

From: EmailMeForm burst@emailmeform.com
Subject: Feedback via the Judicial Candidate Survey 2018 [#50]
Date: March 19, 2018 at 8:42 PM
To: kbyrne@cincinnatirighttolife.org



Check that you have read and understand the following: Surveys may be submitted by mail, fax, email, or online. Upon submission, this survey will be posted to our website and published in the CRTL News Bulletin as public information. We will redact your contact information before posting to our website. The completed survey is required for endorsement consideration. Direct questions to KByrne@CincinnatiRighttoLife.org

Name*: Judge Charles Miller

Phone*: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Web Site: www.judgecharlesmiller.com

Facebook URL: <https://www.facebook.com/Miller4Judge/>

Position and District Sought*: Judge, First District Court of Appeals

Are you an incumbent for this office?: YES

Have you previously held an elected position?: YES, NO

:

: Hamilton County Republican Party (Received)

I seek the endorsement of all who desire a fair-minded judiciary

- : 1. Ensuring that the law is faithfully applied by all judges in Hamilton County
2. Educating the public on the role of the courts

1. Which former U.S. president's political philosophy best matches your own?: Other (please specify)

Comments - Question 1: I do not believe personal political philosophy should influence or inform judicial decision-making. Accordingly, I respectfully decline to respond.

2. Which U.S. Supreme Court Justice's legal philosophy best matches your own?: Justice Alito

Comments - Question 2:

3. Rate your judicial philosophy regarding the U.S. Constitution on a scale of 1-10 with "living/evolving document" being 1 and "strict constructionist" being a 10: 9

Comments - Question 3:

4. In Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), the U.S. Supreme Court recognized a "right to privacy" under the Constitution that includes abortion. The Constitution does not include this right.:

Comments - Question 4: Without prejudging any case that might come before me, my view of that issue, if presented as a question of original impression (which it can no longer be), would likely have been similar to those expressed by Judge Friendly in his draft opinion in Hall v. Lefkowitz. http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/jlpp/Vol29_No3_Randolph.pdf
However, I am bound to follow precedent that has been developed by the U.S.

However, I am bound to follow precedent that has been developed by the U.S. Supreme Court and other higher courts.

5. Judges should refrain from “legislating from the bench.” The translation of public policy into law and the creation, extension, modification or limitation of citizens’ rights (and governmental authority) are properly within the province of the legislative, not judicial, branch of government.: Agree

Comments - Question 5:

6. An unborn child is biologically human at every stage of his or her biological development, beginning at fertilization.: Agree

Comments - Question 6: The statement seems axiomatic.

7. The law should be applied to pro-life demonstrators in the same manner as is applied to environmental, anti-war and labor demonstrators.: Agree

Comments - Question 7: Generally, differences in the content expressed in the exercise of First Amendment rights should not effect a change in the time, place and manner restrictions placed upon the right.

8. There is no provision in the current Ohio Constitution intended to require the use of public funds for abortion.: Undecided

Comments - Question 8: I have not researched this issue.

9. The judiciary does not possess the authority to expand the definition of marriage to include anything but one man and one woman.:

Comments - Question 9: I'm precluded from answering questions that may come before a court.

10. The law protects individuals’ and organizations’ rights of conscience from being forced to participate in abortion or other practices contrary to their moral or religious convictions.:

Comments - Question 10: I'm precluded from answering questions that may come before a court.

11. Laws, regulations, or ordinances that restrict individuals’ and organizations’ rights of conscience are unconstitutional.:

Comments - Question 11:

12. Laws that require businesses or religious organizations to work for or provide services to gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons despite these entities’ religious or moral objections are unconstitutional.:

Comments - Question 12: I'm precluded from answering questions that may come before a court.

13. List all organizations to which you have contributed time or money in the past four years.: