

17

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260  
LEE C.I. 900 WISACKY HWY.  
BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010


RON SANTA McCRAY  
#353031 COOPER B-59  
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205  
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

IN RE: FILING SUPPLEMENT TO APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES  
UNDER RULE 22 TO ESTABLISH A COMPLETE RECORD IN CASE 21A425.

TO: THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROBERTS,  
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ET. AL.,

JUDGE ROBERTS SIR, THE PETITIONER(S) INVOLVED WITHIN THESE  
MULTI-DISTRICT SOUGHT LITIGATION CASES TRULY ARE GRATEFUL FOR  
YOUR KIND ASSISTANCE IN ESTABLISHING CASE 21A425 SIR. BUT STILL  
WE HAVE A SERIOUS AND SUBSTANTIAL PROBLEM AND OR CONCERN IN HOW  
THIS CASE IS NOW ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES  
SUPREME COURT SIR. THE RECORD UNDER CASE 21A425 IS NOT COMPLETE  
FOR THE SAKE OF ESTABLISHING FULL DISCLOSURE AS TO HOW AND WHY WE  
GOT HERE. THUS, THE PETITIONER(S) RESPECTFULLY SEEK AND MOTION TO  
SUPPLEMENT THE PLEADING IN THIS CASE TO ENSURE THAT INDEED THAT  
THE RECORD BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE  
21A425 IS COMPLETE AND THE JURISDICTIONAL FACTS AS TO HOW AND WHY  
WE GOT HERE IS ALSO FULLY ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD IN

1-of-5



CASE THE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22 IS DENIED WHERE THE PETITIONERS WOULD THEN SEEK TO EXERCISE THE DUE PROCESS RIGHT AND OR PROCEDURAL OPTION TO SEEK THEIR REQUEST BEFORE THE ADDITIONAL JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AS SUCH APPLICABLE RULES WOULD PERMIT. WHAT HAPPENED IN THE INITIAL FILING OF THESE CASES IS OUTRAGEOUS JUDGE ROBERTS AND IS A SLAP IN THE FACE OF NOT JUST THE PETITIONER(S) INVOLVED WITHIN THESE CASES, BUT ALSO A SLAP IN THE FACE OF THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT THEMSELVES. THEREFORE, IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE INMATES/PETITIONERS INVOLVED SUBJUDICE. IT WOULD NOT BE INAPPROPRIATE TO ALLOW THE PETITIONER(S) TO SUPPLEMENT THE FILINGS UNDER CASE 21A425 TO ESTABLISH A FULL OFFICIAL RECORD, WHICH INCLUDE THE OFFICIAL REQUEST OF REMOVING MS. WALKER FROM HANDLING ANY ASPECT OF THESE CASES THUS PRESENTED WHERE THESE INDIVIDUALS CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF IN EGREGIOUS VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE TO PUSH THE PETITIONER(S) PAST ANY PRESCRIBED TIMELINES TO HAVE THESE MATTERS PROPERLY AND TIMELY HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THESE DOCUMENTS ARE NOW SOUGHT FILED TOWARDS THAT END.

INSOMUCH, THIS SUPPLEMENT TO ESTABLISH A COMPLETE RECORD TAKES PLACE IN THE FORM OF THREE DOCUMENTS HEREWITH ATTACHED: (1) A COPY OF THE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 THAT WAS IN OBSTRUCTION PUSHED PASSED THE TIME LIMIT TO FILE SEEKING TO FILE IT OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT ALSO SEEKING ADDITIONAL TIME TO GET THE EXHIBITS RELATED TO THIS FILING BEFORE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT; (2) THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "MOTION TO FILE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES PURSUANT TO RULE 22; MOTION TO AMEND THE APPLICATION UNDER RULE 22 SEEKING STAY OF CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT TO SEEK STAY OF CASE 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DUE TO SEEKING DISQUALIFICATION OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND TRANSFER

PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE DUE TO MULTI-DISTRICT SOUGHT LITIGATION", (22) PAGES DATED FEBRUARY 25, 2022; (3) A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "MOTION TO FILE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES PURSUANT TO RULE 22; MOTION TO AMEND THE APPLICATION UNDER RULE 22 SEEKING TO STAY CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT TO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT FOR BOTH CASE(S) 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT DUE TO OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, MULTI-DISRICT LITIGATION AND THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1407 DISQUALIFICATION AND TRANSFER", (22) PAGES DATED FEBRUARY 25, 2022. THE REMAINDER OF THE DOCUMENTS ATTACHED ARE EXHIBITS LISTED WITHIN THESE THREE LISTED DOCUMENTS.

PLEASE BE ADVISED SIR, THAT THIS ATTACHED EXHIBIT ENTITLED, "INITIAL PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI" RELATED TO CASE 20-7073 IS NOT THE PETITION THAT THE PETITIONER(S) SEEK WRIT OF CERTIORAI FOR. DUE TO THE OBSTRUCTION THAT OCCURRED WITHIN THE FILING OF THESE CASES, THE INITIAL PETITION SOUGHT TO BE FILED MUST NOW BE AMENDED. THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBMITTED SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSES OF ESTABLISHING THE JURISDICTIONAL FACTS AND PLACE ON THE COURT RECORD WHAT EXACTLY OCCURRED WHEN THESE CASES WERE INITIALLY SOUGHT FILED BEFORE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THE PETITIONER(S) GIVE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT THESE DOCUMENTS WERE ALSO SERVED ON JUDGE ALITO RELATED TO THE 3rd. CIRCUIT CASE INVOLVED AND PURSUANT TO SEEKING STAY OF CASE 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. BUT FOR THE SAKE OF JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS A COMPLETE RECORD MUST BE PERMITTED TO BE ESTABLISHED WITHIN ALL CASES INVOLVED. THIS INCLUDE THE PETITIONER(S) EXERCISING THEIR DUE PROCESS RIGHTS TO SEEK POTENTIAL SANCTIONS AND OR ANY OTHER RIGHT OR ACTION NECESSARY TO REMEDY THE DAMAGE AND CLAIM/CAUSE OF THE DEFENDANTS INVOLVED WITHIN THESE MULTI-DISTRICT SOUGHT LITIGATION CASES TAKING POTENTIALLY CRIMINAL STEPS TO COMPROMISE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME

COURT ITSELF THROUGH MS. WALKER, SPOILATION, AND OBSTRUCTION TO IMPEDE THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE WHERE THE INJUSTICES RELATED TO SEEKING TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI RELATED TO CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-000974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT HAVE YET TO BE ADDRESSED OR REMEDIED. THE PETITIONER(S) WITHIN THESE CASES SEEK TO HAVE THE MOTION TO GRANT FILING OF CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-000974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT TO BE FILED OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT GRANTED AS WELL AS TO ADDRESS THESE EGREGIOUS CRIMINAL ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT HAS OCCURRED RELATED TO THESE CASES IN THEIR TOTALITY. THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROBERT'S RULING UNDER CASE 21A425 RELATED TO CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHERE THESE ARE DIRECTLY RELATED PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO SEEKING THE DISQUALIFICATION OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AT BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL HAS FAILED TO ADDRESS THE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND EGREGIOUS VIOLATIONS OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE THAT HAS OCCURRED RELATED TO THESE CASES IN THEIR TOTALITY AS THEY ARE PRESENTED BEFORE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PETITIONER(S) A RULING RELATED TO FILING THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT CASES OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT MUST BE OBTAINED FOR THE SAKE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". THE PETITIONER(S) RESPECTFULLY SEEK FROM THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT THAT MS. WALKER BE REMOVED FROM HANDLING ANY MATTERS RELATED TO THESE CASES IF POSSIBLE IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS.


THESE PLEADINGS WERE INITIALLY SENT TO JUDGE ALITO BY CERTIFIED MAIL # 7021 0950 0001 0779 5586 AND ACCORDING TO THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE. THE PLEADING WAS PICKED UP BY AN AGENT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON MARCH 9, 2022 ACCORDING TO THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THE PETITIONER(S) RESPECTFULLY SEEK THAT THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 21A425 OBTAIN A COPY OF ANY NEEDED AND OR REQUIRED FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS AND OR FORMS RELATED TO MCCRAY AND CRAWFORD FROM WITHIN THOSE CERTIFIED SENT FILINGS WHERE OUR

FINANCIAL STATUS HAS NOT CHANGED AND THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD IS ARGUING THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER AS IT RELATES TO THESE PENDING CASES. FOR THE RECORD, ALL PARTIES REQUIRED HAVE BEEN SERVED A COPY OF THE FILING AS UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES REQUIRE. THE PETITIONER(S) PRAY THAT THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROBERTS WOULD GRANT THE SUPPLEMENT TO INCLUDE ANY AND ALL OTHER RELIEF THE COURT WOULD DEEM JUST, FAIR AND PROPER.

RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron Santa McCray*

JONAH THE TISHBITE

A large, handwritten signature in black ink. The signature is fluid and cursive, appearing to read "Ron Santa McCray". It is written over a few horizontal lines and includes a small, stylized circular mark or logo.

MARCH 17, 2022

NO. 21A425

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

VS.


THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF  
CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,  
RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT  
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY AND LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY ON THIS DATE OF NOVEMBER 9, 2021, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED, BY

1-of-3



DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4th. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTER 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

(10) THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS AND

JUDGE NEWMAN 1701 MAIN STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(11) THE S.C. SUPREME COURT P.O. BOX 11330 COLUMBIA,  
S.C. 29211.

(12) ATTORNEY D. SETTANA AT THE MCKAY LAW FIRM 1303  
BLANDING STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(13) THE LAW FIRM OF DABOSE-ROBINSON 935 BROAD STREET  
CAMDEN, S.C. 29020.

(14) THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549  
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

WE DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS  
TRUE AND CORRECT.

EXECUTED ON NOVEMBER 8, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,  
LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

RON SANTA McCRAY

Ron Mey  
Ron & Mey

NO. 21A425

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF  
CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,  
RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT  
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RON SANTA McCRAY

#353031 COOPER B-59

LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205

RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA

#300839 F2B. RM. 1260

LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.

BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

(1) DO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBENT COUNTY TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) AND HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159(U.S.2018) APPLY TO THE STATES BY THE PETITIONER(S) 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AS IT PERTAINS TO THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THEIR RIGHTS UNDER THE 14th. AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE AS IT PERTAINS TO PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AND ORDERS THAT TRIGGER A JUDGMENT RELATED TO THE TORRENCE RULING COMING FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA?

(2) DO THE PRESENCE OF JUDGE KAYE HEARN FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT SITTING UPON THESE CASES PRODUCE A CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359 (U.S.2016) WHERE SHE IS A DEFENDANT IN THE RELATED CASES THAT ARE SOUGHT 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER PRODUCING A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL VOIDING THE STATE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION?

(3) DO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723 (U.S.2016), UNDER MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193

L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4064(U.S.2016), UNDER NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249, 197 L.Ed.2d. 611, 85 U.S.L.W. 4205 (U.S.2017), AND UNDER WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016) APPLY TO THE CRAWFORD CASE PRODUCING EXCEPTIONAL AND OR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THE OTHER INMATES ARE ENTITLED TO CLAIMS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DUE TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA CONCEALING, SUPPRESSING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA EVIDENCE AND SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE, ALSO BLOCKING CRAWFORD FROM FILING FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED FOR OVER (16) YEARS WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER DETERMINING WHY AND THE LEGAL ISSUES ARGUED WITHIN ALL THEIR CASES ARE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME AND OR IDENTICAL?

(4) DID THE PETITIONER(S) MEET THE CRITERION FOR ESTABLISHING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND 1455(c) TRANSFER DUE TO THE SEEKING OF DISQUALIFYING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SEEKING TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY BY THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION RULES?

(5) BY THE RECENT AND PAST RULINGS COMING OUT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SINCE 2016, DID THE STATE COURTS ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION BY ADJUDICATING THE ISSUE OF FATAL DEFECTS OF CRIMINAL INDICTMENT UNDER THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION WHEN DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRED THAT SUCH ISSUES BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION?

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

THE PARTIES WITHIN THIS PARTICULAR CASE ARE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL; THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; KERSHAW COUNTY AND ITS CLERK; BERKLEY COUNTY AND THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGES FROM BOTH KERSHAW AND BERKELEY COUNTIES; THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS IN ITS ENTIRETY; JUDGE NEWMAN; THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS; THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS PURSUANT TO THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT.

## **RELATED CASES**

THIS CASE IS RELATED TO THE APPEAL OF BOTH CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL CASES REFERRED WITHIN THAT PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI THAT IS PRESENTLY PENDING WITHIN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINION BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1-2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	3-5
STATEMENT OF CASE.....	6-11
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	12-34
CONCLUSION.....	34-39

## INDEX OF APPENDICES

**APPENDIX---A** THE ORDERS FROM THE LOWER COURTS.

**APPENDIX---B** EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE #1".

**APPENDIX---C** EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE # 2".

**APPENDIX---D** EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE # 3".

**APPENDIX---E** EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE # 4".

**APPENDIX---F** EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE # 5".

**APPENDIX---G** EXHIBIT, "WRIT OF CERTIORARI # 1"

**APPENDIX---H** EXHIBIT, "WRIT OF CERTIORARI # 2".

**APPENDIX---I** EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 1".

**APPENDIX---J** EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 2".

**APPENDIX---K** EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 3".

**APPENDIX---L** EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 4".

**APPENDIX---M** EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 5".

**APPENDIX---N** EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 6".

**APPENDIX---O** EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 7".

**APPENDIX---P** EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 8".

**APPENDIX---Q** EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 1".

**APPENDIX---R** EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 2".

**APPENDIX---S** EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 3".

**APPENDIX---T** EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 4".

**APPENDIX---U** EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 5".

**APPENDIX---V** EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 6".

**APPENDIX---W** EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 7".

**APPENDIX---X** EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER # 1".

**APPENDIX---Y** EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER # 2".

**APPENDIX---Z** EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER # 3"

**APPENDIX---AA** EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER # 4".

OPINION BELOW

THE CONDITIONAL ORDER IN THE RON SANTA McCRAY CASE WAS ISSUED IN CASE 2019-CP-08-1992 FROM THE BERKELEY COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS ON APRIL 12, 2021 AND THE ORDER OF CONTINUANCE IN THE CRAWFORD CASE UNDER 2006-CP-400-3567 FROM THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT WAS ISSUED NOVEMBER 2020 FOR WHICH THE PETITIONER(S) ASSERT PRODUCE JUDGMENT THAT TRIGGER A RULING PURSUANT TO TORRENCE AND HALL v. HALL CASES BY THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND THE INVOKING OF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY THE FORTBEND COUNTY TEXAS v. DAVIS CASE. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDER ADJUDICATED BOTH THE PETITIONER(S) CASES THAT WERE SOUGHT CONSOLIDATED BY ORDER ISSUED ON AUGUST 6, 2021 FOR WHICH THE PETITIONERS TIMELY, IMMEDIATELY, SOUGHT REVIEW BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THE ORDERS ARE UNPUBLISHED AND ARE ATTACHED AND FOUND UNDER APPENDIX--A.

JURISDICTION

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION IS ESTABLISHED WHERE (1) THE STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION IN A

WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH THE DECISION OF ANOTHER STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT AND OR OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS PURSUANT TO UNITED STATES v. WHEELER AND; (2) THE STATE COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW THAT HAS NOT BEEN, BUT SHOULD BE, SETTLED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO THE FORTBEND COUNTY TEXAS v. DAVIS CASE, AND THE STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT; MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA; BETTERMAN v. MONTANA; NELSON v. COLORADO AND WEARRY v. CAIN AND OTHER U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT. THE DATE THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT DECIDED THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES IS ON AUGUST 6, 2021 WHERE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS TIMELY SOUGHT. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT CLERK NOTIFIED THE PETITIONERS THAT THEY HAD UNTIL NOVEMBER 15, 2021 TO FILE MAKING THIS PLEADING TIMELY. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION IS INVOKED UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 2101 AND OR 1254(1).

JURISDICTION OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS ALSO ESTABLISHED UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASE	PAGES
BARNES v. STATE, 859 S.E.2d. 260(S.C.App.2021).....	27
BENSON v. FOSTER, 2020 WL 2770267(E.D.Wis.2020).....	14
BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609(U.S.2016).....	25
BRADDY v. U.S., 2016 WL 1031301(E.D.Va.2016).....	39
BRNOVICH v. DEMOCRATIC..., 141 S.Ct. 2321(U.S.2021).....	27
BURNS v. INCH, 2020 WL 8513758(N.D.Fla.2020).....	14
BURNS v. STATE..., 79 S.Ct. 1164(U.S.1959).....	28
BODMAN v. STATE, 742 S.E.2d. 363(S.C.2013).....	16
CHELSEY... v. LOUISVILLE..., 2020 WL 4745771(W.D.Ky.2020)....	39
CITY... v. MILBURN, 398 P.3d. 486(2017).....	34
COLLINS v. YEMEN, 141 S.Ct. 1761(U.S.2021).....	27
COMMONWEALTH... v. WILLIAMS, 55 S.Ct. 380(U.S.1935).....	24
CRETE... v. SULLIVAN..., 2021 WL 2685253(D.Md.2020).....	36
DOLORES... v. ROBINSON, 2019 WL 12095416(C.D.Cal.2019).....	30
DRAKE v. TRAVELERS..., 2019 WL 5423099(D.Md.2019).....	25
EASTWOOD v. LEHMAN..., 2010 WL 774073(D.Nev.2010).....	31
ENGLISH v. GEN..., 100 S.Ct. 2270(U.S.1990).....	37
EVANCHO v. PINE-RICH..., 237 F.Supp.3d.267(M.D.Pa.2017).....	33
FARROW v. LIPETZKY, 2017 WL 1540637(N.C.2017).....	34
FERNANDEZ... v. U.S., 2021 WL 11165197(D.PUERTO RICO.2021)....	14
FORTBEND... v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct.1843(U.S.2019).....	14
FOSTER v. CHATMAN, 136 S.Ct. 1737(U.S.2016).....	13
FREYTAG v. C.I.R., 111 S.Ct. 2631(U.S.1991).....	28
GEARIN v. MARION..., 233 P. 296(1922).....	38
HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118(U.S.2018).....	14
HENDERSON... v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197 U.S.....	32
HILL v. SNYDER, 821 F3d. 763(6th.Cir.Mich.).....	34
IN RE: NEW YORK..., 2021 WL 1666860(S.D.N.Y.2021).....	30
IN RE: SOCIETY..., 2021 WL 3290962(N.D.ILL.2021).....	31
IN RE: WALDEN..., 273 F.Supp.3d. 1367(2017).....	31
JENNINGS v. RODRIQUEZ, 138 S.Ct. 830(U.S.2018).....	36

JOHNSON v. PARRIS, 2021 WL 1232774(E.D.Tenn.2021).....	25
JOHNSON v. PERSON, 781 Fed. Appx' 69(3rd.Cir.2019).....	28
JOHNSON v. U.S., 2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015).....	34
JONES v. NEUSCHARD, 2021 WL 1056597(N.D.Cal.2021).....	25
KINGDOM... v. U.S., 136 S.Ct. 1969(U.S.2016).....	36
JUSTIN... v. MATT..., 2021 WL 4350123(W.D.Mich.2021).....	25
LEXICON... v. MILBERG..., 118 S.Ct. 956(U.S.1998).....	31
LOUMIET v. U.S., 65 F.Supp.3d. 19 (2014).....	16
MAINE... v. U.S., 140 S.Ct. 1308 U.S.....	36
MARSHALL v. JERRICO, 100 S.Ct. 1610(U.S.1980).....	24
MARTIN v. U.S., 2018 WL 1626578(D.Md.2018).....	34
MASTERPIECE... v. COLORADO..., 138 S.Ct. 1719(U.S.2018).....	38
MARBURY v. MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137.....	34
MCFAULY v. RAMSEY, 61 U.S. (20 HOW) 523.....	39
MILLER v. STATE, 659 S.E.2d.492(S.C.2008).....	28
MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718(U.S.2016).....	16
MONTANA v. U.S., 99 S.Ct. 970(U.S.1979).....	28
MURPHY v. SMITH, 138 S.Ct. 784(U.S.2018).....	36
NATION... v. SHALALA, 112 F3d. 151.....	37
NETTLES v. RUMBERGER..., 276 SO.3d. 663(Ala.App.2018).....	30
NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249(U.S.2017).....	13
NEW... v. POOLE, 966 F3d. 145(2nd.Cir.2020).....	39
ODOM v. STATE, 523 S.E.2d. 753(S.C.1999).....	27
PARKLANE... v. SHORE, 99 S.Ct. 645(U.S.1979).....	287
PARADIS v. CHARLESTON, 2021 WL 3668152(S.C.2021).....	18
PASCAL v. CITY..., 2021 WL 4303202(Pa.2021).....	23
PEGG v. HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112(4th.Cir.2017).....	16
PENN... v. MAPP, 521 F3d. 290 CA4 (Va.2008).....	18
PEOPLE v. FIELDS, N.E.3d., ILL. APP. (1st.) 122012-UB.....	34
PLATT v. NEWBERRY..., 205 P. 296(1922).....	38
PROPHET v. BALLARD, 2018 WL 1518351(W.Va.2018).....	13
PYNE v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 1377402(D.C.Md.2016).....	34
RIVERA v. SUPERINTENDENT..., 738 Fed. Appx' 59(3rd.Cir.2018) ..	23
SHOUP v. CASSANO, 2021 WL 4259962(U.S.2021).....	17
SNYDER v. NOLEN, 380 F3d. 279(7th.Cir.2004).....	28
SMOTHERS v. GRESHAM..., 23 P.3d. 333(2011).....	38

STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS..., 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998).....	13
STRUNK v. GASTELO, 2019 WL 5684414(S.D.Cal.2019).....	14
SUPERNUS... v. IANCU, 913 F3d. 1351 Fed.Cir.(Va.).....	36
TAGGART v. LORENZEN, 139 S.Ct. 1795(U.S.2019).....	17
TAYLOR v. U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2074(U.S.2016).....	33
TELESCOPE... v. LUCERO, 936 F3d. 740(8th.Cir.2019).....	39
TORRENCE v. S.C.D.C., 2021 WL 1114310(S.C.2021).....	14
U.S. v. AJRAWAT, 2018 WL 3045619(4th.Cir.2018).....	34
U.S. v. COTTON, 122 S.Ct. 1781(U.S.2002).....	31
U.S. v. KOEBER, 2018 WL 4188465(UTAH.2018).....	25
U.S. v. LIBOUS, 858 F3d. 63(2nd.Cir.2017).....	34
U.S. v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415(4th.Cir.2018).....	15
U.S. v. LAWRENCE, 2015 WL 856866(S.D.Va.2015).....	18
VINES v. U.S., 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1165(1).....	34
WELLS... v. H.M.H...., 859 F3d. 295(4th.Cir.2017).....	33
WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002(U.S.2016).....	13
WIDMYER v. BALLARD, 2018 WL 1518350(W.Va.2018).....	13
WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899(U.S.2016).....	18
WHITE OAK... v. LEXINGTON..., 753 S.E.2d. 537(S.C.2014).....	17
WITHROW, 95 S.Ct. 1456.....	23
ZIVOTOFSKY... v. KERRY, 135 S.Ct. 2076(U.S.2015).....	39
24 SENATORIAL... v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016).....	34

#### OTHER CITINGS

ARTICLE 1 § 10 U.S. CONSTITUTION.....	8
28 U.S.C. § 1407.....	10
28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.....	30
42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF ADA.....	19
18 U.S.C. §§ 242, 1001.....	10
42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(2), 1985(3).....	10

## STATEMENT OF CASE

THE PETITIONER LAWRENCE CRAWFORD WAS TRIED, CONVICTED AND FRAMED FOR THE MURDER OF HIS 11 YEAR OLD CHILD IN APRIL 2004 BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED WHO DIED BY THE SEXUAL ASSAULTS OF HER HALF BROTHER MICHAEL LEE WHERE THE CAUSE OF DEATH WAS SUPPRESSED IN THE AUTOPSY AND WHERE THE STATE BROUGHT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS INTO THE COURTROOM FOR THE SAKE OF ESTABLISHING LAW. THESE WERE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS THAT HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CHARGE OF MURDER FOR WHICH HE PRESENTLY STANDS CONVICTED OF TO TAINT THE MINDS OF THE JURORS DURING THE TIME OF 9/11 WHICH OF COURSE PREJUDICED THE PETITIONER DUE TO CLAIMS THAT HE WAS CHRISTIAN, JEWISH AND MUSLIM COMBINED BEING A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND OF ROYAL BLOODLINE. THE STATE SUPPRESSED EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA EVIDENCE TESTING AND A INVESTIGATIVE FILE IN THE POSSESSION OF S.L.E.D. (S.C. LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION). THE SOLICITOR JOHN MEADORS LIED IN ACTS OF PERJURY AND PROSECUTIONAL MISCONDUCT STATING ON THE COURT RECORD THAT HE DID NOT KNOW WHAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS TALKING ABOUT RECORDED ON RECORD AT THE PETITIONER'S COMPETENCY HEARING BEFORE TRIAL, SUPPRESSING THIS EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE EVEN WHEN DIRECTLY ASKED FOR IT. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS FORCED TO REPRESENT HIMSELF AT TRIAL IN ORDER TO PLACE THE EXISTENCE OF THIS EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE ON THE COURT RECORD DUE TO STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL'S REFUSAL TO PURSUE AND INVESTIGATE THE EXISTENCE OF THIS ACTUAL INNOCENCE EVIDENCE, VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S RIGHT OF AUTONOMY UNDER

McCoy v. Louisiana 2018. A SHAM INDICTMENT WAS PRODUCED THAT NEVER WENT TO THE GRAND JURY THOUGH IT FRAUDULENTLY GAVE THE IMPRESSION THAT IT DID, A FEW DAYS BEFORE THE PETITIONER WAS BROUGHT TO TRIAL AFTER HOLDING THE PETITIONER OVER 4½ YEARS IN CAPTIVITY AS A PRETRIAL DETAINEE DESPITE CONSTANT OBJECTION, MOTION FOR A SPEEDY TRIAL, IGNORING THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE THAT IS JURISDICTIONAL IN THIS CASE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. THIS PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE IS AT THE HEART OF THE MATTERS RELATED TO ALL CASES BEFORE THE STATE SUPREME COURT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT. ON DIRECT APPEAL IN A JUDGE KAYE HEARN LED COURT. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD MADE EVERY EFFORT TO BRING THESE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS BEFORE THAT COURT BUT WAS BLOCKED BY JUDGE HEARNS STATING THERE IS NO HYBRID DEFENSE WHERE THAT COURT DENIED THE MOTION TO ACT PRO SE BEFORE THAT COURT PRODUCING STRUCTURAL ERROR ALSO VIOLATING McCoy v. Louisiana 2018, TO PREVENT THE LEGAL MATTERS FROM BEING PROPERLY ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD AND TO CREATE AN INCOMPLETE RECORD TO THWART ANY POTENTIAL SUBSEQUENT JUDICIAL REVIEW. THAT DIRECT APPEAL WAS AFFIRMED INCLUDING THE SENTENCE OF LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TRIED TO FILE FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF IN 2006. BUT JUDGE HEARN, JUDGE TOAL, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND OTHER CONSPIRING STATE ACTORS GOT THE KERSHAW COUNTY CLERK OF COURT AT THE TIME, JOYCE McDONALD, TO BLOCK AND PREVENT THE PETITIONER FROM FILING HIS PCR SINCE 2006 UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND THE S.C. CONSTITUTION AND THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE WHERE THE STATE LEGISLATURE AND CONSTITUTION ALLOWS FOR COLLATERAL REVIEW OF CONVICTION. THE STATE OF SOUTH

CAROLINA DID THIS EGREGIOUS ACT OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION FOR OVER (16+) YEARS DUE TO THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS DYNAMICS ARGUED IN THE CASE WITHOUT ANY ORDER OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IN THE LOWER COURT THAT WOULD EXPLAIN WHY DUE TO WHO IT WAS ALLEGED THAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS BY HIS HEREDITARY RIGHTS UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW AND ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION BEING A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. TO MAKE THE RECORD CLEAR. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD NEVER BROUGHT ANY OF THE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS BEFORE THE STATE COURT FIRST. THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND SOLICITOR DID, BRINGING THE PETITIONER'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS INFORMED THEM BY FAMILY MEMBERS, INTO THE TRIAL AND ESSENTIALLY CONVICTED THE PETITIONER OF THESE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS THAT BROKE NO LAWS TO TAINT THE MINDS OF THE JURORS DURING THE TIME OF 9/11 PRODUCING OVERWHELMING PREJUDICE VIOLATING THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE 1st. AMENDMENT.

ONCE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS ILLEGALLY BLOCKED FROM FILING BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT REGARDING HIS PCR APPLICATION, WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER OR DETERMINATION EXPLAINING WHY BY JOYCE McDONALD. THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL PRACTICE WAS CONTINUED BY HER SUCCESSOR JANET HASTY UNTIL THIS PRESENT DAY CONSPIRING WITH THE STATE ACTORS AND WAS BROUGHT BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT BUT NO SANCTIONS WERE ATTRIBUTED TO THE ACTION AND THE ATTORNEY FOR THE CLERK OF COURT LIED STATING NO SUCH BLOCKAGE OCCURRED WHEN THE EVIDENCE IN THE APPENDICES INDISPUTABLY PROVE

OTHERWISE. DUE TO THESE INITIAL ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE BY THE STATE ACTORS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED, ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS. THIS FORCED THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TO FILE FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT CHALLENGING THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTION IN RICHLAND COUNTY DUE TO THE PARTIES ILLEGALLY PREVENTING THE FILING OF PCR IN KERSHAW COUNTY, THE COUNTY OF CONVICTION. THIS PRODUCED CASES 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569, 2013-CP-400-0084 AND 2013-CP-400-2294 WHICH WERE FILED UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT DUE TO THE INORDINATE DELAY AND THE RICHLAND COURT WORKING WITH THE CONSPIRING STATE ACTORS TO HOLD THESE CASES IN LIMBO FOR OVER (16+) YEARS DESPITE THE PLAINTIFF(S) OBJECTIONS AND TIMELY MOTIONING FOR DEFAULT BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON WITHIN ALL THESE CASES IN QUESTION SINCE 2014, BUT WAS COMPLETELY IGNORED BY THE RICHLAND COURT CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT.

DURING THE COURSE OF THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND VIOLATION OF THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION, THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD, McCRAY AND THE OTHER INMATES INVOLVED SUBJUDICE, DISCOVERED LEGAL ISSUES THAT POTENTIALLY EFFECTED NOT JUST THE STATES OF SOUTH CAROLINA; BUT ALSO THE STATES OF NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, ILLINOIS, N. CAROLINA, GEORGIA AND OTHER STATES AT THE STATE LEVEL, AND ALL STATES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL AS IS SEEN BY THE CONVICTION LEGAL

ISSUES IN THE APPENDICES. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD SOUGHT TO ARGUE THE DISCOVERED LEGAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES FOR A PAST CONVICTION HE HAD IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY IN 1986 FOR WEAPON POSSESSION WHICH HE PLED GUILTY WHILE ATTENDING RUTGERS UNIVERSITY BECAUSE AT HIS AGE HE HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OF LAW. THIS ESTABLISHED MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION UNDER CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH IN THE N.J. DISTRICT COURT WHERE ALL OTHER STATE CASES ARE SOUGHT TRANSFER AS TAG ALONG CASES UNDER THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION RULES. THE CONSPIRING STATE AND FEDERAL JUDGES DUE TO THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CLAIMS BEING MADE CONSPIRED TO IMPEDED, HINDER, OBSTRUCT AND DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE VIOLATING 42 U.S.C. § 1895(2), 1985(3) AND 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 TO THWART REVIEW AND CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS WHICH PRODUCED THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-1330 IN THE 3rd CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS WHERE DISQUALIFICATION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS SOUGHT AND TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407. THIS IS ALSO COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT THE FEDERAL CASES ARE FILED CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL AND ITS PROVISIONS THAT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGET AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT WHICH PRODUCED THE OTHER PRESENT PETITION BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT APPEALING CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. SEE DOCUMENTS IN APPENDICES. IF THE LEGAL ISSUES AT BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL ARE PROPERLY AND FAIRLY HEARD, WE ARE POTENTIALLY DEALING WITH NATIONAL PRISON REFORM IN A COVIT-19 ENVIRONMENT THAT THE PUBLIC WAS SCREAMING FOR FOR YEARS TO NO AVAIL WHICH BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATORS HAVE BEEN UNABLE

TO ACHIEVE. WITH THE LEGAL ISSUES FILED IN BOTH THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES AT THE STATE LEVEL AND ALL THE OTHER INMATES CASES INVOLVED. THE PETITIONER(S) MADE EVERY EFFORT TO JUSTLY AND FAIRLY EXHAUST AS IT RELATES TO THE LEGAL ISSUES, ONLY TO BE MET WITH EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THIS PRODUCED CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHICH IS THE SOURCE OF THIS PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI WHERE THE OTHER INMATES IN QUESTION CASES ARE STILL PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DEMONSTRATING THAT THE ISSUES OF CONCERN ARE NOR MOOT WHERE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT REFUSED TO HEAR THE MATTERS UNDER THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASE BECAUSE MONETARY RELIEF WAS DEFAULTED ON WITHIN THESE TWO CASES AGAINST THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THUS, IT PRODUCED "POISON PILL" LITIGATION WHICH IN FRAUD WAS CIRCUMVENTED BECAUSE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT KNEW FULLY WELL THE PETITIONER(S) WERE CORRECT IN THEIR ASSESSMENT OF THE LAW AS IT PERTAINS TO THESE MATTERS. THOUGH THE OTHER CASES ARE STILL PENDING, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DISMISSED THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES ESSENTIALLY ADJUDICATING ALL LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ARGUED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS IN THE APPENDICES BY THEY DETERMINING NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXISTED WITHIN THESE CASES THAT WARRANT THEY ENTERTAINING THESE MATTERS WITHIN THEIR ORIGINAL JURISDICTION DESPITE THE FACT THAT THESE CASES STILL REMAIN UNRESOLVED FOR OVER (16+) YEARS. THE DOCUMENTS WITHIN THE APPENDICES ARE SUBMITTED TO SUPPORT ALL THESE CLAIMS MADE.

RULE 12(4) PROVIDE: PARTIES INTERESTED JOINTLY, SEVERALLY, OR OTHERWISE IN A JUDGMENT MAY PETITION SEPARATELY FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI; OR ANY TWO OR MORE MAY JOIN IN A PETITION ALLOWING THE PETITIONERS TO SUBMIT PETITION TOGETHER. WHEN TWO OR MORE JUDGMENTS ARE SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED ON A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SAME COURT AND INVOLVE IDENTICAL OR CLOSELY RELATED QUESTIONS, A SINGLE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI COVERING ALL JUDGMENTS SUFFICES.... THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI NOW FOLLOWS.

**NOTE TO THE COURT:** THE INITIAL NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO FILE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS SENT TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DATED AUGUST 12, 2021 ASKING FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION MAKING THIS PLEADING TIMELY. IT WAS RETURNED TO THE PETITIONER(S) STATING WE NEED TO FILE COPY OF THE LOWER COURTS ORDERS WITH THE PLEADING AND HAD UNTIL NOVEMBER 15, 2021 TO CORRECT THE DEFICIENCY WHICH IS DONE. THUS, THE FILING MUST BE DEEMED TIMELY.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE DECISION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT CONFLICTS WITH DECISION OF THE COURTS OF APPEALS IN VARIOUS CIRCUITS INCLUDING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ON THE SAME MATTER AND THEY DECIDED FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THIS COURT AND OR ADDRESS A MATTER THAT SHOULD BE DECIDED BY THIS COURT AS IT PERTAINS TO CASES SUCH AS FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843; HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118; WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899; BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 718; NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249; WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002; STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 118 S.Ct. 1003 AND THE OTHER RELEVANT CASES CITED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS CONTAINED IN THE APPENDICES. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAS JURISDICTION OVER THE FINAL JUDGMENT OF STATE POST CONVICTION COURTS AND EXERCISES THAT JURISDICTION IN APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES, 28 U.S.C.A. § 1257(a); WEARRY v. CAIN, 577 U.S. 385, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78(U.S.2016). WHEN APPLICATION OF A STATE BAR DEPENDS ON A FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RULING, THE STATE-LAW PRONG OF THE STATE'S HOLDING IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF FEDERAL LAW, AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION IS NOT PRECLUDED, FOSTER v. CHATMAN, 578 U.S. 1023, 136 S.Ct. 1737, 195 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.2016); WIDMYER v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518350 (W.Va.2018); PROPHET v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518351 (W.Va.2018).

WHETHER A STATE LAW DETERMINATION IS CHARACTERIZED AS "ENTIRELY DEPENDENT ON", "RESTING PRIMARILY ON", OR "INFLUENCED BY" A QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW, THE RESULT IS THE SAME; THE STATE LAW, SUCH AS THE ONE USED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DETERMINING THAT THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WARRANT THEY ENTERTAINING THESE MATTERS IN THEIR ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WHEN ALL THE FEDERAL LAW AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS WITHIN THE APPENDICES WERE ADJUDICATED BEING A PART OF THOSE PROCEEDINGS, THE STATE RULING IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF FEDERAL LAW AND THUS POSES NO BAR TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION, STRUNK v. GASTELO, 2019 WL 5684414 (S.D.Cal.2019). BY THE LITIGATION CONTAINED IN THE APPENDICES THE STATE GROUND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IN THIS CASE, UNDER BOTH CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 ARE NOT INDEPENDENT OF THE MERITS OF FEDERAL CLAIMS ARGUED AND HAVE BECOME A BASIS FOR THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S DECISION GIVING WAY TO ALLOW THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER THESE MATTERS, FERNANDEZ-SANTOS v. UNITED STATES, 2021 WL 11165197, \* 2+ D.PUERTO RICO; BURNS v. INCH, 2020 WL 8513758, \* 4 N.D.Fla.; BENSON v. FOSTER, 2020 WL 2770267, \* 2+ E.D.Wis..

