimination asserted in the instant lawsuit and in one other pending case captioned *Rogers et al. v. U.S. Dept. of Health & Humans Servs. et al.*, No. 6:19-cv-01567-JD (D.S.C.). Specific information relating to the factual allegations in those suits may be found in the court filings available to the public on PACER. The Governor is unaware of other allegations of religious

discrimination in the State's foster care system, and any qualified person can be licensed as a foster parent by SCDSS in any county in the State and can work with SCDSS or with private CPAs in his or her area.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 5:** Identify any CPA that has a policy or practice, formal or informal, of turning away prospective foster parents from participating in the State's foster-care program or otherwise refusing to provide services to prospective foster parents on the basis of the CPA's or the prospective foster parents' religious beliefs or practices.

**RESPONSE:** Governor McMaster objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it incorrectly asserts or implies that a CPA can exclude a qualified person from participation in the State's foster care program, much less that the Governor has permitted such exclusion. The licensing of foster parents is the exclusive purview of the South Carolina Department of Social Services ("SCDSS"). SCDSS gladly accepts applications from qualified prospective foster parents, regardless of their religious beliefs or practices, and SCDSS licenses foster parents for participation in the State's foster care program regardless of their religious beliefs or practices. Once licensed, such individuals or couples may serve as a foster parent directly with SCDSS, regardless of their religious beliefs or practices, or they may serve in partnership with any number of private CPAs who partner with foster parents without regard to their religious beliefs or practices.

In addition to, and independent of, the foregoing objections, Governor McMaster lacks information regarding the internal policies and practices of private CPAs across the State and thus has no knowledge or information responsive to this Interrogatory.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 6:** Identify and describe all governmental interests that you may argue in a dispositive motion or at trial in this action that are furthered by permitting faith-based CPAs, including Miracle Hill Ministries, to exclude from participation in the State's foster-care program prospective foster parents who do not share the CPA's religious beliefs or meet the CPA's religious criteria, or otherwise limit their services to such foster parents on the basis of either the CPA's or the prospective foster parents' religious beliefs or practices. Include in your response the reasons and bases, including any purported factual, scientific, or policy basis, that support or otherwise justify your position.

**RESPONSE**: Governor McMaster objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it incorrectly asserts or implies that a CPA can exclude a qualified person from participation in the State’s foster care program, much less that the Governor has permitted such exclusion. The licensing of foster parents is the exclusive purview of the South Carolina Department of Social Services (“SCDSS”). SCDSS gladly accepts applications from qualified prospective foster parents, regardless of their religious beliefs or practices, and SCDSS licenses foster parents for participation in the State’s foster care program regardless of their religious beliefs or practices. Once licensed, such individuals or couples may serve as a foster parent directly with SCDSS, regardless of their religious beliefs or practices, or they may serve in partnership with any number of private CPAs who partner with foster parents without regard to their religious beliefs or practices.

Governor McMaster further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it purports to require the Governor to prepare and preview for Plaintiff legal arguments that may be asserted in future stages of this litigation—a request that exceeds the permissible scope of discoverable information under the rules applying to interrogatories.

To the extent this Interrogatory requests the Governor assert contentions that relate to the application of law to facts, it is premature for Governor to assert such contentions in a complete and exhaustive way, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(a)(2), and the Governor reserves the right to supplement his response at a later date, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1)(A). Nevertheless, subject to the foregoing objections and reservations, the Governor identifies, in no particular order, the following legitimate, secular governmental interests or purposes that were furthered by his actions challenged in this lawsuit:

1. Adherence to the United States Constitution and South Carolina Constitution.
2. Adherence to precedent set by the Supreme Court of the United States, including but not limited to *Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer*, 137 S. Ct. 2012 (2017).

3. Adherence to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.
4. Adherence to the South Carolina Religious Freedom Act.
5. Maximizing the number of foster parents in the foster-care system to ensure that every child in the State without a home can find a suitable foster family.
6. Ensuring that the number of foster parents in the State does not decline as is often the case when faith-based CPAs are disallowed from participating in the foster-care system.
7. Increasing community support and options for foster-child placement by maximizing the number and diversity of CPAs. *See Lipscomb ex rel. DeFehr v. Simmons*, 962 F.2d 1374, 1380 (9th Cir. 1992).
8. Avoiding unnecessary violations of faith-based CPAs' free-exercise rights that would result from forcing them to renounce their beliefs in order to participate in generally available state programs. *See Trinity Lutheran*, 137 S. Ct. at 2022.
9. Avoiding unnecessary violations of faith-based CPAs' free-speech and associational rights that would result from forcing them to partner with unwelcome individuals who perform ministerial functions in order to participate in generally available state programs. *See Hosana-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & Sch. v. E.E.O.C.*, 565 U.S. 171, 188–89 (2012).
10. Avoiding unnecessary entanglement in religion that would result from the enforcement of its religious-matching statute and regulation in the absence of faith-based CPAs. *See* S.C. Code. Ann. § 63-15-20.
11. Increasing the number of CPAs in the State.
12. Expanding the diversity of types of CPAs in the State.
13. Increasing the number of licensed foster parents in the State.
14. Increasing the longevity of service of licensed foster parents in the State.
15. Ensuring that CPAs can operate in the foster-care system without compromising their religious beliefs.
16. Ensuring the current and future wellbeing of children in the State that are or may be in the foster-care system.
17. Ensuring that the State has the maximum amount of federal funds available for support of the State's foster care system.
18. Reducing the State's homelessness rate.
19. Reducing the State's unemployment rate.

