



Questions for Candidates for Court of Criminal Appeals Conservative Coalition of Harris County

This questionnaire will be posted onto the Conservative Coalition of Harris County website for public voter viewing.

Candidate Name	Position for which Candidate is Running
Gina Parker	Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, Place 7

Please give your answer to each of the following questions and please include your rationale with each answer. Please be concise & clear.

- Please describe the qualifications and experience that make you the best candidate for the office for which you are running. What differentiates you from your opponent (s)?

Answer: I'm an accomplished attorney with more than 30 years of experience. I've practiced as both a prosecutor and defense attorney, so I would bring a balanced perspective to the court. I have a wide-ranging legal career, including criminal law, business law, church law, and appellate work. As a public servant, I've represented Texas citizens as a City Attorney, Assistant County Attorney, and Assistant District Attorney. I've served on and chaired the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation overseeing and ruling on over a thousand administrative law case appeals.

Most importantly, I'm a true constitutional conservative with a strong belief that judges should preserve the rule of law and interpret the law as written. My legal career and political involvement demonstrate that this is more than a politically correct conservative statement. Over the years, I have lectured about constitutional issues. I received the Outstanding Texas Eagle Award for Dedicated Work to the United States Constitution and also served as the Eagle Forum National Judicial Reform Chairwoman. I helped write the study guide for Phyllis Schlafly's book the *Supremacists, The Tyranny of Judges and How to Stop It*.

I will uphold the rule of law and will not legislate from the bench!

2. Please describe what you believe are the most significant issues in this race and why.

Answer: Foremost, we need judges that will uphold the rule of law and not legislate from the bench. While Justice Scalia has passed away, he remains the justice that I most respect because he ardently believed in strict constitutional interpretation as opposed to viewing the constitution as an evolving document subject to the social and political currents of the times. Justice Scalia speaking at SMU in 2013, unequivocally declared that the “constitution is not a living document.” He said, “It is dead, dead, dead.”

In the landmark Stephen’s case, the TX Court of Criminal Appeals, in a majority opinion in which my opponent participated, stripped the Texas Attorney General, the state’s chief law enforcement officer, of authority to unilaterally prosecute election fraud. This means in blue cities with Soros backed DA’s election fraud will go unchecked and undermine the will of the people at the ballot box. It’s time for a change. I’m a Constitutional conservative. This is more than a mere politically correct statement. For 20 years, I’ve lectured on the Constitution. I was awarded the prestigious Texas Eagle Forum Award for my Dedicated Work in Support of the United States Constitution and served as the National Eagle Forum Judicial Reform Chairman. I’m passionately committed to upholding the rule of law and not legislating from the bench.

In 2023, the total number of signed opinions on the merits and Per Curiam opinions was about 170. Perhaps the number of cases heard as well as the number of opinions issued should be increased. This could be accomplished with a rule change that would require the lower intermediate appeals court judges to note the cases with meritorious arguments and/or reoccurring issues. Also, generally it takes over a year to issue an opinion. Perhaps this time could be decreased. In summary, the internal procedures of the court have failed to produce the workflow consistent with the responsibilities of the court.

3. List the state(s) in which you are or have been licensed to practice law, and the date(s) you received such licenses.

Answer: Texas State Bar - 1987

4. Do you have judicial experience? To what extent have you practiced in the area of Criminal law?

Answer: I do not have judicial experience. I'm an accomplished criminal attorney with more than 30 years of experience. I've practiced as both a prosecutor and defense attorney, so I would bring a balanced perspective to the court. I have a wide-ranging legal career, including criminal law, business law, and appellate work. As a public servant, I've represented Texas citizens as a City Attorney, Assistant County Attorney, and Assistant District Attorney.

5. What carries the greatest influence in your rulings: criminal case law, the Constitution, state statutes, or other?

Answer: United States Constitution carries the greatest influence.

6. What has been your greatest accomplishment in your legal career and/or in your personal life?

Answer: My greatest accomplishment in my legal career is the award I received from Phyllis Schlafly for my work in support of the Constitution. My greatest accomplishments in my personal life are the books that I have written, The 828 Journey and Hush, Little Baby, Don't Say a Word. Both books encourage people in their spiritual life. I am also proud of the fact that along with my family, we were able to help purchase a Hungarian television station that reaches approximately 10 million people with the gospel of Jesus Christ.

BY RETURNING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, THE CANDIDATE ASSUMES FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL ANSWERS TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. THE ANSWERS ON THE FOREGOING REFLECT THE CANDIDATE'S BEST EFFORTS TO ANSWER THIS QUESTIONNAIRE HONESTLY AND DIRECTLY.