INSOMUCH, IN REGARD TO QUESTIONS PRESENTED #1. DO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) AND HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159(U.S.2018) APPLY TO THE STATES BY THE PETITIONER(S) 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AS IT PERTAINS TO THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THEIR

RIGHTS UNDER THE 14TH. AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE AS IT RELATES TO PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AND ORDERS THAT TRIGGER A JUDGMENT RELATED TO THE TORRENCE RULING COMING FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA? THE PETITIONER(S) BRING THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ATTENTION TO APPENDICES "B" THROUGH "F". THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF ARGUING THIS ISSUE. THIS ISSUE CONCERNS PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AND WHETHER THE S.C. TORRENCE v. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,--S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL 1114310(S.C.2021) RULING IS A MIRROR AND OR IS SIMILAR TO THE LAW ADJUDICATED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT UNDER HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118. IN THE CASE OF UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415 (4th.Cir.2018), THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ADDRESSED THE DUE PROCESS INJUSTICE THAT PERSISTED WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURTS RELATED TO THEIR ADHERENCE TO ESTABLISHED PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES. THAT COURT DETERMINED THAT THERE WERE TWO TYPES OF PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES, THOSE THAT WERE JURISDICTIONAL AND NON JURISDICTIONAL. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON HERE IN THE STATE COURT IS JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED DUE TO IT BEING ATTACHED TO THE S.C. CONSTITUTION UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 23 AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW ARGUED WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS PRODUCING A VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS PROVISIONS IF NOT ADHERED TO, VOIDING THE STATE COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND THE CONVICTION(S) ATTACHED TO IT, TRIGGERING THE PROVISIONS OF FINAL ORDER PURSUANT TO BOTH TORRENCE AND HALL. WHAT FURTHER ESTABLISH THIS CLAIM IS THAT THE

U.S. SUPREME COURT UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS 139 S.Ct. 1843 ADJUDICATED WHETHER THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE IS JURISDICTIONAL OR NON JURISDICTIONAL, IF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON IS "TIMELY" ASSERTED? IT BECOMES MANDATORY IN BOTH INSTANCES. JUST LIKE THE FEDERAL COURTS ADDRESSED THE ABUSE AND VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS LAW THAT ATTACHED TO THE FEDERAL COURTS FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE EXISTENCE AND OR DUE PROCESS RIGHTS THAT EXIST BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES IN QUESTION. THE S.C. STATE COURTS IN REGARD TO THIS IDENTICAL, SIMILAR MATTERS, HAVE ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION, OBSTRUCTED JUSTICE CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, IS FAR MORE EGREGIOUS THAN THE INJUSTICE THAT HAS OCCURRED WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURTS. THE QUESTION THAT IS PLACED BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS THIS. IS THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RULING PERTAINING TO FEDERAL PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES APPLICABLE TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA'S PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES BY THE PETITIONER(S)' RIGHTS UNDER THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND OUR RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE?, MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718; LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19 (2014); BODMAN v. STATE, 403 S.C. 60, 742 S.E.2d. 363(S.C.2013); PEGG v. HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112(4th.Cir.2017).

IF THIS POSITION IS TRUE AND AFFIRMED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. THEN IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) ASSERTION THAT ONCE THE CONDITIONAL ORDER AND OR ORDER OF CONTINUANCE WAS FILED IN EITHER THE McCRAY OR CRAWFORD CASE(S) WHERE THE RIGHTS OF THE PROCEDURAL

PROCESSING RULE WAS TIMELY ASSERTED. THE RIGHTS PERTAINING TO THE RULE BECAME MANDATORY IN FAVOR OF THE PETITIONER(S) WHO CLAIMED THE RIGHT. THEREUPON, THESE ORDERS TRIGGERED A TORRENCE AND OR HALL JUDGMENT WHERE ALL INDICATION POINT TO TORRENCE BEING TRANSPLANTED FROM HALL. IT IS A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF LAW RESTING UPON LONGSTANDING INTERPRETIVE PRINCIPLE: WHEN A STATUTORY TERM, AND IN THIS CASE, WE CAN ADD, "A STATE LAW", IS OBVIOUSLY TRANSPLANTED FROM ANOTHER LEGAL SOURCE, IT BRINGS THE OLD SOIL WITH IT. IF THE ORDERS END THE LITIGATION AS THE CONDITIONAL ORDER AND ORDER OF CONTINUANCE FILED IN BOTH CASES DID DUE TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND VIOLATIONS OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE? IT FALLS WITHIN THE COLLATERAL ORDER EXCEPTION'S "CONCLUSIVENESS" REQUIREMENT IN THAT IT WILL BE A FINAL WORD VIA THE DEFAULT WHERE IN THE CRAWFORD CASE THE WHITE OAK MANOR CASE DETERMINED NOT BEING ABLE TO LOCATE PLEADINGS IS NOT A VALID EXCUSE TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT WHICH WAS GIVEN BY THE DEFENDANTS AFTER THE FACT, WHEN THE DEFENDANTS BEING GIVEN NOTICE OF THE NOVEMBER 2020 HEARING FAILED TO EVEN SHOW UP TO PLEAD, IT WILL BE A FINAL WORD ON THE SUBJECT ADDRESSED. THE ARCHETYPAL FINAL DECISION FROM WHICH AN APPEAL MAY BE TAKEN IS ONE THAT TRIGGERS THE ENTRY OF JUDGMENT; APPEAL FROM SUCH DECISION IS A MATTER OF RIGHT, HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159(U.S.2018); SHOUP v. CASSANO,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 4259962 (MEM)(U.S.2021); TAGGART v. LORENZEN, 139 S.Ct. 1795, 204 L.Ed.2d. 129(U.S.2019); WHITE OAK MANOR INC. v. LEXINGTON INS. CO., 407 S.C. 1, 753 S.E.2d. 537 (S.C.2014).

QUESTION PRESENTED # 2: DO THE PRESENCE OF JUDGE KAYE HEARN FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT SITTING UPON THESE CASES PRODUCE A CONSTITUTIONAL, STRUCTURAL ERROR PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359 (U.S.2016) WHERE SHE IS A DEFENDANT IN THE RELATED CASES THAT ARE SOUGHT 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER PRODUCING A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL VOIDING THE STATE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION? THE PETITIONER(S) BRING THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ATTENTION TO APPENDICES "G" THROUGH "W". THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF ARGUING THIS ISSUE. CIVIL CONSPIRACY ELEMENTS ARE (1) AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE INDIVIDUALS, (2) TO DO AN UNLAWFUL ACT OR TO DO A LAWFUL ACT IN AN UNLAWFUL WAY, (3) RESULTING IN INJURY TO THE PLAINTIFF SUCH AS THIS OVER (16+) YEAR DELAY AND EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, INFILCTED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE CONSPIRATORS, AND (4) PURSUANT A COMMON SCHEME SUCH AS TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS AND THWART FAIR AND JUST REVIEW, PRAADIS v. CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT,--S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL 3668152 (S.C.App.2021); U.S. v. LAWRENCE, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 856866 (S.D.Va.2015); PENN AMERICAN INS. CO. v. MAPP, 521 F3d. 290 CA4 (Va.2008). ALL OF THIS SIMPLY BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED DUE TO WHAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S FAMILY TOLD THE S.C. 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE AND S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE REGARDING THE PETITIONER'S CRAWFORD'S "FAMILY TREE" AND LEGAL INHERITANCE BEING THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AND MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, PROTECTED BY

STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW, THE LAW OF TRUSTS, THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE 1st. AMENDMENT AND LAWS OF CONTRACT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WHERE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BROUGHT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS BEFORE A COURT OF LAW FOR THE SAKE OF ESTABLISHING LAW WHEN THESE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DUE WITH THE ALLEGED CRIME FOR WHICH THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD STANDS CONVICTED OF. FOR THE RECORD THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD IS OFFICIALLY MOTIONED INTERVENED IN THE RON SANTA McCRAY PCR CASE BEFORE THE BERKELEY COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS. EVERY UNCONSTITUTIONAL ATTACK UPON ALL THE INMATES CRIMINAL POST CONVICTION CASES AT EVERY TURN, AT EVERY LEVEL, BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER INVOLVED HERE WERE BASED UPON AND DONE IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO THWART FAIR AND PROPER JUDICIAL REVIEW DUE TO THE OTHER INMATES CONNECTION TO AND THEIR AIDING THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TO OBTAIN THAT LEGAL EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN HIS CASE WHERE THE INMATES INVOLVED HERE WERE ALSO PROTECTED BY 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT. JUDGE KAYE HEARN, ALONG WITH JUDGE JEAN TOAL WHO IN THE PAST HEADED THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AT THAT TIME, HENRY McMASTER AND HIS NOW SUCCESSORS, JOHN MEADORS AND MEMBERS OF THE 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE, THE KERSHAW COUNTY S.C. CLERKS OF COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, IN EX PARTE EXTRA-JUDICIAL SECRET MEETINGS IN THEIR MEETING OF THE

MINDS SUPPORTED BY THE FEDERAL JUDGES OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND 4TH. CIRCUIT, AT ALL LEVELS ENGAGED IN ACTS OF MACHINATION AND FRAUD TO BLOCK THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD, McCRAY AND THE OTHER INMATES FROM THE COURTS TO PREVENT THE CONTROVERSIAL CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUES FROM EVER OBTAINING FAIR, JUST AND PROPER REVIEW. THIS IS WHY THEY ATTACKED THE OTHER INMATES CASES INVOLVED TO DO THE SAME. THESE ARE EXTRA JUDICIAL ACTS TARGETING THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED DUE TO THE RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL AND POTENTIAL GLOBAL RAMIFICATIONS OF THE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BROUGHT INTO THAT KERSHAW COUNTY S.C. COURT ROOM AT THE CRAWFORD TRIAL TO CONVICT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD OF, DURING THE TIME OF 9/11 WHEN THERE WAS AN INTENSE HATRED OF MUSLIMS, THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD SAID TO BE CHRISTIAN, MUSLIM AND JEW COMBINED, WHICH HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIMINAL CHARGE AT ALL. SINCE THE CONSPIRACY AND ACTS CLAIMED WERE DONE OUTSIDE ANY JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND AUTHORITY WHERE THERE IS NO ORDER EXPLAINING WHY THIS WAS DONE REGARDING THE PCR COURT BARRING THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD FROM FILING FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF SINCE 2006? THE JUDGES ENGAGED IN NON JUDICIAL, MINISTERIAL ACTS BY BLOCKING THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD FROM THE PCR COURT WITHOUT EXPLAINING WHY WITHIN JURISDICTION SHE HAD ABSOLUTELY NO POWER OR AUTHORITY. JUDGE KAYE HEARN AND PARTIES DID NON JUDICIAL ACTS INSTRUCTING THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS NOT TO MAKE LEGAL COPIES TO HINDER OR PREVENT THE CASES FROM BEING PLACED IN PROPER FORM WITH THE FEDERAL JUDGES INVOLVED WHICH RESULTED IN THE DISMISSAL OF MANY OF THE CASES. THERE ARE EMAILS TO CPL. BOUCH SHE INFORMED THE

PETITIONERS OF THAT WOULD FURTHER SUPPORT THESE CLAIMS. THE JUDGES ARE NOT EMPLOYEES OF THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR GIVING OUT LEGAL COPIES TO INMATES. THE CONSPIRING PARTIES INSTRUCTED S.C.D.C. MAILROOM PERSONNEL TO ENGAGE IN ACTS OF MAIL TAMPERING TO PREVENT FILINGS. THE JUDGES ARE NOT EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAIL DELIVERY. THE CONSPIRING JUDGES AND PARTIES INSTRUCTED COURT CLERKS TO SPOLIATE LEGAL FILINGS OR CONCEAL THEM AS JUDGE TOAL DID INSTRUCTING THE RICHLAND CLERK TO SEND ESSENTIAL LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO THE COURT WAREHOUSE TO PREVENT SCRUTINY IN CASE THERE WAS AN INVESTIGATION, ACTS THEY ALL WERE PRIVY TO. THEY ARE NOT CLERKS OF COURT OR CASE MANAGERS RESPONSIBLE FOR FILING OR DESTROYING OR STORING LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND EVIDENCE OF THEIR FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY. THIS STRIPS THEM OF ANY IMMUNITY. THEY ARE NOT IMMUNE FROM INJUNCTIVE OR DECLARATORY RELIEF TO ADDRESS THE CRIMINAL ACTS. IF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WILL LOOK AT THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASES 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM; 9:21-cv-2139-TLW-MHC IN SOUTH CAROLINA, AT 1:18-cv-13459-NLH IN THE N.J. DISTRICT COURT AND 2013-CP-400-0084 IN THE RICHLAND S.C. COMMON PLEAS COURT, WHICH IS ANOTHER CASE THAT IS THE SOURCE OF DEFAULT BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON? THESE JUDGES INCLUDING JUDGE KAYE HEARN CONSPIRED WITHIN EACH OTHER'S JURISDICTIONS FOR WHICH THEY HAD ABSOLUTELY NO POWER OR AUTHORITY TO BE IN VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION(S), STATE AND FEDERAL, TO PREVENT THEIR NAMES FROM BEING LISTED AS DEFENDANTS TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE THEY WERE NOT ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASES TO AVOID SUIT, AND TO

MAKE IT LOOK LIKE WE WERE SUING INDIVIDUALS WHO COULD NOT BE SUED FOR THE CLAIMS MADE. JUDGE KAYE HEARN KNEW ALL OF THIS DUE TO HER DIRECT INVOLVEMENT, WAS AWARE OF ALL CLAIMS AND ISSUES FROM THE START IN 2006, AND KNEW THAT SHE WAS ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON HER OWN CASES TO THWART JUDICIAL REVIEW, ALSO DUE TO THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER BASED UPON THE FEDERAL CASES TO WHICH SHE IS A DEFENDANT. SHE SAT ON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CASES OF THE PETITIONER(S) TO INFLUENCE THE MINDS OF THE OTHER JUDGES INVOLVED AND TO MOLD THE DECISIONS OF THE COURT TO CAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM TO THE PETITIONER(S) WHO SOUGHT TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION, ALSO BECAUSE THESE TWO CASES HAVE MONETARY RELIEF ATTACHED TO BOTH OF THEM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA DEFAULTED ON AND DUE TO CRAWFORD MOTIONING TO INTERVENE IN THE McCRAY PCR CASE TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST. THIS PRODUCES STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE VOIDING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THUS, THE DECISION OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO BOTH CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-000974 MUST BE REVERSED AND VACATED. JUDGE KAYE HEARN SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN ALLOWED TO SIT ON THESE PROCEEDINGS IN ANY WAY KNOWING HER DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT JUDGE KAYE HEARN'S PRESENCE IN THESE CASES PRODUCE A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. UNDER THE DUE PROCESS, NO MAN CAN BE JUDGE IN HIS OR HER OWN CASE AND NO MAN OR WOMAN IS PERMITTED TO TRY CASES WHERE HE OR SHE HAS IN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME,

WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 579 U.S. 1, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132 (U.S.2016); PASCAL v. CITY OF PITTSBURG ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, 2021 WL 4303202(Pa.2021); RIVERA v. SUPERINTENDENT HOUTZDALE, S.C.I., 738 Fed. Appx' 59 (3rd.Cir.2018).

JUDGE KAYE HEARNS INVOLVEMENT ON THESE CASES SITTING ON THAT S.C. SUPREME COURT PANEL TO INFLUENCE THE DECISIONS OF THE OTHER JUDGES WHEN SHE IS DIRECTLY ONE OF THE SOURCES OF THE INJUSTICES THAT OCCURRED IN HOLDING THE PETITIONER(S) CASES IN LIMBO FOR OVER (16+) YEARS WHERE SHE CONSPIRED BEYOND HER JUDICIAL AUTHORITY IN THE AFOREMENTIONED ACTS AND WHERE ALL OF THESE JUDGES ARE SOUGHT DISQUALIFIED SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER GIVES A RISE TO AN UNACCEPTABLE RISK OF BIAS THAT CAN HAVE EASILY BEEN REMEDIED BY HER RECUSING HER SELF ONCE SEE SEEN THAT THIS CASE INVOLVED THE PETITIONER(S) AND THEY WERE SEEKING TRANSFER FOR WHICH SHE CONSPIRED ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION TO PREVENT HER NAME FROM BEING LISTED AS A DEFENDANT IN THE FEDERAL CASES INVOLVED. THIS RISK SO ENDANGERS THE APPEARANCE OF NEUTRALITY WHERE THEY CONSPIRED TO BLOCK THE HEARING OF THESE LEGAL ISSUES FOR OVER (16+) YEARS THAT JUDGE KAYE HEARN'S PARTICIPATION IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT RULING "MUST BE FORBIDDEN" IF THE GUARANTEE OF DUE PROCESS IS TO BE ADEQUATELY IMPLEMENTED, WITHROW, 421 U.S. AT 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456. DUE PROCESS ENTITLES THE PETITIONER(S) TO A PROCEEDING IN WHICH HE MAY PRESENT HIS CASE WITH ASSURANCE "THAT NO MEMBER OF THE COURT IS "PREDISPOSED TO FIND AGAINST HIM". THIS ISSUE IS ALSO BEING ARGUED FOR JUDGE YOUNG WHO SAT ON THE RON SANTA McCRAY PCR TO

ISSUE THE CONDITIONAL ORDER IN THAT CASE WHEN THAT SAME JUDGE WAS INVOLVED IN PRIOR PROCEEDING INVOLVING McCRAY WHO BY SOUTH CAROLINA LAW AND FEDERAL LAW WAS REQUIRED TO RECUSE HIMSELF CALLING IN QUESTION THE INTEGRITY OF THE CONDITIONAL ORDER ISSUED WITHIN THE McCRAY CASE AS WELL. THIS IS THE TYPE OF REPEATED INJUSTICE THE PETITIONER(S) WERE SUBJECT TO FURTHER WARRANTING THE 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER DISQUALIFYING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND LOWER COURTS IN THEIR ENTIRETY, MARSHALL v. JERRICO INC., 446 U.S. 238, 242, 100 S.Ct. 1610, 64 L.Ed.2d. 182(1980); COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA v. WILLIAMS, 294 U.S. 176, 55 S.Ct. 380 79 L.Ed. 841 (U.S.1935).

A JUDGE'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL FAILURE TO RECUSE WHEN SHE KNEW OF HER DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN THESE MATTERS, IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION(S), CONSTITUTE STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS-ERROR REVIEW, EVEN IF THE JUDGE IN QUESTION DID NOT DO THE DEED OF NOT CRIMINALLY LISTING THEM AS DEFENDANTS WHEN ON THE FACE OF THE COMPLAINT THAT MAKE UP CASE 9:21-cv-2139-TLW STILL PENDING AND NOW BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT SEEKING STAY OF THAT CASE. JUDGE KAYE HEARN'S NAME IS LISTED AS A DEFENDANT AS WELL AS JUDGE YOUNG RELATED TO THE PRIOR FEDERAL CASES THAT WERE INAPPROPRIATELY IN ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DISMISSED. DUE PROCESS ENTITLES CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS TO PROCEEDINGS IN WHICH HE MAY PRESENT HIS CASE WITH ASSURANCE THAT "NO MEMBER" OF THE COURT IS PREDISPOSED TO FIND AGAINST HIM. IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT THE OBJECTIVE RISK OF ACTUAL

BIAS AS IT PERTAIN TO BOTH JUDGE KAYE HEARN AND JUDGE YOUNG IN THE McCRAY PCR, RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL CREATING STRUCTURAL ERROR VIOLATING DUE PROCESS THAT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE, JOHNSON v. PARRIS, 2021 WL 1232774 (E.D.Tenn.2021); JONES v. NEUSCHARD, 2021 WL 1056597 (N.D.Cal.2021); WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA SUPRA.; UNITED STATES v. KOEBER, 2018 WL 4188465, \* 2 UTAH; JUSTIN PATRICK ODLE, PETITIONER v. MATT MACAULEY, RESPONDENT, 2021 WL 4350123 (W.D.Mich.2021); DRAKE v. TRAVELERS INDEMNITY COMPANY, 2019 WL 5423099, \* 3 D.Md..

**QUESTION PRESENTED # 3:** DO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723(U.S.2016), UNDER MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4064(U.S.2016), UNDER NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249, 197 L.Ed.2d. 611, 85 U.S.L.W. 4205(U.S.2017), AND UNDER WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016) APPLY TO THE CRAWFORD CASE PRODUCING EXCEPTIONAL AND OR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THE OTHER INMATES ARE ENTITLED TO CLAIMS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DUE TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA CONCEALING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA EVIDENCE AND S.L.E.D. INVESTIGATIVE FILE, ALSO BLOCKING CRAWFORD FROM FILING FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED FOR OVER (16+) YEARS WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER DETERMINING WHY AND THE LEGAL ISSUES ARGUED WITHIN ALL THEIR CASES ARE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME AND OR IDENTICAL? THE PETITIONER(S) PRESENT THE

DOCUMENTS FOUND IN THE APPENDICES "B" THROUGH "W" IN SUPPORT OF ARGUING THIS ISSUE. THERE IS NO NEED TO MAKE THIS ISSUE LENGTHY DUE TO THE ARGUMENT ESTABLISHED IN THE PREVIOUS QUESTIONS PRESENTED. THERE ARE NO LEGAL INDICTMENTS BY SHAM LEGAL PROCESS WHICH IS ANOTHER REASON WHY THEY BLOCKED THE GIVING OF THE GRAND JURY PANEL DOCUMENTS. THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON IN FRAUD IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA FOR DECADES. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DETERMINED UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA THAT THE PETITIONER(S) WOULD HAVE AVAILABLE TAILORED RELIEF UNDER THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE HELD CRAWFORD FOR OVER (4½) YEARS AS A PRETRIAL DETAINEE DESPITE HIS FILING FOR MOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL. THE STATE BROUGHT CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN TRIAL AND ESSENTIALLY CONVICTED HIM FOR THEM WHEN THEY HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIME. NOR DID THEY BREAK ANY LAWS WHICH VIOLATE MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA ESTABLISHING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, WHICH INCLUDE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE STATE TOOK AWAY THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE BY THE LANGUAGE WITHIN THE INDICTMENT(S) CONSTRUCTIVELY AMENDING THE INDICTMENTS ALL OVER THE PLACE ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE(S). THE STATE SUPPRESSED EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA EVIDENCE AND S.L.E.D. INVESTIGATIVE FILE #5501014 IN THE STATE'S POSSESSION THEN LIED ABOUT IT ON THE COURT RECORD IN PROSECUTIONAL MISCONDUCT. THE STATE BLOCKED CRAWFORD FROM FILING PCR APPLICATION IN KERSHAW COUNTY FOR OVER (16+) YEARS FORCING HIM TO FILE TORT ACTION IN ANOTHER COUNTY VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. THE ATTORNEY FOR THE CLERK OF COURT,

DABOSE-ROBINSON, LIED ABOUT IT ON THE COURT RECORD BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHEN APPENDICES "I" THROUGH "O" ESTABLISH CLEAR EVIDENCE CRAWFORD WAS INDEED BLOCKED BY AN EXTRA-JUDICIAL CONSPIRACY WITHOUT COURT ORDER EXPLAINING WHY. THE OTHER INMATES INVOLVED BECAME ATTACHED TO CRAWFORD VIA 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT TO HELP PREVENT THE RETALITORY ACTS AND TO PROTECT CRAWFORD'S RIGHTS TO THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE ENTITLING THEM TO NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL RELIEF WHERE BY THE PETITIONER(S) CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, THE STATE CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO RELITIGATE ISSUES THEY WAIVED BY REPEATED DEFAULTS ON THE BASES OF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON AND THE FRAUD THEY ENGAGED IN PLACING THE STATE IN FORFEITURE ON THE CAUSES OF CONVICTION. S.C. CODE ANN. § 17-27-45(a) PROVIDE: AN APPLICATION FOR RELIEF FILED PURSUANT TO THIS CHAPTER MUST BE FILED WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY OF A JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION OR WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER THE SENDING OF THE REMITTITUR TO THE LOWER COURT FROM AN APPEAL OR THE FILING OF THE FINAL DECISION UPON AN APPEAL, WHICHEVER IS LATER. THE PREVENTING OF THIS BY THE CONSPIRING STATE ACTORS VIOLATED THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE STRIPPING FROM THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS PLACED UPON HIM BY THE LEGISLATORS, COLLINS v. YEMEN, 141 S.Ct. 1761, 210 L.Ed.2d. 432(U.S.2021); BRNOVICH v. DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, 141 S.Ct. 2321, 210 L.Ed.2d. 753(U.S.2021); ODOM v. STATE, 337 S.C. 256, 523 S.E.2d. 753(S.C.App.1999); BARNES v. STATE, 433 S.C. 399, 859 S.E.2d.

260(S.C.App.2021). THE CLERK OF COURT HAS A MINISTERIAL DUTY TO DOCKET FILINGS IRRESPECTIVE OF POTENTIAL FLAWS THAT MAY EXIST AND HER FAILURE TO DO SO CONSPIRING WITH THE OTHER JUDICIAL OFFICERS OF THE COURT(S) INVOLVED WITHOUT ORDER STATING WHY VIOLATED S.C. CODE ANN §17-27-40 PRODUCING ANOTHER SEPARATION OF POWERS VIOLATION THE CLERK ACTING AS JUDGE FOR WHICH SHE HAD NO POWER OR AUTHORITY TO DO TO PREVENT THE HEARING OF THE CONVICTION ISSUES WHERE THE STATE DEFAULTED WITHIN THE MANY CASES INVOLVED HERE PURSUANT TO THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON WARRANTING THE DEFAULT AND RIGHTS OF NON PARTY COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, BARNES v. STATE SUPRA.; MILLER v. STATE, 377 S.C. 99, 659 S.E.2d. 492(S.C.App.2008); SNYDER v. NOLEN, 380 F3d. 279(7th.Cir.2004); JOHNSON v. PERSON, 781 Fed. Appx' 69 (3rd.Cir.2019); BURNS v. STATE OF OHIO, 360 U.S. 252, 79 S.Ct. 1164, 3 L.Ed.2d. 1209(U.S.1959); FREYTAG v. C.I.R., 501 U.S. 868, 111 S.Ct. 2631, 115 L.Ed.2d. 764(U.S.1991); PARKLANE HOSIERY CO., INC. v. SHORE, 439 U.S. 322, 99 S.Ct. 645, 58 L.Ed.2d. 552(U.S.1979); MONTANA v. U.S., 440 U.S. 147, 99 S.Ct. 970, 59 L.Ed.2d. 210(U.S.1979).

**QUESTION PRESENTED # 4:** DID THE PETITIONER(S) MEET THE CRITERION FOR ESTABLISHING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND 1455(c) TRANSFER DUE TO THE SEEKING OF DISQUALIFICATION OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SEEKING TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY BY THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION RULES? HABEAS CORPUS WAS SOUGHT BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURT IN SOUTH CAROLINA UNDER CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM. IT IS SOUGHT UNDER CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH. IT WAS SOUGHT REPEATEDLY BEFORE THE VARIOUS

FEDERAL COURTS EVEN LOOKING TO POTENTIALLY ESTABLISH CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION AND THE APPOINTMENT OF LEGAL COUNSEL DUE TO THE COMPLEXITY OF THE CASE BEING ARGUED OVER MULTIPLE STATES. THE STATE CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS ARE ALREADY INVALIDATED BY THE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND THE DEFAULT BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON WHICH IS JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. WHEN THE SUPREME COURT LOOK AT THE APPENDICES IN THEIR TOTALITY WITH EMPHASIS ON APPENDICES "Q" THROUGH "AA". THE LEGAL ISSUES UNDER APPENDICES "Q", "S", "T", "U", "V" AND "W" ARE ESSENTIALLY BEING ARGUED FOR THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, IN THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH, AS IS ALSO FOR THE PETITIONERS/INMATES STILL PENDING BEFORE THE LOWERS COURTS INVOLVED. THE PETITIONERS ASK THE COURT TO DISREGARD THE VARIATIONS IN THE PLEADING DUE TO THE CASE INVOLVING MULTIPLE INMATES AND THE LITIGATION IS CONSTRUCTED WITH THIS IN MIND. PLEASE JUST APPLY THE MATTERS THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THESE PARTICULAR PETITIONER(S). THE CLINTON BILL AND THE UNITED STATES EXECUTING, ARRESTING OR ATTACHING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION DEFAULTED ON IS BEING ARGUED FOR ALL (50) STATES CREATING COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT. ANY ONE OF THE CASES THAT WERE SOUGHT CONSOLIDATED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FOR MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION PURPOSES IS IMMEDIATELY APPEALABLE UPON AN ORDER DISPOSING OF THAT CASE SUCH AS THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ISSUED HERE, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER ANY OF THE OTHER CASES REMAIN PENDING, 28 U.S.C. § 1407; HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118 (U.S. 2018). ONCE A FINAL

JUDGMENT HAS BEEN ENTERED IN A CASE, IT IS IMMEDIATELY APPEALABLE, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER IT IS CONSOLIDATED WITH ANOTHER STILL PENDING CASE, NETTLES v. RUMBERGER, KIRK & CALDWELL, P.C., 276 SO.3d. 663 (Ala.App.2018); IN RE: NEW YORK CITY POLICING DURING SUMMER 2020 DEMONSTRATIONS,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2021 WL 1666860 (S.D.N.Y.2021); DOLORES PRESS, INC. v. ROBINSON, 2019 WL 12095416(C.D.Cal.2019). 28 U.S.C. § 1407 PROVIDE: WHEN CIVIL ACTIONS WHERE EVEN THE HABEAS CORPUS WAS FILED ALSO UNDER § 1983 AND REMOVAL STATUTES PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., INVOLVING ONE OR MORE COMMON QUESTIONS OF FACT. ARE PENDING IN DIFFERENT DISTRICTS, SUCH ACTIONS MAY BE TRANSFERRED TO ANY DISTRICT FOR COORDINATED OR CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS. SUCH TRANSFERS SHALL BE MADE BY THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION AUTHORIZED BY THIS SECTION UPON ITS DETERMINATION THAT TRANSFER OF SUCH PROCEEDINGS WILL BE FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF PARTIES AND WITNESSES AND WILL PROMOTE THE JUST AND EFFICIENT CONDUCT OF SUCH ACTIONS. EACH ACTION SO TRANSFERRED SHALL BE REMANDED BY THE PANEL AT OR BEFORE THE CONCLUSION OF SUCH PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS TO THE DISTRICT FROM WHICH IT WAS TRANSFERRED UNLESS IT SHALL HAVE BEEN PREVIOUSLY TERMINATED: PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT THE PANEL MAY SEPARATE ANY CLAIM, CROSS CLAIM, COUNTER CLAIM OR THIRD-PARTY CLAIM BEFORE THE REMAINDER OF THE ACTION IS REMANDED. THE JUDICIAL PANEL UPON ITS OWN INITIATIVE, OR MOTION FILED WITH THE PANEL BY A PARTY IN ANY ACTION IN WHICH TRANSFER FOR COORDINATED OR CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS UNDER THIS SECTION MAY BE APPROPRIATE. A COPY OF SUCH MOTION, WHICH IN THIS CASE IS EMBEDDED WITHIN THE COMPLAINTS FILED, SHALL BE FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT IN WHICH THE MOVING

PARTY'S ACTION IS PENDING. THE PANEL SHALL GIVE NOTICE TO THE PARTIES IN ALL ACTIONS IN WHICH TRANSFER FOR COORDINATED OR CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS ARE CONTEMPLATED. BY THE LEGAL ISSUES AND CLAIMS PRESENTED, THE PETITIONER(S) HAVE MET THE CRITERION FOR ESTABLISHING MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION AND 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER ALONG WITH ALL TAG ALONG CASES, EASTWOOD v. LEHMAN BROS., BANK, F.S.B., F.Supp.2d., 2010 WL 774073 (D.Nev.2010); IN RE: WALDEN UNIVERSITY, LLC., DOCTORAL PROGRAM LITIGATION, 273 F.Supp.3d. 1367 (2017); LEXICON INC. v. MILBERG, WEISS, BERSHAD, HYNES & LERACH, 523 U.S. 26, 118 S.Ct. 956, 140 L.Ed.2d. 62(U.S.1998); IN RE: SOCIETY INSURANCE CO. COVID-19 BUSINESS INTERRUPTION PROTECTION INSURANCE LITIGATION, 2021 WL 3290962(N.D.ILL.2021).

**QUESTION PRESENTED ¶ 5:** BY THE RECENT AND PAST RULINGS COMING OUT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SINCE 2016, DID THE STATE COURTS ABUSE THEIR DISCRETION BY ADJUDICATING THE ISSUE OF FATAL DEFECTS OF CRIMINAL INDICTMENT(S) UNDER THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION WHEN DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRED THAT SUCH ISSUES BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION? THE PETITIONER(S) BRING THE COURT'S ATTENTION BACK TO APPENDICES "Q", "R", "S", "T", "U", "V" AND "W". THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF SEEKING REVIEW FOR THIS QUESTION OF LAW. THE CONCERN EMERGES FROM THE CASE OF UNITED STATES v. COTTON, 535 U.S. 625, 122 S.Ct. 1781, 152 L.Ed.2d. 860(2002) ADJUDICATED BY THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. WHEN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT MADE ITS

RULING IN THE COTTON CASE, WHETHER IT WAS INTENTIONAL OR UNINTENTIONAL, THAT RULING "MUDDIED THE WATERS" CREATING A SUBSTANTIAL DEGREE OF "VAGUENESS" AND "UNCERTAINTY" AS IT RELATES TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND THE "[F]ATAL [D]EFECTS" OF INDICTMENT(S) USED WITHIN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AS IT PERTAINS TO "[E]SSENTIAL [E]LEMENTS" OF THE OFFENSE(S). THE COTTON DECISION GIVES THE UNINTENDED, INDISPUTABLE, IMPRESSION THAT THERE IS ONLY "ONE PRONG" TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, SPECIFICALLY, THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG, WHEN IN TRUTH WE ALL KNOW THAT THIS IS AN INCORRECT ASSUMPTION. THIS DECISION CONFLICTS WITH OTHER U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION UNDER STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998); HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+ U.S. AND MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193. L.Ed.2d. 599(U.S.2016) AND A PLETHORA OF OTHER CASES COMING OUT OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND OTHER CIRCUITS SINCE 2016. THE COTTON DECISION IS VAGUE. IT FAILED TO ADDRESS THE EXISTING "**DUE PROCESS/CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG**" TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION REQUIRING FOR THE SAKE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" THAT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT NOW REVISIT THIS ISSUE TO GIVE THE COURTS, BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL, "CERTAINTY AND CLARITY" TO CLEAN UP THE SEEMING CONTRASTING OR OPPOSING HOLDINGS AS IT PERTAINS TO THE "FATAL DEFECTS OF AN INDICTMENT" AND WHETHER UNDER THE "CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG" TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, IS JURISDICTION MADE VOID IN CRIMINAL CASES AS INDICATED BY MONTGOMERY FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. IF YOU TAKE A FATALLY DEFECTIVE INDICTMENT AND YOU BRING IT BEFORE A CRIMINAL COURT FOR

THE SAKE OF FRAUDULENTLY PROCURING A CONVICTION, DEPRIVING THE DEFENDANT OF THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, PREDETERMINING IN ADVANCE THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS BY THE LANGUAGE CONTAINED THEREIN, DEPRIVING THE DEFENDANT OF FAIR AND PROPER NOTICE OF THE "[C]AUSE AND [N]ATURE" OF THE ACCUSATION(S) BEING LEVIED AGAINST HIM DEPRIVING HIM OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IT IS THAT HE IS CALLED UPON TO MEET AND DEFEND, CONSTRUCTIVELY AMENDING THE INDICTMENTS ALL OVER THE PLACE ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSES CHARGED ALONG WITH THE OTHER CLAIMS ARGUED IN THIS CASE? SUCH ACTIONS DONE WITHIN THOSE PROCEEDINGS VIOLATE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS RENDER THE PROCEEDINGS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. ALL JUDGMENTS AND OR ACTS AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS THAT VIOLATE DUE PROCESS LAW AND ARE CONTRARY TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARE VOID AND CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW, HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL SUPRA.; EVANCHO v. PINE-RICH AND SCHOOL DISTRICT, 237 F.Supp.3d. 267, 301(M.D.pa.2017); TAYLOR v. U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2074, 195 L.Ed.2d. 84 U.S.L.W. 4462(U.S.2016); STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT SUPRA.; WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C., LLC., 859 F3d. 295 (4th.Cir.2017). INDEED INSOFAR A CRIMINAL CONVICTION AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR LEGISLATIVE STATUTE AND OR ACT RUNS COUNTER TO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE LAND (THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, DUE PROCESS LAW, THAT INDICTMENTS ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS/CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, NOT THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG AS THE COURTS MISTAKINGLY HAVE DONE.), IT IS SUPERSEDED THEREBY. NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY FRAUD AND OR AN

UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. A REVERSIBLE CONVICTION IS REVERSIBLE REGARDLESS OF THE REASON, AND AN INVALID CONVICTION IS NO CONVICTION AT ALL. A CONVICTION UNDER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW IS NOT MERELY ERRONEOUS, BUT IT IS ILLEGAL AND VOID, AND CANNOT BE A LEGAL CAUSE OF IMPRISONMENT. ALL RULES, STATUTES, LAWS, PRACTICES (SUCH AS THE ONES ARGUED IN THIS CASE), WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARE "**NULL**" AND "**VOID**". THE U.S. SUPREME COURT MUST NOW GIVE THE COURTS CERTAINTY AND CLARITY DUE TO THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE THAT HAS RESULTED FROM THE COTTON RULING, UNITED STATES v. LIBOUS, 858 F3d. 63 (2nd.Cir.2017); CITY OF LEBANNON v. MILBURN, Or. App. 212, 398 P.3d. 486(2017); PEOPLE v. FIELDS, N.E.3d., ILL. App. (1st.) 122012-UB; FARROW v. LIPETZKY, 2017 WL 1540637 (N.C.2017); UNITED STATES v. AJRAWAT,--Fed. Appx'--, 2018 WL 3045619 (4th.Cir.2018); BETTERMAN v. MONTANA SUPRA.; MARTIN v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 1626578, \* 2 D.Md.; PYNE v. UNITED STATES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 1377402(D.C.Md.2016); MARBURY v. MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; VINES v. UNITED STATES, 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1163(1), 1165(1); LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19 (2014); JOHNSON v. UNITED STATES,--S.Ct.--, 2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA SUPRA.; NELSON v. COLORADO SUPRA.; HILL v. SNYDER, 821 F3d. 763, 765+ (6th.Cir.Mich.); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624 (4th.Cir.2016).

