

RECEIVED

2016 JAN 27 AM 11:40

SENATE OF PA  
SECRETARY'S OFFICE



## **Senate of Pennsylvania**

---

**FINAL COMMITTEE REPORT  
OF THE  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE ADDRESS**

---

**SUMMARIZING THE DUE NOTICE AND FULL HEARING PROVIDED TO  
PENNSYLVANIA ATTORNEY GENERAL KATHLEEN G. KANE AND EXAMINING  
WHETHER THE SENATE SHOULD PROCEED TO VOTE ON HER REMOVAL**

**CHAIRMAN  
JOHN R. GORDNER**

**DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN  
SEAN WILEY**

**MEMBERS  
LISA BAKER  
ART HAYWOOD  
JUDITH L. SCHWANK  
GENE YAW  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE JOSEPH B. SCARNATI, III, *EX OFFICIO***

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE ADDRESS**

John R. Gordner, Chairman

Sean Wiley, Democratic Chairman

Lisa Baker

Art Haywood

Judith L. Schwank

Gene Yaw

Joseph B. Scarnati, III, *ex officio*

**SECRETARY OF THE SENATE**

Megan Martin

**CHIEF CLERK OF THE SENATE**

Donetta M. D’Innocenzo

**COMMITTEE COUNSEL**

J. Andrew Crompton  
*General Counsel to the  
Majority Caucus*

Joshua D. Funk  
*Majority Counsel*

C. J. Hafner  
*Chief Counsel to the  
Minority Caucus*

Shannon Sargent  
*Minority Counsel*

Mark A. Rush  
Thomas C. Ryan  
*Special Counsels*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	5
1. The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that before the Senate considers moving forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution that such a vote should not occur until the Pennsylvania Supreme Court makes a determination that it does not intend to consider Kathleen Kane’s Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned <i>In Re Kathleen Granahan Kane</i> , 3 WM 2016 (Pa.). .....	5
2. The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decides to fully consider Kathleen Kane’s Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned <i>In Re Kathleen Granahan Kane</i> , 3 WM 2016 (Pa.), that the Senate not consider moving forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution unless the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rules against her Application for Extraordinary Relief. ....	5
3. The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decides to fully consider Kathleen Kane’s Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned <i>In Re Kathleen Granahan Kane</i> , 3 WM 2016 (Pa.), that the Senate should not move forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rules in favor of her Application for Extraordinary Relief and removes her law license from suspended status. ....	5
4. After fulfilling the due notice and full hearing requirements under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, and without making a determination on removal, the Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that the Senate, after meeting the conditions of recommendation 1 or 2, vote on the removal of Kathleen Kane from office. ....	6

**BACKGROUND FACTS** ..... 6  
**RELEVANT LAW**..... 9  
**COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES**..... 14  
**LIST OF EXHIBITS**..... 19

**SUMMARIZING THE DUE NOTICE AND FULL HEARING  
PROVIDED TO PENNSYLVANIA ATTORNEY GENERAL KATHLEEN  
G. KANE AND EXAMINING WHETHER THE SENATE SHOULD VOTE  
ON HER REMOVAL**

On behalf of the Special Committee on Senate Address, Senator John R. Gordner, Chairman of the Committee, submits to the Senate, through the President Pro Tempore Joseph B. Scarnati, III and the Secretary of the Senate Megan Martin, this report fulfilling its charge contained within Senate Resolution 256, Printer's No. 1461 of the 2015 Session of the Senate of Pennsylvania to provide a report within 15 days of the conclusion of due notice and the full hearing afforded to Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution. That hearing occurred on January 12, 2016.

**REPORT**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Special Committee on Senate Address, after careful consideration and deliberation of the testimony presented and evidence received, provides four recommendations in this report:

1. The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that before the Senate considers moving forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution that such a vote should not occur until the Pennsylvania Supreme Court makes a determination that it does not intend to consider Kathleen Kane's Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned *In Re Kathleen Granahan Kane*, 3 WM 2016 (Pa.).
2. The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decides to fully consider Kathleen Kane's Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned *In Re Kathleen Granahan Kane*, 3 WM 2016 (Pa.), that the Senate not consider moving forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution unless the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rules against her Application for Extraordinary Relief.
3. The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decides to fully consider Kathleen Kane's Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned *In Re Kathleen*

*Granahan Kane*, 3 WM 2016 (Pa.), that the Senate should not move forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rules in favor of her Application for Extraordinary Relief and removes her law license from suspended status.

4. After fulfilling the due notice and full hearing requirements under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, and without making a determination on removal, the Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that the Senate, after meeting the conditions of recommendation 1 or 2, vote on the removal of Kathleen Kane from office.

### **BACKGROUND FACTS**

The “Background Facts” section from the Special Committee’s previous report entitled “Examining Pennsylvania Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane’s Ability to Perform the Duties of her Office with a Suspended Law License,” (“First Report”) is incorporated by reference. The First Report and its eleven exhibits are attached to this report. *See* Exhibit A, Exhibits A1–A11.

To recount in brief, Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane earned her license to practice law in Pennsylvania in 1993. On September 21, 2015, the Supreme Court temporarily suspended that license during the pendency of her attorney disciplinary proceedings. *See* Exhibit A1.

On October 26, 2015, the Senate established the Special Committee to determine whether there was sufficient evidence that warranted due notice to Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane and a full hearing as required under the Pennsylvania Constitution before considering her removal from office before the full Senate. *See* Exhibit A.

On November 25, 2015, the Special Committee issued the First Report. The First Report made the following three findings and recommendations:

1. After careful consideration and deliberation of the testimony presented and evidence received, including the Legislative Reference Bureau memorandum dated November 17, 2015 and the testimony of the Constitutional and Legal Ethics panel on November 17, 2015, the Special Committee on Senate Address finds that the Senate has jurisdiction over a removal action against the Pennsylvania Attorney General pursuant to Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

2. After careful consideration and deliberation of the testimony presented and evidence received, the Special Committee on Senate Address, while making no specific finding on direct removal, finds a sufficient basis for the Senate to move forward with due notice to Pennsylvania Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane and a full hearing pursuant to Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution.
3. The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that the Senate accept this report and, within 15 days of the acceptance, the Special Committee shall submit a proposed resolution outlining the procedures for providing the required due notice and full hearing before removal that would be considered by the full Senate.

*See Exhibit A.*

On December 7, 2015, the members of the Special Committee introduced Senate Resolution 256, Printer's No. 1461, which was then referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations. *See Exhibit B.* This resolution was reported as committed on December 9, 2015 and unanimously adopted by the Senate on the same day.

Senate Resolution 256 adopted rules of procedure governing the due notice to Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane and her full hearing as required under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

On December 10, 2015, Senate Resolution 256, the First Report and all of the First Report's exhibits were served on both the Office of Attorney General and private counsel for Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane, fulfilling the notice requirement of Article VI, Section 7. *See Exhibits C and D.*

Regarding the full hearing requirement of Article VI, Section 7, Senate Resolution 256 proclaimed that Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane "may file a written response to the [First] Special Committee Report, its exhibits or any part thereof with the President pro tempore and the Chair of the Special Committee on Senate Address any time prior to 12 noon on January 11, 2016." Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane did send a letter on January 11, 2016 to the Special Committee in which she declined to appear before the Special Committee to defend herself. Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane restated her argument that the Special Committee lacks jurisdiction to remove her and noted, "[T]he suspension [of her law license] is temporary and may be dissolved or amended at any time . . ." *See Exhibit E.*

Senate Resolution 256 further proclaimed that a full hearing for Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane would be held on January 12, 2016 and that she had the “right to appear before the Special Committee to offer testimony, submit a sworn or unsworn statement, submit third party affidavits and/or produce documents related solely to her ability to perform the duties of her office with a suspended law license and to answer questions posed by Special Committee members.” Additionally, Senate Resolution 256 stated that Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane “may appoint counsel to represent her and appear on her behalf before the Special Committee.” The Special Committee did hold the full hearing on January 12, 2016, in which Jonathan Duecker, Chief of Staff for Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane, and Edward G. Rendell, the 45<sup>th</sup> Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and former Philadelphia County District Attorney, testified before the Special Committee. *See* Exhibit F and G.

Last, Senate Resolution 256 proclaimed that upon conclusion of the full hearing, Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane “or her counsel shall be permitted to submit additional documents or information prior to January 15, 2016, at 5 p.m.” She did not submit any additional documents or information to the Special Committee after the full hearing.

On January 11, 2016 Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane filed an Application for Extraordinary Relief (“Application”) in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (“Supreme Court”). In this Application, Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane petitioned the Supreme Court to use its discretionary authority to exercise jurisdiction over her disciplinary proceedings and to vacate its September 21, 2015 order and immediately reinstate her law license. *See* Exhibit H.

## RELEVANT LAW

The Supreme Court uses its King’s Bench authority only in extraordinary circumstances, generally when “an issue of public importance that requires timely intervention by the court of last resort to avoid the deleterious effects arising from delays incident to the ordinary process of law.” *See Commonwealth v. Williams*, No. 14 EM 2015, 2015 WL 9284095, at \*4-\*5 (Pa. Dec. 21, 2015). The authority is “exercised with extreme caution[.]” *In re Bruno*, 101 A.3d 635, 670 (Pa. 2014) (citing *Commonwealth v. Balph*, 3 A. 220, 230 (Pa. 1886)).

“[T]he exercise of King’s Bench authority is discretionary.”<sup>1</sup> *Bruno*, 101 A.3d at 689 (Castille, C.J., concurring). Therefore, it is the Supreme Court’s prerogative to decide whether to consider the Application. If it decides not to consider the Application, Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane’s law license will remain suspended as the administrative process at the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (“Disciplinary Board”) runs its course. This administrative process began when the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) filed a Petition for Emergency Temporary Suspension and Related Relief Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E. 208(f)(1) asking the Supreme Court to suspend the Attorney General’s license to practice law because she was causing “immediate and substantial public harm[.]” Thereafter, the Supreme Court ordered that Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane’s law license be indefinitely suspended. Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane is now asking the Supreme Court to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction over this matter outside of the established administrative process and vacate a unanimous decision it made just over four months ago.

Nonetheless, the President Pro Tempore has given the Special Committee only one charge: to examine the ability of Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane to

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Application, Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane states, without any further support, that the Supreme Court has jurisdiction “pursuant to its King’s Bench powers granted onto it by Article V, Section 2 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and pursuant to 48 Pa. Cons. Stat. §502 and §726; and Pa. R. of App. P. 3309.” The Application erroneously provides citations to Pa. Consolidated Title 48 (Lodging and Housing), but the correct citations are contained in Pa. Consolidated Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure). In this statement, the Application references two separate types of jurisdiction: extraordinary jurisdiction under 42 Pa. C.S.A. § 726 and the use of King’s Bench authority to acquire jurisdiction under 42 Pa. C.S.A. §502. *See In re Dauphin County Fourth Investigating Grand Jury*, 943 A.2d 929, 933 n.3 (Pa. 2007) (explaining that the two bases for jurisdiction—both discretionary—are similar but not the same). For purposes of this Report, the distinction is not relevant. In either instance, an exercise of jurisdiction is discretionary and used only in extraordinary cases.

fulfill her official duties with an indefinitely suspended law license. If the Supreme Court reinstates her law license, the need to examine the charge from the President Pro Tempore would be moot.

Accordingly, after due consideration and investigation, the Special Committee has made recommendations in this report that take into consideration the potential outcomes based on the Supreme Court's decision regarding Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane's Application. Should the Supreme Court reinstate Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane's law license, the Senate does not need to vote to remove her, as the grounds contemplated for removal would no longer apply.

In the event that the status quo is maintained, however, and Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane continues to lead one of the largest law offices in the Commonwealth with an indefinitely suspended license, the issue of whether she is able to perform the duties of her office is appropriate for the Senate to consider. Aside from the potential Supreme Court action noted above, no intervening events are expected to change any relevant fact or law relevant to this inquiry.

Each Senator must exercise his or her own individual judgment in weighing the facts and law that have been gathered and compiled during this process. This document, along with all of its exhibits, provides those facts and laws, noting contradictory statements and interpretations where applicable. Each Senator also must evaluate the credibility of the testimony received across four public hearings—all transcribed, recorded and available on video through the Special Committee's website.

The first hearing featured three District Attorneys chosen to speak on behalf of the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association regarding the legal functions of their offices, which are analogous to the Office of Attorney General as the elected chief law-enforcement officer for a specified jurisdiction. While the District Attorneys had varying approaches to how much time each personally spent in court, all three District Attorneys agreed that they could not effectively do their jobs with a suspended law license. Exhibit A11, pp. 17-22. Indeed, the District Attorneys noted that even "administrative" tasks, such as "budgeting" and directing subordinates, as well as "charging decisions" and "decisions on investigations[,] "involves what [they] consider the practice of law[.]" *Id.* at 20-21. This testimony was consistent with the testimony obtained during the third hearing from the four Executive Deputy Attorneys General, which is discussed below.

The second hearing consisted of three legal experts that provided credible, independent analysis of key laws and regulations concerning the Pennsylvania Constitution, the Attorney General's job responsibilities, and the practice of law in

the Commonwealth. Indeed, experienced legal-ethics attorney Beth L. Weisser concluded that “some of the, if not all of the, [Attorney General’s] obligations under the Commonwealth Attorneys Act falls squarely within the activities that a formerly admitted attorney is not permitted to do.” Exhibit A11, p. 94. A lengthy list of tasks that a suspended attorney cannot do or oversee is found under Pennsylvania Rule of Disciplinary Procedure 217 and was discussed by the independent experts on this panel as restricting what Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane could legally do on behalf of her client, the Commonwealth. *Id.* at 63-65. Further, a suspended or “formerly admitted attorney must file a notice of engagement of a supervising attorney with the disciplinary board.” *Id.* at 70. To date, the Special Committee—despite its best efforts and direct communications to Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane and the Disciplinary Board—is unaware of anyone who is supervising her.

The third hearing featured highly credible testimony from the top four Executive Deputy Attorneys General who are actively practicing lawyers in the Office of the Attorney General and are doing an exemplary job in attempting to keep the Office of Attorney General operational and attempting to perform all of the legal responsibilities assigned to it by the Commonwealth Attorneys Act. The suspension of Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane’s law license has indeed posed real burdens and challenges to them. The witnesses noted that the Office of Attorney General had to expend significant resources to change “the way the office functions and operates...in a way that is unprecedented[.]” *See* Exhibit A11, p. 175. Executive Deputy Attorney General Donahue also explained that “there’s an impact that cases, especially complex cases, get further dragged out because of” the Attorney General’s suspension. *Id.* at 142. As the suspension continues, legal challenges mount and “the volume of things that [the Deputy Attorneys General] have to deal with is going to go up, up, up[.]” *Id.* at 179.

The fourth and final full hearing was accorded to Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane in conformity with Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution after this Special Committee found sufficient evidence for the hearing to be held and the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 256. Two additional witnesses provided testimony, which, at times, contradicted the previous testimony obtained in the first three hearings. The credibility of conflicting statements must be judged by each Senator individually, though it is significant that neither of these witnesses are practicing law on behalf of the Office of the Attorney General.

The first witness was Jonathan A. Duecker, Chief of Staff for Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane. Mr. Duecker is a lawyer with an active law license in Wisconsin, but he does not practice law in Pennsylvania or represent the

Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General in law-related functions. *See* Exhibit I, p. 9, 30. Mr. Duecker testified that “most of (the Attorney General’s roles and responsibilities) are non-legal.” Exhibit F, p.2. He said that “...Attorney General Kane exercises leadership and authority, both statutory and moral, on a broad range of public policy, public safety, and public protection issues.” *Id.* Mr. Duecker went on to criticize some of the statements made by the four Executive Deputy Attorneys General as “absurd.” *Id.* at 3.