20. Increasing the State's college-graduation rate.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 7:** Identify and describe the reasons and bases, including any purported factual, scientific, or policy basis, for the conclusion that enforcing state or federal antidiscrimination requirements against faith-based CPAs would cause CPAs to “abandon their religious beliefs or forgo the available public licensure and funding,” would result in fewer foster-care placements, would not be practicable, or otherwise would harm the foster-care system in South Carolina.

**RESPONSE:** Governor McMaster objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it purports to require the Governor to prepare and preview for Plaintiff legal arguments that may be asserted in future stages of this litigation—a request that exceeds the permissible scope of discoverable information under the rules applying to interrogatories. To the extent this Interrogatory requests the Governor assert contentions that relate to the application of law to facts, it is premature for Governor to assert such contentions in a complete and exhaustive way, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(a)(2), and the Governor reserves the right to supplement his response at a later date, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1)(A).

Nevertheless, subject to the foregoing objections and reservations, the Governor identifies the following reasons and bases to believe the enforcement of the unconstitutional and *ultra vires* requirements found in 45 C.F.R. § 75.300(c) would force faith-based CPAs either to abandon their sincerely held religious beliefs or forgo licensure and funding; would infringe on the constitutional and statutory rights of CPAs and foster parents; and would otherwise harm the State's foster care system and the children who depend on it.

One faith-based CPA in the State expressly stated that the enforcement of the regulation at issue would place it in such a position. Specifically, in correspondence produced to Plaintiff concurrently with the service of these Objections and Responses, Reid Lehman—then the CEO of Miracle Hill—wrote to HHS and made this very assertion. Further, the experience of other States and faith-based CPAs located in those states, including most recently the CPA at issue in *Fulton*

*v. City of Philadelphia* (No. 19-123) pending before the Supreme Court, indicates that the enforcement of regulations and requirements that conflict with a faith-based CPA's sincerely held religious beliefs do, in fact, put the CPA to the choice of either abandoning its beliefs or foregoing licensure and/or funding. The experience of other States and their CPAs likewise illustrates the result of the exclusion of faith-based CPAs from participation in the system: a diminution in the number of foster homes.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 8:** State when you became aware that Miracle Hill denied Plaintiff Aimee Maddonna the opportunity to participate in the State's foster-care program, and please describe any Communications, Documents, investigations, enforcement, or other actions that you took in response.

**RESPONSE:** Governor McMaster became aware of Plaintiff's allegations when she filed and served the instant lawsuit naming Governor McMaster as a defendant. Upon being served with Plaintiff's Complaint and being made aware of Plaintiff's allegations, Governor McMaster conferred with counsel. The Governor's subsequent communications and documents relating to the allegations of the lawsuit are protected by the attorney-client privilege and the work product protection. Any nonprivileged documents or communications have been produced and served on Plaintiff concurrently with these Objections and Responses.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 9:** Identify all persons who assisted in answering these Interrogatories or in answering the allegations of the Complaint.

**RESPONSE:** The Governor's in-house counsel and outside counsel.

NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP

By: s/ Miles E. Coleman \_\_\_\_\_  
Miles E. Coleman  
Federal Bar No. 11594  
E-Mail: miles.coleman@nelsonmullins.com  
2 W. Washington Street / 4th Floor  
Greenville, SC 29201  
(864) 373-2352

Jay T. Thompson  
Federal Bar No. 09846  
E-Mail: jay.thompson@nelsonmullins.com  
1320 Main Street / 17th Floor  
Post Office Box 11070 (29211-1070)  
Columbia, SC 29201  
(803) 799-2000

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Robert D. Cook, South Carolina Solicitor General  
Federal Bar No. 285  
E-Mail: bcook@scag.gov  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
(803) 734-3970

*Attorneys for Governor Henry McMaster*

Greenville, South Carolina  
January 21, 2021

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

Aimee Maddonna, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
United States Department of Health and )  
Human Services, et al., )  
)  
Defendants. )

---

Civil Action No. 6:19-cv-03551-JD

**DEFENDANT HENRY MCMASTER’S  
OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO  
THE PLAINTIFF’S FIRST SET OF  
INTERROGATORIES**

I hereby certify that I have served a copy of Defendant Henry McMaster’s Objections and Response to Plaintiff’s First Set of Interrogatories by electronic mail on the following:

Aaron J. Kozloski  
CAPITOL COUNSEL, LLC  
P.O. Box 1996  
Lexington, SC 29071-1996  
Tel: (803) 465-1400  
Fax: (888) 513-6021  
aaron@capitolcounsel.us