#### CONCLUSION

INSOMUCH, THESE CASES PRODUCE SUBSTANTIAL PUBLIC JURIS CLAIMS. THE CITIZENS, ESPECIALLY THE MONORITY GROUPS, OF THIS NATION HAVE BEEN SCREAMING, CRYING OUT, FOR SOME SORT OF PRISON REFORM FROM ALL STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATORS OF THIS NATION TO NO AVAIL FOR DECADES DUE TO THE CONSTANT PARTISAN BICKERING AND WRANGLING THAT HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR YEARS AT ALL LEVELS. THIS SUPREME COURT CAN GIVE IT TO THE NATIONAL PUBLIC. THE VOIDING OR REVERSING OF THE DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL ARGUED IN THIS CASE AND THE FALLACIOUS ASSUMPTION REGARDING THE CRIMINAL INDICTMENT(S) AS IT PERTAINS TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF GIVING THE NATIONAL PUBLIC WHAT IS TANTAMOUNT TO SOME FORM OF PRISON REFORM THIS NATION SO DESPERATELY NEEDS. THE TRULY EVIL ONES WILL COME BACK. COUNT ON IT. THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS MUST FOR THE SAKE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" BE REVISITED AND ADDRESSED NOW DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN THE RECORD SUBJUDICE BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE IN QUESTION WHICH IS JURISDICTIONAL AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. UNLIKE THE WORD "MAY" WHICH IMPLIES DISCRETION THE WORD "SHALL" IN A STATUTE USUALLY CONNOTES A REQUIREMENT. WHEN A STATUTE DISTINGUISHES BETWEEN "MAY" AND "SHALL" IT IS GENERALLY CLEAR THAT "SHALL" IMPLIES A MANDATORY DUTY WHERE IN THIS CASE THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON IS ALSO ATTACHED TO THE S.C. CONSTITUTION UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 23, AND BOTH THIS PROVISION OF LAW AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER THE FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS CASE COMPOUND IT, ESTABLISHING IT IS MANDATORY

SINCE THE PROVISION WAS TIMELY ASSERTED WHICH ESTABLISH ALL JURISDICTION FACTS MADE BEFORE THIS COURT, KINGDOM WARE TECHNOLOGIES, INC. v. U.S., 579 U.S. 162, 136 S.Ct. 1969, 195 L.Ed.2d. 334(U.S.2016); CRETE CARRIER CORP. v. SULLIVAN & SONS, INC., 2021 WL 2685253, \* 6 D.Md.; MAINE COMMUNITY HEALTH OPTIONS v. UNITED STATES, 140 S.Ct. 1308, 1320+ U.S.; SUPERNUS PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. v. IANCU, 913 F3d. 1351, 1359 Fed.Cir.(Va.); MURPHY v. SMITH, 138 S.Ct. 784, 200 L.Ed.2d. 75, 86 U.S.L.W. 4069(U.S.2018); JENNINGS v. RODRIQUEZ, 138 S.Ct. 830, 200 L.Ed.2d. 122, 86 U.S.L.W. 4094(U.S.2018). THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA SHOULD HAVE NEVER BROUGHT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS WITHIN THAT COURTROOM AT TRIAL FOR THE SAKE OF ESTABLISHING LAW WHEN SUCH BELIEFS HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIME CONVICTING HIM OF IT, RELIGIOUS BELIEFS PROTECTED BY THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE. THEREUPON, THE STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS INVOLVED SHOULD HAVE NEVER CONSPIRED TO DENY THE PETITIONER(S) AND OTHER INMATES SUBJUDICE REMEDY AT EVERY STAGE AND EVERY LEVEL BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED BECAUSE THE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS BY THE STATE WERE INITIALLY INTRODUCED, WHICH IS THE GENESIS OF ALL THE COURT PERCEIVES BEFORE IT, CLAIMS PROTECTED BY "WILL AND TESTAMENT", BY "CONTRACT/COVENANT", BY STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW AND ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THE FRAUD IS OVERWHELMING. "HAERES EST EADEM PERSONA CUM ANTECESSORE"--THE HEIR IS THE SAME PERSON AS HIS ANCESTOR DEFULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE CASES INVOLVED BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON. SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF MUHAMMAD; BOOKS ENTITLED, "BEFORE THE MAYFLOWER, A

HISTORY OF BLACK AMERICA" BY LEONE BENNETT; "SUNAH IBN-E-MAJAH" VOL. 5 ISBN No. 81-7151-294-1 PAGES 391-395; "WORLD'S GREATEST MEN OF COLOR" VOL. 1 BY J.A. RODGERS ISBN NO. 978-0-684-81581-7; "THE KEBAR NAGAST" OR "GLORY OF THE KINGS" A CHRONICLE OF THE RULERS OF ETHIOPIA; THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH 6:12-13 (BIBLE); NATION, COX v. SHALALA, 112 F3d. 151; ENGLISH v. GEN. ELEC. CO., 496 U.S. 72, 79, 100 S.Ct. 2270, 2275, 110 L.Ed.2d. 65(1990). FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, WHICH INCLUDE FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, IS BASIC IN A SOCIETY OF FREEMEN,...IT EMBRACES THE RIGHT TO MAINTAIN THEORIES OF LIFE AND DEATH AND OF THE HEREAFTER WHICH ARE RANKED HERESIES TO MEMBERS OF ORTHODOX FAITHS. MEN MAY BELIEVE WHAT THEY CANNOT PROVE. THEY MAY NOT BE PUT TO PROOF OF THEIR RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES OR BELIEFS. RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE WHICH ARE AS REAL AS LIFE TO SOME MAY BE INCOMPREHENSIBLE TO OTHERS,...THE FATHERS OF OUR CONSTITUTION WERE NOT UNAWARE OF THE VARIED AND EXTREME VIEWS OF RELIGIOUS SECTS, OF THE VIOLENCE OF DISAGREEMENT AMONG THEM, AND THE LACK OF ANY ONE RELIGIOUS CREED ON WHICH ALL MEN MAY AGREE. THEY FASHIONED A CHARACTER OF GOVERNMENT WHICH ENVISAGED THE WIDEST POSSIBLE TOLERANCE TO CONFLICTING VIEWS. MAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO HIS GOD WAS MADE NO CONCERN OF THE STATE. HE IS GRANTED THE RIGHT TO WORSHIP AS HE PLEASE AND IS NOT REQUIRED TO ANSWER TO ANY MAN FOR THE VERITY OF HIS RELIGIOUS VIEWS, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT HE IS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR OF A FOREIGN STATE AND GENUINE PROPHET AND LAWGIVER OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, S.C. RULES OF CIV. PRO. RULE 44 DEFAULTED ON. THE COURTS HAVE EXPLAINED THAT THERE IS NO WRONG WITHOUT REMEDY WHICH THE CONSPIRING PARTIES TOOK FROM THE

PETITIONERS BY THE FRAUD. THE HISTORY OF THE REMEDY CLAUSE INDICATES THAT IT'S PURPOSE IS TO PROTECT ABSOLUTE COMMON LAW RIGHTS RESPECTING PERSONS PROPERTY, AND REPUTATION, AND THOSE RIGHTS EXISTED WHEN THE CONSTITUTION WAS ESTABLISHED. THE COURT HAS STATED THAT THE GUARANTEE OF REMEDY BY THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE FOR INJURY TO PERSON, PROPERTY, OR REPUTATION, "IS ONE OF THE MOST SACRED AND ESSENTIAL OF ALL THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES" AND THAT "WITHOUT IT A FREE GOVERNMENT CANNOT BE PRESERVED" AND SUCH A CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE DOES NOT DISAPPEAR JUST BECAUSE A PERSON IS INCARCERATED, SMOTHERS v. GRESHAM TRANSFER INC., 332 Or. 83, 23 P.3d. 333 (2011); GEARIN v. MARION COUNTY, 110 Or. 390, 396, 233 P. 929; PLATT v. NEWBERRY ET. AL., 104 Or. 148, 153, 205 P. 296(1922). THE SAME PRINCIPLE OF LAW APPLIES HERE IN S.C.. UNDER THE 1st. AMENDMENT THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BY WHAT THEY DID HERE CANNOT BURDEN THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, ESPECIALLY IF THEY BEAR NEXUS TO PROPERTY RIGHTS AND RIGHTS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., WHERE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD IS FOREIGN SOVEREIGN BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH PURSUANT TO THE (3) HOLY BOOKS, COVENANTS, OR THEY MAY NOT PROHIBIT THE EXPRESSION OF AN IDEA BECAUSE SOCIETY FINDS THE IDEA OFFENSIVE AS MENTIONED, OR DISAGREEABLE. THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE ALONG WITH THE OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AND DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS ARGUED IN THIS CASE WOULD BAR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA FROM ENGAGING IN THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ARGUED WHICH ATTACHES TO THE CONVICTION(S) THEMSELVES ALSO DUE TO CLAIMS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719, 201

L.Ed.2d. 35 (U.S.2018); McFAUL v. RAMSEY, 61 U.S. (20 HOW) 523, 525, 15 L.Ed. 1010, 1011 (U.S.1858); NEW HOPE FAMILY SERVICES INC. v. POOLE, 966 F3d. 145 (2nd.Cir.2020); TELESCOPE MEDIA GROUP v. LUCERO, 936 F3d. 740 (8th.Cir.2019); CHELSEY NELSON PHOTOGRAPHY LLC. v. LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT, --F.Supp.3d.--, 2020 WL 4745771 (W.D.Ky.2020); BRADDY v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 1031301 (E.D.Va.2016); ZIVOTOFSKY EX REL ZIVOTOFSKY v. KERRY, 135 S.Ct. 2076, 192 L.Ed.2d. 83, 83 U.S.L.W. 4391 (U.S.2015). THEREFORE, THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED.


LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA

JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE

#300839 F2B. RM. 1260

LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.

BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010




RON SANTA McCRAY

#353031 COOPER B-59

LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205

RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

NOVEMBER 6, 2021



28  
NO. 21A425

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCARY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON; S.C.D.C.;  
DIRECTOR BRYAN STIRLING; THE S.C.D.C. MUSLIM CHAPLAINS;  
MS. FOX ET. AL.,---DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY AND LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY ON THIS DATE OF FEBRUARY 26, 2022, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED MOTION TO FILE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES PURSUANT TO RULE 22; MOTION TO AMEND THE APPLICATION UNDER RULE 22 SEEKING STAY ON CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT TO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI OUT OF TIME AND OR

BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT FOR BOTH CASE(S) 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT DUE TO OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION AND THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1407 DISQUALIFICATION AND TRANSFER ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDING OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED, BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL

ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

(10) THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS AND JUDGE NEWMAN 1701 MAIN STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(11) THE S.C. SUPREME COURT P.O. BOX 11330 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

(12) ATTORNEY D. SETTANA AT THE McKAY LAW FIRM 1303 BLANDING STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(13) THE LAW FIRM OF DABOSE-ROBINSON 935 BRAD STREET CAMDEN, S.C. 29020.

(14) THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

WE DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

EXECUTED FEBRUARY 25, 2022.

RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron Santa  
Ron Santa*

3-of-3

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

*Lawrence L. Crawford*

NO. 21A425

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCARY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON; S.C.D.C.;  
DIRECTOR BRYAN STIRLING; THE S.C.D.C. MUSLIM CHAPLAINS;  
MS. FOX ET. AL.,---DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

MOTION TO FILE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES PURSUANT  
TO RULE 22; MOTION TO AMEND THE APPLICATION UNDER RULE  
22 SEEKING TO STAY CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT  
TO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORAI  
OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT FOR BOTH CASE(S)  
20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND  
CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-000974 OUT OF THE SOUTH  
CAROLINA SUPREME COURT DUE TO OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE,  
MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION AND THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C.  
§ 1407 DISQUALIFICATION AND TRANSFER

IN RE: CRAWFORD AND McCRAY ET. AL.,

TO: THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO,  
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,  
THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.

HERE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO, THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND ALL PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "U.S. SUPREME COURT SERVICE". THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBMITTED TO DEMONSTRATE THE REPEATED EFFORT THAT THE PETITIONER(S) HAVE MADE TO GET THESE MATTERS TIMELY FILED BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT ONLY TO BE MET WITH EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD, CONSPIRACY VIOLATING 42 U.S.C. §§ 1985(2)(3) AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DUE TO POTENTIALLY RELIGIOUS HATRED. THIS DON'T EVEN COUNT THE TIMES THE PETITIONER(S) SENT IN THE PLEADING(S) WHEN IT WAS NOT CERTIFIED.

(2) EXHIBIT, "SPOILIATION/OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE". THIS DOCUMENT GOES MORE INTO THE DETAILS OF THE OBSTRUCTION THAT OCCURRED BY THE DEFENDANTS WHO ARE POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO TOOK STEPS TO COMPROMISE THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT ITSELF VIA CERTAIN OF ITS EMPLOYEES WHO ARE PARTAKERS WITHIN THE INJUSTICE THAT HAS OCCURRED WHICH WAS INITIALLY SOUGHT REVIEW BY JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR. A COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT IS ATTACHED TO THIS EXHIBIT FOR REVIEW.

(3) EXHIBIT, "CASE(S) 20-7073/ 21-6275".

(4) EXHIBIT, "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT".

(5) EXHIBIT. "THREAT TO SOVEREIGN'S SAFETY # 1".

(6) EXHIBIT, "THREAT TO SOVEREIGN'S SAFETY # 2". THE FINAL ORDER DENYING THE STAY IN CASE 21-6275 IS FOUND ATTACHED AT THE END OF THIS EXHIBIT.

(7) EXHIBIT, "S.C. SUPREME COURT PETITION". EXHIBITS 3 THROUGH 7 DEMONSTRATE THAT CASE 21-1330, 21-6275, 20-7073 WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURT(S) AND CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 ARE DIRECTLY RELATED AND ARE ESSENTIALLY SISTER CASES OF EACH OTHER WHERE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE 4th. CIRCUIT IN ITS ENTIRETY IS SOUGHT DISQUALIFIED AND THE STATE AND FEDERAL CASES SOUGHT TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT AND 3rd. CIRCUIT DUE TO MULTI-DISTRICT SOUGHT LITIGATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE BY WHAT IS ARGUED WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS.

(8) EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". THIS EXHIBIT IS SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT TO DEMONSTRATE A POINT OF MOTIVE FOR THE CONSPIRING FEDERAL AND OR STATE OFFICIALS COMPROMISING CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF TO KEEP THESE CASES FROM THE HONORABLE JUSTICES SCRUTINY AND PRIVY AND TO PUSH THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE PERIOD FOR TIMELY FILING PETITION TO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE WRIT OF CERTIORAI TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE.

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT VIA ITS LETTER SENT TO THE PETITIONER(S) DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2022 INFORMED THE PETITIONER(S) THAT THERE WERE SEVERAL DEFICIENCIES THAT HAD TO BE CORRECTED BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO WOULD BE PERMITTED TO HEAR AND REVIEW A MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-1330. THEY ARE: (1) THAT THE PETITIONER(S) DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY FIRST SOUGHT THE SAME RELIEF FROM THE LOWER COURT(S), AND (2) THAT THE PETITIONERS MUST SET FORTH WHY THE RELIEF IS NOT AVAILABLE FROM ANY OTHER COURT AND WHY A STAY IS JUSTIFIED. THE REASON WHY SUCH IS NOT AVAILABLE IS THAT DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CLAIMS BEING MADE THERE IS CLEAR

OBSTRUCTION AT ALL LEVELS AS IS DEMONSTRATED BY THE PLEADING. THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT FILED SEEKING THE STAY ON CASE 21-6275 BUT IS FILED TO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT PETITIONS SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASES 20-7073 OUT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND 2020-001615; 2020-00974 OUT OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT THAT IS TO BE FURTHER ELABORATED ON WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT TO INCLUDE THE FACT THAT (A) THERE IS A "REASONABLE PROBABILITY" THAT [4] JUSTICES WILL GRANT CERTIORARI, OR AGREE TO REVIEW THE MERITS OF THE CASE, (B) THERE IS A "FAIR PROSPECT" THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE COURT WILL CONCLUDE UPON REVIEW THAT THE DECISIONS BELOW BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL WERE ERRONEOUS, (C) THAT IRREPARABLE HARM WILL RESULT FROM DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO FILE THE PETITIONS OUT OF TIME DUE TO WHAT OCCURRED BEING OUTSIDE OF THE PETITIONER'S CONTROL BY THE FRAUD WHERE THE DEFENDANTS COMPROMISED AGENTS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, (D) FINALLY, IN CLOSE CASE THE CIRCUIT JUSTICES MAY FIND IT APPROPRIATE TO BALANCE THE EQUITIES BECAUSE OF THE OBSTRUCTION, BY EXPLORING THE RELATIVE HARM TO THE APPLICANT(S) AS WELL AS THE INTEREST OF THE RELIGIOUS PUBLIC AT LARGE PROTECTED BY THE 1st. AMENDMENT, THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE.

THE PETITIONER(S) BRING THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ATTENTION TO EXHIBIT(S) 1 THROUGH 8 ATTACHED TO THIS DOCUMENT. IT IS CLEAR FROM THE EXHIBITS NOW REFERRED TO, THAT THESE CASES INVOLVE SOUGHT MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION AND § 1407 TRANSFER, WHICH IS ALSO PENDING BEFORE THE MULTI-DISTRICT PANEL AND FILED SEEKING JURY TRIAL AND TRANSFER UNDER CASE 9:21-cv-2526-TLW-MHC IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT; AND THERE IS INDEED A FINAL ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 20-7073 OUT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS SOUGHT DISQUALIFIED AND ALL PROCEEDINGS WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT STATE AND FEDERAL BE MOVED AND TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT AND 3rd. CIRCUIT BY THE EXHIBITS PRESENTED. IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PETITIONER(S) DUE TO THE OBSTRUCTION, IT WOULD NOT BE

INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE PETITIONER(S) TO MOTION TO AMEND THE SOUGHT APPLICATION BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT NOT TO JUST SEEK THE STAY FOR CASE 21-6275 FROM 4TH. CIRCUIT AS WAS ARGUED IN THE PREVIOUS MOTION. BUT ALSO BY THIS MOTION TO SEEK TO FILE PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORAI OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMITS FOR CASES 20-7073(FEDERAL) AND 2020-001615, 2020-00974(STATE CASES) DUE TO WHAT IS ARGUED IN THIS DOCUMENT WHERE THESE CASES ARE DIRECTLY RELATED AND ARE ESSENTIALLY SISTER CASES PURSUANT TO SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BE DEEMED DISQUALIFIED BASED UPON WHAT IS ARGUED IN THE EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO THIS APPLICATION ACCEPTING AND ADDING THE NAME OF RON SANTA McCRAY AS A PARTY AS EQUITIES WOULD REQUIRE. APPLICATION TO TRANSFER BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF TRIAL UNDER RULE 22 IS NOT TOO LATE, SCHOENTHAL v. IRVING TRUST CO., 287 U.S. 92, 53 S.Ct. 50, 77 L.Ed. 185(U.S.1932); IN RE: SLOECKER, 117 B.R. 342 (E.D.ILL.1990).

THE PETITIONER(S) WITH LEAVE OF THE COURT SEEK TO AMEND THIS APPLICATION IN TWO PARTS (1) TO SEEK THAT THE REVIEW PURSUANT TO OBTAINING THE STAY BE DONE FOR CASE 21-6275 IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AS OPPOSED TO CASE 21-1330 IN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT SINCE THERE IS A FINAL ORDER RULING ON AND DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-6275 WHICH WAS THE PRIOR DOCUMENT'S AIM; AND (2) THE PETITIONER(S) ALSO SEEK TO AMEND THE APPLICATION TO ALSO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORAI FOR CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT DUE TO POTENTIAL EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CONSPIRACY VIOLATING 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3), AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE INVOLVING THE DEFENDANTS WHO ARE PARTY TO THESE CASES WHO HAVE POWERFUL CONNECTIONS REACHING UP INTO BOTH THE U.S. SENATE AND CONGRESS WHO ENGAGED IN POTENTIAL CRIMINAL EFFORTS TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW AND KEEP THESE CASES FROM THE HONORABLE JUSTICES SCRUTINY AND PRIVY TO PUSH THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE

TIME FOR NORMAL FILING IN CLEAR ACTS OF FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION, AND VIOLATIONS OF THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE STATE AND OR FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS, ALSO IN VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE EXTREMELY PREJUDICING THE PETITIONER(S), WARRANTING SANCTIONS AT MINIMUM AND POTENTIALLY SOME SORT OF INTERNAL AND OR EXTERNAL INVESTIGATION WHICH IS INDEED SOUGHT BY THE ADDITIONAL MOTION SENT WITH THIS DOCUMENT TO ACCOMPLISH THE SECOND PORTION OF THE AMENDMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT APPLICATION; WHICH IS SEEKING TO FILE THE PETITIONS SEEKING LEAVE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR BOTH CASE 20-7073 AND THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT TO CORRECT THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE AND ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.

THIS IS WHAT OCCURRED JUSTICE ALITO SIR. DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CLAIMS BEING MADE RELATED TO THESE CASES, THE PETITIONER(S) SENT THE PETITIONS SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, THESE TWO DISTINCT AND SEPARATE FILINGS, INTO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN TWO SEPARATE, INDEPENDENT, ENVELOPES AT MINIMUM A WEEK APART FROM EACH OTHER. DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY UNPRECEDENTED CLAIMS BEING ARGUED IN THESE CASES, DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE OTHER [192] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGING FROM CASES 2006-CP-400-3567, 35678, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084, SEE EXHIBITS 3 THROUGH 7. THE STATE AND FEDERAL DEFENDANTS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY, ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, TOOK STEPS TO COMPROMISE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF, BY COMPROMISING CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THIS COURT TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW TO PREVENT THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FROM EVER HEARING THESE CASES THUS PRESENTED. THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS WITH POTENTIALLY THE AID OF MS. EMILY WALKER. ONCE THEY VIEWED THE MAGNITUDE OF THE LITIGATION PRESENTED. THE CONSPIRING ACTORS DESTROYED, SPOLIATED THE LEAD PETITION FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, AND AT LEAST [5]

EXHIBITS THAT WERE PRESENTED AS EVIDENCE OUT OF THE [27] EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF THE CLAIMS MADE WHICH DEMONSTRATE THEIR EFFORTS WERE SPECIFICALLY TARGETED TO DESTROY EVIDENCE OF THEIR GUILT AND DEFAULT AT THE STATE LEVEL. THEY ALSO DESTROYED THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS FOR BOTH CRAWFORD AND MCCRAY WHEN INITIALLY SENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THE CONSPIRING ACTORS IN COMPROMISING THIS COURT THEN TOOK THE LEAD STATE PETITION AND DESTROYED IT, SPOLIATED IT, SENT WITH THE FILING FOR THE STATE COURT, THEN THEY TOOK THE PETITION IN CASE 20-7073 FILED FOR THE FEDERAL PETITION, AND PLACED THE FEDERAL PETITION FOR CASE 20-7073 IN PLACE OF THE STATE PETITION SENT FOR THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CASES, FRAUDULENTLY CLAIMING THAT THE MISTAKE WAS THE PETITIONER(S), THAT WE SENT THE STATE AND FEDERAL PLEADING INTO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TOGETHER IN ONE ENVELOPE AS THEY CLAIMED THEY HAVE RECEIVED IT, WHICH OF COURSE IS FAR FROM THE TRUTH. THE LEAD STATE PETITION BEING DESTROYED WAS ONE THING THOUGH THAT WAS SERIOUSLY SUSPECT. BUT WHEN THEY ALSO DESTROYED [5] KEY EXHIBITS OF EVIDENCE OF THEIR GUILT. IT BECOMES PERSPICUOUS THAT THIS CRIMINAL ACT WAS INTENTIONALLY DESIGNED TO PRODUCE THE VERY RESULTS THAT HAVE PRESENTLY OCCURRED IN THESE CASES FOR WHICH WE OBJECT. THIS EGREGIOUS ACT OF SPOLIATION, DESTRUCTION OF LEGAL PLEADING AND FILINGS AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE ON THE PART OF THE CONSPIRING PARTIES COMPROMISING EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF, CAUSED A CASCADE OF SUBSEQUENT EVENTS THAT PUSHED THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE TIME ALLOTTED TO FILE THE VARIOUS PETITIONS, INCLUDING THE ACT OF MISREPRESENTATION AND FRAUD ON THE PART OF MS. WALKER CLAIMING SHE COULD NOT SEE WHERE MCCRAY IS A PARTY WHICH IS ELABORATED ON WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS, CLAIMING THERE WAS NO SUCH THING AS A MOTION TO EXPEDITE A CASE BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, AND THAT THE PETITIONER(S) COULD NOT FILE AN APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22, SPOLIATING, DESTROYING SUBSEQUENT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS AND OTHER ACTS OF MACHINATION THAT PUSHED THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE PRESCRIBED TIMELINES TO PREVENT THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT FROM EVER

GIVING REVIEW ON THESE MATTERS IN ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO THWART THE EXERCISE OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT JURISDICTION IN VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE, THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, AND ROSS v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850(U.S.2016) VIA MACHINATION. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION TO FILE CASES 20-7073 (FEDERAL) AND 2020-001615, 2020-000974 (STATE CASES) OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT DUE TO THE DEFENDANT'S ATTEMPTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND DESTRUCTION OF U.S. SUPREME COURT DOCUMENTS VIA SANCTIONS. THUS, IT IS NOT INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE PETITIONER(S) TO SEEK THE AMENDING OF THE APPLICATION UNDER RULE 22 TO HAVE THESE MATTERS ADDRESSED, SUSINKA v. U.S., 19 F.Sdpp.3d. 829 (N.D.ILL.2014); MADDEN v. TEXAS, 498 U.S. 1301, 111 S.Ct. 902, 112 L.Ed.2d. 1026 (U.S.1991); PERRY v. TEXAS, 515 U.S. 1304, 116 Sct. 2, 132 L.Ed.2d. 887(U.S.1995); WILKINS v. U.S., 441 U.S. 468, 99 S.Ct. 1829, 60 L.Ed.2d. 365(U.S.1979).

THE QUESTION NOW BECOMES WHAT EXACTLY IS IN THESE CASES THAT WOULD ESTABLISH MOTIVE AS TO WHY THESE POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WOULD GO OUT THEIR WAY TO COMPROMISE EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF TO THWART THE HONORABLE JUSTICES REVIEW GIVING CREDENCE AND VERITY TO THESE CLAIMS THUS PRESENTED? THE ANSWER TO THAT IS AS FOLLOWS:

(1) FOR THE RECORD. THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD WAS NOT THE ONE WHO INITIALLY BROUGHT THESE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS BEFORE THE COURT. THE STATE PROSECUTOR DID FORCING THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD TO RESPOND, REBUT AND ANSWER THE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS WHILE ON THE STAND DURING TRIAL AS DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRED WHERE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ESSENTIALLY CONVICTED THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD FOR THESE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS THAT HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO WITH THE CRIME OF MURDER FOR WHICH HE PRESENTLY STANDS CONVICTED OF TO TAINT THE MINDS OF THE JURY DURING THE TIME OF 9/11 BECAUSE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD WAS TOLD THE PROSECUTION BY HIS FAMILY MEMBERS THAT HE WAS CHRISTIAN, MUSLIM AND JEW COMBINED AND A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND OF ROYAL

BLOODLINE VIOLATING U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719(U.S.2018) AND HOBBS v. HOLT, 574 U.S. 352, 135 S.Ct. 853, 190 L.Ed.2d. 747(U.S.2015).

(2) YOU HAVE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA CONCEALING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE WHEN SPECIFICALLY ASKED FOR THIS EVIDENCE ON THE COURT RECORD BEFORE TRIAL, INVOLVING HENRY McMaster WHO WAS ATTORNEY GENERAL AT THE TIME WHO IS NOW PRESENTLY GOVERNOR OF THIS STATE AND FUTURE POTENTIAL PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, SUPPRESSING DNA EVIDENCE THAT IF TESTED WOULD PROVE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA SIMILAR TO THE JIM CROW ERA, PRODUCED A FICTITIOUS HOMICIDE WHERE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD'S CHILD DIED OF NATURAL CAUSES DUE TO THE SEXUAL ASSAULT OF HER HALF BROTHER, SUPPRESSING THE TRUE CAUSE OF DEATH IN THE AUTOPSY BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED DUE TO CRAWFORD'S FAMILY CLAIM TO THE STATE PROSECUTOR THAT HE WAS A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, WHICH IS WHY THEY PREVENTED THIS DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE FROM BEING TESTED FOR OVER [20] YEARS VIOLATING U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002(U.S.2016).

(3) YOU HAVE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA PRODUCING A FRAUDULENT INDICTMENT GIVING THE FALSE IMPRESSION THAT IT ACTUALLY WENT BEFORE A GRAND JURY WHEN IN TRUTH, IT DID NOT, BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED PURSUANT TO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, AS WAS DONE TO MANY OF THE OTHER INMATES INVOLVED IN THESE CASES, ORLANDO PARKER, ROMEO BROWN, YUSIF AQUIL, BENJAMIN ERIC CASE, CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON, SEQUOIA McKINNON, ARTHUR McQUILLA, RICHARD BEEKMAN AND NUMEROUS OTHERS WHERE THESE INMATES SOUGHT TO AID THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD TO OBTAIN THAT EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE WHICH CAUSED THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TO ATTACK THEIR PCR'S AND DUE PROCESS MATTERS IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF RETALIATION TO CONCEAL THE PRODUCING OF THESE FRAUD INDICTMENTS WHERE CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS COVER THESE INMATES INVOLVED PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH

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v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718 (U.S.2016) BY THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. IF THIS CASE IS HEARD BY THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT, HENRY McMASTER A KEY FIGURE IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY A POTENTIAL FUTURE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE'S CAREER WOULD BE POTENTIALLY RUINED BEHIND THE SCANDAL FURTHER ESTABLISHING MOTIVE FOR COMPROMISING THE EMPLOYEES OF THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THERE MAY POTENTIALLY BE PRISON TIME INVOLVED DEALING WITH THESE STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS WHO ACTED WITHOUT JURISDICTION VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS REQUIRING SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO 5 U.S.C. §§ 3331, 3333 AND 7311.

(4) YOU HAVE THE CONSPIRING PARTIES BLOCKING THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD FROM THE PCR COURT TO PREVENT THE TRUTH OF THESE CLAIMS FROM BEING REVEALED FOR OVER [16+] YEARS WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER BEING FILED EXPLAINING WHY, VIOLATING U.S. SUPREME

COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609 (U.S. 2016). THIS LED TO THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD BEING FORCED TO FILE FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT IN RICHLAND COUNTY S.C. TO CIRCUMVENT THE BLOCK AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE PRODUCING CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294 WHERE DUE TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BRINGING THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN THAT TRIAL COURTROOM TO ESTABLISH LAW AND THOSE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIME FOR WHICH HE PRESENTLY STANDS CONVICTED. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS NOW FORCED TO ARGUE THE CLAIMS PROPERLY SERVING THE [193] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, THE U.S. STATE DEPT., THE U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE AND FEDERAL ATTORNEY GENERAL WHO APPEARED WITHIN THOSE STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS WHERE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CONCEALED THEIR APPEARANCE HIDING IN THE BACK OF THE COURTROOM AND NEVER CHALLENGED ANY OF THE CLAIMS MADE HAVING FULL OPPORTUNITY TO REBUT THEM WHICH FAILURE BINDS ALL STATES BY THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE. THEY COULD HAVE CLAIMED THAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS NUTS, THAT THE ELEVATOR DIDN'T QUITE GO UP TO THE TOP FLOOR, SOMETHING, ANYTHING.

INSTEAD OF PLEADING. THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CHOSE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND RAN RIGHT DEAD SMACK INTO THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON BY THE PETITIONER(S) AND OR INMATES MENTIONED IN THEIR TOTALITY IN THE LOWER COURTS INVOLVE, A PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE BEING JURISDICTION IN NATURE WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED SUBJECTING THE DEFENDANTS, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO DEFAULT, JUDGMENT AND FORFEITURE ON ALL CLAIMS MADE TO INCLUDE THE VOIDING OF THE LOWER COURT(S) JURISDICTION FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION SO THEY HELD THE CASE IN LIMBO SINCE 2006 VIOLATING BETTERMAN v. MONTANA. THIS DEFAULT IS COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT AT THE LAST SCHEDULED HEARING IN THE RICHLAND COUNTY S.C. COURT OF COMMON PLEAS NOVEMBER 2020, THE PARTIES FAILED TO APPEAR TO PLEAD OR CHALLENGE AS THEY WERE ORDERED TO DO BY THE COURT FURTHER ESTABLISHING THE DEFAULT AND FORFEITURE SUPPORTED

BY U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843 (U.S.2019). THIS PRODUCED SEVERAL JURISDICTIONAL RESULTS:

(5) THE DEFAULT NOW LEGALLY MADE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD, ALSO DUE TO THE OTHER [193] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS BEING PARTY TO THE DEFAULT, **THE FIDUCIARY HEIR OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN** ESTABLISHED BY RELIGIOUS PROPHESY OF CHRISTIANITY, JUDAISM AND ISLAM, A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION WITH LEGAL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES, IMMUNITIES AND STANDING NOW PROTECTED BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW, THE LAW OF TRUSTS, THE LAW OF CONTRACTS AND THE F.S.I.A. OF 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH WRITTEN WITHIN THE [3] HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH), LEGAL BINDING "CONTRACTS", "COVENANTS", ESTABLISHED BY GOD, HIS HOLY PROPHETS, HIS APPOINTED KINGS, KHALIFAHS AND HIGH PRIEST, MEMBERS OF THE SOLE CORPORATION WHERE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD DENOUNCED HIS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP ON BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL COURT RECORD ADOPTING THE ISRAELI CITIZENSHIP OF HIS FOREFATHER(S) KINGS DAVID AND SOLOMON ALSO INVOKING THE ISRAELI LAW OF RETURN TO ASSERT THE NOW LEGAL RIGHT TO SIT UPON THE THRONE OF ISRAEL AS IS WRITTEN IN THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" IN THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH 6:12-13; JEREMIAH 23:5; 33:15-21 AUTHORIZED KING JAMES BIBLE.

(6) IT ESTABLISHED LEGAL ISSUES RELATED TO CONVICTION THAT ARE JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED BY THE PETITIONER(S) THAT THEY FAILED TO ADDRESS IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, THAT ARE NOT JUST FILED IN THE PETITIONER(S) PCR CONVICTION AND FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT CASE, BUT ALSO WITHIN NUMEROUS OTHER INMATES CASES AT THE STATE LEVEL, INCLUDING THOSE OTHER INMATES LISTED, THAT ESTABLISH RIGHTS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ALLOWING THEIR TRANSFER AS TAG ALONG CASES, ALSO ARGUED IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY UNDER

CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH IN THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT ESTABLISHING MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION, FOR WHICH THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA IS BEING SOUGHT DISQUALIFIED AND FOR WHICH THEY DEFAULTED ON BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407, 1602-1612 TRANSFER REGARDING THESE TAG ALONG CASES. THESE FACTS, ALONG WITH CHALLENGES TO THE 1996 CLINTON BILL DUE TO IT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THEIR DETRIMENT, WOULD AUTOMATICALLY FORCE THE NATION TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF NATIONAL PRISON REFORM WHICH WOULD FULFILL JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN PROPHESY WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH 61:1-3 WHICH STATE AS A SIGN FROM GOD THAT THIS MAN IS WHO HE CLAIMS TO BE. HE WOULD CAUSE THE PRISON DOORS TO OPEN AND PROCLAIM A DAY OF LIBERTY FOR THE CAPTIVES.

(7) BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASES PREVIOUSLY REFERRED TO, THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND [193] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS HAVE DEFAULTED ON, THE PAYING OF REPARATIONS FOR THE ATROCITIES COMMITTED PURSUANT TO THE TRANS-ATLANTIC AND EUROPEAN SLAVE TRADES VIA THE CAPTIVITY OF AFRICAN SLAVES IS ALSO NOW LEGALLY ESTABLISHED INCLUDING THE MAINTAINING OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM AS IT WAS ESTABLISHED DURING THE TIME OF MARTIN LUTHER KING JR., FULFILLING MARK 9:12 AND ISLAMIC PROPHESY STATING THAT THIS MAN WOULD RESTORE ALL THINGS AND FILL THE EARTH WITH JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS THE SAME WAY IT WAS FILLED WITH TYRANNY AND OPPRESSION, WHICH IS WHY THE CONSPIRING FEDERAL ACTORS BLOCKED HIM FROM THE BOSTON DISTRICT COURT FAILING TO RULE ON THE TIMELY MOTION TO INTERVENE IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT.

(8) BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASE(S) REFERRED TO, THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT HAS DEFAULTED ON THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY BEING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN, WHICH WAS GIVEN TO

THE GLOBAL NATIONS AS A **"GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS** BEING THAT IT CAN ONLY BE GIVEN TO HETEROSEXUAL COUPLES DUE TO THE **"GRANT'S EXPLICIT TERMS AND CONDITIONS** THAT THE ONE IN THE PUBLIC ARENA AND OR SOCIETY THAT PARTAKES IN AND OR MAKES USE OF THIS **"GRANT"** ESTABLISHED SINCE THE TIME OF ADAM, REAFFIRMED THROUGH THE PROPHET ABRAHAM, WHERE GOD PROMISED TO MAKE ABRAHAM THE **"FATHER OF MANY NATIONS"**, THUS, THE CHRISTIAN, JEWISH AND MUSLIM WORLD; THE ABILITY TO PROCREATE BY NATURAL CONCEPTION BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES PARTAKING IN AND OR MAKING USE OF THE **"GRANT"** WAS REQUISITE, UNLESS THERE WAS SOME MEDICAL IMPEDIMENT BETWEEN THE HETEROSEXUAL COUPLE THAT WAS BEYOND THEIR CONTROL, WHERE GOD EXPLICITLY SAID, **"MAN AND WOMAN CREATED HE THEM"**, NOT MAN AND MAN, OR WOMAN AND WOMAN, AND THAT SUCH INTIMATE SAME SEX RELATIONSHIPS ARE AN ABOMINATION, HIGHLIGHTING THIS ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENT AND TERMS OF THE **"GRANT"**. BY THE GLOBAL NATIONS EXECUTING AND OR ARRESTING AND OR ATTACHING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION IN VIOLATION OF THE TERMS OF THE **"GRANT"** GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS. AS FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN AND MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION VIA THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD'S ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED ESTABLISHED BY **"CONTRACT"**, **"COVENANT"**. THIS GIVES THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD AND EVERY CHRISTIAN, MUSLIM AND JEWISH PERSON STANDING TO CHALLENGE THIS INJUSTICE AS FIDUCIARY HEIR AND BENEFICIARIES OF THE TRUST GIVEN TO US BY THE ONE TRUE GOD PRODUCING CLEAR OBLIGATION TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE THE TERMS OF THE **"GRANT"** GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATION FOR THE SAKE OF **"JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS"**.