Mr. Duecker noted that he is “objectively loyal” to Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane. *See* I, p. 57. Noting that he had no day-to-day familiarity with or was “not necessarily privy to” the legal topics, he was unable to answer basic questions that a Chief of Staff would be expected to answer, such as how often Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane had been at work, what engagements appeared on her schedule, or what—if any—written directions she provided to govern her subordinates during her suspension. *Id.* at 58-59, 64, 75, 97-99. Indeed, Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane’s most recent and highest profile action involved the appointment of a special prosecutor, which Mr. Duecker was unable to discuss, instead saying, among other things, “you would have to speak to her or the lawyers in the office[,]” “I don’t know[,]” and “I can’t answer that.” *Id.* at 50-51.

The second witness was former Governor Edward G. Rendell, who also served as Philadelphia County’s District Attorney “from 1978 to 1986”—thirty years ago. *Id.* at 107. He explained that, during that time, he “acted as a policymaker” and felt that “well over 95 percent of [his] duties were administrative or policy setting or communications, PR, and outreach.” *Id.* While he had no direct insight or knowledge of the operations with the Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General (or even county district attorney offices) in 2016, he speculated that “some decisions...are mixtures between legal decisions and policy decisions” and “the only two offices even close to the Attorney General are the District Attorney of Allegheny County and the District Attorney of Philadelphia.” *Id.* at 117, 121. While his testimony contradicted the prior testimony of other individuals regarding the legal functions that the chief law-enforcement officer for a jurisdiction is required to perform, he did suggest that—contrary to Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane’s position—the Senate has “the purview and the ability to act” to remove her by address. *Id.* at 148.

Accordingly, after due consideration and investigation, the Special Committee has made a recommendation that the full Senate make a determination on removal pursuant to Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> In making the recommendations contained herein, the Special Committee on Senate Address factored in all of the testimony presented and evidence received. Therefore, this Report should be considered in its entirety, including all of the attached exhibits.

## COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

The record of the roll call votes of the Special Committee on Senate Address on the recommendations presented is as follows:

**The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that before the Senate considers moving forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution that such a vote should not occur until the Pennsylvania Supreme Court makes a determination that it does not intend to consider Kathleen Kane’s Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned *In Re Kathleen Granahan Kane*, 3 WM 2016 (Pa.).**

	AYE	NAY	NV
BAKER	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
GORDNER, <i>Chair</i>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
HAYWOOD	<u>      </u>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>
SCARNATI, <i>Ex Officio</i>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
SCHWANK	<u>      </u>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>
WILEY	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
YAW	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
AYES	<u>    5    </u>		
NAYS	<u>    2    </u>		
NV	<u>    0    </u>		

**The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decides to fully consider Kathleen Kane’s Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned *In Re Kathleen Granahan Kane*, 3 WM 2016 (Pa.), that the Senate not consider moving forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution unless the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rules against her Application for Extraordinary Relief.**

	AYE	NAY	NV
BAKER	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
GORDNER, <i>Chair</i>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
HAYWOOD	<u>      </u>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>
SCARNATI, <i>Ex Officio</i>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
SCHWANK	<u>      </u>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>
WILEY	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
YAW	<u>  X  </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>

AYES	<u>  5  </u>
NAYS	<u>  2  </u>
NV	<u>  0  </u>

**The Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court decides to fully consider Kathleen Kane’s Application for Extraordinary Relief in the matter captioned *In Re Kathleen Granahan Kane*, 3 WM 2016 (Pa.), that the Senate should not move forward with a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from office under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court rules in favor of her Application for Extraordinary Relief and removes her law license from suspended status.**

	AYE	NAY	NV
BAKER	<u>X</u>	_____	_____
GORDNER, <i>Chair</i>	<u>X</u>	_____	_____
HAYWOOD	<u>X</u>	_____	_____
SCARNATI, <i>Ex Officio</i>	<u>X</u>	_____	_____
SCHWANK	<u>X</u>	_____	_____
WILEY	<u>X</u>	_____	_____
YAW	<u>X</u>	_____	_____
AYES	<u>7</u>		
NAYS	<u>0</u>		
NV	<u>0</u>		

