Supreme Court of Ohio
Candidate Questionnaire

Judge Terri Jamison (D)

1. To what extent should Ohioans have a right to bodily autonomy when it comes to reproductive decisions?

Did not answer the question.

2. As a jurist, what is your role in protecting the right to vote?

The court's role in protecting the right to vote and the importance of maintaining its Constitutionally granted status as an independent co-equal branch of government that serves as a check and balance on the executive and legislative branches is being demonstrated by the ongoing redistricting litigation. The Court has both the power and the obligation to order the members of the Ohio Redistricting Commission to abide by the provisions of Articles XI and XIX and to hold them accountable if they refuse to do so.

3. Do you believe that DuBose v. McGuffey, which in part held that money bail could not be used for the purpose of public safety, was decided correctly? Yes or no? Why or why not?

Yes. Public safety is not the only consideration when deciding bail. You must review the factors of criminal history, history of appearing or failing to appear for court hearings, longevity in the community, employment status, the type of crime, i.e., is it a crime of violence, is the defendant on community control or parole at the time of the offense, just to name a few factors to consider. If you're concerned about the defendants return to court, you can add conditions such as GPS monitoring or pre-trial reporting with urine screens or counseling. The prosecutor can always request a hearing to revoke bond or change the bond to surety for the defendant to have a bondsman who is also concerned of their whereabouts. The court must be mindful that the purpose of bond is not to punish but to guarantee the defendant's return to court.

4. What's your proudest case decision and why?

I'm proud of every decision as it brings closure or resolution to the case for each party. I don't believe any case is more important than another. If I am able to persuade my peers to reach a different conclusion that gives a better outcome for the entirety of the jurisdiction I serve, I believe that I have done my job.

Balfour v. Hayman, 2021-Ohio-3499, comes to mind where research showed that a quit claim deed could be used for a mortgage. The gentleman gave a quit claim deed to borrow money and the grantee attempted to evict him from the property. The Plaintiff got a judgment on the pleadings from the trial court, which Defendant appealed. I wrote the decision that remanded the case for further proceedings. The case showed the power of the court to bring equity in this case and give Appellant the ability to provide evidence rather than the court making a ruling solely on the pleadings.

5. What's one state or federal Supreme Court case you disagree with and why?

Maryland v. King, 569 U.S. 435 (2013), the United States Supreme Court decided that a cheek swab of an arrestee's DNA is comparable to fingerprinting and therefore, a legal police booking procedure that is reasonable under the Fourth Amendment. There's no reason to gather DNA unless you're using it for investigative purposes.

6. What else would you like voters to know about how you would decide cases?

I believe my judicial philosophy will provide the voters with valuable insight into the process I utilize to decide cases: I begin to interpret a regulation, statute, or constitutional provision by referring to the original intent or original meaning of the rule at the time it was created and look to what legislators intended at the time it was written. I will apply the law to the individual facts of the case and to our current society to ensure justice and equity for all people. I believe that Chief Justice Roberts said it best, "Judges are like umpires. Umpires don't make the rules. They apply them." When there is no rule that fits the facts, I believe a judge has the authority to interpret the law and render a decision that will answer questions that are of great interest to the public.