ALL THE FOREMENTIONED GIVES CREDENCE, OBJECTIVE VERITY, AND SERVE TO SUBSTANTIATE THE PETITIONER(S) CLAIMS AND ESTABLISH MOTIVE AS TO WHY POWERFUL FEDERAL ACTORS OF OUR GOVERNMENT WOULD GO OUT THERE WAY NOT JUST TO SPOLIATE, DESTROY, CORRUPT NOT JUST EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, BUT ALSO THE INITIAL PLEADING AND FILINGS THAT PRODUCED MANIFEST INJUSTICE AND EXTREME PREJUDICE TO THE PETITIONER(S) CREATING THE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

THAT PUSHED THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE PRESCRIBED DEADLINES FOR FILING THE PETITION(S) SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASES 70-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASE(S) 2020-001615, 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT IN THEIR ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND VIOLATIONS OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE WARRANTING THE STAYING OF CASE 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO ALLOW THE PETITIONER(S) TO PLACE FORTH THE EVIDENCE AND LEGAL DOCUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF ALL CLAIMS MADE AND TO SEEK THE DISQUALIFICATION OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ALTOGETHER AND 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE TRANSFER.

THE PETITIONER(S) GIVE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO AND U.S. SUPREME COURT JUDICIAL NOTICE, THAT THE PETITIONER(S) SEEK LEAVE TO FILE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT REGARDING CASE 70-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND FOR CASES 2020-001615, 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT OR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DUE TO THE DEFENDANTS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO THWART THE JUSTICES REVIEW AND TO CAUSE DELAY PUSHING THE SOUGHT FILED PETITION(S) IN FRAUD PAST THE PRESCRIBED TIME LINES GIVEN BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO FILE THOSE PETITIONS WHICH ARE DIRECTLY RELATED TO CASES 21-6275 AND 21-1330. THIS SUBSEQUENT MOTION IS SUBMITTED WITH THE PRIOR MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-6275 IN A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT DOCUMENT EVIDENT BY THAT DOCUMENT'S CAPTION. THE PETITIONER(S) WILL NEED THIS SUBSEQUENT ATTACHED MOTION GRANTED ALSO BECAUSE DUE TO THE ATTACK UPON THESE CASES BY RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED WHERE THE STATE ACTORS SIMILARLY IN THE CASE OF BERGEFELL v. HODGES, 576 U.S. 644, 135 S.Ct. 2584(U.S.2015) WHERE THAT CLERK BECAME ATTACKED FOR HER RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE AND BELIEF RELATED TO SAME SEX MARRIAGE, A SIMILAR AND ALMOST IDENTICAL IMPETUS EXIST IN THESE CASES BASED UPON THE POSITION TAKEN AGAINST SAME SEX MARRIAGE WHERE THEY RETALIATED AGAINST US AND SOUGHT TO MAINTAIN THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTIONS RELATED TO SUCH RELIGIOUS POSITION AND BELIEFS AMONG

OTHER THINGS, GIVING MOTIVE AS TO WHY THESE OFFICIALS SOUGHT TO COMPROMISE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ITSELF AS A SLAP IN THE FACE OF BOTH THE PETITIONER(S) AND HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. A PURELY ECCLESIASTICAL MATTER IS TO BE DETERMINED BY CHURCH TRIBUNAL ALONE, WHEREAS MATTERS OF PROPERTY RIGHTS (e.g. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REGARDING SAME SEX MARRIAGE), ARE TO BE DETERMINED BY THE CIVIL COURTS ALONE, HATCHER v. SOUTH CAROLINA COUNCIL OF ASSEMBLIES OF GOD INC., 267 S.C. 107, 226 S.E.2d. 253(S.C.1976).

WHEN THE WORLD WITHDREW FROM DIRECT CONTROL OF CHURCH ESTABLISHING SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, TITLE TO THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AND GLOBAL BELIEVERS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND THE PARAMETERS ON WHICH IT IS TO BE PARTAKEN AND OR USED REMAINS WITH THE SOLE CORPORATION AND DOES NOT GO TO GENERAL PUBLIC ABSENT THE TERMS ESTABLISHED BY THE "GRANT". SEE EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE" PAGES 12 THROUGH 30. ALSO SEE FIRE BAPTIZED HOLINESS CHURCH OF GOD OF AMERICA v. GREATER FULLER TABERNACLE FIRE BAPTIZED HOLINESS CHURCH, 323 S.C. 418, 475 S.E.2d. 767(S.C.App.1996); IN RE: ALL SAINTS EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 2021 WL 6140256 (N.D.Tex.2021).

INSOMUCH, THIS MOTION TO FILE CASE(S) 20-7073 (FEDERAL) AND CASE(S) 2020-001615, 2020-00974 (STATE CASES) OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT SHOULD BE GRANTED FOR THE SAME REASONS THE MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS JUSTIFIED, THAT BEING, (A) THERE IS A "REASONABLE PROBABILITY" THE [4] JUSTICES WILL GRANT CERTIORARI, OR AGREE TO REVIEW THE MERITS OF THE CASE, (B) THERE IS A "FAIR PROSPECT" THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE COURT UPON REVIEW WILL CONCLUDE THAT THE OBSTRUCTION AND DECISIONS BELOW BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL WERE ERRONEOUS, (C) THAT IRREPARABLE HARM WILL RESULT FROM DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO FILE THE PETITION(S) OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT, (D) FINALLY, IN CLOSE CASE THE CIRCUIT JUSTICES MAY FIND IT APPROPRIATE TO BALANCE THE EQUITIES BECAUSE OF THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION AND THE INSULT WAS NOT JUST AGAINST THE

PETITIONER(S), BUT WAS ALSO AIMED AT THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF, IN CONSPIRING TO IMPEDED THE NORMAL FUNCTIONS OF THE COURT, DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE AND USURP THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. HAD THE PETITIONER(S) NOT FILED APPEAL SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT. THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION, SPOLIATION, AND DESTRUCTION OF LEGAL PLEADING TO THWART THE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICES FROM EVER HEARING THESE CASES BY MS. WALKER AND THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS MAY HAVE NEVER BEEN DISCOVERED AND GONE UNCHALLENGED UNTIL IT WAS TOO LATE, CAUSING IRREPARABLE DAMAGE. THE PETITIONERS STILL SEEK TO HAVE MS. WALKER REMOVED FROM HANDLING THESE CASES AND MS. WOODS BE PLACED OVER THE CASES IN QUESTION IF THIS IS AT ALL POSSIBLE. IF WHAT MS. WALKER SAID WAS TRUE, GIVING CLEAR INDICATION BY HER STATEMENTS THAT THE PETITIONER(S) HAD NO REMEDY UNDER RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES, AND WE HAD NOT SOUGHT APPEAL REGARDING CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT WHERE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO AND MS. LAURIE WOODS NOW BEGAN INITIAL REVIEW. THEN WHAT THE HECK ARE THE PETITIONER(S) DOING HAVING CASE NUMBERS ASSIGNED BEFORE THIS COURT PRODUCING CASE NUMBERS 21A383 AND 21A425? APPARENTLY THERE IS REMEDY UNDER RULE 22 WHICH MS. WALKER INITIALLY LIED AND MISINFORMED THE PETITIONER(S) ABOUT. NEVERTHELESS, STILL THE MATTER ADDRESSING THE CORRUPTING AND DESTRUCTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT CASE HAS NOT BEEN REMEDIED, ACKNOWLEDGED NOR A CASE NUMBER ASSIGNED FOR THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT PETITION(S) REQUIRING THAT THE PETITIONER(S) FOLLOW UP WITH THIS DOCUMENT AND PLEADING. EMILY WALKER IS NOW ATTACHED TO CASE 21A425. WHY DID SHE INITIALLY LIE TO THE PETITIONER(S) GIVING INDICATION THAT WE COULD NOT SEEK APPLICATION UNDER RULE 22 WHICH GOES TO SUPPORTING THE PETITIONER(S) CLAIMS THAT THE DEFENDANTS INVOLVED IN THIS CASE HAS SOUGHT TO COMPROMISE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ITSELF VIA ITS EMPLOYEES. WHY WAS THE INITIAL FILING AND PLEADING CORRUPTED, SPOLIATED, DESTROYED CAUSING THE MANIFEST INJUSTICE CRIMINALLY

PUSHING THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE TIME TO NORMALLY FILE? CIVIL COURTS DO HAVE JURISDICTION AS TO CIVIL, CONTRACT, TRUSTS, AND PROPERTY RIGHTS WHICH ARE INVOLVED IN A CHURCH CONTROVERSY, EVEN THOUGH THEY HAVE NO JURISDICTION OF ECCLESIASTICAL QUESTIONS AND CONTROVERSIES, JENKINS v. REFUGE TEMPLE CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST, INC., 424 S.C. 320, 818 S.E.2d. 13 (S.C.App.2018).

DISPOSITION OF ECCLESIASTICAL, REAL, PERSONAL, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY FOLLOWING THE WORLD'S DISASSOCIATION FROM THE CHURCH ESTABLISHING CHURCH AND STATE POLICIES, IS A QUESTION OF CHURCH GOVERNANCE THAT WAS NOT PERMITTED TO BE RESOLVED BY THE COURTS REGARDING THE "GRANT" RELATED TO MARRIAGE ALLOWING THE SUPREME COURT TO GRANT THIS RIGHT TO SAME SEX COUPLES REQUIRING THAT THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ACTIONS BE REVISITED, PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DIOCESE OF SOUTH CAROLINA v. EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 421 S.C. 211, 806 S.E.2d. 82(S.C.2018); SERBIAN EASTERN ORTHODOX DIOCESE OF U.S. OF AMERICA AND CANADA v. MILIVOJEVICH, 426 U.S. 696, 96 S.Ct. 2372(U.S.1976).

THE ISSUE HERE IS WHETHER THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN QUESTION, DEVOTED BY THE EXPRESSED TERMS OF THE "GIFT", "GRANT", OR SALE BY WHICH IT WAS ACQUIRED, TO THE SUPPORT OF ANY SPECIFIC RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE OR BELIEF, OR WAS IT ACQUIRED FOR THE GENERAL USE OF THE SOCIETY FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES, WITH NO OTHER LIMITATIONS. IN THIS CASE, THE LIMITATION WAS THAT IT BE GIVEN OR PARTAKEN BY HETEROSEXUAL COUPLES ONLY DUE TO ONE OF ITS MANDATES BEING PROCREATION BY NATURAL CONCEPTION AS DETERMINED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD AND THE SOLE CORPORATION, WATSON v. JONES, 80 U.S. 679, 1871 WL 14848, 20 L.Ed. 666, 13 WALL 679, U.S. 1871; PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S. v. MARY ELIZABETH BLUE HULL MEMORIAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, 393 U.S. 440, 89 S.Ct. 601, 21 L.Ed.2d. 658(U.S.1969); IN RE: ZION WESTERN EPISCOPAL DISTRICT, 629 B.R. 69 (E.D.Cal.2021); BRUNDAGE v. DEARDORF, 92 F. 214 (6th.Cir.1899); IN RE: ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF PORTLAND OREGON, 335 B.R. 842 (D.OREGON.2005).

BY HISTORY AND TRADITION, BUT NOT BY "GRANT", "COVENANT", THE DEFINITION AND REGULATION OF MARRIAGE HAS BEEN TREATED AS BEING WITHIN THE AUTHORITY AND REALM OF THE SEPARATE STATES. STATE POWER AND AUTHORITY OVER MARRIAGE CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO DIVEST AN ESTATE OF ITS INHERITANCE AND PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTED UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW AND THE 1st. AMENDMENT ESTABLISHMENT AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE, AS WELL AS ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONST.. THEREBY IT CANNOT BE MEASURED IN ABSENCE OF DETERMINATION OF THE CONDITIONS OF THE "GRANT" PLACED AND ESTABLISHED WITH CLEAR RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS AS DEFINED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION. THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN STATE MUST BE PROTECTED FROM ENCROACHMENT IN A MANNER THAT VIOLATES THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" GIVING THE PETITIONER(S) STANDING TO ADDRESS THE MATTERS AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, 28 U.S.C. § 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.; ALLEN v. COOPER, 140 S.Ct. 994, 2020 WL 1325815 (U.S.2020); GEORGIA v. PUBLIC RESOURCE ORG., INC., 140 S.Ct. 1498, 206 L.Ed.2d. 732(U.S.2020); ZIVOTOFSKY EX REL ZIVOTOFSKY v. KERRY, 576 U.S. 1, 135 S.Ct. 2076, 192 L.Ed.2d. 83 (U.S.2015). IN THIS CASE RELIGIOUS PROTECTIONS OF THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE AND ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE ATTACH AS WELL WHERE BY GIVING THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY TO GAYS AND LESBIANS YOU HAVE ESTABLISHED A RELIGIOUS RIGHT VIOLATING THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE, SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES, 83 U.S. 36, 1872 WL 15386, 21 L.Ed. 394, 16 WALL 36; MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP, LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719(U.S.2018); FULTON v. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, 141 S.Ct. 1868, 210 L.Ed.2d. 137(U.S.2021). RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL OBJECTIONS TO GAY MARRIAGE ARE PROTECTED VIEWS AND IN SOME INSTANCES PROTECTED FORMS OF EXPRESSION UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT, WHERE SUCH RIGHTS ATTACH TO THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN, EVEN ESTABLISHING VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE AND FALLS WITHIN THE COMMERCIAL EXCEPTION OF THE F.S.I.A. WHERE PEOPLE MAKE MONEY FROM THIS EVIL ENTERPRISE THAT STANDS IN BLATANT DEFIANCE TO THE TERMS OF THE

"GRANT" GIVEN TO YOUR GLOBAL NATIONS VIA ABRAHAM. SEE EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE" ATTACHED PAGES 12 THROUGH 30, NEW HOPE FAMILY SERVICE INC. v. POOLE, 966 F3d. 145, 161+ 2nd.Cir.(N.Y.); TELESCOPE MEDIA GROUP v. LUCERO, 936 F3d. 740, 751+ 8th.Cir.(MINN.); CHELSEY NELSON PHOTOGRAPHY LLC. v. LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT, 479 F.Supp.3d. 543 (W.D.Ky.2020). CHALLENGE TO WINDSOR IS ESTABLISHED, UNITED STATES v. WINDSOR, 570 U.S. 744, 133 S.Ct. 2675(U.S.2013).

THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES THAT NO MAN SHALL BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE LIBERTY OR PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW. UNLESS THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY TIMELY FILED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION, BEING JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, REQUIRING THAT THEY RESPOND BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT CAN RULE ON THIS ISSUE? THE RIGHT TO MARRY IS NOW LEGALLY A "GRANT" GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION WITH RESTRICTIONS. SINCE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD WAS NOT PARTY TO THE WINDSOR RULING IT DOES NOT BIND AT THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN, AND THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS IN VIOLATION OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AND 28 U.S.C. § 2679. WE SEEK THAT THE COURT ORDER THAT THE PETITIONER(S) BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. WE ARE NO THREAT FOR THE SAKE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". THE SOLE CORPORATION HAS BEEN UNJUSTLY DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRING THAT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT REVISIT BOTH THE WINDSOR AND OBERGEFELL RULING TO DETERMINE THE JURISDICTIONAL FACT(S) THAT IF THE RIGHT TO MARRY IS THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION BEING GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS, SOCIETY, AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS. WOULD THIS MATERIAL UNDETERMINED FACT REQUIRED THAT THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RULING IN THESE CASES BE ALTERED AND OR AMENDED SINCE THE DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS REGARDING THE SOLE CORPORATION, ALSO WOULD BE A VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE AS THE COURT DETERMINED SUCH EQUAL

PROTECTION VIOLATION EXISTED IN THE CASE REGARDS TO GAYS AND LESBIANS WHERE HERE, IT EVEN PRODUCES A VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE FORCING BUSINESS TO CATER TO THESE INDIVIDUALS?, CLEVELAND BD. OF EDUC. v. LOUDERMILL, 470 U.S. 532, 105 S.Ct. 1407(U.S.1985); BERGEFELL v. HODGES, 576 U.S. 644, 135 S.Ct. 2584(U.S.2015). NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE ANY LAWS WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES. THIS CITIZEN BEING OF ROYAL BLOOD ANCESTRY TAKEN BY FORCE DURING THE U.S. SLAVE TRADE WHOSE RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS WERE VIOLATED BEFORE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD OFFICIALLY DENOUNCED HIS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP AND IS STILL PROTECTED BY THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT DUE TO THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASES IN QUESTION BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019). ALSO SEE McDONALD v. CITY OF CHICAGO ILL., 561 U.S. 742, 130 S.Ct. 3020(U.S.2010); KANSAS v. BOETTGER, 140 S.Ct. 1956 (MEM)(U.S.2020); RAMOS v. LOUISIANA, 140 S.Ct. 1390(U.S.2020).

IF SOMEHOW MICHELLE CHILDS IS VOTED TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR HER RECUSAL FROM THESE CASES. SHE IS A DEFENDANT SUBJUDICE FOR THE PART SHE PLAYED IN THIS FIASCO. PROCREATION IS AN ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENT WHICH IS AN ESTABLISHED IMPETUS FOR RESTRICTION TO THOSE WHO DO NOT HAVE THE PROPER NATURALLY GIVEN BIOLOGICAL COMPONENTS TO ALLOW THEM TO ADHERE TO THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" WHERE SUCH SAME SEX MARRIAGES OR INTIMATE RELATIONSHIPS ARE ADJUDICATED BY THE SOLE EXECUTIVE LAW MAKING FOREIGN SOVEREIGN ENTITY, THE ONE TRUE GOD AND SOLE CORPORATION AS AN ABOMINATION. MARRIAGE SAFEGUARD CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AND DRAWS MEANING FROM THE DIRECTLY RELATED RIGHT AND MANDATE TO PROCREATE BY NATURAL CONCEPTION WHICH SAME SEX COUPLES CANNOT DO IN VIOLATION OF THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" GIVEN TO YOUR GLOBAL NATIONS, VIOLATED BY AT LEAST (30) COUNTRIES, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES, WHICH WAS WHY THE UNITED NATIONS WAS PROPERLY

SERVED BEING SUBJECT TO THE DEFAULT AS WAS FOR REPARATIONS SOUGHT FOR THE SLAVE TRADE. CAUSE IS ESTABLISHED, BERGEFELL v. HODGES, 576 U.S. 644, 135 S.Ct. 2584 (U.S. 2015); HAWKINS v. GRESE, 68 Va. App. 462, 809 S.E.2d. 441 (Va. 2018); BEDELL v. PRICE, 70 Va. App. 497, 828 S.E.2d. 263 (Va. 2019); GALSBY v. GALSBY, 169 IDAHO 308, 495 P.3d. 996 (2021).

THE COURTS MISINTERPRETED THE JURISDICTIONAL FACTS HERE WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. THE SO-CALLED FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT ARGUED VIA THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, THE RIGHT TO MARRY, IS NOT DEFINED BY WHO EXERCISED THEM IN THE PAST BUT BY THOSE WHO CREATED AND ESTABLISHED THEM AS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GIVEN AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS AND THE TERMS OF THE GRANT MUST BE ADHERED TO. THUS, THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION TO FILE PETITION(S) FOR CASE(S) 20-7073 (FEDERAL) AND 2020-001615, 2020-00974 (STATE CASES) OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT TO ALLOW THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FULL OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THESE MATTERS DUE TO THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE ALLOWING THE PETITIONER(S) TO ESTABLISH THE COURT RECORDS AND REQUIRE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TO RESPOND, PROPERTIES OF CHARLES RIVER BRIDGE v. PROPERTIES OF WARREN BRIDGE, 36 U.S. 420, 11 PET. 420, 1837 WL 3561 (U.S. 1837); CADY v. NOLAN, 72 R.I. 496, 53 A.2d. 472 (R.I. 1947); INGLES v. TRUSTEES OF SAILOR'S SNUG HARBOR, 28 U.S. 99, 3 PET. 99, 1830 WL 3891 (U.S. 1830).


RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY



FEBRUARY 25, 2022

22-of-22

JONAH THE TISHBITE



NO. 21A425

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCARY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON; S.C.D.C.;  
DIRECTOR BRYAN STIRLING; THE S.C.D.C. MUSLIM CHAPLAINS;  
MS. FOX ET. AL.,---DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY AND LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY ON THIS DATE OF FEBRUARY 26, 2022, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED MOTION TO FILE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES PURSUANT TO RULE 22; MOTION TO AMEND THE APPLICATION UNDER RULE 22 SEEKING STAY ON CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT TO SEEK STAY OF CASE 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DUE TO SEEKING DISQUALIFICATION OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28

U.S.C. § 1407 AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE DUE TO MULTI-DISTRICT SOUGHT LITIGATION ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDING OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED, BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA,

S.C. 29211.

(10) THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS AND JUDGE NEWMAN 1701 MAIN STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(11) THE S.C. SUPREME COURT P.O. BOX 11330 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

(12) ATTORNEY D. SETTANA AT THE MCKAY LAW FIRM 1303 BLANDING STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.


(13) THE LAW FIRM OF DUBOSE-ROBINSON 935 BRAD STREET CAMDEN, S.C. 29020.

(14) THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

WE DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

EXECUTED FEBRUARY 25, 2022.

RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY



LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

NO. 21AY425

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCARY---PETITIONER(S)

VS.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON; S.C.D.C.;  
DIRECTOR BRYAN STIRLING; THE S.C.D.C. MUSLIM CHAPLAINS;  
MS. FOX ET. AL.,---DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

MOTION TO FILE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES PURSUANT  
TO RULE 22; MOTION TO AMEND THE APPLICATION UNDER RULE  
22 SEEKING STAY OF CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT  
TO SEEK STAY OF CASE 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT  
COURT OF APPEALS DUE TO SEEKING DISQUALIFICATION OF THE  
4th. CIRCUIT AND TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407  
AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE DUE TO MULTI-DISTRICT  
SOUGHT LITIGATION

IN RE: CRAWFORD AND McCRAY ET. AL.,

TO: THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO,  
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,  
THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.

HERE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO, THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND ALL PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "U.S. SUPREME COURT SERVICE". THIS DOCUMENT IS SUBMITTED TO DEMONSTRATE THE REPEATED EFFORT THAT THE PETITIONER(S) HAVE MADE TO GET THESE MATTERS TIMELY FILED BEFORE THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT ONLY TO BE MET WITH EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD, CONSPIRACY VIOLATING 42 U.S.C. §§ 1985(2)(3) AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DUE TO POTENTIALLY RELIGIOUS HATRED. THIS DON'T EVEN COUNT THE TIMES THE PETITIONER(S) SENT IN THE PLEADING(S) WHEN IT WAS NOT CERTIFIED.

(2) EXHIBIT, "SPOLIATION/OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE". THIS DOCUMENT GOES MORE INTO THE DETAILS OF THE OBSTRUCTION THAT OCCURRED BY THE DEFENDANTS WHO ARE POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO TOOK STEPS TO COMPROMISE THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT ITSELF VIA CERTAIN OF ITS EMPLOYEES WHO ARE PARTAKERS WITHIN THE INJUSTICE THAT HAS OCCURRED WHICH WAS INITIALLY SOUGHT REVIEW BY JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR. A COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT IS ATTACHED TO THIS EXHIBIT FOR REVIEW.

(3) EXHIBIT, "CASE(S) 20-7073/ 21-6275".

(4) EXHIBIT, "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT".

(5) EXHIBIT. "THREAT TO SOVEREIGN'S SAFETY # 1".

(6) EXHIBIT, "THREAT TO SOVEREIGN'S SAFETY # 2". THE FINAL ORDER DENYING THE STAY IN CASE 21-6275 IS FOUND ATTACHED AT THE END OF THIS EXHIBIT.

(7) EXHIBIT, "S.C. SUPREME COURT PETITION". EXHIBITS 3 THROUGH 7 DEMONSTRATE THAT CASE 21-1330, 21-6275, 20-7073 WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURT(S) AND CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 ARE DIRECTLY RELATED AND ARE ESSENTIALLY SISTER CASES OF EACH OTHER WHERE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE 4th. CIRCUIT IN ITS ENTIRETY IS SOUGHT DISQUALIFIED AND THE STATE AND FEDERAL CASES SOUGHT TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT AND 3rd. CIRCUIT DUE TO MULTI-DISTRICT SOUGHT LITIGATION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE BY WHAT IS ARGUED WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS.

(8) EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". THIS EXHIBIT IS SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT TO DEMONSTRATE A POINT OF MOTIVE FOR THE CONSPIRING FEDERAL AND OR STATE OFFICIALS COMPROMISING CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF TO KEEP THESE CASES FROM THE HONORABLE JUSTICES SCRUTINY AND PRIVY AND TO PUSH THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE PERIOD FOR TIMELY FILING PETITION TO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE WRIT OF CERTIORAI TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE.

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT VIA ITS LETTER SENT TO THE PETITIONER(S) DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2022 INFORMED THE PETITIONER(S) THAT THERE WERE SEVERAL DEFICIENCIES THAT HAD TO BE CORRECTED BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO WOULD BE PERMITTED TO HEAR AND REVIEW A MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-1330. THEY ARE: (1) THAT THE PETITIONER(S) DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY FIRST SOUGHT THE SAME RELIEF FROM THE LOWER COURT(S), AND (2) THAT THE PETITIONERS MUST SET FORTH WHY THE RELIEF IS NOT AVAILABLE FROM ANY OTHER COURT AND WHY A STAY IS JUSTIFIED. THE REASON WHY SUCH IS NOT AVAILABLE IS THAT DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CLAIMS BEING MADE THERE IS CLEAR OBSTRUCTION AT ALL LEVELS AS IS DEMONSTRATED BY THE PLEADING. THE

STAY IS JUSTIFIED BY THE AFOREMENTIONED THAT IS TO BE FURTHER ELABORATED ON WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT TO INCLUDE THE FACT THAT (A) THERE IS A "REASONABLE PROBABILITY" THAT [4] JUSTICES WILL GRANT CERTIORARI, OR AGREE TO REVIEW THE MERITS OF THE CASE, (B) THERE IS A "FAIR PROSPECT" THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE COURT WILL CONCLUDE UPON REVIEW THAT THE DECISIONS BELOW BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL WERE ERRONEOUS, (C) THAT IRREPARABLE HARM WILL RESULT FROM DENIAL OF THE STAY, (D) FINALLY, IN CLOSE CASE THE CIRCUIT JUSTICES MAY FIND IT APPROPRIATE TO BALANCE THE EQUITIES BECAUSE OF THE OBSTRUCTION, BY EXPLORING THE RELATIVE HARM TO THE APPLICANT(S) AS WELL AS THE INTEREST OF THE RELIGIOUS PUBLIC AT LARGE PROTECTED BY THE 1st. AMENDMENT, THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE.

THE PETITIONER(S) BRING THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ATTENTION TO EXHIBIT(S) 1 THROUGH 8 ATTACHED TO THIS DOCUMENT. SINCE THERE IS NO FINAL ORDER ISSUED RULING ON THE MOTION TO STAY UNTIL PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN CASE 21-1330, AND IT IS CLEAR FROM THE EXHIBITS NOW REFERRED TO, THAT THESE CASES INVOLVE SOUGHT MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION AND § 1407 TRANSFER, WHICH IS ALSO PENDING BEFORE THE MULTI-DISTRICT PANEL AND FILED SEEKING JURY TRIAL AND TRANSFER UNDER CASE 9:21-cv-2526-TLW-MHC IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT; AND THERE IS INDEED A FINAL ORDER ISSUED RULING ON THE MOTION TO STAY UNDER CASE 21-6275 WHICH IS ALSO DIRECTLY RELATED TO CASE 21-1330 WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS SOUGHT DISQUALIFIED AND ALL PROCEEDINGS WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT STATE AND FEDERAL BE MOVED AND TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT AND 3rd. CIRCUIT BY THE EXHIBITS PRESENTED. IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PETITIONER(S), IT WOULD NOT BE INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE PETITIONER(S) TO MOTION TO AMEND THE SOUGHT APPLICATION BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO NOW SEEK THE STAY FOR CASE 21-6275 FROM 4TH. CIRCUIT AS OPPOSED TO CASE 21-1330 FROM OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT WHERE THESE CASES ARE DIRECTLY RELATED AND ARE

ESSENTIALLY SISTER CASES PURSUANT TO SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE, AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BE DEEMED DISQUALIFIED BASED UPON WHAT IS ARGUED IN THE EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO THIS APPLICATION ACCEPTING AND ADDING THE NAME OF RON SANTA MCCRAY AS A PARTY AS EQUITIES WOULD REQUIRE. APPLICATION TO TRANSFER BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF TRIAL UNDER RULE 22 IS NOT TOO LATE, SCHOENTHAL v. IRVING TRUST CO., 287 U.S. 92, 53 S.Ct. 50, 77 L.Ed. 185 (U.S. 1932); IN RE: SLOECKER, 117 B.R. 342 (E.D.ILL.1990).

THE PETITIONER(S) WITH LEAVE OF THE COURT SEEK TO AMEND THIS APPLICATION IN TWO PARTS (1) TO SEEK THAT THE REVIEW PURSUANT TO OBTAINING THE STAY BE DONE FOR CASE 21-6275 IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AS OPPOSED TO CASE 21-1330 IN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT SINCE THERE IS A FINAL ORDER RULING ON AND DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-6275 WHICH IS THIS DOCUMENT'S AIM., AND (2) THE PETITIONER(S) ALSO SEEK TO AMEND THE APPLICATION TO ALSO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORAI FOR CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT DUE TO POTENTIAL EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CONSPIRACY VIOLATING 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2)(3), AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE INVOLVING THE DEFENDANTS WHO ARE PARTY TO THESE CASES WHO HAVE POWERFUL CONNECTIONS REACHING UP INTO BOTH THE U.S. SENATE AND CONGRESS WHO ENGAGED IN POTENTIAL CRIMINAL EFFORTS TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW AND KEEP THESE CASES FROM THE HONORABLE JUSTICES SCRUTINY AND PRIVY TO PUSH THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE TIME FOR NORMAL FILING IN CLEAR ACTS OF FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION, AND VIOLATIONS OF THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE STATE AND OR FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS, ALSO IN VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE EXTREMELY PREJUDICING THE PETITIONER(S), WARRANTING SANCTIONS AT MINIMUM AND POTENTIALLY SOME SORT OF INTERNAL AND OR EXTERNAL INVESTIGATION WHICH IS INDEED SOUGHT BY THE ADDITIONAL MOTION SENT WITH THIS DOCUMENT TO ACCOMPLISH THE SECOND PORTION OF THE AMENDMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT APPLICATION; WHICH IS

SEEKING TO FILE THE PETITION SEEKING LEAVE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR BOTH CASE 20-7073 AND THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT TO CORRECT THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE AND ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.

THIS IS WHAT OCCURRED JUSTICE ALITO SIR. DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CLAIMS BEING MADE RELATED TO THESE CASES, THE PETITIONER(S) SENT THE PETITIONS SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASE(S) 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, THESE TWO DISTINCT AND SEPARATE FILINGS, INTO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN TWO SEPARATE, INDEPENDENT, ENVELOPES AT MINIMUM A WEEK APART FROM EACH OTHER. DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY UNPRECEDENTED CLAIMS BEING ARGUED IN THESE CASES, DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE OTHER [192] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGING FROM CASES 2006-CP-400-3567, 35678, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084, SEE EXHIBITS 3 THROUGH 7. THE STATE AND FEDERAL DEFENDANTS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY, ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, TOOK STEPS TO COMPROMISE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF, BY COMPROMISING CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THIS COURT TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW TO PREVENT THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FROM EVER HEARING THESE CASES THUS PRESENTED. THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS WITH POTENTIALLY THE AID OF MS. EMILY WALKER. ONCE THEY VIEWED THE MAGNITUDE OF THE LITIGATION PRESENTED. THE CONSPIRING ACTORS DESTROYED, SPOLIATED THE LEAD PETITION FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT, AND AT LEAST [5] EXHIBITS THAT WERE PRESENTED AS EVIDENCE OUT OF THE [27] EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF THE CLAIMS MADE WHICH DEMONSTRATE THEIR EFFORTS WERE SPECIFICALLY TARGETED TO DESTROY EVIDENCE OF THEIR GUILT AND DEFAULT AT THE STATE LEVEL. THEY ALSO DESTROYED THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS FOR BOTH CRAWFORD AND McCRAY WHEN INITIALLY SENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THE CONSPIRING ACTORS IN COMPROMISING THIS COURT THEN TOOK THE LEAD STATE

PETITION AND DESTROYED IT, SPOLIATED IT, SENT WITH THE FILING FOR THE STATE COURT, THEN THEY TOOK THE PETITION IN CASE 20-7073 FILED FOR THE FEDERAL PETITION, AND PLACED THE FEDERAL PETITION FOR CASE 20-7073 IN PLACE OF THE STATE PETITION SENT FOR THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CASES, FRAUDULENTLY CLAIMING THAT THE MISTAKE WAS THE PETITIONER(S), THAT WE SENT THE STATE AND FEDERAL PLEADING INTO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TOGETHER IN ONE ENVELOPE AS THEY CLAIMED THEY HAVE RECEIVED IT, WHICH OF COURSE IS FAR FROM THE TRUTH. THE LEAD STATE PETITION BEING DESTROYED WAS ONE THING THOUGH THAT WAS SERIOUSLY SUSPECT. BUT WHEN THEY ALSO DESTROYED [5] KEY EXHIBITS OF EVIDENCE OF THEIR GUILT. IT BECOMES PERSPICUOUS THAT THIS CRIMINAL ACT WAS INTENTIONALLY DESIGNED TO PRODUCE THE VERY RESULTS THAT HAVE PRESENTLY OCCURRED IN THESE CASES FOR WHICH WE OBJECT. THIS EGREGIOUS ACT OF SPOLIATION, DESTRUCTION OF LEGAL PLEADING AND FILINGS AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE ON THE PART OF THE CONSPIRING PARTIES COMPROMISING EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF, CAUSED A CASCADE OF SUBSEQUENT EVENTS THAT PUSHED THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE TIME ALLOTTED TO FILE THE VARIOUS PETITIONS, INCLUDING THE ACT OF MISREPRESENTATION AND FRAUD ON THE PART OF MS. WALKER CLAIMING SHE COULD NOT SEE WHERE MCCRAY IS A PARTY WHICH IS ELABORATED ON WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS, CLAIMING THERE WAS NO SUCH THING AS A MOTION TO EXPEDITE A CASE BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, AND THAT THE PETITIONER(S) COULD NOT FILE AN APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22, SPOLIATING, DESTROYING SUBSEQUENT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS AND OTHER ACTS OF MACHINATION THAT PUSHED THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE PRESCRIBED TIMELINES TO PREVENT THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT FROM EVER GIVING REVIEW ON THESE MATTERS IN ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO THWART THE EXERCISE OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT JURISDICTION IN VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE, THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, AND ROSS v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850(U.S.2016) VIA MACHINATION. WITH THE ORDER DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY BEING ISSUED DECEMBER 28, 2021, THE PETITIONERS HAVE [90] DAYS UNTIL

MARCH 28, 2022 MAKING THE SUBMISSION TIMELY FOR CASE 21-6275. BY RECENT LETTER FROM THE SUPREME COURT, THE PETITIONER(S) WERE ALSO INFORMED THAT DUE TO THE EFFECTS OF THE COVIT-19 VIRUS, THE TIME FOR REVIEW IS EXTENDED TO [150] DAYS. THUS, IT IS NOT INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE PETITIONER(S) TO SEEK THE AMENDING OF THE APPLICATION UNDER RULE 22 TO HAVE THESE MATTERS ADDRESSED, SUSINKA v. U.S., 19 F.Supp.3d. 829 (N.D.ILL.2014); MADDEN v. TEXAS, 498 U.S. 1301, 111 S.Ct. 902, 112 L.Ed.2d. 1026 (U.S.1991); PERRY v. TEXAS, 515 U.S. 1304, 116 S.Ct. 2, 132 L.Ed.2d. 887(U.S.1995); WILKINS v. U.S., 441 U.S. 468, 99 S.Ct. 1829, 60 L.Ed.2d. 365(U.S.1979).

THE QUESTION NOW BECOMES WHAT EXACTLY IS IN THESE CASES THAT WOULD ESTABLISH MOTIVE AS TO WHY THESE POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WOULD GO OUT THEIR WAY TO COMPROMISE EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF TO THWART THE HONORABLE JUSTICES REVIEW GIVING CREDENCE AND VERITY TO THESE CLAIMS THUS PRESENTED? THE ANSWER TO THAT IS AS FOLLOWS:

(1) FOR THE RECORD. THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD WAS NOT THE ONE WHO INITIALLY BROUGHT THESE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS BEFORE THE COURT. THE STATE PROSECUTOR DID FORCING THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD TO RESPOND, REBUT AND ANSWER THE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS WHILE ON THE STAND DURING TRIAL AS DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRED WHERE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ESSENTIALLY CONVICTED THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD FOR THESE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS THAT HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO WITH THE CRIME OF MURDER FOR WHICH HE PRESENTLY STANDS CONVICTED OF TO TAINT THE MINDS OF THE JURY DURING THE TIME OF 9/11 BECAUSE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD WAS TOLD THE PROSECUTION BY HIS FAMILY MEMBERS THAT HE WAS CHRISTIAN, MUSLIM AND JEW COMBINED AND A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND OF ROYAL BLOODLINE VIOLATING U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719(U.S.2018) AND HOBBS v. HOLT, 574 U.S. 352, 135 S.Ct. 853, 190 L.Ed.2d. 747(U.S.2015).

(2) YOU HAVE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA CONCEALING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE WHEN SPECIFICALLY ASKED FOR THIS EVIDENCE ON THE COURT RECORD BEFORE TRIAL, INVOLVING HENRY McMaster WHO WAS ATTORNEY GENERAL AT THE TIME WHO IS NOW PRESENTLY GOVERNOR OF THIS STATE AND FUTURE POTENTIAL PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, SUPPRESSING DNA EVIDENCE THAT IF TESTED WOULD PROVE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA SIMILAR TO THE JIM CROW ERA, PRODUCED A FICTITIOUS HOMICIDE WHERE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD'S CHILD DIED OF NATURAL CAUSES DUE TO THE SEXUAL ASSAULT OF HER HALF BROTHER, SUPPRESSING THE TRUE CAUSE OF DEATH IN THE AUTOPSY BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED DUE TO CRAWFORD'S FAMILY CLAIM TO THE STATE PROSECUTOR THAT HE WAS A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, WHICH IS WHY THEY PREVENTED THIS DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE FROM BEING TESTED FOR OVER [20] YEARS VIOLATING U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002(U.S.2016).