**Based on the testimony and record developed by the Special Committee on Senate Address, the Special Committee recommends that the Senate do not consider a vote on removal of Kathleen Kane from the office of Attorney General under the provisions of Article VI, Section 7 for reasonable cause.**

	AYE	NAY	NV
BAKER	<u>          </u>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>          </u>
GORDNER, <i>Chair</i>	<u>          </u>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>          </u>
HAYWOOD	<u>  X  </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
SCARNATI, <i>Ex Officio</i>	<u>          </u>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>          </u>
SCHWANK	<u>  X  </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
WILEY	<u>  X  </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
YAW	<u>          </u>	<u>  X  </u>	<u>          </u>
AYES	<u>    3    </u>		
NAYS	<u>    4    </u>		
NV	<u>    0    </u>		

**After fulfilling the due notice and full hearing requirements under Article VI, Section 7 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, and without making a determination on removal, the Special Committee on Senate Address recommends that the Senate, after meeting the conditions of 1 or 2, vote on the removal of Kathleen Kane from office.**

	AYE	NAY	NV
BAKER	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
GORDNER, <i>Chair</i>	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
HAYWOOD	<u>          </u>	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>
SCARNATI, <i>Ex Officio</i>	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>
SCHWANK	<u>          </u>	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>
WILEY	<u>          </u>	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>
YAW	<u>X</u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>

AYES	<u>4</u>
NAYS	<u>3</u>
NV	<u>0</u>

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

- Exhibit A: The Special Committee's report entitled "Examining Pennsylvania Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane's Ability to Perform the Duties of her Office with a Suspended Law License" ("First Report") issued on November 25, 2015.
- Exhibit A1: The September 21, 2015 Supreme Court order suspending Attorney General Kane's license to practice law. *Office of Disciplinary Counsel v. Kathleen Granahan Kane*, 2202 DD 3.
- Exhibit A2: The October 29, 2015 document request to the Attorney General.
- Exhibit A3: The October 30, 2015 document request to the ODC.
- Exhibit A4: The November 2, 2015 response by the ODC to the Special Committee's document request.
- Exhibit A5: The November 6, 2015 response by the Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane to the Special Committee's document request.
- Exhibit A6: The November 6, 2015 subpoena compelling document production to Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane.
- Exhibit A7: The November 13, 2015 response by Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane, including the October 22 Beemer Memorandum, to the subpoena compelling document production.
- Exhibit A8: The November 16, 2015 supplemental response by Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane regarding the subpoena compelling document production.
- Exhibit A9: The November 16, 2015 subpoenas compelling testimony issued to the four top Office of Attorney General Deputy Attorneys General.

- Exhibit A10: The November 17, 2015 legal opinion issued by the Legislative Reference Bureau.
- Exhibit A11: Transcripts (Vols. I-III) of testimony before the Special Committee.
- Exhibit B: Senate Resolution 256, Printer's No. 1461 of the 2015 Session, introduced by the members of the Special Committee on December 7, 2015.
- Exhibit C: December 10, 2015 Certificate of Service from Justin Ferrante, Chief Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate of Pennsylvania.
- Exhibit D: December 10, 2015 Certificate of Service deputizing Mark Rush of K&L Gates to deliver Exhibit A and Senate Resolution 256, Printer's No. 1461 to Gerald Shargel, Attorney of Record for Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane.
- Exhibit E: Correspondence from Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane addressed to the members of the Senate and specifically, the Special Committee members in which she declines to appear for the January 12, 2016 full hearing, dated January 11, 2016.
- Exhibit F: Written Testimony from Jonathon Duecker, Chief of Staff for Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane, dated January 12, 2016.
- Exhibit G: Correspondence from Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane authorizing Chief of Staff Jonathon Duecker, former appointed Attorney General Walter Cohen and former Governor Edward G. Rendell to testify on her behalf, dated January 12, 2016.
- Exhibit H: The January 11, 2016 Application for Extraordinary Relief filed by the Attorney General in the Supreme Court in the case captioned *In re Kathleen Granahan Kane*, 3 WM 2016.

Exhibit I: Transcripts (Vols. IV) of testimony before the Special Committee.