PLEASE SAVE YOUR COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO YOUR LOCAL MACHINE IN THE EVENT THAT THERE ARE ANY TECHNICAL PROBLEMS WHEN YOU ATTEMPT TO EMAIL IT BACK.

Once this questionnaire has been completed, please email it to:

alex@cchc-pac.org

* **Please note:** You **must** return your questionnaire from the email address to which it was sent. Questionnaires returned from any other email address will be considered fraudulent and will **not** be recorded and no answers will be published in the voter's guide. CCHC-PAC deems a return from the proper email address as authentication of the correct respondent.

CONSERVATIVE ENDORSEMENTS



Ken Paxton
Attorney General of Texas



Sid Miller
Texas Agriculture Commissioner

MAKE JUSTICE GREAT AGAIN



VOTE STATEWIDE FOR

**GINA
PARKER**

For Texas Court of Criminal Appeals, Place 7

EXPERIENCED CONSTITUTIONAL CONSERVATIVE



**"I'm passionately
committed to uphold
the rule of law and
never legislate
from the bench."
- Gina Parker**

GINA FOR JUDGE

Political ad paid for and authorized by Gina Parker Campaign, Shelli Rosenkranz, Treasurer.

GINA FOR JUDGE

ENDORSED BY CONSERVATIVE GROUPS

- ★ Over 30 years experience with complex criminal law, including criminal appellate work
- ★ Worked as a City Attorney, Assistant County Attorney, and Assistant District Attorney and has prosecuted thousands of criminal cases
- ★ Served as the appointed Commissioner and Chair on the Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation in a quasi-judicial capacity ruling on administrative law appeals
- ★ Over 30 years as a lecturer on Constitutional Law
- ★ Past Eagle Forum National Chairman for Judicial Reform
- ★ Outstanding National Eagle Forum Award (For Dedicated Work in Support of the United States Constitution)
- ★ Republican Party of Texas, Past Associate General Counsel
- ★ Republican Party of Texas, Past Ballot Security Team Member
- ★ Texas Republican Hispanic Assembly, Past General Counsel
- ★ Lifetime Member of the NRA
- ★ TURF, Stars of Texas, For Superior Dedication to Defeating the Trans Texas Corridor, 2011



Ronald Reagan
Conservative
Club of Texas



GINAPARKERCAMPAIGN.COM



Political ad paid for and authorized by Gina Parker Campaign, Shelli Rosenkranz, Treasurer.

GINA FOR JUDGE

Election Integrity Ruling Key Issue in Criminal Appeals Court Races

Harmful Decision Still Stands

[LOU ANN ANDERSON](https://louannanderson.substack.com/podcast) – Political Pursuits Podcaster - <https://louannanderson.substack.com/podcast>

JAN 9, 2024

A stunning 2021 Texas Court of Criminal Appeals ruling which now blocks the Attorney General from prosecuting election integrity cases is set to be revisited in the March primary as three of the court's judges are up for reelection. On Dec. 15, 2021, the CCA's 8-1 decision on *State of Texas v. Stephens* declared Section 273.021 of the Texas Election Code – a statute granting the Texas Attorney General authority to “prosecute a criminal offense prescribed by the election laws of this state” – as unconstitutional. The ruling undoubtedly came when – as now - election integrity was on the minds both of many Americans and of many Texans.

Upon its release, Texas Criminal Appeals Court Creates New Election Fraud Opportunities noted:

And despite those on the political left telling us that voter fraud doesn't exist, per the Texas Attorney General's Office, 534 election fraud offenses involving 155 individuals have been prosecuted since 2005. Currently, a total of 510 offenses are pending against 43 defendants while an additional 386 active election fraud investigations are ongoing.

State of Texas v. Stephens Background

The case, *State of Texas v. Stephens*, centered on the 2018 indictment of Jefferson County Sheriff Zena Stephens along with two others for accepting illegal cash contributions from a Beaumont car dealership owner who was under federal investigation. Stephens was indicted on one felony count of tampering with a government record and two counts for the misdemeanor of accepting a cash donation exceeding \$100. The Beaumont Enterprise described the felony charge as “tampering with a governmental record for allegedly reporting the \$5,000 donation in the section of her campaign finance report designated for documenting donations of less than \$50.”

Per reporting at the time:

An investigation was conducted by the Texas Rangers with its results presented to the Jefferson County District Attorney who in turn advised the Rangers to contact the Attorney General's office. Though district attorneys have jurisdiction for such cases, the Texas Constitution also directs the Attorney General to “perform such other duties as may be required by law.” With that, the Attorney General used prosecutorial discretion to pursue the case and moved it to Chambers County for the start of a three-year legal battle.