(3) YOU HAVE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA PRODUCING A FRAUDULENT INDICTMENT GIVING THE FALSE IMPRESSION THAT IT ACTUALLY WENT BEFORE A GRAND JURY WHEN IN TRUTH, IT DID NOT, BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED PURSUANT TO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, AS WAS DONE TO MANY OF THE OTHER INMATES INVOLVED IN THESE CASES, ORLANDO PARKER, ROMEO BROWN, YUSIF AQUIL, BENJAMIN ERIC CASE, CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON, SEQUOIA McKINNON, ARTHUR McQUILLA, RICHARD BEEKMAN AND NUMEROUS OTHERS WHERE THESE INMATES SOUGHT TO AID THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD TO OBTAIN THAT EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE WHICH CAUSED THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TO ATTACK THEIR PCR'S AND DUE PROCESS MATTERS IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF RETALIATION TO CONCEAL THE PRODUCING OF THESE FRAUD INDICTMENTS WHERE CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS COVER THESE INMATES INVOLVED PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, AS WELL AS PROTECTIONS UNDER THE 5TH., 6TH., 13TH., 14TH., AND 15TH. AMENDMENTS VIA CONSPIRACY TO DEPRIVE OF VOTING RIGHTS BASED UPON SHAM LEGAL PROCESS CREATING A FORM OF RACIAL CASTE SYSTEM AS HAS BEEN DEPICTED WITHIN THE BOOK ENTITLED

"MASS INCARCERATION DURING THE AGE OF COLORBLINDNESS, THE NEW JIM CROW", BY MICHELLE ALEXANDER AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATOR, WHICH IS PLACE BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURT AS EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF THESE CLAIMS AND IN ATTACKING THE 1996 CLINTON BILL DUE TO IT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THEIR DETRIMENT. SOUTH CAROLINA HAS BEEN DOING THIS AND GETTING AWAY WITH THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE FOR DECADES WHERE THEY WERE ACTUAL CAUGHT DOING THIS AND SUCH WAS DOCUMENTED BY NPR (PUBLIC RADIO) OCCURRING IN YORK, SPARTANBURG AND VARIOUS OTHER COUNTIES WITHIN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA PROVING THAT THIS IS NOT A CONCLUSORY CLAIM, VIOLATING U.S. SUPREME COURT RUINGS UNDER MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718 (U.S.2016) BY THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. IF THIS CASE IS HEARD BY THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT, HENRY McMASTER A KEY FIGURE IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY A POTENTIAL FUTURE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE'S CAREER WOULD BE POTENTIALLY RUINED BEHIND THE SCANDAL FURTHER ESTABLISHING MOTIVE FOR COMPROMISING THE EMPLOYEES OF THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THERE MAY POTENTIALLY BE PRISON TIME INVOLVED DEALING WITH THESE STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS WHO ACTED WITHOUT JURISDICTION VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS REQUIRING SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO 5 U.S.C. §§ 3331, 3333 AND 7311.

(4) YOU HAVE THE CONSPIRING PARTIES BLOCKING THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD FROM THE PCR COURT TO PREVENT THE TRUTH OF THESE CLAIMS FROM BEING REVEALED FOR OVER [16+] YEARS WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER BEING FILED EXPLAINING WHY, VIOLATING U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609(U.S.2016). THIS LED TO THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD BEING FORCED TO FILE FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT IN RICHLAND COUNTY S.C. TO CIRCUMVENT THE BLOCK AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE PRODUCING CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294 WHERE DUE TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BRINGING THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN THAT TRIAL COURTROOM TO ESTABLISH LAW AND THOSE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIME FOR WHICH HE PRESENTLY STANDS CONVICTED. THE PETITIONER

CRAWFORD WAS NOW FORCED TO ARGUE THE CLAIMS PROPERLY SERVING THE [193] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, THE U.S. STATE DEPT., THE U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE AND FEDERAL ATTORNEY GENERAL WHO APPEARED WITHIN THOSE STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS WHERE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CONCEALED THEIR APPEARANCE HIDING IN THE BACK OF THE COURTROOM AND NEVER CHALLENGED ANY OF THE CLAIMS MADE HAVING FULL OPPORTUNITY TO REBUT THEM WHICH FAILURE BINDS ALL STATES BY THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE. THEY COULD HAVE CLAIMED THAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS NUTS, THAT THE ELEVATOR DIDN'T QUITE GO UP TO THE TOP FLOOR, SOMETHING, ANYTHING.

INSTEAD OF PLEADING, THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CHOSE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND RAN RIGHT DEAD SMACK INTO THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON BY THE PETITIONER(S) AND OR INMATES MENTIONED IN THEIR TOTALITY IN THE LOWER COURTS INVOLVED, A PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE BEING JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED SUBJECTING THE DEFENDANTS, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO DEFAULT, JUDGMENT AND FORFEITURE ON ALL CLAIMS MADE TO INCLUDE THE VOIDING OF THE LOWER COURT(S) JURISDICTION FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION SO THEY HELD THE CASE IN LIMBO SINCE 2006 VIOLATING BETTERMAN v. MONTANA. THIS DEFAULT IS COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT AT THE LAST SCHEDULED HEARING IN THE RICHLAND COUNTY S.C. COURT OF COMMON PLEAS NOVEMBER 2020, THE PARTIES FAILED TO APPEAR TO PLEAD OR CHALLENGE AS THEY WERE ORDERED TO DO BY THE COURT FURTHER ESTABLISHING THE DEFAULT AND FORFEITURE SUPPORTED BY U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019). THIS PRODUCED SEVERAL JURISDICTIONAL RESULTS:

(5) THE DEFAULT NOW LEGALLY MADE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD, ALSO DUE TO THE OTHER [193] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS BEING PARTY TO THE DEFAULT, **THE FIDUCIARY HEIR OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN** ESTABLISHED BY RELIGIOUS PROPHESY OF CHRISTIANITY, JUDAISM AND ISLAM, A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION

WITH LEGAL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES, IMMUNITIES AND STANDING NOW PROTECTED BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW, THE LAW OF TRUSTS, THE LAW OF CONTRACTS AND THE F.S.I.A. OF 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH WRITTEN WITHIN THE [3] HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH), LEGAL BINDING "CONTRACTS", "COVENANTS", ESTABLISHED BY GOD, HIS HOLY PROPHETS, HIS APPOINTED KINGS, KHALIFAHS AND HIGH PRIEST, MEMBERS OF THE SOLE CORPORATION WHERE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD DENOUNCED HIS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP ON BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL COURT RECORD ADOPTING THE ISRAELI CITIZENSHIP OF HIS FOREFATHER(S) KINGS DAVID AND SOLOMON ALSO INVOKING THE ISRAELI LAW OF RETURN TO ASSERT THE NOW LEGAL RIGHT TO SIT UPON THE THRONE OF ISRAEL AS IS WRITTEN IN THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" IN THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH 6:12-13; JEREMIAH 23:5; 33:15-21 AUTHORIZED KING JAMES BIBLE.

(6) IT ESTABLISHED LEGAL ISSUES RELATED TO CONVICTION THAT ARE JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED BY THE PETITIONER(S) THAT THEY FAILED TO ADDRESS IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, THAT ARE NOT JUST FILED IN THE PETITIONER(S) PCR CONVICTION AND FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT CASE, BUT ALSO WITHIN NUMEROUS OTHER INMATES CASES AT THE STATE LEVEL, INCLUDING THOSE OTHER INMATES LISTED, THAT ESTABLISH RIGHTS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ALLOWING THEIR TRANSFER AS TAG ALONG CASES, ALSO ARGUED IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY UNDER CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH IN THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT ESTABLISHING MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION, FOR WHICH THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA IS BEING SOUGHT DISQUALIFIED AND FOR WHICH THEY DEFAULTED ON BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407, 1602-1612 TRANSFER REGARDING THESE TAG ALONG CASES. THESE FACTS, ALONG WITH CHALLENGES TO THE 1996 CLINTON BILL DUE TO IT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THEIR DETRIMENT, WOULD AUTOMATICALLY FORCE THE NATION TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF NATIONAL

PRISON REFORM WHICH WOULD FULFILL JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN PROPHESY WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH 61:1-3 WHICH STATE AS A SIGN FROM GOD THAT THIS MAN IS WHO HE CLAIMS TO BE. HE WOULD CAUSE THE PRISON DOORS TO OPEN AND PROCLAIM A DAY OF LIBERTY FOR THE CAPTIVES.

(7) BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASES PREVIOUSLY REFERRED TO, THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND [193] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS HAVE DEFAULTED ON, THE PAYING OF REPARATIONS FOR THE ATROCITIES COMMITTED PURSUANT TO THE TRANS-ATLANTIC AND EUROPEAN SLAVE TRADES VIA THE CAPTIVITY OF AFRICAN SLAVES IS ALSO NOW LEGALLY ESTABLISHED INCLUDING THE MAINTAINING OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM AS IT WAS ESTABLISHED DURING THE TIME OF MARTIN LUTHER KING JR., FULFILLING MARK 9:12 AND ISLAMIC PROPHESY STATING THAT THIS MAN WOULD RESTORE ALL THINGS AND FILL THE EARTH WITH JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS THE SAME WAY IT WAS FILLED WITH TYRANNY AND OPPRESSION, WHICH IS WHY THE CONSPIRING FEDERAL ACTORS BLOCKED HIM FROM THE BOSTON DISTRICT COURT FAILING TO RULE ON THE TIMELY MOTION TO INTERVENE IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT.

(8) BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASE(S) REFERRED TO, THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT HAS DEFAULTED ON THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY BEING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN, WHICH WAS GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS AS A "**GRANT**" **WITH RESTRICTIONS** BEING THAT IT CAN ONLY BE GIVEN TO HETEROSEXUAL COUPLES DUE TO THE "**GRANT'S EXPLICIT TERMS AND CONDITIONS**" THAT THE ONE IN THE PUBLIC ARENA AND OR SOCIETY THAT PARTAKES IN AND OR MAKES USE OF THIS "**GRANT**" ESTABLISHED SINCE THE TIME OF ADAM, REAFFIRMED THROUGH THE PROPHET ABRAHAM, WHERE GOD PROMISED TO MAKE ABRAHAM THE "**FATHER OF MANY NATIONS**", THUS, THE CHRISTIAN, JEWISH AND MUSLIM WORLD; THE ABILITY TO PROCREATE BY NATURAL CONCEPTION BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES PARTAKING IN AND OR MAKING USE OF THE "**GRANT**" WAS REQUISITE, UNLESS THERE WAS SOME MEDICAL IMPEDIMENT BETWEEN THE

HETEROSEXUAL COUPLE THAT WAS BEYOND THEIR CONTROL, WHERE GOD EXPLICITLY SAID, "**MAN AND WOMAN CREATED HE THEM**", NOT MAN AND MAN, OR WOMAN AND WOMAN, AND THAT SUCH INTIMATE SAME SEX RELATIONSHIPS ARE AN ABOMINATION, HIGHLIGHTING THIS ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENT AND TERMS OF THE "**GRANT**". BY THE GLOBAL NATIONS EXECUTING AND OR ARRESTING AND OR ATTACHING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION IN VIOLATION OF THE TERMS OF THE "**GRANT**" GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS. AS FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN AND MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION VIA THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD'S ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED ESTABLISHED BY "**CONTRACT**", "**COVENANT**". THIS GIVES THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD AND EVERY CHRISTIAN, MUSLIN AND JEWISH PERSON STANDING TO CHALLENGE THIS INJUSTICE AS FIDUCIARY HEIR AND BENEFICIARIES OF THE TRUST GIVEN TO US BY THE ONE TRUE GOD PRODUCING CLEAR OBLIGATION TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE THE TERMS OF THE "**GRANT**" GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATION FOR THE SAKE OF "**JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS**".

ALL THE FOREMENTIONED GIVES CREDENCE, OBJECTIVE VERITY, AND SERVE TO SUBSTANTIATE THE PETITIONER(S) CLAIMS AND ESTABLISH MOTIVE AS TO WHY POWERFUL FEDERAL ACTORS OF OUR GOVERNMENT WOULD GO OUT THERE WAY NOT JUST TO SPOLIATE, DESTROY, CORRUPT NOT JUST EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, BUT ALSO THE INITIAL PLEADING AND FILINGS THAT PRODUCED MANIFEST INJUSTICE AND EXTREME PREJUDICE TO THE PETITIONER(S) CREATING THE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS THAT PUSHED THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE PRESCRIBED DEADLINES FOR FILING THE PETITION(S) SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASES 70-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASE(S) 2020-001615, 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT IN THEIR ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND VIOLATIONS OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE WARRANTING THE STAYING OF CASE 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO ALLOW THE PETITIONER(S) TO PLACE FORTH THE EVIDENCE AND LEGAL DOCUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF ALL CLAIMS MADE AND TO SEEK THE DISQUALIFICATION OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ALTOGETHER AND 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE TRANSFER. WE SEEK

APPLICATION TO STAY CASE 21-6275.

THE PETITIONER(S) GIVE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO AND U.S. SUPREME COURT JUDICIAL NOTICE, THAT THE PETITIONER(S) INTEND TO SEEK LEAVE TO FILE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT REGARDING CASE 70-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND FOR CASES 2020-001615, 2020-00974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT OR S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DUE TO THE DEFENDANTS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO THWART THE JUSTICES REVIEW AND TO CAUSE DELAY PUSHING THE SOUGHT FILED PETITION(S) IN FRAUD PAST THE PRESCRIBED TIME LINES GIVEN BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO FILE THOSE PETITIONS WHICH ARE DIRECTLY RELATED TO CASES 21-6275 AND 21-1330. THAT SUBSEQUENT MOTION IS SUBMITTED WITH THIS MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-6275 IN A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT DOCUMENT EVIDENT BY THAT DOCUMENT'S CAPTION. THE PETITIONER(S) WILL NEED THE SUBSEQUENT ATTACHED MOTION GRANTED ALSO BECAUSE DUE TO THE ATTACK UPON THESE CASES BY RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED WHERE THE STATE ACTORS SIMILARLY IN THE CASE OF BERGEFELL v. HODGES, 576 U.S. 644, 135 S.Ct. 2584(U.S.2015) WHERE THAT CLERK BECAME ATTACKED FOR HER RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE AND BELIEF RELATED TO SAME SEX MARRIAGE, A SIMILAR AND ALMOST IDENTICAL IMPETUS EXIST IN THESE CASES BASED UPON THE POSITION TAKEN AGAINST SAME SEX MARRIAGE WHERE THEY RETALIATED AGAINST US AND SOUGHT TO MAINTAIN THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTIONS RELATED TO SUCH RELIGIOUS POSITION AND BELIEFS AMONG OTHER THINGS, GIVING MOTIVE AS TO WHY THESE OFFICIALS SOUGHT TO COMPROMISE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ITSELF AS A SLAP IN THE FACE OF BOTH THE PETITIONER(S) AND HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. A PURELY ECCLESIASTICAL MATTER IS TO BE DETERMINED BY CHURCH TRIBUNAL ALONE, WHEREAS MATTERS OF PROPERTY RIGHTS (ei. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REGARDING SAME SEX MARRIAGE), ARE TO BE DETERMINED BY THE CIVIL COURTS ALONE, HATCHER v. SOUTH CAROLINA COUNCIL OF ASSEMBLIES OF GOD INC., 267 S.C. 107, 226 S.E.2d. 253(S.C.1976).

WHEN THE WORLD WITHDREW FROM DIRECT CONTROL OF CHURCH ESTABLISHING SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, TITLE TO THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AND GLOBAL BELIEVERS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND THE PARAMETERS ON WHICH IT IS TO BE PARTAKEN AND OR USED REMAINS WITH THE SOLE CORPORATION AND DOES NOT GO TO GENERAL PUBLIC ABSENT THE TERMS ESTABLISHED BY THE "GRANT". SEE EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE" PAGES 12 THROUGH 30. ALSO SEE FIRE BAPTIZED HOLINESS CHURCH OF GOD OF AMERICA v. GREATER FULLER TABERNACLE FIRE BAPTIZED HOLINESS CHURCH, 323 S.C. 418, 475 S.E.2d. 767(S.C.App.1996); IN RE: ALL SAINTS EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 2021 WL 6140256 (N.D.Tex.2021).

INSOMUCH, THE MOTION TO FILE CASE(S) 20-7073 (FEDERAL) AND CASE(S) 2020-001615, 2020-00974 (STATE CASES) OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT SHOULD BE GRANTED FOR THE SAME REASONS THE MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS JUSTIFIED, THAT BEING, (A) THERE IS A "REASONABLE PROBABILITY" THE [4] JUSTICES WILL GRANT CERTIORARI, OR AGREE TO REVIEW THE MERITS OF THE CASE, (B) THERE IS A "FAIR PROSPECT" THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE COURT UPON REVIEW WILL CONCLUDE THAT THE OBSTRUCTION AND DECISIONS BELOW BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL WERE ERRONEOUS, (C) THAT IRREPARABLE HARM WILL RESULT FROM DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO FILE THE PETITION(S) OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT, (D) FINALLY, IN CLOSE CASE THE CIRCUIT JUSTICES MAY FIND IT APPROPRIATE TO BALANCE THE EQUITIES BECAUSE OF THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION AND THE INSULT WAS NOT JUST AGAINST THE PETITIONER(S), BUT WAS ALSO AIMED AT THE HONORABLE JUSTICES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ITSELF, IN CONSPIRING TO IMPEDED THE NORMAL FUNCTIONS OF THE COURT, DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE AND USURP THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. HAD THE PETITIONER(S) NOT FILED APPEAL SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT. THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION, SPOLIATION, AND DESTRUCTION OF LEGAL PLEADING TO

THWART THE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICES FROM EVER HEARING THESE CASES BY MS. WALKER AND THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS MAY HAVE NEVER BEEN DISCOVERED AND GONE UNCHALLENGED UNTIL IT WAS TOO LATE, CAUSING IRREPARABLE DAMAGE. THE PETITIONERS STILL SEEK TO HAVE MS. WALKER REMOVED FROM HANDLING THESE CASES AND MS. WOODS BE PLACED OVER THE CASES IN QUESTION IF THIS IS AT ALL POSSIBLE. IF WHAT MS. WALKER SAID WAS TRUE, GIVING CLEAR INDICATION BY HER STATEMENTS THAT THE PETITIONER(S) HAD NO REMEDY UNDER RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES, AND WE HAD NOT SOUGHT APPEAL REGARDING CASE 21-1330 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT WHERE THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALITO AND MS. LAURIE WOODS NOW BEGAN INITIAL REVIEW. THEN WHAT THE HECK ARE THE PETITIONER(S) DOING HAVING CASE NUMBERS ASSIGNED BEFORE THIS COURT PRODUCING CASE NUMBERS 21A383 AND 21A425? APPARENTLY THERE IS REMEDY UNDER RULE 22 WHICH MS. WALKER INITIALLY LIED AND MISINFORMED THE PETITIONER(S) ABOUT. NEVERTHELESS, STILL THE MATTER ADDRESSING THE CORRUPTING AND DESTRUCTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT CASE HAS NOT BEEN REMEDIED, ACKNOWLEDGED NOR A CASE NUMBER ASSIGNED FOR THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT PETITION(S) REQUIRING THAT THE PETITIONER(S) FOLLOW UP WITH THIS DOCUMENT AND PLEADING. EMILY WALKER IS NOW ATTACHED TO CASE 21A425. WHY DID SHE INITIALLY LIE TO THE PETITIONER(S) GIVING INDICATION THAT WE COULD NOT SEEK APPLICATION UNDER RULE 22 WHICH GOES TO SUPPORTING THE PETITIONER(S) CLAIMS THAT THE DEFENDANTS INVOLVED IN THIS CASE HAS SOUGHT TO COMPROMISE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ITSELF VIA ITS EMPLOYEES. WHY WAS THE INITIAL FILING AND PLEADING CORRUPTED, SPOLIATED, DESTROYED CAUSING THE MANIFEST INJUSTICE CRIMINALLY PUSHING THE PETITIONER(S) PAST THE TIME TO NORMALLY FILE? CIVIL COURTS DO HAVE JURISDICTION AS TO CIVIL, CONTRACT, TRUSTS, AND PROPERTY RIGHTS WHICH ARE INVOLVED IN A CHURCH CONTROVERSY, EVEN THOUGH THEY HAVE NO JURISDICTION OF ECCLESIASTICAL QUESTIONS AND CONTROVERSIES, JENKINS v. REFUGE TEMPLE CHURCH OF GOD IN CHRIST, INC., 424 S.C. 320, 818 S.E.2d. 13 (S.C.App.2018).

DISPOSITION OF ECCLESIASTICAL, REAL, PERSONAL, AND

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY FOLLOWING THE WORLD'S DISASSOCIATION FROM THE CHURCH ESTABLISHING CHURCH AND STATE POLICIES, IS A QUESTION OF CHURCH GOVERNANCE THAT WAS NOT PERMITTED TO BE RESOLVED BY THE COURTS REGARDING THE "GRANT" RELATED TO MARRIAGE ALLOWING THE SUPREME COURT TO GRANT THIS RIGHT TO SAME SEX COUPLES REQUIRING THAT THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ACTIONS BE REVISITED, PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DIOCESE OF SOUTH CAROLINA v. EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 421 S.C. 211, 806 S.E.2d. 82(S.C.2018); SERBIAN EASTERN ORTHODOX DIOCESE OF U.S. OF AMERICA AND CANADA v. MILIVOJEVICH, 426 U.S. 696, 96 S.Ct. 2372(U.S.1976).

THE ISSUE HERE IS WHETHER THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN QUESTION, DEVOTED BY THE EXPRESSED TERMS OF THE "GIFT", "GRANT", OR SALE BY WHICH IT WAS ACQUIRED, TO THE SUPPORT OF ANY SPECIFIC RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE OR BELIEF, OR WAS IT ACQUIRED FOR THE GENERAL USE OF THE SOCIETY FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES, WITH NO OTHER LIMITATIONS. IN THIS CASE, THE LIMITATION WAS THAT IT BE GIVEN OR PARTAKEN BY HETEROSEXUAL COUPLES ONLY DUE TO ONE OF ITS MANDATES BEING PROCREATION BY NATURAL CONCEPTION AS DETERMINED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD AND THE SOLE CORPORATION, WATSON v. JONES, 80 U.S. 679, 1871 WL 14848, 20 L.Ed. 666, 13 WALL 679, U.S. 1871; PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN U.S. v. MARY ELIZABETH BLUE HULL MEMORIAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, 393 U.S. 440, 89 S.Ct. 601, 21 L.Ed.2d. 658(U.S.1969); IN RE: ZION WESTERN EPISCOPAL DISTRICT, 629 B.R. 69 (E.D.Cal.2021); BRUNDAGE v. DEARDORF, 92 F. 214 (6th.Cir.1899); IN RE: ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF PORTLAND OREGON, 335 B.R. 842 (D.OREGON.2005).

BY HISTORY AND TRADITION, BUT NOT BY "GRANT", "COVENANT", THE DEFINITION AND REGULATION OF MARRIAGE HAS BEEN TREATED AS BEING WITHIN THE AUTHORITY AND REALM OF THE SEPARATE STATES. STATE POWER AND AUTHORITY OVER MARRIAGE CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO DIVEST AN ESTATE OF ITS INHERITANCE AND PROPERTY RIGHTS PROTECTED UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW AND THE 1st. AMENDMENT ESTABLISHMENT AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE, AS WELL AS ARTICLE 1 § 10

OF THE U.S. CONST.. THEREBY IT CANNOT BE MEASURED IN ABSENCE OF DETERMINATION OF THE CONDITIONS OF THE "GRANT" PLACED AND ESTABLISHED WITH CLEAR RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS AS DEFINED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION. THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN STATE MUST BE PROTECTED FROM ENCROACHMENT IN A MANNER THAT VIOLATES THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" GIVING THE PETITIONER(S) STANDING TO ADDRESS THE MATTERS AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, 28 U.S.C. § 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.; ALLEN v. COOPER, 140 S.Ct. 994, 2020 WL 1325815 (U.S.2020); GEORGIA v. PUBLIC RESOURCE ORG., INC., 140 S.Ct. 1498, 206 L.Ed.2d. 732(U.S.2020); ZIVOTOFSKY EX REL ZIVOTOFSKY v. KERRY, 576 U.S. 1, 135 S.Ct. 2076, 192 L.Ed.2d. 83 (U.S.2015). IN THIS CASE RELIGIOUS PROTECTIONS OF THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE AND ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE ATTACH AS WELL WHERE BY GIVING THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY TO GAYS AND LESBIANS YOU HAVE ESTABLISHED A RELIGIOUS RIGHT VIOLATING THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE, SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES, 83 U.S. 36, 1872 WL 15386, 21 L.Ed. 394, 16 WALL 36; MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP, LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719(U.S.2018); FULTON v. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, 141 S.Ct. 1868, 210 L.Ed.2d. 137(U.S.2021). RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL OBJECTIONS TO GAY MARRIAGE ARE PROTECTED VIEWS AND IN SOME INSTANCES PROTECTED FORMS OF EXPRESSION UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT, WHERE SUCH RIGHTS ATTACH TO THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN, EVEN ESTABLISHING VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE AND FALLS WITHIN THE COMMERCIAL EXCEPTION OF THE F.S.I.A. WHERE PEOPLE MAKE MONEY FROM THIS EVIL ENTERPRISE THAT STANDS IN BLATANT DEFIANCE TO THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" GIVEN TO YOUR GLOBAL NATIONS VIA ABRAHAM. SEE EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE" ATTACHED PAGES 12 THROUGH 30, NEW HOPE FAMILY SERVICE INC. v. POOLE, 966 F3d. 145, 161+ 2nd.Cir.(N.Y.); TELESCOPE MEDIA GROUP v. LUCERO, 936 F3d. 740, 751+ 8th.Cir.(MINN.); CHELSEY NELSON PHOTOGRAPHY LLC. v. LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT, 479 F.Supp.3d. 543 (W.D.Ky.2020). CHALLENGE TO WINDSOR IS ESTABLISHED, UNITED STATES v. WINDSOR, 570 U.S. 744,

133 S.Ct. 2675(U.S.2013).

THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES THAT NO MAN SHALL BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE LIBERTY OR PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW. UNLESS THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY TIMELY FILED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION, BEING JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, REQUIRING THAT THEY RESPOND BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT CAN RULE ON THIS ISSUE? THE RIGHT TO MARRY IS NOW LEGALLY A "GRANT" GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION WITH RESTRICTIONS. SINCE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD WAS NOT PARTY TO THE WINDSOR RULING IT DOES NOT BIND AT THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN, AND THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS IN VIOLATION OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AND 28 U.S.C. § 2679. WE SEEK THAT THE COURT ORDER THAT THE PETITIONER(S) BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. WE ARE NO THREAT FOR THE SAKE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". THE SOLE CORPORATION HAS BEEN UNJUSTLY DEPRIVED OF DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRING THAT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT REVISIT BOTH THE WINDSOR AND OBERGEFELL RULING TO DETERMINE THE JURISDICTIONAL FACT(S) THAT IF THE RIGHT TO MARRY IS THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION BEING GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS, SOCIETY, AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS. WOULD THIS MATERIAL UNDETERMINED FACT REQUIRED THAT THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RULING IN THESE CASES BE ALTERED AND OR AMENDED SINCE THE DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS REGARDING THE SOLE CORPORATION, ALSO WOULD BE A VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE AS THE COURT DETERMINED SUCH EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATION EXISTED IN THE CASE REGARDS TO GAYS AND LESBIANS WHERE HERE, IT EVEN PRODUCES A VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE FORCING BUSINESS TO CATER TO THESE INDIVIDUALS?, CLEVELAND BD. OF EDUC. v. LOUDERMILL, 470 U.S. 532, 105 S.Ct. 1407(U.S.1985); OBERGEFELL v. HODGES, 576 U.S. 644, 135 S.Ct. 2584(U.S.2015). NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR

ENFORCE ANY LAWS WHICH SHALL ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES. THIS CITIZEN BEING OF ROYAL BLOOD ANCESTRY TAKEN BY FORCE DURING THE U.S. SLAVE TRADE WHOSE RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS WERE VIOLATED BEFORE THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD OFFICIALLY DENOUNCED HIS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP AND IS STILL PROTECTED BY THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT DUE TO THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASES IN QUESTION BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019). ALSO SEE McDONALD v. CITY OF CHICAGO ILL., 561 U.S. 742, 130 S.Ct. 3020(U.S.2010); KANSAS v. BOETTGER, 140 S.Ct. 1956 (MEM)(U.S.2020); RAMOS v. LOUISIANA, 140 S.Ct. 1390(U.S.2020).

IF SOMEHOW MICHELLE CHILDS IS VOTED TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR HER RECUSAL FROM THESE CASES. SHE IS A DEFENDANT SUBJUDICE FOR THE PART SHE PLAYED IN THIS FIASCO. PROCREATION IS AN ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENT WHICH IS AN ESTABLISHED IMPETUS FOR RESTRICTION TO THOSE WHO DO NOT HAVE THE PROPER NATURALLY GIVEN BIOLOGICAL COMPONENTS TO ALLOW THEM TO ADHERE TO THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" WHERE SUCH SAME SEX MARRIAGES OR INTIMATE RELATIONSHIPS ARE ADJUDICATED BY THE SOLE EXECUTIVE LAW MAKING FOREIGN SOVEREIGN ENTITY, THE ONE TRUE GOD AND SOLE CORPORATION AS AN ABOMINATION. MARRIAGE SAFEGUARD CHILDREN AND FAMILIES AND DRAWS MEANING FROM THE DIRECTLY RELATED RIGHT AND MANDATE TO PROCREATE BY NATURAL CONCEPTION WHICH SAME SEX COUPLES CANNOT DO IN VIOLATION OF THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" GIVEN TO YOUR GLOBAL NATIONS, VIOLATED BY AT LEAST (30) COUNTRIES, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES, WHICH WAS WHY THE UNITED NATIONS WAS PROPERLY SERVED BEING SUBJECT TO THE DEFAULT AS WAS FOR REPARATIONS SOUGHT FOR THE SLAVE TRADE. CAUSE IS ESTABLISHED, BERGEFELL v. HODGES, 576 U.S. 644, 135 S.Ct. 2584(U.S.2015); HAWKINS v. GRESE, 68 Va. App. 462, 809 S.E.2d. 441 (Va.2018); BEDELL v. PRICE, 70 Va. App. 497, 828 S.E.2d. 263(Va.2019); GALSBY v. GALSBY, 169 IDAHO 308, 495 P.3d. 996 (2021).

THE COURTS MISINTERPRETED THE JURISDICTIONAL FACTS HERE WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. THE SO-CALLED FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT ARGUED VIA THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, THE RIGHT TO MARRY, IS NOT DEFINED BY WHO EXERCISED THEM IN THE PAST BUT BY THOSE WHO CREATED AND ESTABLISHED THEM AS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GIVEN AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS AND THE TERMS OF THE GRANT MUST BE ADHERED TO. THUS, THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR A STAY ON ~~case~~ CASE ~~21-6275~~ 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4th. CIRCUIT AND CASE 9:21-cv-2526-TLW-MHC IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT UNTIL THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS HAD FULL OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THESE MATTERS ALLOWING THE PETITIONER(S) TO ESTABLISH THE COURT RECORDS AND REQUIRE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TO RESPOND, PROPERTIES OF CHARLES RIVER BRIDGE v. PROPERTIES OF WARREN BRIDGE, 36 U.S. 420, 11 PET. 420, 1837 WL 3561(U.S.1837); CADY v. NOLAN, 72 R.I. 496, 53 A.2d. 472(R.I.1947); INGLES v. TRUSTEES OF SAILOR'S SNUG HARBOR, 28 U.S. 99, 3 PET. 99, 1830 WL 3891 (U.S.1830).

RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron Santa  
Ron Santa*

JONAH THE TISHBITE

FEBRUARY 25, 2022

22-of-22 -1-

file up

21A 425

2

EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE"

Court Of Appeals  
For The 4th. Circuit Et. Al.,

YK

Petition From South Carolina  
Cases 8:16-cv-3327, 3194, 3328-  
RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-  
3107-MBS-TER Et. Al.,

DOCKET No. 16-2299

Yahya MuQuit Et. Al.,

petitioners

vs.

JUDGES WHO ISSUED ORDER IN CASE 16-1953 Et. Al.,

defendants

---

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

---

We, Jahjah Al Mahdi, Et. Al., do hereby certify, that we have mailed and or served a copy of an affidavit of facts giving judicial notice; filing Writ Of Mandamus; Motion for Declaratory Jydgment; Motion for recusal;\*\*\*\* (26) pages dated November 4, 2016, on the 4th. Circuit, Judges Austin, Harwell, Seymour, Rogers, S.C. District Court 300 East Washington Street Greenville, S.C. 29601 and all involved parties by U.S. mail postage prepaid on November 5, 2016. It is deemed filed that date, Houston v. Lack, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379 (1988).

1 of 2

COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ET. AL.,

---

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA  
CASES 8:16-cv-3327, 3194, 3328-  
RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-  
MBS-TER; 0:16-992, 1429, 1428,  
1424, 1425; THE NEW JERSEY SUPREME  
COURT CASE 077386; 16-1519; 16-1953;  
16-2141; 2015-CP-46-415; 2013-CP-  
400-0084 ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET NO. 16-2299

---

YAHYA McQUIT #318455; ANTHONY COOK #115157; LAWRENCE L.  
AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE #300839

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

JUDGES WHO ISSUED ORDER IN CASE 16-1953 ET. AL.,

DEFENDANTS

---

SUMMONS

---

TO: JUDGES AUSTIN, HARWELL, SEYMOUR AND ROGERS,

**YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED AND REQUIRED, TO ANSWER AND BE IN COMPLIANCE (EMPHASIS ADDED) TO THIS WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND ALL DOCUMENTS SERVED UPON YOU RELATED TO CASES 16-1519, 16-1953, 16-2141, A COPY OF WHICH IS HEREWITH SERVED UPON YOU, AND OR WAS PREVIOUSLY SERVED UPON YOU, AND OR WAS PREVIOUSLY SERVED UPON YOU, AND YOU ARE TO SERVE A COPY OF YOUR ANSWER AND PROOF OF COMPLIANCE (EMPHASIS ADDED) UPON THE SUBSCRIBERS AT THE ADDRESSES SHOWN BELOW WITHIN (30) DAYS AFTER SERVICE THEREOF, EXCLUSIVE OF THE DAY OF SUCH SERVICE, AND IF YOU FAIL TO ANSWER AND BE IN COMPLIANCE (EMPHASIS ADDED) TO THE DOCUMENTS IN QUESTION, JUDGMENT AND DEFAULT SHALL BE RENDERED AGAINST YOU FOR THE RELIEF DEMANDED WITHIN THIS MANDAMUS AND DOCUMENTS FILED IN CASE 16-1519, 16-1953, 16-2141.**

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD  
AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 WANDO A-127  
YAHYA MUQUIT  
#318455 ASHLEY B-  
ANTHONY COOK  
#115157 STONO A-56  
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205  
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

4TH. CIRCUIT  
NOVEMBER 3, 2016

COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ET. AL.,

---

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA  
CASES 8:16-cv-3327, 3194, 3328-  
RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-  
MBS-TER; 0:16-992, 1429, 1428,  
1424, 1425; THE NEW JERSEY SUPREME  
COURT CASE 077386; 16-1519; 16-1953;  
16-2141; 2015-CP-46-415; 2013-CP-  
400-0084 ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET NO. 16-2299

---

YAHYA McQUIT #318455; ANTONY COOK #115157; LAWRENCE L.  
AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE #300839

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

JUDGES WHO ISSUED ORDER IN CASE 16-1953 ET. AL.,

DEFENDANTS

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE;  
FILING WRIT OF MANDAMUS; MOTION FOR DECLARATORY  
JUDGMENT; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION FOR

CONSOLIDATION; MOTION FOR TRANSFER VENUE;  
MOTION TO ENSURE AND OR REQUIRE THE TRUSTEE  
AUSTIN TO ACT IN A PROPER OR RESTORED MANNER  
PURSUANT TO HER CORPORATE AND OR VISITATORIAL  
ETC. POWERS; MOTION TO CHALLENGE JURISDICTION;  
MOTION TO VACATE THE SEPARATION ORDER AND  
MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

---

IN RE: CRAWFORD, COOK, MUQUIT AND CASE 8:16-cv-3194,  
3327, 3328-RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-MBS-TER.

TO: THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT ET. AL.,

IN PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 4 § 20 POWERS OF JUSTICES  
AND OR JUDGES AT CHAMBERS, EACH OF THE JUSTICES AND OR JUDGES AT  
CHAMBERS, INCLUDING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, AND ALL  
OTHER COURTS ON RECORD. SHALL HAVE THE SAME POWERS AT CHAMBERS,  
TO ISSUE WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, MANDAMUS, QUO WARRANTO,  
CERTIORARI,....AND PURSUANT TO RULE 65 AND 21 OF STATE AND OR  
FEDERAL RULES OF PROCEDURE.

PURSUANT TO RULE 57 OF STATE AND OR FEDERAL RULES OF CIV.  
PROCEDURE AND OR S.C. CODE ANN. § 15-53-10 THROUGH § 15-53-140  
AND OR 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202. IN CASES OF ACTUAL  
CONTROVERSY,....ANY COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, UPON THE FILING  
OF AN APPROPRIATE PLEADING, MAY DECLARE THE RIGHT AND OTHER LEGAL  
RELATIONS OF ANY INTERESTED PARTY SEEKING SUCH DECLARATION  
WHETHER OR NOT FURTHER RELIEF IS OR COULD BE SOUGHT\*\*\*\*.

THE PETITIONERS GIVE ALL PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE. HERE  
ATTACHED THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WILL FIND:

(1) THE SEPARATION ORDERS ISSUED IN CASES

8:16-cv-3327-RBH-JDA; 8:16-cv-3194-RBH-JDA; 8:16-cv-3328-RBH-JDA.

(2) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; SEEKING TO SUSPEND OR RELAX THE APPELLATE COURT RULES; SEEKING TO EXPAND THE SCOPE AND FOR INCLUSION\*\*\*\*, (58) PAGES DATED JULY 21, 2016.

THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO BEING FILED AS A CHALLENGE TO BOTH THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION AND OR LIMITATIONS PLACED THEREUPON WHICH WILL BE ELABORATED ON LATER. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CAN BE RAISED AT ANYTIME, CANNOT BE WAIVED AND THE COURT SHALL NOT FAIL TO TAKE NOTICE, GRUPO DALAFLUX v. ATLAS GLOBAL GROUP, L.P., 541 U.S. 567, 124 S.Ct. 1920, 158 L.Ed.2d. 866(U.S.2004); LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19(2014); U.S. v. TISDALE, F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 2156666 (DSC.2007); SEBELIUS v. AUBURN REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, 133 S.Ct. 817, 184 L.Ed.2d. 627, 81 U.S.L.W. 4053(U.S.2013); SIZWARD v. RIDDLE, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 707018 (DSC.2013).