Richard B. Katskee  
Kenneth D. Upton, Jr.  
Sarah R. Goetz  
AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE  
1310 L Street NW, Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: (202) 466-3234  
Fax: (202) 466-3353  
katskee@au.org  
upton@au.org  
goetz@au.org

*Counsel for Plaintiff Aimee Maddonna*

Peter M. McCoy, Jr.  
Joseph H. Hunt  
Christie V. Newman  
Christopher A. Bates  
Michelle Bennett  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
1441 Main Street, Suite 500  
Columbia, South Carolina 29201  
Christie.Newman@usdoj.gov

James R. Powers  
Trial Attorney  
Federal Programs Branch  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, CIVIL DIVISION  
1100 L. Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
James.R.Powers@usdoj.gov

*Counsel for the Federal Defendants*

William H. Davidson  
Kenneth P. Woodington  
DAVIDSON, WREN & DEMASTERS P.A.  
1611 Devonshire Drive, 2nd Floor  
Post Office Box 8568  
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-8568  
(803) 806-8222  
wdavidson@dml-law.com  
kwoodington@dml-law.com

*Counsel for Defendant Leach*

/s/ Miles E. Coleman  
Miles E. Coleman

*Counsel for Governor Henry McMaster*



NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH LLP  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

Miles E. Coleman  
T 864.373.2352 F 864.373.2925  
miles.coleman@nelsonmullins.com

2 W. Washington Street | Fourth Floor  
Greenville, SC 29601  
T 864.250.2300 F 864.232.2925  
nelsonmullins.com

December 18, 2020

**Via electronic mail**

Peter Barbur  
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP  
Worldwide Plaza  
825 Eighth Avenue  
New York, NY 10019-7475  
PBarbur@cravath.com

RE: *Rogers et al. v. U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Servs. et al.*  
Civil Action No. 6:19-cv-01567-TMC (D.S.C.)  
Our File No. 059326/01501

Peter:

I write in response to your letter dated December 1, 2020. Notwithstanding our continued objection to the expansive scope and dubious relevance of the Plaintiffs' discovery requests that were disputed by the Governor, we have searched for, collected, and reviewed potentially responsive documents as discussed in our prior correspondence, using the search protocol and date ranges described in that correspondence. Enclosed you will find (i) Governor McMaster's Objections and Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of RFPs; (ii) a supplemental document production; (iii) a Supplemental Response to Plaintiffs' Interrogatory No. 2; and (iv) a supplemental privilege log.

Per our prior correspondence, the enclosed supplemental privilege log lists post-litigation documents or communications that relate to the *subject matter* of the litigation and that were withheld on the basis of privilege, work product, common interest, or joint defense. It does not, however, list post-litigation documents or communications relating to the *conduct* of the litigation and that were withheld on the basis of privilege, work product, common interest, or joint defense.

Further, as noted in my email of December 9, in addition to our previously described search efforts, we have attempted to search for communication using the five searches you proposed in your letter of November 13, 2020. Those efforts have been complicated by the enormous number of false positives generated by the searches. The first search, for example, returned more than 28,000 results, and several of the other searches returned tens of thousands more. After sampling the results to identify the factors causing this over-inclusivity, we proceeded with the searches as follows:

December 18, 2020  
Page 2

- (1) We replaced the search term trans! with: “trans” OR transgender! This eliminated thousands of emails and attachments that are unrelated to the subject matter of this litigation but which contained words like “transportation” and “transfer.”
- (2) We replaced the search term foster! with: “foster child” OR “foster children” OR “foster kid” OR “foster kids” OR “foster care” OR “foster agency” OR “foster agencies” OR “foster placement” or “foster home” or “foster homes.” This, combined with the prior modification, eliminated thousands of false hits on documents unrelated to the subject matter of this litigation but which, for example, discussed efforts to “foster” a good learning environment for the State’s school children while they “transitioned” to a virtual classroom.
- (3) We excluded e-blasts such as those sent by Law360, Politico, SCOTUSblog, the National Governors’ Association, the State Services Organization, and news aggregators.
- (4) Where the proposed searches used an “AND” connector between two parenthetical groups of terms, we replaced it with a “NEAR” connector. This replacement eliminated thousands of false hits on emails with sizeable attachments unrelated to the subject matter of this litigation, including, for example, sprawling PDFs summarizing every bill pending in the General Assembly, in which a term like “CPA” may be dozens of pages away from a term like “faith.”

Even after performing the foregoing modifications, the searches you proposed have returned a significant number of results we are in the process of reviewing. Some of the results are still false positives, and many of the remainder appear to be duplicative of documents and communications already produced. We anticipate we may need another week or so to complete the review of these documents. Accordingly, and in light of the upcoming holidays, we expect we will produce the additional responsive documents, if any, uncovered by the searches on or before January 4, 2021.

Very truly yours,



Miles E. Coleman

CC: (by electronic mail):  
M. Malissa Burnette  
Bob Cook  
Currey Cook  
Leslie Cooper  
Susan Dunn  
Miranda J. Li  
Daniel Mach  
Mika Madgavkar  
Christopher Ray

December 18, 2020  
Page 3

Nekki Shutt,  
Jay Thompson  
Ken Woodington