With regard to the legal argument, the Enterprise reported:

Ultimately, the ongoing-case swiveled on whether the Legislature “properly authorized” the Attorney General to prosecute election-law violations. “Against this, Stephens argues that the lower court broadened the Attorney General's power in a manner violative of the separation of powers requirement in the Texas Constitution,” court documents state.

Reaction to the ruling

The *State of Texas v. Stephens* ruling was an 8-to-1 decision made by a Republican court. Of course, statewide election to office in Texas is difficult without an “R” by your name. The term “RINO” exists for a reason and with this ruling, a group of new examples emerged.

The eight judges voting to remove the Attorney General from election integrity prosecutions were Presiding Judge Sharon Keller plus Judges Barbara Hervey, Bert Richardson, David Newell, Mary Lou Keel, Scott Walker, Michelle Slaughter and Jesse McClure III. The only dissent came from Judge Kevin Yeary.

“If the court's decision stands, certain rogue county and district attorneys will be allowed to turn a blind eye to election fraud, and they will have the final say on whether election fraud is prosecuted at all. To me, this is completely unacceptable.” — Lt. Gov. Dan Patrick

In a Townhall.com column, Texas-based talk show host Chris Salcedo wrote this of the court's decision:

First, CCA's decision is illogical. The Court says that because county and district attorneys are created under an article called "Judicial Department," their role in prosecuting crimes is a judicial rather than an executive function. At the same time, because the Attorney General is created under the "Executive Department" article, he cannot prosecute crimes because that'd be "judicial" and thus an impermissible encroachment on a "judicial" function by an executive. You read that right! The court has laughingly proclaimed that a Texas Attorney General cannot prosecute crime. That would come as a shock to...well...just about anyone with a brain.

It was shocking that a court had proclaimed a state attorney general ineligible to prosecute crime, but this wasn't the only "shock" presented by this case.

Another troubling aspect of this decision was it being handed down on Dec. 15, two days after the candidate filing period for the March 2022 primary ended. Three of the judges - Keel, McClure and Walker - were up for reelection with only one, Walker, facing a primary opponent (who he defeated and then went on to win the general). Might this action have been purposefully timed to escape a primary challenge backlash? Attorney General Ken Paxton suspected as much.

In an interview with Steve Bannon, Paxton discussed circumstances of the ruling and how it opened the door to voter fraud or other election-related crime as we routinely see local district attorneys - many in office with help from George Soros-affiliated PACs - refuse to prosecute certain classes of crimes.

"This Court has violated basic separation of powers principles by legislating from the bench. The Court's decision to eliminate the authority of the Attorney General to prosecute election law violations implicates the interests of RPT, Republican voters, and candidates because it affects the security, fairness, and integrity of elections in the State of Texas" — Texas Republican Party Chair Matt Rinaldi

Where things stand

Short of legislative action, a constitutional amendment or an additional case allowing the court to establish new precedent, the ruling for now stands. Opportunity does exist, however, as three more of the eight affirming judges are seeking reelection in the March primary.

Texans for Responsible Judges PAC says this of the three:

In the battleground of Texas justice, a dangerous game unfolds. Judges Michelle Slaughter, Barbara Hervey, and Sharon Keller, parading as conservatives, now face damning accusations of abandoning their duty.

Their latest move binds the hands of the Attorney General, snatching away the power to nail election fraud. It's not just an overreach; it's a gut punch to every Texan who cherishes fair and safe elections.

Slaughter, Hervey, and Keller—once champions of conservative values—are now accused of ditching their duty. Ignoring election fraud is like hacking away at the soul of our democracy.

We're standing on the edge, staring down at a renegade judiciary that threatens the heart of our democracy. It's time to rip off the facade, expose their betrayal, and demand that the law isn't just a suggestion—it's the backbone of our state. If we don't act, big Dem counties will get a free pass for their reckless DAs who turn a blind eye to crimes that rock the foundation of our electoral system.

The PAC has further responded with a slate of candidates featuring Lee Finley running against Slaughter, **GINA PARKER** against Hervey and David Schenck against Keller.

We've long known Democrats to be strategizing on "turning Texas blue," but an egregious ruling by eight "Republican" judges helping to potentially deliver such a victory was unexpected.

As the integrity of our elections must be protected, the invitation for illegal voting and other irregularities created by this ruling cannot be allowed to stand. With that, voters must pay close attention to the Court of Criminal Appeals races and in the March primary, we have three opportunities to start righting the course.

Pol. ad paid for and authorized by the Gina Parker Campaign, Shelli Rosenkranz, Treasurer