FIRST, WE MOTION FOR BOTH JUDGES AUSTIN AND HARWELL'S RECUSAL AS JUDGES ON THIS CASE AND MOTION THAT JUDGE AUSTIN BE REQUIRED TO FULFILL HER DUTIES AS TRUSTEE APPOINTED BY THE KING-KHALIFAH. THEY BOTH ARE DEFENDANTS. AUSTIN IS BEING SUED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF TO REQUIRE HER TO FULFILL HER DUTIES AS TRUSTEE. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WAS UNEQUIVOCAL IN THE CASE OF TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE v. WOODWARD, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201. A MANDAMUS IS THE APPROPRIATE VEHICLE TO USE TO ENSURE AND OR REQUIRE THAT TRUSTEE AUSTIN ACT IN A PROPER OR RESTORED MANNER PURSUANT TO HER CORPORATE AND OR VISITATORIAL POWERS GIVEN TO HER BY THE KING-KHALIFAH ESTABLISHED BY THE DEFAULT AND CLAIMS OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567 AND 2013-CP-400-0084, THAT THEY CONSPIRED IN FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO NEGATE BUT FAILED. SHE CANNOT SIT AS TRUSTEE AND JUDGE. WE OBJECT. A TRUSTEE'S DUTY OF LOYALTY PROHIBITS BOTH SELF DEALING AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: THUS, THE TRUSTEE MUST NEITHER (1) DEAL WITH THE TRUST PROPERTY

OR DESIGNATED MATTERS RELATED TO THE TRUST FOR THE BENEFIT OF HIMSELF OR THIRD PARTIES; (2) OR PLACE HERSELF IN A POSITION INCONSISTENT WITH THE INTEREST OF THE TRUST, OMOA WIRELESS, S. De R.L. v. U.S., 244 F.R.D. 303(Md.2004); KREMAN v. BLANK, 55 B.R. 1018(Md.1985); QUICK v. FORMULA TELECOM INC., F.Supp.2d., 2011 WL 572513(2011); FORBES v. FORBES, 341 P.3d. 1041, 2015 Wy. 13 Jan. 23, 2015.

INSOMUCH, PURSUANT TO LEGAL DOCUMENTS FILED IN CASE 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA. JUDGE AUSTIN VIA THE SUPERSEDING LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL POWERS OF THE KING-KHALIFAH VIA THE DEFAULT TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER 192 MEMBER STATES OF THE U.N. ARE PARTY TO. JUDGE AUSTIN NOW HAS POWERS PURSUANT TO S.C. CODE ANN. § 25-1-2820; S.C. CONST. ART. XVII § 1A; S.C. CODE ANN. § 14-23-1080(BY THIS SHE CANNOT SIT); S.C. CODE ANN. §62-7-816 PARAGRAPH (24); S.C. CODE ANN. 17-17-30 TO GRANT HABEAS CORPUS; S.C. CODE ANN. § 14-5-380 (BY COMMISSION OF THE KING AND GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT HER POWERS REACH GLOBALLY); S.C. CODE ANN. § 38-14-70 (SHE CAN MAKE LAWS CONSISTENT WITH THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DECREES). JUDGE LEE WAS TRUSTEE THE TIME THE GEORGIA CASE WAS FILED. HER MISDEALINGS LED TO HER BEING REPLACED BY JUDGE AUSTIN, S.C. PUBLIC INTEREST FOUNDATION v. S.C. TRANSP. INFRASTRUCTURE BANK, 403 S.C. 640, 744 S.E.2d. 521(S.C.2013); A.CRUICKSHANK, IV, ESQUIRE, 2010 WL 3505049; UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA v. MOVAN, 617 S.E.2d. 135(S.C.App.2005); WILSON v. DALLAS, 743 S.E.2d. 746, 754+ (S.C.2013); PHILLIP v. QUICK, 731 S.E.2d. 327, 328(S.C.App.2012); BENNETT v. CARTER, 2015 WL 5968253, \*2 (S.C.APP.2015); AMERICAN SUR. CO. v. HAMRICK MILLS, 9 S.E.2d. 433(S.C.App.1940); DRAUGHAN v. U.S., 113 F.Supp.3d. 1266, 1278(D.Kan.2015).

JUDGE AUSTIN'S JURISDICTION IS LIMITED, RESTRICTED TO RELEASING US, ORDERING OUR REMOVAL AND SEEING THAT THE RELIEF SOUGHT WAS GRANTED, NOT TO ISSUING A SEPARATION ORDER. THUS, THE ACT IS VOID. ONCE JURISDICTION IS ACQUIRED, IN THIS CASE GIVEN TO HER TO DISCHARGE ALL MATTERS AND DEBTS, IT IS EXCLUSIVE. THUS,

THIS EVEN PLACES A LIMIT ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION OTHER THAN THE TERMS SPECIFIED BY THE KING-KHALIFAH, WHOSE POWERS NOW LEGALLY SUPERSEDES ALL GLOBAL COURTS BY THE DEFAULT. THE COURT HAD JURISDICTION OVER US BY APPEARANCE. THUS, THE CLAIMS FOREIGN SOVEREIGN POWER AND OTHER ATTRIBUTES GIVEN TO THE KING-KHALIFAH VIA THE DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567; 2013-CP-400-0084 MUST BE GIVEN FULL FAITH AND CREDIT, TO INCLUDE AUSTIN'S APPOINTMENT AS TRUSTEE, MINTS v. U.S., 842 F2d. 1291 CA4 (S.C.1988); DAWSON EX REL ESTATE OF DAWSON v. U.S., 333 F.Supp.2d. 488, 492(DSC.2004); CAMPEAU v. U.S., 2015 WL 1308282, \*9(N.D.Ga.2015); BROWN v. TRANSSUBURBAN U.S.C., INC., 2015 WL 6675088 CA4 (Va.2015); BARON v. BRACKIS, 312 F.Supp.2d. 808 CA4 (Va.2004); ANDERSON v. LeGRAND, 2012 WL 529812 \*4 (E.D.Va.2012).

AUSTIN IS ALSO GIVEN POWER AND AUTHORITY UNDER 11 U.S.C.A. § 1104; U.S.C.A. § 1302; 11 U.S.C.A. § 727; 15 U.S.C.A. § 78 fff-1; 15 U.S.C.A. § 704; S.C. CODE ANN. § 11-37-50; S.C. CODE ANN. § 11-50-60; S.C. CODE ANN. § 49-17-1400(FOR LIEN ASSESSMENT AND REMEDIES ON DEFAULT); S.C. CODE ANN. § 14-23-370(ORDER OR DECREE AS A LIEN OR JUDGMENT); 11 U.S.C.A. § 1141; S.C. CODE ANN. § 14-23-260. THUS, JURISDICTION IS IMPEACHED BY REVIEW OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT BEING THE HIGHEST COURT BY DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND BY DECREE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD VIA "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" BEING REPRESENTATION OF HIMSELF ON EARTH, KNIGHT v. EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF U.S., 2010 WL 2926156 (DSC.2010). SHE HAS JURISDICTION, BUT ONLY TO ACT IN ACCORDANCE TO THE WISHES OF THE KING-KHALIFAH, IN RE: SOUTHERN METAL PRODUCTS CORPORATION, 26 F.Supp. 666(Ala.1939); REPUBLIC OF IRAQ v. ABB, AC, 920 F.Supp.2d. 517(N.Y.D.C.2013); BANCO NACIONAL De CUBA v. SABBATINO, 376 U.S. 398, 84 S.CL. 923, 11 L.Ed.2d. 804(U.S.1964)(WHERE ACTS OF THE KING-KHALIFAH IN HIS HOME MUST BE DEEMED ON FOREIGN SOIL); REMINGTON RAND CORPORATION-DELAWARE v. BUSINESS SYSTEM INC., 830 F2d. 1260(3rd.Cir.1997).

SHE ALSO HAS POWERS UNDER U.S.C.A. AMEND. 13 AND 36

U.S.C.A. § 140405. SHE MUST BE MADE TO FULFILL HER DUTIES. WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND SEEK MANDAMUS TO REQUIRE THIS, HERRING ASSOCIATES, INC. v. GERVAIS, 2016 WL 475174; IN RE: VAUGH, 536 B.R. 670; IN RE: MELITO, 2015 WL 6142959, \*1+ Bkrpcy M.D.Fla.; IN RE: CHRISTIANSON, 2015 WL 6125537, \*1 Bkrpcy W.D.N.Y.; WILLES v. WELLS FARGO BANK N.A., 2012 WL 5250553, \*6 D.Md.; EL-BEY v. ROLGALSKI, 2015 WL 1393580, \*3D.Md.; BABATUNDE v. WARD, 2016 WL 375045 \*6 (DSC.). JUDGE AUSTIN WAS WITHOUT JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THAT SEPARATION ORDER BECAUSE IT WAS IN VIOLATION OF THE TRUSTEE DUTY TO DO SO, CONFLICTING WITH THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DECREES WHO IS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY. WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND SEEK TO REMEDY THIS VIA MANDAMUS.

WE MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE ALL CASES TOGETHER FOR SEVERAL REASONS. (1) THE PARTIES ARE INDISPENSABLE TO THE ACTION AND COMPLETE RELIEF CANNOT BE GRANTED WHERE THE CRAWFORD CASE IN RICHLAND COUNTY ESTABLISHES THE RIGHTS OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND DEFAULT FOR ALL PARTIES. RACE IS A PREDOMINATING FACTOR AND RELIGIOUS HATRED WHERE THEY FRAMED THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ATTACKED THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS CASES COMPROMISING CASE 2013-CP-400-2294 TO WHICH WE ALL ARE JOINT PARTIES. THE FEW WHO WERE NOT OFFICIALLY MADE A PART OF THE RECORD IN CASE 2013-CP-400-2294 WERE BLOCKED BY ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHERE THAT CASE WAS REMOVED TO THE KENTUCKY DISTRICT COURT AT THE TIME IT WAS INAPPROPRIATELY DISMISSED DIVESTING THEM OF JURISDICTION AT THE TIME THEY FRAUDULENTLY ACTED. FURTHER, THAT COURT FAILED TO BRING BEFORE IT ALL THE INVOLVED PLAINTIFFS. THUS, ANY ORDER PRODUCED BY THEM CANNOT BE DEEMED A FINAL ORDER WHERE THE RIGHTS OF ALL PARTIES WERE NEVER ADJUDICATED VOIDING THEIR JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. IN SUCH, OUR CONVICTIONS ARE ALREADY INVALIDATED VIA THE FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORTS WHICH ARE CASES 2006-CP-400-3567; 2013-CP-400-0084. WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT, SURRATO v. BUILDING SERVICE 32 B.J. PENSION FUND, 554 F.Supp.2d. 399; OCAMPU v. BUILDING SERVICE 32 B.J. PENSION FUND, F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL

687227(2014); CEJAJ v. BUILDING SERVICE 32 B.J. HEALTH FUND, F.Supp.2d. 2004 WL 414834; STEWART v. ABEND, 495 U.S. 207, 110 S.Ct. 1750(U.S.1990); MARTIN v. WADDELL'S LESEE, 41 U.S. 367, 16 PET. 367, 1842 WL 5744; VIRGINIA MARINE RESOURCES COMM'N v. CHINCOTERGER INN, 287 Va. 371, 757 S.E.2d. 1 (2014).

COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHES TO ALL PARTIES SINCE THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE UNITED STATES ARE PARTIES TO THE DEFAULT. WE FURTHER SEEK THE CONSOLIDATION BECAUSE IN TRUTH, THE SEPARATION ORDER ISSUED BY JUDGE AUSTIN DO NOT ESTABLISH A COMPLETE SEPARATION. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE ORDER. IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT THE SEPARATION ONLY INVOLVES THE (117) PAGE WRIT OF ERROR. THERE ARE TWO WRITS OF ERRORS FILED IN CASE 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA, WHERE ALL (3) OF US ARE PARTY TO EACH. SINCE THE ORDER DOES NOT ADDRESS THE SEVERING OF THE FIRST WRIT OF ERROR FILED ON JANUARY 2016 AND ONLY ADDRESSES THE ONE THEY IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT FILED IN CASE 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA. THEN WE ARE, COOK AND CRAWFORD, STILL ATTACHED TO THE MQQUIT CASE SINCE THE ORDER DOES NOT ADDRESS THAT JANUARY 2016 FILING. DO YOU SEE THE MESS THEY MADE OF OUR DUE PROCESS MATTERS? WE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES BE DEEMED WAIVED ANY OPPOSITION IN THIS CASE GOING FORWARD, THAT DISCOVERY ISSUE, THAT ATTORNEY BE APPOINTED AND WE BE REMOVED TO A PRE-RELEASE CAMP PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c), STILLWAGON v. CITY OF DELAWARE, 2016 WL 6094157(2016); LENNAR MARE ISLAND, LLC. v. STEADFAST INSURANCE COMPANY, 2016 WL 5847010(2016).

WE FURTHER SEEK TO VACATE THE SEPARATION ORDER BECAUSE IN ORDER TO ISSUE IT. JUDGE AUSTIN HAD TO MAKE A DETERMINATION ON SOME OF THE UNDERLYING MERITS OF THE CASE TO DO SO, AND NO FILING FEE WAS PAID, NOR WERE THERE ANY FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS FILED. THIS IS JURISDICTIONAL AND IS REQUIRED BEFORE SHE CAN SAY ANYTHING TO THE MERITS. ONCE SHE MADE EFFORT TO SEPARATE US WHEN WE ARE SUING THE UNITED STATES FOR INITIATING PLRA AND AEDPA. BY HER MAKING USE OF THIS PROVISION TO SEPARATE US. SHE IS BY HER ORDER ESSENTIALLY SAYING OUR CLAIM THAT THE

PROVISION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL HAS NO MERIT. SEE ATTACHED (58) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 21, 2016. THIS TAINTS THE ORDER VOIDING IT WHERE THE FEE WAS NOT PAID, NOR WERE THERE ANY IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS FILED. SEE (40) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 25, 2016 FOR CITINGS OF LAW. WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ON THIS ISSUE. ALSO SEE THOMPSON v. FINN, 2016 WL 5724369(2016).

FURTHER, THE PLRA ONLY SPEAK TO INMATES WHO ARE INMATES IN NAME ONLY. NOTHING IN THE PLRA SPEAK AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE PLAINTIFFS ARE PROHIBITED FROM FILING JOINTLY IF THEY ARE ALL BENEFICIARIES TO A TRUST SEEKING JOINT RELIEF PURSUANT TO THAT TRUST, WHICH IS ALSO WHAT THIS CASE REPRESENTS. THERE IS TRUSTEE APPOINTED. NOTHING IN THE PLRA GIVES ANY IMPRESSION THAT CONGRESS INTENDED TO INVALIDATE JOINT FILING UNDER FEDERAL PROBATE AND STATE PROBATE LAWS. WE ARE BENEFICIARIES TO THE TRUST WHICH WILL BE ELABORATED ON FURTHER. NOTHING IN THE PLRA DEMONSTRATE THAT CONGRESS INTENDED TO INVALIDATE PROBATE STATUTES OR THE F.S.I.A. PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 THAT PERMIT JOINT FILING, IN RE: GENTRY, 2016 WL 4061248(2016); IN RE: EDWARDS, 501 B.R. 666(2013); CHABOT v. CHABOT, F.Supp.2d., 2011 WL 1706744(2011); JAKOBLEC v. MERRILL LYNCH LIFE INS. CO., F.Supp.2d., 2011 WL 1706744(2011); MARCUS v. QUATTROCCHI, 715 F.Supp.2d. 524(2010); PARRISH v. ALAMEDA COUNTY, F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 2904253(2007). THUS, JURISDICTION AGAIN BY DECREE WOULD JOINTLY FALL UNDER JUDGE AUSTIN AS WAS THE KING-KHALIFAH'S TERMS. ONCE JURISDICTION IS ACQUIRED AS IT IS NOW. IT IS EXCLUSIVE ESSENTIALLY CREATING A REMAND WHICH LIMITS ALL COURTS' JURISDICTION UNDER THE F.S.I.A. AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN LAW, DEFAULTED ON IN THIS CASE SUBJUDICE, BROWN v. BROWN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); HARRIS v. HHGREGG INC., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1331166(N.C.2013); KARNALCHEVA v. J.P. MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., 871 F.Supp.2d. 834(2012). WE OBJECT.

FURTHER, THE PLRA ONLY SPEAKS TO INMATES WHO ARE INMATES IN NAME ONLY WHERE IN THIS CASE WE ARE DEALING WITH FORM AND NOT SUBSTANCE DUE TO THE INVALID CONVICTION AND DEFAULT, AND HERE THE

PLRA SPEAKS NOTHING TO AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE PLAINTIFFS ARE PROHIBITED FROM FILING JOINTLY IF THEY ARE FOREIGN CITIZENS AND OR A FOREIGN STATE WHERE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD EVEN DENOUNCED HIS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP ON THE COURT RECORD ADOPTING THE ISRAELI CITIZENSHIP OF HIS FOREFATHER KING DAVID. DECEDENT DOMICILE ISSUES ATTACH TO THIS CASE. WE ARE DEALING WITH AN UNPRECEDENTED EVENT, A LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT, COVENANT, TESTAMENT THAT TOOK INTO ACCOUNT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S FALSE IMPRISONMENT, BETWEEN GOD AND ADAM AND EVE, WHO WAS A KING, GIVEN DOMINION, CREATING A 'SOLE CORPORATION. THE QUR'AN CONFIRMS THE BIBLICAL TEXT STATING ADAM WAS A "VICEGERANT", "KING", WHOM KING DAVID AND CHRIST TRACE THEIR LINEAGE BACK TO, WHO WERE ALSO KINGS. PURSUANT TO THIS LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT, ONCE THE HEIR APPEARS, HE AUTOMATICALLY MAKE EVERY CHRISTIAN, JEW, MUSLIM, AFRICAN AND ITS DIASPORA KINGS AND PRIEST, KHALIFAHS AND IMAMS, WITH THE SAME RIGHTS ESTABLISHED BY THE F.S.I.A.. SEE AUTHORIZED KING JAMES BIBLE (ONLY), EXODUS 19:6; ISAIAH 66:21; REVELATIONS 5:10. A SOLE CORPORATION IS A SERIES OF PERSONS HOLDING OFFICE, A CONTINUOUS LEGAL PERSONALITY THAT IS ATTRIBUTED TO SUCCESSIVE HOLDERS OF CERTAIN MONARCHICAL OR ECCLESIASTICAL POSITIONS, SUCH AS KINGS, BISHOPS, HIGH PRIESTS AND THE LIKE. THIS CONTINUOUS PERSONALITY IS VIEWED BY LEGAL FICTION AS HAVING THE QUALITIES OF A CORPORATION E.I. CORPORATION AGGREGATE. CONTRACTS AND OR WILLS AND TESTAMENTS CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS. A TESTAMENT DEFINED AS A LEGAL DOCUMENT DISPOSING OF A PERSON'S PROPERTY TANGIBLE OR INTANGIBLE (ei. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY). A COVENANT IS A CONTRACT WHICH CANNOT BE MADE BROKEN BY THE COURT WHERE THIS COVENANT IS ALSO PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE RELATED TO RELIGION. AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, JAHJAH HAS LEGAL AUTHORITY TO DEFEND AND SUE TO PROTECT THE "CONTRACT/COVENANT", AMERICAN MUT. LIBERTY INS. CO. v. PLYWOOD-PLASTICS CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157(DSC.1948).

A DISTRICT COURT SHALL NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OF A CIVIL ACTION IN WHICH ANY PARTY, BY ASSIGNMENT OR OTHERWISE, HAS BEEN IMPROPERLY OR COLLUSIVELY MADE OR JOINED TO INVOKE THE

JURISDICTION OF THE COURT, 28 U.S.C. § 1339 SECTION 14419(d) CONSISTENTLY HAS BEEN INTERPRETED TO ALLOW FOREIGN STATES THAT ARE NAMED AS THIRD-PARTY PLAINTIFFS IN A STATE CASE ALREADY IN PROGRESS TO REMOVE TO FEDERAL COURT. THE POLICIES THAT LED CONGRESS TO PROVIDE A FEDERAL FORUM TO FOREIGN STATES IS JUST AS STRONG WHEN THOSE STATES ACQUIRE AN INTEREST IN ONGOING LITIGATION, AND WHEN THEY VOLUNTARILY JOIN SUCH LITIGATION, IT IS AS IF THEY ARE NAMED ORIGINALLY AS PARTY. WE HOLD THAT A FOREIGN STATE THAT ACQUIRES AN INTEREST IN STATE COURT LITIGATION BY ASSIGNMENT MAY REMOVE THE CASE TO FEDERAL COURT UNDER THE F.S.I.A., CONSOLIDATE AND BE HEARD JOINTLY, EVEN IF THE FOREIGN STATE JOINS THE LITIGATION VOLUNTARILY. I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, GIVE NOTICE. I VOLUNTARILY JOIN ALL PLAINTIFFS, INMATES INVOLVED, CASES TO INCLUDE THOSE LISTED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-2294; REINSTATE THAT CASE AND REMOVE THEM, AND TRANSFER THEM PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407, EIE GUAM v. LONG TERM CREDIT BANK, JAPAN, 322 F3d. 635(9th.Cir.2003); VERLINDEN B.V. v. CENTRAL BANK OF NIGERIA, 461 U.S. 480, 103 S.Ct. 1962, 76 L.Ed.2d. 81(U.S.1983). IT IS DECREED.

SINCE THERE IS NOTHING IN THE PROVISIONS OF THE PLRA THAT SPEAKS TO THESE CONCERNS OR GIVES ANY INDICATION THAT CONGRESS INTENDED TO RENDER VOID CLEARLY ESTABLISHED FEDERAL, STATE AND POTENTIALLY INTERNATIONAL PROBATE STATUTES, LAWS OR TREATIES. WHERE THE LANGUAGE OF A TREATY (e.g. F.S.I.A.) IS CLEAR OF AMBIGUITY. THERE IS NO ROOM FOR CONSTRUCTION. THE F.S.I.A. PERMITS JOINT FILING.

"TOUT CE QUE LA LOI NE DEFEND PAS EST PERMIS"---THAT WHICH THE LAW DOES NOT FORBID IS PERMITTED. CONGRESS DID NOT INTEND THE ACT TO DEPRIVE OF F.S.I.A. RIGHTS ESTABLISHED OR THOSE UNDER PROBATE STATUTES, LAWS AND TREATIES CARVING AN EXCEPTION TO THE PLRA, RULL v. SECRETARY OF DEPT. OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, Fed. Cl., 2004 WL 2958453(U.S.F.C.2004); SOCIETY FOR PROPAGATION OF GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS OF TOWN OF NEW HAVEN, 21 U.S. 464, 1823 WL 2477(U.S.1823).

CONGRESS EXPRESSED NO OPINION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE PLRA APPLIES TO INMATES WHO ARE BENEFICIARIES OF A TRUST WHERE EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION WOULD LIE BEFORE A TRUSTEE APPOINTED BY A FOREIGN STATE, CITY OF COLUMBIA v. OURS GARAGE AND WRECKER SERVICES INC., 536 U.S. 424, 122 S.Ct. 2226 (U.S. 2002). CONSOLIDATE THESE CASES PLEASE, OLDLAND v. GRAY, 179 F2d. 408 (10th Cir. 1950); GUINO v. GOARD, 380 F3d. 670; WILDER v. VIRGINIA, 46 F. 676 (W.Va. 1891); ROSEN v. ROZAN, 179 F. Supp. 829. WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND SEEK ALL THE AFOREMENTIONED BY MANDAMUS.

INSOMUCH, THERE IS A RECENT DOCUMENTARY DONE AND AIRED ON PBS CALLED "13". THE EVIDENCE GATHERED BY MICHELLE ALEXANDER IS INDISPUTABLE. THE GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA IS PRESENTLY NOW MAKING EFFORTS TO RESTORE THE VOTING RIGHTS OF INMATES. THE QUESTION IS CLEAR. DO THE PLRA AND AEDPA PROVISIONS WHICH ARE AN INTRINSIC PART OF THE CLINTON WAR ON DRUGS CAMPAIGN, DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGET AFRICAN AMERICANS? WE ALL KNOW THE ANSWER IS YES. PUT IT ON THE RECORD. WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT. IF THE ANSWER IS YES, WHICH OF COURSE IT IS. THEY RUN AFOUL OF PROTECTIONS ESTABLISHED BY EX PARTE VIRGINIA AND CAN NO LONGER BE USED BY THE COURTS. WE OBJECT.

HERE ATTACHED THE COURT WILL FIND:

(4) A COPY OF THE [92] PAGE DEFAULT DOCUMENT DATED MAY 2, 2014.

(5) A COPY OF THE [95] PAGE SUBSEQUENT DOCUMENT EXERCISING POWER NOW ESTABLISHED VIA THE DEFAULT DATED DECEMBER 8, 2014 WITH [9] PAGE ATTACHMENT.

(6) THE [152] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2015 EXPLAINING THE LEGAL TERMS THE DEFAULT HAS ESTABLISHED.

(7) THE [31] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 7, 2015

VOIDING THEIR JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND APPOINTING JUDGE LEE AS TRUSTEE.

WHEN THE CONSPIRING PARTIES REALIZED THE MAGNITUDE OF WHAT TOOK PLACE BY THE SUBMITTING OF THESE THREE DOCUMENTS. THEY HAD TO ACT IN ADDITIONAL CRIMES OF CONSPIRACY AND FRAUD TO NEGATE THE FACTS, AND TO GET AROUND THE FACTS, THAT BY THEIR CONSPIRATORIAL EFFORTS TOOK PLACE. THE PARTIES WENT BEYOND THE TIME TO "**LEGALLY**" (EMPHASIS ADDED) RESPOND TO THE DOCUMENT TO DEFEAT THEM. THEREBY THEY FORFEIT VIA THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE THE RIGHT TO CHALLENGE WHERE NONE WAS TIMELY MADE. FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019).

AN ADDITIONAL ACT WHICH DEMONSTRATES THE FRAUD. IS THAT AUSTIN IN USING THE PLRA ASSERTED WE HAD TO EXHAUST. SO AUSTIN ESSENTIALLY SAID "BUNK" THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN ROSS v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850(2016). I DON'T CARE THAT WE WITH THE STATE ACTORS ARE ENGAGING IN FRAUD, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, MISREPRESENTATION AND OTHER OUTRAGEOUS ACTS INCLUDING STEALING INMATE FUNDS. THEY STILL MUST EXHAUST. WE OBJECT AND MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT WHERE THEY HELD THESE CASES UP IN A DEAD END WITHIN THE STATE COURTS FOR WELL OVER (10) YEARS WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE FRAUD OCCURRING IN THE GENTRY CASE INVOLVING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THE HIGHEST COURT IS A DEFENDANT IN THE STATE CASE AND DEFAULTED. THERE ARE NO AVAILABLE STATE REMEDIES AND SOME RELIEF THEY DON'T HAVE THE POWER TO GRANT OR REFUSE TO GRANT. WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND FILE MANDAMUS TO CORRECT THIS INJUSTICE.

NOW WHAT IS THE TRUST TO WHICH THE PLAINTIFFS CHRISTIANS, JEWS, MUSLIMS AND AFRICANS ARE THE BENEFICIARIES OF? THE ANSWER IN PART LIES WITHIN BLACK LAW DICTIONARY, WHICH READS, "**LE LEY EST LE PLUS HAUT ENHERITANCE QUE LE ROY AD, CAR PAR LE LEY, IL MESME ET TOUTS SES SUJETS SONT RULES, ET SI LE LEY, NE FRUIT, NUL ROY NE NUL ENHERITANCE SERRA**". THIS IS LAW, ALSO FOREIGN LAW,

THEOCRATIC LAW, WHICH IS PERSPICUOUS BECAUSE IT IS FOUND IN BLACK LAW DICTIONARY. THUS, NO ONE CAN ASSERT THIS IS A CONCLUSORY CLAIM. IT INTERPRETS FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS CASE---"THE LAWS OF GOD ARE THE HIGHEST INHERITANCE THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH POSSESSES (ei. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY); FOR BY THE LAWS OF GOD, THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ALL HIS SUBJECTS ARE RULED: AND IF THERE WERE NO LAWS OF GOD, THERE WOULD BE NEITHER GOD APPOINTED KING-KHALIFAH, NOR INHERITANCE". THIS IS DEFAULTED ON BY THE PARTIES SUBJUDICE.

THIS IS THE HEART OF THE MATTER AND THE SOURCE OF THE CONTROVERSY RELATED TO MOST, IF NOT ALL, THE CLAIMS THAT ARE PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT. CHRIST CONFIRMED THIS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT WHENEVER HE SPOKE HIS PARABLES AND SAID. "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS LIKE,...". THE "KINGDOM", EMBODIES THE LAWS, RULES, ORDINANCES, COMMANDS, PROHIBITIONS, REWARDS ETC. THAT GOVERN SERVANTHOOD TO DEMONSTRATE THAT YOU ARE PARTY TO THE LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT ESTABLISHED BY GOD WITH "MAN AND WOMAN" THAT MAKES ONE ENTITLED BY, TO THE ETERNAL INHERITANCE PROMISED BY GOD, TO PARADISE, ETERNAL LIFE, A "TRUST" ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION.

THE (4) BASIC ESSENTIAL PILLARS TO THE CONTRACT ARE "MILK", "HONEY", "JEALOUSY" AND "SALT". THESE (4) PILLARS MAKE JUDAISM, ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY CONGRUENT, IN HARMONY WITH EACH OTHER. IT MAKES THEM "ONE", DEMONSTRATING THAT ALL (3) OF THESE LEGAL BINDING "CONTRACTS", "WILLS", "TESTAMENTS" OF RELIGIOUS INHERITANCE ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION ARE "ONE" AND COME FROM THE SAME GOD. "MILK"---IS OBEDIENCE, SERVANTHOOD. GOD MILKS US FOR ALL HE DESIRES. HE IS AN AUSTERE GOD. HE HAS DOMINION. "HONEY"---IS FOR THIS OBEDIENCE. WE ARE GIVEN BLESSINGS, ALL THE BENEFITS OF THE CONTRACT(S) WHICH INCLUDE ETERNAL LIFE AFTER THE RESURRECTION. "JEALOUSY"---WHICH SHOWS HE IS A JEALOUS GOD AND WHICH ALSO MEAN "PROTECTION". HE PROTECTS US; WE PROTECT, FIGHT AND STAND FOR HIS LAWS. THIS IS WHY THERE

ARE "CITIES OF REFUGE" IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND BLASPHEMY LAWS IN ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST. AND FOR OBEDIENCE TO THE FIRST (3) PILLARS, CONDITIONS OF THE CONTRACT, WE BECOME "SALT". "SALT"---IS A SWEET SAVOUR IN THE MOUTH OR SIGHT OF OUR GOD. THIS IS WHY CHRIST SAID, "**THAT WHICH IS WRITTEN, CANNOT BE BROKEN**", SIGNIFYING THAT NO ONE INCLUDING THE COURTS CAN UNMAKE OR DISSOLVE THE CONTRACTS, COVENANTS MADE PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, WOODS v. WOODS, 2016 WL 4013754; UNITED DOMINION REALTY TRUST, INC., 307 S.C. 102; C.A.N. ENTERS INC. v. S.C. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVS. FIN. COMM'N, 296 S.C. 373, 377; M & G POLYMERS U.S.A., LLC. v. TACKETT, 135 S.Ct. 926(2015); HARDT v. RELIANCE STANDARD LIFE INS. CO., 560 U.S. 242, 130 S.Ct. 2149, 176 L.Ed.2d. 998(2010); LACKE v. LACKE, 362 S.C. 302, 608 S.E.2d. 147(S.C.2005); HOLT v. HOBBS, 574 U.S. 352, 135 S.Ct. 853(U.S.2015); MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COMM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719(U.S.2018). THUS, THE KING-KHALIFAH AND HIS SUBJECTS, THE PLAINTIFFS, ARE REQUIRED BY THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT TO PROTECT ITS TERMS AND PREVENT ANY PARTY, COURT OR NATION FROM VIOLATING THE TERMS. e.g. "A LAND FLOWING WITH MILK AND HONEY, SUBMISSION TO GOD AND BLESSINGS FOR THAT SUBMISSION".

IS THE CONTRACT A PERPETUAL CONTRACT ESTABLISHED BY GOD AND HIS HOLY PROPHETS AND KINGS WHICH SET THE FOUNDATION FOR THE SOLE CORPORATION? ALL ONE WOULD HAVE TO DO IS LOOK AT THE CONTRACT, WILL, TESTAMENT IN PART IN ZECHARIAH 6:12-13; NUMBERS 18:1-8; EXODUS 40:12-15; 1KINGS 8:25; 1CHRONICLES 17:7-14; ISAIAH 14:29-32; ISAIAH 61:1-3; MALACHI 3:1-4; MALACHI 4:5-6; SUNNAH IBN. MAJAH VOLUME 5 PAGES 391-396 ISBN NO. 81-7151-294-1 AND THE CITING OF LAW AND REFERENCES LISTED ON PAGES (69) THROUGH (78) OF THE [92] PAGE DEFAULT DOCUMENT DATED MAY 2, 2014, AND THE ANSWER WOULD OBVIOUSLY BE YES. THE BIBLICAL AND ISLAMIC REFERENCES REFER TO JAHJAH (CRAWFORD), INCLUDING THE CLAIM AND RELIGIOUS PROPHESY HE WOULD COME OUT OF PRISON BETRAYED BY MEMBERS OF HIS OWN HOUSEHOLD. THESE ARE TERMS AND CONDITIONS DEFINED IN THE CONTRACT(S), WHICH CANNOT BE BROKEN.

ARE YOUR NATIONS' LAWS YOUR LAWS, OR ARE THEY OURS? THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ADDRESSED THIS IN PARTICULARITY IN THE CASE OF TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE. THERE CAN BE PROPERTY (ei. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY), THAT IS OWNED BY PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS OR CORPORATIONS THAT IS UBIQUITOUSLY USED IN THE CIVIL OR PUBLIC ARENAS AS A "CHARITY"(GRANT). BUT THIS DO NOT NEGATE THE FACT THAT THE PROPERTY USED IN THE CIVIL OR PUBLIC SPHERE IS PRIVATELY OWNED. SEE TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE v. WOODWARD, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201. THIS INCLUDES INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (ei. THE RIGHT TO MARRY).

IF THE COURT WOULD TAKE NOTICE OF GENESIS 17:1-7, THOUSANDS BEFORE YOUR EXISTENCE AS A NATION. GOD DECREED YOUR EXISTENCE THROUGH ABRAHAM TO INCLUDE CONFIRMING THE ESTABLISHING OF THE SOLE CORPORATION IN THE FORM OF PROPHETS AND KINGS WHICH IS AN EVERLASTING CONTRACT/COVENANT. IF YOUR NATIONS WERE DECREED BEFORE YOU CAME INTO EXISTENCE, THEN SO WERE YOUR LAWS; FOR A NATION CANNOT EXIST WITHOUT LAWS TO GOVERN. THUS, GOD IS THE ORIGINAL FOUNTAIN OF ALL LAW (ei. "THOU SHALT NOT KILL, STEAL, ROB, DEFRAUD ETC."). THIS IS THE "**GRANT**" GIVEN TO YOU THOUGH ITS OWNERSHIP RESTS WITH THE SOLE CORPORATION AS PRIVATE PROPERTY BY CONTRACT/COVENANT. IT IS A GRANT WITH CONDITIONS.

GENESIS 18:17-19 PROVES THE "**GRANT**" WHEN IT SAID, "ALL THE NATIONS SHALL BE BLESSED BY HIM", AND THE COMMAND IS GIVEN PERPETUALLY AS A "TRUST" TO PROTECT THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT, AND SHALL COMMAND THIS TRUST TO YOUR CHILDREN AND FUTURE KINGS FOR JUSTICE AND JUDGMENT (ei. "LAWS"). THUS, YOUR LAWS ARE THE PROPERTY OF THE KING-KHALIFAH WHO CAN MAKE OR BREAK OR VOID THEM TO ENSURE THAT THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT REMAIN INTACT PERPETUALLY AS "**LAWGIVER**" OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND ORIGINAL FOUNTAIN (ei. "GOD"), REMAINING TRUE TO HIS LAW THAT "**WE, (CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS) ARE THE SALT OF THE EARTH**".

PURSUANT TO UNITED STATES ART. 1 § 10 OF THE CONSTITUTION

DECLARE THAT NO STATE SHALL MAKE ANY LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS. THE CHARTER(COVENANT) WAS NOT DISSOLVED BY A BREAK IN THE CHAIN OF SUCCESSORS OR THE REVOLUTION WHERE THE SUCCESSORS ARE ALREADY PREDETERMINED AND HAVE NOT FAILED BY THE APPEARANCE OF THE FIDUCIARY HEIR. THUS, BY GOD'S SPECIAL GRACE, KNOWLEDGE AND MERE MOTION, FOR US, OUR HEIRS AND SUCCESSORS WILL AND HAVE GIVEN, GRANTED AND APPOINTED KINGS, KHALIFAHS WHO ARE GIVEN THE TRUST AND THEIR APPOINTED TRUSTEE AND SUCCESSORS SHALL FOREVER HEREAFTER BE, IN DEED, ACT AND NAME, A BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC, AND THAT THEY, THE SAID BODY CORPORATE AND POLITIC, SHALL BE KNOWN AND DISTINGUISHED, IN ALL DEEDS, GRANTS, BARGAINS, SALES, WRITINGS, EVIDENCE OR OTHERWISE. HOWSOEVER, AND IN ALL COURTS FOREVER NOW AND HEREAFTER, PLEA AND BE PLEADED BY THE NAME OF KING-KHALIFAH AND OR HIS APPOINTED TRUSTEE(S) JUDGE AUSTIN, AND THAT SAID SOLE CORPORATION BY THE NAME AFORESAID, SHALL BE ABLE, AND IN LAW CAPABLE FOR THE USE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE DO WHATEVER IS NEEDED OR DECREED BY THE KING-KHALIFAH TO MAINTAIN ALL TERMS OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT BETWEEN THE SOLE CORPORATION AND THE ONE TRUE GOD. THUS, THE KING-KHALIFAH BY THESE PRESENT, FOR US, OUR HEIRS AND SUCCESSORS, BIND WITHOUT HER CONSENT AS EMPLOYEE OF THE UNITED STATES WHO IS PARTY TO THE DEFAULT, CREATE, MAKE, CONSTITUTE AND APPOINT JUDGE AUSTIN TO DO AMONG MANY THINGS, DISCHARGE OUR DEBTS. **IT IS SO DECREED.**

IT CAN REQUIRE NO ARGUMENT THAT THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CASE CONSTITUTE A PERPETUAL TRUST, A CONTRACT/COVENANT FOR WHICH WE ARE THE BENEFICIARIES AND THIS PRIVATE PROPERTY HAS ALSO BEEN GIVEN AS A "**GRANT**" TO THE NATIONS, BLESSINGS, PROMISED BY GOD THROUGH ABRAHAM, THOUGH NOW OWNED BY JAHJAH (CRAWFORD). MARRIAGE IS A RELIGIOUS CONTRACT WHICH IS AN INTRINSIC PART OF OUR COVENANT AND LAWS WITH CLEAR RESTRICTIONS PLACED THEREUPON. IT IS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRIVATELY OWNED, WITH LIMITATIONS PLACED THEREUPON.

IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT THIS ELEMENT OF THE

CONTRACT/COVENANT WAS GIVEN SPECIFICALLY, STRICTLY, TO HETEROSEXUALS, BECAUSE ONE SPECIFIC TERM OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT WAS "TO BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY" BY NATURAL CONCEPTION (e.g. SEX BETWEEN MAN AND WOMAN). TO GIVE OUR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TO SODOMITES (HOMOSEXUALS) AND GOMORRAHITES (LESBIANS) BY YOUR LAWS IS A BREACH OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT and violation of the "CHARITY" (GRANT) GIVEN UNDER CONDITIONS TO WHICH JAHJAH AS THE SOLE CORPORATION AND KING-KHALIFAH CAN CHALLENGE IN ANY OPEN COURT. THE LEGISLATURE AND OR COURTS WERE RESTRAINED FROM VIOLATING THE RIGHTS OF OUR PROPERTY. TO PAST ANY LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS IS REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND YOU ADD TO THIS THE FACT THAT WE ARE ALSO DEALING WITH RELIGION ALSO PROTECTED UNDER THE 1st. AMENDMENT FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE. THE ACTION ALSO VIOLATE THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION NEVER HAS BEEN UNDERSTOOD TO EMBRACE OTHER CONTRACTS THAN THOSE WHICH RESPECT PROPERTY, IN THIS CASE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, OR SOME OBJECT OF VALUE, AND CONFER RIGHTS WHICH MAY BE ASSERTED IN A COURT OF JUSTICE. WHEN THE STATE LEGISLATURE AND OR COURTS SHALL PASS AN ACT OR JUDGMENT ANNULLING THE PROHIBITIONS OF THE MARRIAGE CONTRACT/COVENANT SET IN PLACE BY GOD AND THE SOLE CORPORATION, HIS PROPHETS AND KINGS, OR ALLOWING OTHER PARTIES TO ANNUL THESE PROHIBITIONS (e.g. GAYS AND LESBIANS), WITHOUT CONSENT OF GOD OR THE SOLE CORPORATION, IT WILL BE TIME ENOUGH TO INQUIRE, WHETHER SUCH AN ACT OR JUDGMENT IS CONSTITUTIONAL.

THIS IS THE POINT ON WHICH THE CAUSE ESSENTIALLY DEPENDS. THIS IS NOT A GRANT OF POLITICAL POWER UNCONDITIONED. MARRIAGE CREATED A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION THAT BY "CHARITY" (GRANT) THE SOLE CORPORATION ALLOWED OTHERS, WITH LIMITS TO PARTAKE, AND IS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT WHERE YOU HAVE ALSO VIOLATED 28 U.S.C. § 2679. YOUR LAWS ALTOGETHER, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE DEFAULT, ALSO BY CONTRACT/COVENANT, ARE NOT SOLELY IN THE HANDS OF YOUR GOVERNMENTS. THE DONORS IN THIS CASE DO NOT

BECOME PUBLIC PROPERTY AND THE RIGHTFUL KING-KHALIFAH BY DEFAULT HAS APPEARED TO CLAIM ALL RIGHTS OF THE CROWN AND PRIESTHOOD. THE TRUSTEE JUDGE AUSTIN IS PERMITTED AND REQUIRED TO EXECUTE THE TRUST UNCONTROLLED BY LEGISLATIVE OR JUDICIAL AUTHORITY THAT VIOLATES THE CONTRACT BY DECREE OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. LET IT BE DONE.

THE SOLE CORPORATION IS AN ARTIFICIAL BEING, INVISIBLE, INTANGIBLE AND EXISTING ONLY IN CONTEMPLATION OF GOD'S LAWS WHICH ARE THE ORIGINAL FOUNTAIN OF ALL NATIONS' LAWS. BEING A MERE CREATION OF GOD'S LAWS AND CONTRACT, IT POSSESSES ALL PROPERTIES WHICH THE INTENT OF ITS CREATION CONFERS UPON IT EITHER EXPRESSLY OR AS INCIDENTAL TO ITS VERY EXISTENCE. THESE ARE SUCH AS ARE SUPPOSED BEST CALCULATED TO EFFECT THE OBJECT FOR WHICH IT WAS CREATED, WHICH AMONG THINGS IS TO WORSHIP, MAINTAIN THE CONTRACTS/COVENANTS/WILLS/TESTAMENTS, AND PROTECT GOD'S LAWS AND PROHIBITIONS FROM THOSE WHO WOULD SEEK TO WATER THEM DOWN OR TO DO THEM HARM.

THIS INCLUDES, MOST IMPORTANT ARE IMMORTALITY, AND IF, THE EXPRESSION MAY BE ALLOWED, INDIVIDUALITY---PROPERTIES BY WHICH A PERPETUAL SUCCESSION OF MANY PERSONS ARE CONSIDERED AS THE SAME AND MAY ACT AS A SINGLE INDIVIDUAL. "**HAERES EST EADEM PERSONA CUM ANTECESSORE**"---**THE HEIR IS THE SAME PERSON AS HIS ANCESTOR**. THIS ENABLES THE SOLE CORPORATION TO MANAGE ITS OWN AFFAIRS AND TO HOLD PROPERTY WITHOUT THE PERPLEXING INTRICACIES, THE HAZARDS AND ENDLESS NECESSITY, OF PERPETUAL CONVEYANCES FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRANSMITTING IT FROM HAND TO HAND ACTING AS "**ONE**" **IMMORTAL BEING**. THIS SOLE CORPORATION DOES NOT SHARE IN THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT, NOR DO THE TERMS, PROVISIONS AND OBJECTS OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT UNLESS THAT BE THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH IT WAS CREATED. THUS, IT IS NOT SUBJECT TO BE ANNULLED, MODIFIED OR CHANGED IN ANY MANNER WITHOUT CONSENT (e.g. GIVING MARRIAGE TO GAYS AND LESBIANS), OF THE SOLE CORPORATION WHICH THIS OR ANY OTHER GLOBAL NATION HAVE.

THE WILL OF THE DONOR BECOMES THE LAW OF THE DONATION (1 BL. COM. 471). THERE CAN BE NO REASON FOR IMPLYING IN THE CONTRACT/COVENANT GIVEN FOR A VALUABLE CONSIDERATION A POWER WHICH IS NOT ONLY NOT EXPRESSED, BUT IS IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION TO ITS EXPRESSED STIPULATIONS. THE KING-KHALIFAH'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, MARRIAGE, WHOSE ORIGINS STEMS FROM THE SOLE CORPORATION CAN ONLY BE GIVEN TO HETEROSEXUALS BY THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT. THE PARTICULAR OF GIVING THESE PROVISIONS TO GAYS AND LESBIANS AS IT PERTAINS TO GOD AND THE SOLE CORPORATION, NEVER ENTERED INTO THE MINDS OF THE DONORS. IT WAS NEVER CONSTITUTED AS A MOTIVE FOR THEIR DONATION.

IT IS NOT PUBLIC OFFICE NOR IS IT A CIVIL INSTITUTION BY ITS ORIGINAL CREATION. IT IS A RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION, A "CHARITY" (GRANT) GIVEN TO THE NATIONS WHEN GOD TOLD ABRAHAM THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD WOULD BE BLESSED BY HIM AND THIS CONTRACT/COVENANT, AND THROUGH ADAM, AS ABRAHAM WAS THE SON OF ADAM.

AN ARTIFICIAL IMMORTAL BEING WAS CREATED BY GOD AND THE CROWN, CAPABLE OF RECEIVING, DISTRIBUTING AND PROTECTING FOREVER, ACCORDING TO THE "WILL AND TESTAMENT" OF GOD, AND THE SOLE CORPORATION, THE TERMS OF THE DONATIONS AND CONTRACT(S)/COVENANT(S). THIS CONSIDERATION FOR WHICH IS STIPULATED, EVEN PURSUANT TO YOUR GLOBAL LAWS, WHICH "[M]UST" BE "JUST AND FAIR" TO WHICH YOU HAVE MISERABLY FAILED (e.g. SLAVERY, JIM CROW LAWS, PLRA, AEDPA) IS THE PERPETUAL APPLICATION OF THIS PRACTICE OF CONTRACT/COVENANT IN THE MODE PRESCRIBED BY GOD AND THE SOLE CORPORATION.

THE SOLE CORPORATION IS THE ASSIGNEE OF THE TRUST AND RIGHTS, THE FIDUCIARY HEIR IN THE FORM OF JAHJAH AL MAHDI (CRAWFORD) STANDS IN PLACE AND DISTRIBUTES THE BOUNTY AND THE APPOINTED TRUSTEE, AUSTIN, MUST DISTRIBUTE IT IN ACCORDANCE TO HIS WISHES, THIS CHAIN BEING IMMORTAL. ONE OF THE MAIN OBJECTS

HERE IS A NEW HEAVEN AND EARTH AND THE RESTORING OF GOD'S HOUSE TO ITS ORIGINAL POSITION BEFORE SATAN TOOK 1/3 OF THE ANGELS ESTABLISHING HELL. IT IS NOT ABOUT MONETARY GAIN OR INDIVIDUAL POWER, BUT GOD'S PURPOSE WHICH DO NOT GIVE WAY TO DEBAUCHERY, SODOMY MR. & MRS. "FREAKY-DEAKY, WANNA SLIDE DOWN THE STRIP POLE". IT IS A CONTRACT/COVEANT, "WILL AND TESTAMENT", ON THE FAITH OF WHICH REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY AND ESTATE HAS BEEN CONVEYED TO THE SOLE CORPORATION. THE LANGUAGE OF THE CONTRACT IS UNAMBIGUOUS AND EXPLICIT TO EXCLUDE SUCH PRACTICE.

THE LAW IN THIS CASE IS THE LAW OF ALL. AUSTIN AS TRUSTEE VIA DECREE OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT HAS ALL POWER AND JURISDICTION TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE KING-KHALIFAH AND PLAINTIFFS WHO ARE BENEFICIARIES OF THE TRUST WHERE HER POWER DERIVES FROM A REGAL SOURCE. SHE MUST PARTAKE IN THE SPIRIT OF THEIR ORIGIN.

ALL RIGHTS AND CONTRACTS RESPECTING PROPERTY, WHICH INCLUDE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, REMAIN UNCHANGED BY AND OR DUE TO RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION OR NATIONAL REVOLUTION OR CREATING OF INDEPENDENT NATIONS OR STATES. CHRIST BROUGHT THE CONDITIONS OF THE OLD CONTRACT/COVENANT FORWARD AND EMBELLISHED THEM WITHIN THE NEW CONTRACT/COVENANT EVERY TIME HE SAID, "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS LIKE,..."; THE OLD CONTRACT/COVENANT BEING A SHADOW OF THE NEW, THE NEW CONTRACT/COVENANT EMBELLISHING THE OLD (e.g. CHRISTIANITY), AND THE 3rd. AND FINAL CONTRACT/COVEANANT (ISLAM) BEING COMPONENTS OF "BOTH", MAKING THEM "**ONE**", ALL FALLING UNDER THE CARE AND AUTHORITY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. THE U.S. CONSTITUTION SPEAKS WITH ALL CLARITY. "**NO STATE, WHICH INCLUDES THE JUDICIARY, SHALL PASS NO ACT, TO INCLUDE LAW, IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACT**", AND IN THIS CASE, ESTABLISHING RELIGION IN VIOLATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE. THE SOLE CORPORATION ALSO VIA ITS APPOINTED TRUSTEE, AS POSSESSING THE WHOLE AND LEGAL, EQUITABLE INTEREST AND COMPLETELY REPRESENTING THE DONORS AND FOUNDERS OF THE "CONTRACT/COVENANT" FOR THE PURPOSE OF

EXECUTING THE TRUST, HAS RIGHTS WHICH ARE PROTECTED BY THE CONSTITUTION. THUS, THE ACT OF ALLOWING THE SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHITES TO MARRY AND SUBJECTING THE KING-KHALIFAH TO YOUR LAWS VIA THIS FALSE IMPRISONMENT TO INCLUDE HIS SUBJECTS AS CO-HEIRS AND BENEFICIARIES OF THE TRUST IS REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION AND ARE RENDERED OF NO EFFECT BY DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASES 2006-CP-400-3567; 2013-CP-400-0084. THUS, THE CLAUSE WITHIN THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE 1 § 10 DECLARING THAT "NO STATE SHALL PASS ANY BILL OF ATTAINER, EX POST FACTO LAW, OR ANY LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS" AND THE 1st. AMENDMENT FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE BEAR ON THE CLAIMS MADE IN THIS CASE, KING v. PASSMORE, 3 T.R. 246; PHILLIP v. BURY, 1 LORD RAYN 5 S.C. 2 T.R. 346.

THE INGREDIENTS REQUISITE TO FORM A CONTRACT/COVENANT ARE PARTIES, CONSENT, AND AN OBLIGATION TO BE CREATED OR DISSOLVED; THESE MUST ALL OCCUR, BECAUSE THE REGULAR EFFECT OF ALL CONTRACTS IS, ON ONE SIDE, TO ACQUIRE, AND ON THE OTHER, TO PART WITH, SOME PROPERTY OR RIGHTS, OR TO ABRIDGE OR TO RESTRAIN NATURAL LIBERTY(SUCH AS ALLOWING SOMEONE TO VIOLATE THE TERMS OF THE GRANT PURSUANT TO THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY), BY BINDING THE PARTIES TO DO OR RESTRAINING THEM FROM DOING, SOMETHING WHICH BEFORE THEY MIGHT HAVE DONE OR OMITTED, FLETCHER v. PECK, 6 CRANCH 87, IN WHICH IT WAS LAID DOWN THAT A CONTRACT/COVENANT IS EITHER EXECUTORY OR EXECUTED; BY THE FORMER, A PARTY BINDS HIMSELF TO DO OR NOT TO DO A PARTICULAR THING(THE GLOBAL BELIEVERS ARE BOUND TO ONLY GIVE THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TO HETEROSEXUALS); THE LATTER IS ONE IN WHICH THE OBJECT OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT IS PERFORMED, AND THIS DIFFERS IN NOTHIN FROM A "GRANT"; BUT WHETHER EXECUTED OR EXECUTORY, THEY BOTH CONTAIN OBLIGATIONS BINDING ON THE PARTIES, AND BOTH ARE EQUALLY WITHIN THE PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WHICH FORBID THE STATES, GOVERNMENTS, COURTS, TO PASS LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACTS WHICH IN THIS CASE IS ALSO PROTECTED BY THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE FIRST

AMENDMENT.

YOUR NATIONS' LIBERTY WAS RESTRAINED IN GIVING THE RIGHT TO MARRY TO THESE PEOPLE. YOUR NATIONS WERE RESTRAINED FROM ESTABLISHING LAWS LIKE AEDPA AND PLRA THAT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGET AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THEIR DETRIMENT, INSTITUTIONALIZING SLAVERY AND JIM CROW LAWS, PLACING INTO EFFECT INDICTMENTS THAT TAKE AWAY THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND THE OTHER LAWS IN QUESTION THAT YOU PROMOTED WHICH DEFY "**JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS**". YOUR NATIONS ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE CONTRACT, "THE GRANT" AND THE RIGHTS OF THE BENEFICIARIES OF THE TRUST. CAUSE IS ESTABLISHED.

A CONTRACT IS ALSO A "GRANT" BY MEANING WITHIN THE CONSTITUTION. A CORPORATION DEFINED BY MR. JUSTICE BLACKSTONE (2 Bl. Com. 37) IS TO BE A FRANCHISE WITH POWER TO MAINTAIN PERPETUAL SUCCESSION AND TO DO CORPORATE ACTS. TO THIS "GRANT", "CONTRACT", "FRANCHISE" ARE GOD, THE KING, WHICH IN THIS CASE IS ADAM, HIS WIFE AND CO-HEIR EVE AND THE PERSON FOR WHOM THE BENEFIT IS CREATED, OR TRUSTEE FOR THEM WHICH IS THE SOLE CORPORATION, AND THOSE THEY MAY FOR WHATEVER REASON APPOINT. THE ASSENT OF BOTH ARE NECESSARY WHICH WE HAVE IN THIS CASE.

THE SUBJECTS OF THE "GRANT" ARE NOT ONLY PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES, BUT PROPERTY, REAL AND INTELLECTUAL, OR, WHICH IS THE SAME THING, A CAPACITY TO ACQUIRE AND HOLD PROPERTY IN PERPETUITY. CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS ARE CREATED BINDING BOTH THE GRANTOR AND GRANTEES. ON THE PART OF THE FORMER, IT AMOUNTS TO AN EXTINGUISHMENT OF THE KING'S PREROGATIVE TO BESTOW THE SAME IDENTICAL FRANCHISE ON ANOTHER CORPORATE BODY, BECAUSE IT WOULD PREJUDICE THE PRIOR "GRANT". YOU CANNOT GRANT THE SAME RIGHTS OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT (e.g. MARRIAGE) ON ANOTHER CORPORATE BODY (e.g. SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHITES), BECAUSE IT WOULD PREJUDICE THE PRIOR "GRANT" GIVEN TO HETEROSEXUALS AND VIOLATE THE TERMS OF THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT", "GRANT", "FRANCHISE", "WILL" AND

TESTAMENT", (2 Bl. COM. 37).

YOU CANNOT MAKE LAWS OR SUBJECT PEOPLE TO LAWS THAT DEFY "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" AND THE 1st. AMENDMENT ESTABLISHMENT AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE AND THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT, COVENANT SET IN PLACE BY GOD, ADAM AND EVE WHO WERE YOUR FOREFATHERS AS WELL AS MINE, BINDING US ALL AS MANKIND. **"SEEING THAT ABRAHAM SHALL SURELY BECOME A GREAT AND MIGHTY NATION, AND ALL THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD SHALL BE BLESSED IN HIM? FOR I KNOW HIM, THAT HE WILL "COMMAND" (EMPHASIS ADDED) (NOT ASK) HIS CHILDREN AND HIS HOUSEHOLD "AFTER", "AFTER" HIM, AND THEY "SHALL" (MANDATORY) KEEP THE WAYS (LAWS) OF THE LORD, AND DO JUSTICE AND JUDGMENT\*\*\*\*".** AND RIGHT AFTER THIS VERY PASSAGE YOU HAVE GOD'S REFERENCE TO SODOM AND GOMORRAH. COINCIDENCE? NOT ON YOUR LIFE. THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT ARE UNAMBIGUOUS. CORRUPT JUDGES, CROOKED, RACIST, BRUTAL COPS, SLAVERY, JIM CROW LAWS, PLRA, AEDPA, SAME SEX MARRIAGES. YOUR NATIONS SPEAK BLASPHEMIES, AND YOU VIOLATED THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT MANKIND, PERMITTING JAHJAH (CRAWFORD) TO LEGALLY INTERVENE, CHALLENGE, ABOLISH ALL UNJUST LAWS, INDICTMENTS, MARRIAGES, ATTACK UPON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, GUTTING THE VOTING RIGHTS LAWS OF THIS NATION AND RESTORE ALL TERMS OF THE CONTRACT, TO WHICH JUDGE AUSTIN IS TRUSTEE. SUCH IS DONE AND ESTABLISHED BY DECREE OF JAHJAH AL MAHDI.

THIS FULFILLS THE PROPHESY WRITTEN IN MARK 9:12 WHICH STATE, **"ELIJAH MUST FIRST COME AND RESTORE ALL THINGS".** EVERY ALTERATION OF THE CONTRACT, COVENANT, HOWEVER UNIMPORTANT, EVEN THOUGH YOU CLAIMED WAS IN THE INTEREST OF "DEMOCRACY", THOUGH OBJECTED TO BY THE RIGHTFUL HEIRS TO THE KINGDOM OF GOD, IMPAIRED THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT AND VIOLATED THE ESTABLISHMENT AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE 1st. AMENDMENT. FOR IT IS IMPOSSIBLE THAT A NEW CONTRACT/COVENANT OR CONSTRUCTION SHOULD NOT VIOLATE THE OLD CONTRACT, COVENANT THROUGH MOSES, CHRIST AND MUHAMMAD (PBUH), WHICH ARE **"ONE"**. THE REASON IS OBVIOUS---A COVENANT, WILL AND TESTAMENT, IS A CONTRACT TO THE VALIDITY OF WHICH THE CONSENT

OF BOTH PARTIES IS ESSENTIAL, AND THEREFORE IT CANNOT BE ALTERED OR ADDED OR MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS WITHOUT CONSENT OF THE SOLE CORPORATION WHICH WAS NEVER GIVEN IN CASES, AND OR IS OFFICIALLY WITHDRAWN. THIS INCLUDES ANY LAWS MADE BY YOUR GLOBAL LEGISLATIVE BODIES. YOUR NATIONS HAVE INTERPRETED LAW AND PLACED INTO EFFECT LAWS THAT MAKE THE SOLE CORPORATION QUESTION YOUR SANITY AND INTENT, AS THOUGH YOUR NATIONS WERE IN A DRUNKEN STUPOR. MY PEOPLE, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS, JEWS, AFRICANS AND ITS DIASPORA WILL HAVE "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". YOU ARE IN BREACH OF THE TRUST, OF THE "GRANT", OF CONTRACT, ALLOWING ME AND MY PEOPLE TO JOINTLY BRING ACTION AS BENEFICIARIES OF THE TRUST AND THE FIDUCIARY HEIR OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. SEE KING v. PASSMORE, 3 T.R. 246; TERRITT v. TAYLOR, 9 CRANCH 43; 1 Bl. COM. 469, 475, 1 KYD. ON CORP., 13, 69, 189; 1 WOODDES, 471, & C.; ATTORNEY GENERAL v. WHORWOOD, 1 VES. 534; ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE v. TODINGTON, 1 Bl. REP. 84 S.C. 1 BURR. 200; WOODS v. WOODS, 2016 WL 4013754; M & G POLYMERS U.S.A., LLC. v. TACHETT, 135 S.Ct. 926(2015); HARDT v. RELIANCE STANDARD LIFE INS. CO., 560 U.S. 242, 130 S.Ct. 2149, 176 L.Ed.2d. 998(U.S.2010); TRUSTEES OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE v. WOODWARD, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201; TONBAR v. BANGS, 69 U.S. 728, 1864 WL 6590, 17 L.Ed. 768, 2 WALL 728(1864); OPARAH v. THE NEW YORK CITY DEPT. OF EDUC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 4240733 (N.Y.D.C.2015); INTERNATIONAL ASS'N OF MACHINIST LODGE 1652 v. INTERNAL AIRCRAFT SERVICE INC. (CHARLESTON), 302 F2d. 808, 49 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2976(4th.Cir.1962). WE SEEK DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.

AS AFORESAID. THE TRUSTEE'S DUTY OF LOYALTY PROHIBITS BOTH SELF DEALING AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: THUS, THE TRUSTEE(S) MUST EITHER (1) DEAL WITH TRUST PROPERTY FOR THE BENEFIT OF HIMSELF OR THIRD PARTIES, (2) PLACE HERSELF IN A POSITION INCONSISTENT WITH THE INTEREST OF THE TRUST. AUSTIN MUST RECUSE AND VACATE ANY SEPARATION ORDERS. DUTY OF PRUDENCE, UNDER THE COMMON LAW OF TRUST, REQUIRE THE TRUSTEE TO ADHERE TO THE LAW. PLRA AND AEDPA ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL BY THE LITIGATION PRESENTED. SHE BROKE THE LAW ESTABLISHED BY EX PARTE VIRGINIA BY MAKING USE OF IT IN THIS

CASE IN FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY. WE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND ANY INITIAL REVIEW OR TIME FOR SUBMISSION OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BY THE DEFENDANTS BE FORFEITED, HEARING BE SET, HEARING BE SCHEDULED, LEGAL COUNSEL BE APPOINTED FOR THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS EXCEPT THE KING-KHALIFAH WHO WILL ACT PRO SE, DISCOVERY ISSUE AND CASE BE SET FOR TRIAL. ALL RELIEF SOUGHT IN CASES 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294 BE GRANTED VIA SANCTIONS SOUGHT FOR THE FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, FOR MONIES STOLEN FROM US, FOR EVIDENCE SUPPRESSION AND SPOILATION, FOR THE PHYSICAL ASSAULTS, CORRUPT JUDGES, FICTITIOUS HOMICIDE BEING ESTABLISHED, FALSE INDICTMENTS PRESENTED TO FRAME THE KING-KHALIFAH AND RACIAL ANIMUS CONSISTENTLY DISPLAYED. THIS IS OUTRAGEOUS! WE SEEK FULL FAITH AND CREDIT BE GIVEN TO THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF THE LOWER COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, AND WE SEEK IMMEDIATE REMOVAL PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c) AND ALL OTHER RELIEF SOUGHT BY ALL THE (4) MANDAMUS THAT WERE FILED. JUDGE AUSTIN MUST BE MADE TO STAND UP AND FULFILL HER DUTY AS TRUSTEE, FIFTH THIRD BON CORP. v. DUDENHOEFFER, 134 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d. 457(U.S.2014). A TRUSTEE SHALL INVEST AND MANAGE THE TRUST ASSETS SOLELY IN THE INTEREST OF THE BENEFICIARIES, WS. 1977 4-10-905 LOYALTY.

UNDER PRINCIPLES OF EQUITY, A TRUSTEE BEARS AN UNWAVERING DUTY OF COMPLETE LOYALTY TO THE BENEFICIARIES OF THE TRUST, TO THE EXCLUSION OF THE INTEREST OF ALL OTHERS. TO DETER A TRUSTEE FROM ALL TEMPTATION AND TO PREVENT ANY POSSIBLE INJURY TO THE BENEFICIARY, WHICH OCCURRED BY HER ISSUING THIS SEPARATION ORDER, SEPARATING THE PLAINTIFFS FROM EACH OTHER TO CAUSE HARM TO OUR PROCEEDINGS. THE RULE AGAINST THE TRUSTEE DIVIDING HER LOYALTIES MUST BE ENFORCED WITH UNCOMPROMISING RIGIDITY. SELF DEALING BY THE TRUSTEE OR ANY FIDUCIARY IS ALWAYS SUSPECT, AND IT IS A UNIVERSAL RULE OF EQUITY THAT A TRUSTEE SHALL NOT DEAL WITH TRUST PROPERTY TO HIS OR HER OWN ADVANTAGE WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE OR CONSENT OF THE CESTUI QUE TRUST. SHE WAS GIVEN CONSENT TO ESTABLISH THE INDEPENDENT ACTION, BUT NOT TO SEPARATE US AFTER THAT. SHE MUST

BE MADE TO CORRECT THIS INJUSTICE, FOBES v. FORBES, 341 P.3d. 1041, 2015 WY. 13 JAN. 23, 2015; N.L.R.B. v. AMEX COAL CO.,...DIV. OF AMAX, INC., 453 U.S. 322, 101 S.Ct. 2789(U.S.1981); CENTRAL STATES, SOUTHEAST AND SOUTHWEST ARCA PENSION FUNDS v. CENTRAL TRANSPORT, INC., 472 U.S. 559, 105 S.Ct. 2833, 86 L.Ed.2d. 447(U.S.1985).

IT IS A GENERAL RULE OF THE COMMON LAW (THE REVERSE OF THAT APPLIED IN ORDINARY CASES) THAT A "GRANT", "CONTRACT", "WILL AND TESTAMENT" OF A KING-KHALIFAH AT THE SUIT OF THE GRANTOR, IS TO BE CONSTRUED MOST BENEFICIAL FOR THE KING-KHALIFAH AND MOST STRICTLY AGAINST THE GRANTEE. AUSTIN CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO ABUSE THE TRUST. THE LAWS WHICH ARE CONNECTED TO THE CONVICTIONS ABUSE THE TRUST AND ARE CALLED INTO ACCOUNT AND ARE NOW GIVEN NO EFFECT BEING IN EGREGIOUS VIOLATION OF THE CONTRACT/COVENANT. YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE OF ALL RIGHTS ACQUIRED UNDER THEM BEING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ALSO BY THE DECREE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING AND COURT WHOSE POWER SUPERSEDES YOUR GLOBAL COURTS BY THE DEFAULT, VOIDING OF JURISDICTION AND CONTRACT VIA SUCH BREACH, EMERGING FROM CASES 2006-CP-400-3567; 2013-CP-400-0084. ITS TIME FOR PRISON REFORM AND OPPORTUNITY TO FIX THIS MESS WITH THESE SODOMITES YOUR NATIONS DEVISED. IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT ANY OF A LEGISLATURE OR COURTS WITHIN YOUR NATIONS WHICH TAKE AWAY ANY POWERS OF FRANCHISE VESTED BY THE "COVENANT", "WILL AND TESTAMENT", "CONTRACT" IN THE SOLE CORPORATION, OR ITS TRUSTEE, OR WHICH RESTRAINS OR CONTROLS THE LEGITIMATE EXERCISE OF THEM, OR TRANSFER THEM TO OTHER PERSONS WITHOUT ITS ASSENT IS A VIOLATION OF THE OBLIGATIONS OF THAT CONTRACT. IF THE COURT AND LEGISLATURE CLAIM SUCH AN AUTHORITY IT MUST BE WRITTEN WITHIN THE "WILL AND TESTAMENT", (3) HOLY BOOKS, TO WHICH IT IS NOT. THUS, THE 4th. AND 3rd. CIRCUITS ARE BOUND TO DECLARE THAT THE ACTS AND INJUSTICES ARGUED WITHIN THE PLAINTIFFS CASE JOINTLY AND OR SEPARATELY DO IMPAIR THE OBLIGATION OF THE "COVENANT", "TESTAMENT", "CONTRACT" WHICH IN TRUTH DECLARE THAT THERE IS NO SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, WHICH IS OBVIOUS WHEN YOUR

POLITICAL CANDIDATES RUNNING FOR OFFICE CONSISTENTLY BRING UP THEIR RELIGIOUS FAITH. THE FACT THAT THE "CHARITY" (GRANT) GIVEN TO YOU MAY BE USED IN THE PUBLIC ARENAS DON'T MAKE THE SOLE CORPORATION PUBLIC. WE ARE SEPARATE FROM YOU, A PECULIAR PEOPLE, A CHOSEN KINGDOM AND PRIESTHOOD DESIGNATING LIMITS PLACE UPON YOU VIA "CONTRACT" "COVENANT" PERPETUALLY ESTABLISHED RESTRICTED YOU GIVING THIS RELIGIOUS COVENANT, "GRANT" TO HOMOSEXUALS AND LESBIANS. AS "**SALT OF THE EARTH**", BY THE (4) PILLARS WE BRING SUIT.

INSOMUCH, THESE CLAIMS CAN NO LONGER BE CONSIDERED FRIVOLOUS, OR IT BE STATED THAT WE ARE INFRINGING UPON RIGHTS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. THE CLAIMS OF DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASES 2006-CP-400-3567; 2013-CP-400-0084 BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843 (U.S. 2019) WHERE THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ARE PARTIES TO, MAKE THE CLAIMS TRUE WHICH IS COMPOUNDED BY THEIR FAILURE TO EVEN APPEAR AT THE NOVEMBER 2020 HEARING WITH NO VALID EXCUSE OPENING THEM TO FORFEITURE, PRODUCES A PRECLUSIVE EFFECT PREVENTING THE COURTS FROM CHALLENGING THESE CLAIMS. LEGAL BINDING "CONTRACT/COVENANT" IS OFFICIALLY PLACED BEFORE THE COURT(S).

IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT THE LOWER FEDERAL AND STATE COURTS UNDERSTOOD AND KNOW THIS TO BE TRUE OR THEY WOULD HAVE NEVER ENGAGED THEMSELVES IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND FRAUD, ATTEMPTING TO REMAND WHEN THERE WAS NO DISCRETIONARY REMAND TO ALLOW THE STATE ACTORS TO OBTAIN THE FRAUDULENT, TAINTED PROTECTIVE ORDERS TO MISREPRESENT THE TRUTH OF THIS MATTER. DUE TO THIS DILATORY, OBSTRUCTIVE BEHAVIOR, SANCTIONS MUST BE IMPOSED AND THE CLAIMS OF SOVEREIGNTY BE GIVEN FULL FAITH AND CREDIT IN ALL COURT(S) RECORDS, ROBINSON v. U.S., 2015 WL 1524406; U.S. v. STERLING, 724 F3d. 482 CA4 (Va. 2013); TURNER v. U.S., 736 F3d. 274 CA4 (N.C. 2013); LOVELESS v. JOHN

FORD INC., 232 Fed. Appx' 229, 2007 WL 1381597 CA4 (Va.2007).

WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ON ALL ISSUES AND CLAIMS WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT AND ALL THOSE ATTACHED.

WE MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE CAUSES OF ACTION IN ALL PENDING FEDERAL CASES WITH THE CLAIMS, ISSUES AND DEFENSES ARGUED WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT AND SEEK THIS MANDAMUS TO REMEDY ALL ISSUES OF CONCERN.

WE WANT THE INJUNCTION SOUGHT AND ALL RELIEF IN CASES 16-1519, 16-1953, 16-2141 GRANTED. WE SEEK THE RECUSAL OF JUDGE AUSTIN AND HARWELL AND AUSTIN BE REQUIRED TO STAND IN HER POSITION AS TRUSTEE AND TRANSFERRING ALL CASES AFTER CONSOLIDATION TO NEW JERSEY WHERE TRIAL WILL COMMENCE. WE SEEK THAT ALL PLAINTIFFS IN ALL CASES REFERRED TO BE REMOVED TO THE NICEST FEDERAL PRE-RELEASE CAMP THIS NATION HAS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c). WE WANT OUT MASTER'S, OUR GOD'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GIVEN TO THE KING-KHALIFAH, THE SOLE CORPORATION BY DEFAULT AND INHERITANCE RETURNED AND ALL MARRIAGES NATIONALLY BE ORDERED ANNULLED. MARRIAGE BY CONTRACT IN ITS ORIGINAL CONCEPTION IS A RELIGIOUS COVENANT, PRACTICE AND INSTITUTION. NOT MERELY A CIVIL ACT OR PUBLIC PRACTICE. IT IS RESTRICTED BY CONTRACT/COVENANT WHICH YOU VIOLATED. THE SOLE CORPORATION'S RIGHT TO CHALLENGE IS ESTABLISHED.

THE RIGHT TO ISSUANCE OF THE WRIT IS INDISPUTABLE. AUSTIN MUST EXERCISE POWER AS THE KING-KHALIFAH'S TRUSTEE. RECUSAL IS SOUGHT IN OTHER CRUCIAL MATTERS. THE WRIT ISSUES IN ALL CASES WHERE THE PARTY HATH A RIGHT TO HAVE ANYTHING DONE AND HATH NO OTHER SPECIFIC MEANS OF COMPELLING ITS PERFORMANCE. THEREUPON IT MUST ISSUE AS A "WILDCARD" REMEDY. THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF A WRIT OF MANDAMUS IS TO GRANT AN ESTABLISHED RIGHT AND OR ENFORCE AN IMPERATIVE DUTY. BY THE DOCUMENTS CONTINUOUSLY FILED OVER THE

YEARS, (10+), TO INCLUDE THE CLAIMS OF DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASES 2006-CP-400-3567; 2013-CP-400-0084 BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON THAT IS JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED AND CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, THAT THEY CRIMINALLY, FRAUDULENTLY CONSPIRED TO CONCEAL, NEGATE AND FAILED. WE HAVE ESTABLISHED THE RIGHTS WITH SUFFICIENT CERTAINTY AND SHOWN THE IMPERATIVE DUTY PLACED UPON THE CONSPIRING STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS ONLY TO BE DEFRAUDED, CRIMINALLY DELAYED AND UNJUSTLY DENIED. THE WRIT IN THE INTEREST OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" MUST ISSUE, PORTER v. JEDZINIAC, 334 S.C. 16, 18, 512 S.E.2d. 497, 498(1999) CITING WILLIAMS v. CITY OF GREENVILLE, 243 S.C. 82, 132 S.E.2d. 169(1963); BOUNDS v. SMITH, 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct. 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d. 72(N.C.1977); ROBINSON v. LEAHY, D.C.ILL. 1975, 401 F.Supp. 1027; VISTAMAR INC. v. VAZQUEZ, D.C. PUERTO RICO, 1971, 337 F.Supp. 375; WILWORDING v. SWENSEN, 1971, 404 U.S. 249, 92 S.Ct. 407, 30 L.Ed.2d. 418; BUISE v. HUDKINS, CA IND. 1978, 584 F2d. 223; IN RE: WAINWRIGHT, CA5 (FLA.) 1975, 518 F2d. 173; WILL v. UNITED STATES, 389 U.S. 90, 95, 88 S.Ct. 269, 273, 19 L.Ed.2d. 305(1967); KERR v. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 426 U.S. 394, 405, 96 S.Ct. 2119, 48 L.Ed.2d. 725 (1976); 3 BLACKSTONE AT \* 110; IN RE: FIRST FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN ASSOCIATION OF DORHAM, 860 F2d. 135, 138 (4th.Cir.1988); 198 F3d. AT 511; 695 F2d. 1179.


---

IT IS SO ORDERED

---

DATE

JAHJAH AL MAHDI



ANTHONY COOK

Anthony Cook

YAHYA MAQUIT



NOVEMBER 2, 2016

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF  
CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,  
RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT  
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY AND LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY ON THIS DATE OF NOVEMBER 9, 2021, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED MOTION FOR INCLUSION AND TO WAIVE THE SUBMITTING OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ORDER ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE

SERVED, BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4th. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTER 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

(10) THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS AND

JUDGE NEWMAN 1701 MAIN STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(11) THE S.C. SUPREME COURT P.O. BOX 11330 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

(12) ATTORNEY D. SETTANA AT THE MCKAY LAW FIRM 1303 BLANDING STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(13) THE LAW FIRM OF DABOSE-ROBINSON 935 BROAD STREET CAMDEN, S.C. 29020.

(14) THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

WE DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

EXECUTED ON NOVEMBER 8, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,  
LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD



RON SANTA MCCRAY  
*Ron Santa McCray*

NO. 21A425

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

VS.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF  
CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,  
RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT  
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

MOTION FOR INCLUSION AND TO WAIVE THE  
SUBMITTING OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ORDER

IN RE: CRAWFORD AND McCRAY

TO: THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,

FROM WHAT THE PETITIONER(S) COMPREHEND THAT WHICH THE RULES REQUIRE. THE PETITIONER McCRAY MUST FILE A FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT FOR THIS PETITION AND FILING. IT IS ALSO REQUIRED THAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TO SUBMIT THE ORDER FROM ONE OF THE LOWER COURTS INVOLVED, SPECIFICALLY, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. REGARDING McCRAY, A FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT HAS ALREADY BEEN SUBMITTED WITHIN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FOR THE APPEALING OF CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT CLERK ONLY SENT THE PETITIONER McCARY ONE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT THOUGH THE COURT WAS AWARE OF THE PETITIONER'S INTENTION TO FILE TWO PETITIONS. THEY SENT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TWO SETS BUT NOT THE PETITIONER McCRAY. DUE TO S. CAROLINA INSTITUTIONAL ARBITRARY LOCKDOWNS. THE PETITIONER McCRAY WAS UNABLE TO MAKE COPY OF THE ONE FORM SENT TO HIM AND WAS FORCED TO SEND THAT ONE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS FORM IN WITH THE PETITION APPEALING CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4th. CIRCUIT PRESENTLY PENDING WITHIN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. THIS WAS ALSO COURT CLERICAL ERROR THAT PREJUDICED THE PETITIONER McCRAY


LEAVING HIM WITH ONE SET OF FORMS FOR TWO PETITIONS SOUGHT TO BE FILED. DUE TO THE INSTITUTION NOT ALLOWING THE PETITIONER McCRAY TO COPY THE FORM. THIS PRODUCES STATE INTERFERENCE OUT OF HIS CONTROL.

IN THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S CASE, THE FINAL ORDER ISSUED FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WAS SENT TO HIM, AND LIKE McCRAY, THE S.C. INSTITUTION WHERE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD IS HOUSED IS ALSO SUBJECT TO THE SAME ARBITRARY LOCKDOWNS DUE TO SHORTAGE OF STAFF. CRAWFORD HAD (10) DAYS TO GET THE PLEADING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHICH ESTABLISH CASE 2020--00974 AND WAS NOT ABLE TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THAT ORDER BEING FORCED TO SEND HIS ONLY COPY IN ORDER THAT THE FILING BE TIMELY. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD HAS MADE REPEATED ATTEMPTS AND EFFORTS TO OBTAIN AN ADDITIONAL COPY OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS FINAL ORDER ONLY TO BE MET WITH OBSTRUCTION AND LIES WHERE AT FIRST THEY SAID THEY WOULD SEND A COPY BUT DID NOT. THEN AFTERWARD STATED A FEE HAD TO BE PAID FOR A COPY WHERE CRAWFORD IS PRESENTLY INDIGENT. THE PETITIONER(S) FEEL THAT THIS IS BEING DONE BY THE STATE ACTORS TO CREATE A DEFICIENCY IN FILING TO THWART SUPREME COURT JUDICIAL REVIEW. THEREFORE, DUE TO THIS STATE INTERFERENCE, THE PETITIONERS MOTION THAT THE RECORD BE EXPANDED AND THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS APPLICATION SENT BY McCRAY FOR THE APPEAL OF CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BE USED IN THIS CASE BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT SINCE HIS FINANCIAL SITUATION HAS NOT CHANGED SINCE ITS FILING. WE ALSO MOTION TO WAIVE THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE ORDER FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS BE FILED IN THE RECORD SINCE A COPY OF IT IS FILED WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND ALL OTHER REQUIRED

ORDERS ARE ATTACHED IN APPENDIX---A. THE PETITIONER(S) PRAY THE COURT WILL GRANT THIS REQUEST..

RESPECTFULLY,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD



RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron Santa McCray*

NOVEMBER 8, 2021

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

December 16, 2021

Lawrence L. Crawford  
#300839  
Lee CI  
990 Wisacky Hwy  
Bishopville, SC 29010

RE: Crawford, et al. v. South Carolina  
SCSC Nos. 2020-000974, 2020-001615

Dear Mr. Crawford:

The documents pertaining to the above-referenced petition for a writ of certiorari were postmarked December 3, 2021, forwarded to the Clerk by Justice Sotomayor on December 16, 2021, and are returned herewith.

The August 6, 2021 order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina that is included herein must be submitted together with the petition for a writ of certiorari that was returned for corrections on December 15, 2021. As it is now apparent that Mr. McCray is a party to the judgment sought to be reviewed, please ensure that a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and declaration of indigency of each petitioner is included upon resubmission of the petition.

Please also be advised that this Court has no authority to institute or conduct investigations.

Sincerely,  
Scott S. Harris, Clerk  
By:

Emily Walker  
(202) 479-5955

Enclosures

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE NEWMAN; DIRECTOR STIRLING;  
DORM MANAGER LT. REED; GENERAL COUNSEL; ANNIE RUMBLER;  
CAPT. BRIGHTHART; WARDEN WILLIAMS; BARTON VINCENT ET. AL.,  
DEFENDANTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF THIS DATE OF DECEMBER 19, 2021, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073 DUE TO ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF

JUSTICE;\*\*\*\*, ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

JUSTICE;\*\*\*\*, ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE NEWMAN; DIRECTOR STIRLING;  
DORM MANAGER LT. REED; GENERAL COUNSEL; ANNIE RUMBLER;  
CAPT. BRIGHTHART; WARDEN WILLIAMS; BARTON VINCENT ET. AL.,  
DEFENDANTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
FOR CASE 20-7073 DUE TO ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND  
OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; MOTION FOR A NEW CASE MANAGER;  
MOTION FOR A STAY OF CASE 21-6275 IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT  
AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASES 20-7073; 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASES

2020-0001615, 2020-000974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT.

TO: THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,  
THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "LOCAL RULE 45". THIS IS A COPY OF THE LOCAL RULE 45 NOTICE ISSUED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DATED DECEMBER 6, 2021 FILED IN CASE 21-6275.

(2) EXHIBIT, "DEFERMENT". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER DATED OCTOBER 28, 2021 FILED IN CASE 21-6275 WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DETERMINED THAT THEY WOULD DEFER ANY RULING AND OR REQUIREMENT IN CASE 21-6275 UNTIL THE APPEAL OF CASE 20-7073 WAS HEARD IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

(3) EXHIBIT, "JUDGE SOTOMAYOR". THIS IS A COPY OF THE (4) PAGE LETTER DATED DECEMBER 2, 2021 THAT WAS SENT WITH THE REPAIRED SUBSEQUENT PLEADING AFTER THE INITIAL PLEADING WAS COMPROMISED, AND PORTIONS SPOLIATED BY POTENTIAL MEMBERS, AGENTS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY NATURE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SURROUND THIS CASE. THIS LETTER WAS SENT WITH THE REPAIRED SUBSEQUENT FILING TO THE INITIAL FILING BY CERTIFIED MAIL NUMBER 7021 0950 0001 0779 5166 WHICH THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE CONFIRMED AND OR INDICATED BY THEIR 800 NUMBER WAS DELIVERED TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON DECEMBER 6, 2021, BUT EMILY WALKER WHO SHE SAYS HER NAME IS, THE PRESENT CASE MANAGER, INDICATED TO THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER, LENEAU CRAWFORD, OVER THE TELEPHONE, HAS NOT BEEN FORWARDED TO HER BY THE PROCESSING DIVISION OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

THOUGH THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS IN QUESTION WERE IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S POSSESSION FOR ALMOST TWO WEEKS NOW.

(4) EXHIBIT, "INITIAL 20-7073 PETITION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI OF CASE 20-7073 THAT WAS RETURNED TO THE PETITIONERS AS PART OF THE SCHEME, PLOT, AND COMPROMISED INITIAL PLEADING, MIXING THE FEDERAL DOCUMENTS WITH THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA DOCUMENTS IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO JUSTIFY THEIR RETURN. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WAS ALREADY PREVIOUSLY SERVED A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT.

THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER CASES 2020-0001615 AND 2020-000974, CRAWFORD AND McCRAY ARE OFFICIALLY MOTIONING FOR AN INVESTIGATION BECAUSE ALL POINTS TO THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WHO ARE VERY POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS COMPROMISING AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO PREVENT THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FROM EVER HEARING THESE CASES. WE RESPECTFULLY DEMAND AND OR REQUEST AND MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL FULL INVESTIGATION BY AN INDEPENDENT SOURCE TO GET AT THE BOTTOM OF WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THESE CASES INVOLVED.

THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND MOTION FOR A STAY ON CASE 21-6276 DUE TO EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT OCCURRED HERE, SEEKING TIME TO RESET ONCE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES ON WHETHER OR NOT THE PETITIONER(S) ARE ENTITLED TO A COMPLETE AND FULL INVESTIGATION INTO WHAT IS POTENTIALLY CRIMINAL ACTIVITY RELATED TO THE HINDERING AND OBSTRUCTING THE HEARING OF THESE CASES INVOLVED.

THIS IS WHAT OCCURRED. THE PETITIONERS SENT INTO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AS WAS INSTRUCTED BY PRIOR CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SUPREME COURT, A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073

AND 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHICH WAS SENT TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN ONE MAILING. IN ANOTHER SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT MAILING ABOUT (3) DAYS LATER AND APART. THE PETITIONER(S) SENT IN MAILING SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI OUT OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THAT STATE'S SUPREME COURT RELATED TO BOTH CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974.

THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS, POWERFUL POLITICAL FIGURES THAT THEY ARE, THEN SOMEHOW COMPROMISES AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BY GETTING THESE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES, PROBABLY IN THE PROCESSING DIVISION, TO COMPROMISE OUR INITIAL PLEADING. THEY ACCOMPLISHED THIS BY TAKING THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT PROCEEDING AND THEN SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, THE INITIAL STATE PETITION SENT, ALONG WITH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FINAL ORDERS IN APPENDIX 1 BECAUSE WITHOUT THE ORDERS THE CASE CAN'T BE HEARD. THEN THE CONSPIRING AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES WITHIN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, TO PREVENT AND OR HINDER THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUDGES FROM EVER HEARING THE CASE. THE CONSPIRING PARTIES THEN SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, "KEY", "CRUCIAL" EXHIBITS AND OR EVIDENCE, ABOUT (5) APPENDICES LISTED WITHIN THE STATE SUPREME COURT PETITION, EVIDENCE THAT WOULD HAVE CLEARLY PROVEN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND PARTIES INVOLVEMENT IN SUBSTANTIAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITY VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATING PROVISIONS OF 5 U.S.C. §§ 3333, 3331 AND 7311 OF STATUTORY CODE OF LAW.

AFTER SPOLIATING, DESTROYING, COMPROMISING THESE CRUCIAL, ESSENTIAL PORTIONS OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PROCEEDING, THE CONSPIRING PARTIES THEN TAKE THE PLEADING SENT IN FOR SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR THE FEDERAL CASE UNDER 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, AND SUBSTITUTE, PUT THEM IN PLACE OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PLEADING AND OR WRIT OF CERTIORARI, TO PRETEND THAT THIS IS HOW THEY WERE SENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO JUSTIFY THEIR RETURN AND ALLOW THE 4TH. CIRCUIT

TO ISSUE THE RULE 45 NOTICE TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE THE FAULT WAS THE PETITIONERS FAILURE TO PROSECUTE.

THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS SENT BACK TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AFTER REPAIRING THE ACTS OF SPOILATION AND DESTRUCTION OF COURT DOCUMENTS. AS OF THIS DATE MS. EMILY WALKER POSSIBLY CONSPIRING WITH THESE INDIVIDUALS, HAS FAILED TO ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THE NOW RESENT STATE SUPREME COURT PLEADINGS REPAIRING THE SPOILATION AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT IF THE PETITIONER(S) SENT IN THE FEDERAL PLEADING SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI RELATED TO CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT NOW. THE CONSPIRING COMPROMISED AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES NOW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, WILL SEE THIS AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO CRIMINALLY REPEAT THE INJUSTICE AND MIX THE PLEADING AGAIN AND SPOILATE ESSENTIAL LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND PRETEND THAT THE DEFICIENCY WAS CAUSED BY THE PETITIONER(S). THUS, THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT UNTIL AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION IS CONDUCTED AND THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ACKNOWLEDGE ON THE COURT RECORD THAT THE S.C. STATE SUPREME COURT PLEADING IS IN THE HANDS OF A NEW AND PROPER CASE MANAGER NOT WORKING FOR THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, AND IS NOT TAMPERED WITH AND THE CASE IS ALLOWED TO MOVE FORWARD FOR RULING BY THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT JUDGES AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY WOULD GRANT THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.


ONE OF THE SPECIFIC REASONS THAT THE PETITIONER(S) FEEL THAT THE CASE MANAGER EMILY WALKER, ALL INDICATIONS POINT TO HER INVOLVEMENT, IS BECAUSE WHEN THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER AND SISTER, LENEAU CRAWFORD AND YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN CALLED THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO OFFICIALLY COMPLAIN ABOUT THE INJUSTICE DONE TO THE PETITIONER(S) AND ASK FOR AN INVESTIGATION. THE PETITIONER(S) BROTHER ASKED MS. WALKER IF SHE EVEN RECEIVED THE PETITIONERS' MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE AND OR TO EXPEDITE THE

HEARING OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THEREUPON, MS. EMILY WALKER, IF THIS IS HER NAME, INFORMED THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER AND SISTER YAHDINA THAT THERE WAS NO SUCH THING AS A MOTION OR MECHANISM IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PROCEDURES OR RULES THAT CAN BE INVOKED TO SEEK AND OR ALLOW THE PETITIONERS TO REQUEST OR MOTION TO EXPEDITE THE HEARING OF THE CASE. IT IS PERSPICUOUS FROM THE CASES OF DOES 1-3 v. MILLS, --S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 5763094 (MEM) (U.S.2021) AND WHOLE WOMAN HEALTH v. JACKSON, 142 S.Ct. 415 (MEM) 2021 WL 4840468 THAT SUCH A MECHANISM TO SEEK TO EXPEDITE HEARING OF A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI DOES EXIST. MS. EMILY WALKER BLATANTLY, CRIMINALLY, LIED TO THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY MEMBERS DEMONSTRATING HER POTENTIAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY OF THE PARTIES BEING CHALLENGED. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION THAT A NEW CASE MANAGER BE ASSIGNED TO HANDLING THE PETITIONER(S) CASES. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR A STAY ON CASE 21-6275 UNTIL THE INVESTIGATION CONCLUDES AND THE APPEAL OF CASE 20-7073 IS HEARD. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT THE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI REGARDING CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ONCE THOSE MATTERS ARE INVESTIGATED AND REMEDIED.

RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY



JONAH THE TISHBITE



DECEMBER 18, 2021.

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

January 24, 2022

Lawrence L. Crawford

#300839

Lee CI

990 Wisacky Hwy

Bishopville, SC 29010

RE: "Motion for an Official Investigation; Motion for an Extension of Time to Submit Petition for Writ of Cert. for Case 20-7073 Due to Acts of Criminal Conspiracy & Obstruction of Justice; Motion for a New Case Manager; Motion for a Stay of Case 21-6275 in the 4th. Cir. & Motion to Motion Therefor"

Dear Mr. Crawford:

The enclosed documents postmarked January 11, 2022, and received January 19, 2022 are returned unfiled.

United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit case No. 20-7073 was covered by this Court's extension order of March 19, 2020, extending the time to file the petition by sixty days, which is the maximum extension allowed by statute and rule. The Court's July 19, 2021 order rescinds that extension in any case in which the relevant lower court judgment, order denying discretionary review, or order denying a timely petition for rehearing was issued on or after July 19, 2021; for those cases, the deadline to file a petition for a writ of certiorari is as provided by Rule 13. For cases in which the relevant lower court judgment, order denying discretionary review, or order denying a timely petition for rehearing was issued before July 19, 2021, the deadline remains extended to 150 days from that judgment or order, and the Clerk cannot docket applications for further extension of time with respect to cert petitions covered by the March 19, 2020 order.

Moreover, the Rules of this Court make no provision for the filing of an application to extend the time to file a corrected petition for a writ of certiorari. As a corrected petition was not received within sixty days of the Clerk's November 17, 2021 letter, the petition is out-of-time (unless a corrected petition was sent to the Clerk on or before January 17, 2022 and has not yet been received). You may resubmit an otherwise compliant petition together with a motion to direct the Clerk to file the petition out-of-time. The motion will be presented to the full Court.

With respect to the "Motion for a Stay of Case 21-6275 in the 4th. Circuit and Motion to Motion Therefor," please be advised that an application for a stay must comply in all respects with Rules 22 and 23, including the requirement that you append a copy of the order of the Court or judge below denying the relief sought.

With respect to the "Motion for an Official Investigation" and "Motion for a New Case Manager," you are again informed that neither the Court nor any Justice thereof has any authority to institute or conduct investigations, and that the Clerk does not entertain requests for an alternate case analyst.

Sincerely,  
Scott S. Harris, Clerk  
By:   
Emily Walker  
(202) 479-5955

~~File in case~~

21A425

EXHIBIT, "LOCAL RULE 45".

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT  
1100 East Main Street, Suite 501, Richmond, Virginia 23219

December 6, 2021

---

RULE 45 NOTICE

---

No. 21-6275,      Lawrence Crawford v. Warden Nelson  
9:20-cv-02139-TLW-MHC

TO:    Lawrence Crawford

**DEFAULT(S) MUST BE REMEDIED BY: 12/21/2021**

Please take notice that the court will dismiss this case for failure to prosecute pursuant to Local Rule 45 unless the default(s) identified below are remedied within 15 days of the date of this notice through receipt of the requisite form(s) or fee in the appropriate clerk's office. Forms are available for completion as links from this notice and at the court's web site, [www.ca4.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca4.uscourts.gov).

---

**Informal opening brief** must be received in the Court of Appeals clerk's office.

T. Fischer, Deputy Clerk  
804-916-2704





EXHIBIT, "JUDGE SOTOMAYOR"

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260  
LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.  
BISHOPVELLE, S.C. 29010

RON SANTA McCRAY  
\$353031 COOPER B-59  
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205  
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29742

IN RE: POTENTIAL ACTS OF SPOILATION, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND  
THE COMPROMISING OF THE INITIAL PLEADING THAT WAS SENT TO THE  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
CERTIORARI FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT RELATED TO CASES  
2020-001615 AND 2020-000974 OF THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION  
CASES AND THE SEEKING OF AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION.

TO: THE HONORABLE JUDGE SOTOMAYOR AND HER OFFICE,

MA'AM. THIS IS SUBSEQUENT CORRESPONDENCE TO THE  
PREVIOUS ONE SENT. JUDGE SOTOMAYOR THE PETITIONER(S) PRAY THAT  
YOU AND YOUR OFFICE DO NOT CONSTRUE THIS AS ANY ATTEMPT TO  
CIRCUMVENT THE NORMAL FILING PROCESS BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT.  
THIS IS NOT THE CASE HERE. THE PETITIONERS TOOK THE NORMAL AND  
PROPER STEPS TO FILE BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ONLY  
TO FIND TO OUR COMPLETE SURPRISE AND DISMAY, THAT THE POLITICALLY

POWERFUL DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE HAVE SOMEHOW COMPROMISED THE EMPLOYEES AND OR PROCESSING DIVISION OF THIS COURT DUE TO THE EXCEPTIONAL AND EXTRAORDINARY NATURE OF THE CLAIMS BEING MADE WITHIN THIS CASE, DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AT THE STATE LEVEL GIVING ALL CLAIMS VERITY. AS THE PETITIONERS AFORE STATED, ALL INDICATIONS POINT TO DOCUMENTS AND PLEADINGS BEING POTENTIALLY COMPROMISED, SPOLIATING VALUABLE EVIDENCE AND EXHIBITS THAT SERVE TO PROVE ALL CLAIMS MADE INVOLVING PEOPLE OF SUCH POLITICAL POWER, SUCH AS HENRY McMASTER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WHO WAS ONCE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THAT THE INITIAL STATE PETITION AND ABOUT (5) EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT WERE COMPROMISED, SPOLIATED BY EMPLOYEES OF THIS COURT. THE PETITIONERS' INTENT HERE IS ONLY TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS NO FURTHER TAMPERING WITH THIS CASE VIA CRIMINAL ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE INSULT JUDGE SOTOMAYOR WAS NOT MERELY AGAINST THE PETITIONERS AND THE INMATES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THE INSULT WAS ALSO DIRECTLY LEVIED AT THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN AN ATTEMPTED USURPATION OF THE HONORABLE JUDGES REVIEWING AUTHORITY IN CLEAR VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. THE PETITIONERS ARE FORCED TO SEND THESE PLEADINGS TO YOUR OFFICE IN HOPES OF GETTING AID FROM YOU AND YOUR STAFF JUDGE SOTOMAYOR TO ENSURE THAT THE PLEADING IS PROPERLY FILED AND NOT MOLESTED OR COMPROMISED IN ANY WAY.

ATTACHED THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT WILL FIND IS A DUPLICATE COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER FROM CASE(S) 2020-001615 (RON SANTA McCRAY) AND 2020-000974 (LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD) CASES OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT. CAN YOUR OFFICE PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE REQUIRED FINAL ORDER FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT THAT WAS INITIALLY SPOLIATED IN NOW PLACED BACK IN APPENDIX--A OF THE DOCUMENTS JUST SENT TO YOUR OFFICE BY CERTIFIED MAIL? THE SUPREME COURT WILL ALSO FIND A DUPLICATE OF THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE THAT MAY HAVE ALSO BEEN SPOLIATED, COMPROMISED, BY AGENTS OF THIS COURT, FILED TO SEEK TO MOVE THE CASE UP ON THE DOCKET WITH ALL EXHIBITS LISTED THEREIN

AND LISTED WITHIN ITS ATTACHMENTS. IF THESE EXHIBITS AND OR ATTACHMENTS ARE NOT PRESENT? THE FILING HAS SOMEHOW BEEN COMPROMISED BY AGENTS OF THIS COURT AGAIN. THE PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED WITH THE STATEMENT MADE BY MS. WALKER TO OUR FAMILY MEMBER IN A RECENT PHONE CALL WHERE SHE ALLEGED THERE IS NO SUCH MECHANISM TO ADVANCE A CASE ON THE DOCKET WHEN THE CASE LAW CITED GIVES INDICATION OTHERWISE, AS WELL AS RECENT NOTIFICATION GIVEN BY NPR BEING DONE IN THE TRUMP CASE.

THE PETITIONERS, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, ARE STILL DEMANDING THAT A FULL INVESTIGATION OCCUR TO DETERMINE HOW IN THE WORLD DID OUR INITIAL FILING GET COMPROMISED AND SPOLIATED THE WAY IT DID WITHIN THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT, INSULTING THIS COURT'S INTEGRITY. MS. WALKER CLAIMED THAT THIS IS HOW THE INITIAL FILING WAS SENT TO HER ABSENT THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS THAT WERE COMPROMISED. THIS MAY MEAN THAT BEFORE THE INITIAL PLEADING REACHED HER, POSSIBLY IN PROCESSING, THE CASE WAS FRAUDULENTLY COMPROMISED AND LEGAL DOCUMENTS CRIMINALLY SPOLIATED. IT WOULD BE ONE THING IF THE CLAIM WAS SOMEHOW THAT THE PETITIONERS FORGOT TO SEND THE STATE PETITION ALONE, THOUGH WITH ALL CERTAINTY THAT STATE PETITION WAS INDEED SENT WITH THAT INITIAL FILING. IT WAS MORE THAN THAN THIS. THE ACTS OF SPOILATION WERE CRIMINALLY SELECTIVE, TARGETING KEY EVIDENCE AND PROOF, LEGAL DOCUMENTS THAT SERVED TO PROVE THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WAS PROPERLY SERVED, APPEARED IN A BACK DOOR MANNER WITHIN THE STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS AND THEN DEFAULTED ON ALL CLAIMS MADE AT THE STATE LEVEL. THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS HAD MEMBERS EMPLOYED BY THIS COURT TO SPOLIATE EVIDENCE OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE S.L.E.D. INVESTIGATIVE FILE POSSESSING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE OF THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD. THEY SPOLIATED THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT RELATED TO CASE 2020-001667 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS TO JUSTIFY SENDING THE REMITTITUR TO THE LOWER COMMON PLEAS COURT TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. THEY SPOLIATED THE ORDERS FROM THE LOWER COURT THAT WERE APPENDIX--A NOW REPLACED TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. THE ACTS WERE

EGREGIOUS, MALICIOUS, CRIMINAL AND TARGETED AND A VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SUBJECTING THEM TO CRIMINAL PENALTIES UNDER 5 U.S.C. §§ 3333, 3331, 7311 AND OTHER FEDERAL LAWS AND OR STATUTES.

THE ACTION ON THE PART OF THESE CONSPIRING INDIVIDUALS SPIT IN THE FACE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". THE PETITIONERS RESPECTFULLY SEEK THAT THE PLEADING BE FILED WITHOUT ANY FURTHER ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE PETITIONER(S) RESPECTFULLY DEMAND THAT AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION OCCUR BY AN INDEPENDENT PARTY DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY AND EXCEPTIONAL NATURE OF THIS CASE, AND SEEK THAT YOU AND YOUR OFFICE ASSISTANCE IN GETTING AT THE TRUTH OF THESE MATTERS. THE PETITIONERS ARE SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT MA'AM. CAN YOU AND YOUR OFFICE ASSIST US TO ENSURE THAT THESE DOCUMENTS ARE PROPERLY FILED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW, NOT COMPROMISED, AND WE SEEK THAT THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY AS TO THE CASE NUMBER THAT IS ASSIGNED BEFORE ANY JUDICIAL REVIEW OCCURS. THE PETITIONERS ALSO IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION SEEK THAT THE CASE MANAGER, MS. WALKERO, ASSIGNED TO THIS CASE BE REPLACED. TO ENSURE DELIVERY OF THIS PLEADING. THE PLEADING IS BEING SENT CERTIFIED MAIL BY ROBBIE MITCHELL ANOTHER INMATE TO THIS CASE SUBJUDICE. THE PETITIONERS THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,


RESPECTFULLY,  
LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD



DECEMBER 2, 2021

4-of-4

RON SANTA McCRAY



LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260  
LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.  
BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010


RON SANTA McCRAY  
#353031 COOPER B-59  
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205  
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

IN RE: TO SEEKING AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION, SEEKING A NEW CASE  
MANAGER, SEEKING AN EXTENSION TO FILE CASE 20-7073 VIA  
APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR UNDER RULE 22.

TO: JUDGE SOTOMAYOR,  
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ET. AL.,

THE PETITIONERS IN THIS CASE IS RETURNING THESE DOCUMENTS  
BACK TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT VIA MS. WALKER AND OTHER  
CLERKS SEEKING IT BE FORWARDED TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR PURSUANT TO  
RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN  
THEM UNTIL MY BROTHER LENEAU CRAWFORD HAS CONTACTED YOU AND  
CONFIRMED WHAT IS GOING ON. THE PETITIONERS IN THIS CASE ARE  
MOTIONING FOR A NEW CASE MANAGER AND AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION  
MS. WALKER. WE WANT YOU OFF THIS CASE. IT IS OBVIOUS TO THE  
PETITIONERS THAT MS. WALKER'S PRESENCE ON THIS CASE IS IN  
FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY TO CAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM TO THIS

1-of-8



CASE, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT SHE WAS NOT THE FIRST CASE MANAGER ASSIGNED TO THIS CASE, MS. SUSAN FRIMPONG WAS. THERE WAS NO REASON TO EXCHANGE CASE MANAGERS UNLESS AS IT HAS MANIFESTED ITSELF WITHIN THIS CONTEXT, THERE WERE NEFARIOUS INTENTIONS. LET THE PETITIONERS ADDRESS THIS RECENT LETTER MS. WALKER MADE USE OF CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DATED DECEMBER 15, 2021. FIRST, WHEN THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY SPOKE WITH MS. WALKER SHE STATED THAT SHE DID NOT RECEIVE THE MAIN BULK PLEADING BUT HAD THE PLEADING THAT CONTAINED THE MOTION TO EXPEDITE THE CASE AND ADVANCE THE CAUSE, WHICH SHE PREVIOUSLY LIED TO MY FAMILY AND STATED NO SUCH MECHANISM WITHIN THE SUPREME COURT EXISTED TO SEEK TO EXPEDITE CASES. SHE THEN TELLS THE PETITIONER FAMILY MEMBER(S) THAT SHE WOULD NOT RETURN THE LAST PLEADING BUT WOULD WAIT UNTIL MY FAMILY CALLED HER BACK TO GET CLARITY BEFORE SHE RETURNED IT, BUT SHE LIED ABOUT THAT AS WELL. SHE IMMEDIATELY RETURNED THE BULK PLEADING AND THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE PRETENDING THAT SHE DID NOT UNDERSTAND HOW IT WAS BEING FILED. IN PARAGRAPH (1) OF HER DECEMBER 15, 2021 SHE AND HER CO-CONSPIRATORS DIVERT THE FILING FROM EVER REACHING JUDGE SOTOMAYOR VIOLATING RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES WHICH REQUIRED HER TO FORWARD THE PLEADING TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR PROMPTLY. THEN IF YOU READ PARAGRAPH (2) OF THE LETTER, SHE CLAIMS THAT THE FINAL ORDER FROM THE STATE SUPREME COURT CASE WAS NOT PRESENT IN APPENDIX 1 WHEN SHE KNEW GOOD AND WELL IT WAS IN THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE PLEADING TO PROTECT IT, WHICH SHE ADMITTED TO THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY MEMBERS THAT SHE DID HAVE, BEING REPLACED DUE TO SHE AND HER CO-CONSPIRATORS SPOLIATING, DESTROYING THE STATE FINAL ORDERS WHEN THEY WERE INITIALLY SENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

MS. WALKER THEN ASSERTS THAT CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 AND 2020-0001667 APPEAR TO HAVE ONLY CRAWFORD AS A PARTY WHEN THAT IS NOT THE CASE BEING ARGUED IN THE MANNER SHE PURPOSELY MISREPRESENTED. IT IS CASE 2020-000974 WHICH EMBODY THOSE CASE WHICH WAS FILED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHERE CASE

2020-001615 THE RON McCRAY CASE AND 2020-000974 THE CRAWFORD CASE WERE SOUGHT CONSOLIDATED FOR RULING PRODUCING ONE ORDER FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DATED AUGUST 6, 2021 THAT SHE AND HER COHORTS INITIALLY SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, IN THE INITIAL PLEADING, NOW SHE LIES IN RELATION TO THIS FILING, CLAIMING SHE DID NOT HAVE THE FINAL STATE SUPREME COURT ORDER IN HER POSSESSION, CRIMINALLY VIOLATING HER OATH OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION AND JUSTIFY THE RETURN OF THE PLEADING TO THE PETITIONERS TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW.

THEN IN PARAGRAPH 3 OF THIS RECENT LETTER SHE LIES AGAIN STATING THAT A NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS RECEIVED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FOR CASE 2020-001667, 2020-000974 FINALLY ADMITTING THE EXISTENCE OF CASE 2020-000974 BUT IN FRAUD CONCEALING THAT IT WAS A JOINT FILING OF NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL, NOT JUST FOR CASE 2020-00974, BUT WAS ALSO FILED BY RON SANTA McCRAY FOR CASE 2020-001615 AS WELL. THIS IS WHY SHE CONVENIENTLY ASSERTS NO COPY OF THE DOCUMENT WAS KEPT ON FILE SO SHE COULD PERPETRATE THIS FRAUD, LIE AND DECEPTION.

IN PARAGRAPH 4 SHE THEN ADMITS THAT THE PETITIONERS DID INDEED INTEND TO FILE JOINTLY. MS. WALKER THEN IN PARAGRAPH 5 CLAIMS THAT THE PETITION FILED IS FOR THE FEDERAL CASE 20-7073 AS IF THIS IS THE LEAD PETITION WHEN OF COURSE IT IS NOT. THE STATE PETITION FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT (39) PAGES IS THE LEAD PETITION IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE. THAT FEDERAL EXHIBIT, DOCUMENT, WAS NEVER SUBMITTED IN THE APPENDIX TO SPECIFICALLY ARGUE THE MERITS OF THE ISSUES SOUGHT REVIEW IN THAT CASE. IT WAS SUBMITTED SPECIFICALLY TO ANSWER THE QUESTION THE SUPREME COURT ASKED, "ARE THERE ANY RELATED CASES PENDING OR POTENTIALLY COMING BEFORE THE COURT", AND IN SUPPORT OF THE QUESTION SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO THE STATE CASES, AS TO "WHETHER OR NOT THE PETITIONERS MEET THE CRITERION REGARDING THE STATE CASES ONLY, FOR 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER." SINCE THE LEGAL QUESTIONS INTENDED TO SEEK REVIEW OF CASE 20-2073 ARE ENTIRELY AND DISTINCTLY DIFFERENT, SINCE WE ARE

ESSENTIALLY DEALING WITH PENDANT AND TRANSFER JURISDICTIONS, AND THE QUESTION ONLY RELATES TO THE STATE CASE, NOT SEEKING REVIEW OF THE FEDERAL CASE? THE SUBMITTING OF THE DOCUMENT IN THE APPENDIX TO ESTABLISH THESE JURISDICTIONAL FACT WOULD NOT BE PRECLUDED. MS. WALKER CONSTANTLY, PURPOSELY, MISCONSTRUES THE FILINGS TO IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, JUSTIFY HER RETURNING THE PLEADING TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES.

IF THE TIME TO HEAR CASE 20-7073 HAS PASSED? ITS BECAUSE OF THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE ENGAGED IN BY THESE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, WORKING WITH THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, WHO SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, INITIAL PLEADINGS AND EVIDENCE CAUSING THE DELAY ESTABLISHING CAUSE AND PREJUDICE FOR GRANTING ANY EXTENSION FOR FILING CASE 20-7073 AS IS SOUGHT AND THE WAIVING OF THE REQUIREMENT TO HAVE TO SUBMIT ANY REQUIRED ORDERS SUBJUDICE FOR A SECOND TIME.

AS FOR PARAGRAPH 7 STATING ITS UNCLEAR THAT RON SANTA McCRAY IS PARTY. FIRST, WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL CASE YET. LET'S ADDRESS THE STATE CASES AND THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDER. THE RON SANTA McCRAY PCR CASE 2019-CP-08-1992 IS THE SOURCE OF THE APPEAL BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ESTABLISHING CASE 2020-001615. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD OFFICIALLY FILED MOTION TO INTERVENE BY RIGHT NOT DISCRETION OF THAT COURT IN THAT McCRAY PCR CASE AUTOMATICALLY MAKING CRAWFORD AN INTERESTED PARTY AT THE PCR LEVEL. THE McCRAY PCR IS AN ACTION CHALLENGING CONVICTION. THE CRAWFORD CASE 2006-CP-400-**3567** IS A FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT ALSO ACTION CHALLENGING CONVICTION WHICH PRODUCED APPEAL UNDER 2020-0001667 IN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, THEN PRODUCED CASE 2020-000974 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FOR CRAWFORD. THE SAME EXACT LEGAL ISSUES BEING ARGUED IN CHALLENGING THE CONVICTION OF RON SANTA McCRAY PCR UNDER 2019-CP-08-1992 ARE THE IDENTICAL AND

ESSENTIALLY EXACT LEGAL ISSUES BEING ARGUED TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION OF CRAWFORD UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567. ONCE BOTH THE CASES APPEARED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT THEY WERE MOTIONED CONSOLIDATED DUE TO THESE MATERIAL FACTS. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT PRODUCED ONE ORDER, NOT MANY, COMBINING THE RULING IN BOTH CASES UNDER ONE ORDER FOR THE SAME EXACT REASONS SOUGHT AND LEGAL ISSUES ARGUED WHERE BOTH CRAWFORD AND McCRAY'S NAMES APPEARED ON THE JOINTLY FILED PLEADING. ALL THIS IS CLEARLY SEEN IN THE ORDER THAT WAS INITIALLY SPOLIATED BY THE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO PREVENT THE JUDGES FROM HEARING THIS CASE THAT IS NOW REPLACED. THE SAME ORDER THAT THE LYING CASE MANAGER MS. WALKER STATED WAS NOT WITHIN HER POSSESSION BUT SOMEHOW IN FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. SHE NOW RETURNS THIS S.C. SUPREME COURT FINAL ORDER SHE LIED AND SAID SOMEHOW SHE DID NOT HAVE IT. IT IS NOW AGAIN PLACED BACK INTO APPENDIX 1. THEN THE CONSPIRING AGENTS INITIALLY SPOLIATED, DESTROYED TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW AND JUST THE REQUIRED ORDERS, BUT ALSO "KEY", "ESSENTIAL" EVIDENCE THAT WOULD SUBSTANTIATE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN THESE CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES. RULE 12(4) PROVIDE: "PARTIES INTERESTED JOINTLY, SEVERALLY, OR OTHERWISE IN A JUDGMENT MAY PETITION SEPARATELY FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI; OR ANY TWO OR MORE MAY JOIN IN THE PETITION. WHEN TWO OR MORE JUDGMENTS (AS IN THE STATE CASES) ARE SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED ON A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SAME COURT (ei. S.C. SUPREME COURT) AND INVOLVE IDENTICAL OR CLOSELY RELATED QUESTIONS (EMPHASIS ADDED)[AS IT PERTAINS TO THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES], A SINGLE (EMPHASIS ADDED) PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI COVERING ALL THE JUDGMENTS SUFFICES". THIS IS WHAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU IN REGARD TO THE STATE PETITION, WHICH APPLIES ALSO TO THE FEDERAL PETITION THAT IS SOON TO BE FILED REGARDING CASE 20-7073 AND 21-6275.

AS FOR RON SANTA McCRAY BEING A PARTY IN CASE 20-7073? RON McCRAY IS NOT A PARTY UNDER THAT CASE. HE IS A PARTY UNDER CASE 21-6275 FOR WHICH WE ARE SEEKING A STAY JOINTLY UNTIL REVIEW OF

CASE 20-7073 IS POTENTIALLY HEARD BECAUSE A RULING IN THAT CASE WOULD HAVE DIRECT IMPACT AND CONSEQUENCES ON CASE 21-6275. YOU ARE INCORRECT ABOUT RON SANTA McCRAY NOT BEING A PARTY IN THE CASE THAT PRODUCED THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-6275. RON SANTA McCRAY'S NAME APPEAR ON THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT. THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION SEPARATED HIM FROM THE CASE WHICH WE JOINTLY OBJECTED AND TIMELY SOUGHT 4 DISTINCT APPEALS OF THE MAGISTRATE'S ORDERS UNDER RULE 73(c). THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND FEDERAL JUDGE IN FRAUD IGNORED THE 4 NOTICES OF APPEAL AND ONLY SENT THE APPEAL UP FOR CRAWFORD THOUGH BOTH NAMES APPEARED ON THE APPEAL DOCUMENTS JOINTLY AND McCRAY EVEN SENT SOME IN INDIVIDUALLY BUT HIS RIGHT TO APPEAL WAS STILL IGNORED WHICH PROMPTED HIM TO MOTION TO INTERVENE IN THE CASE UNDER 21-6275 TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST. THIS IS ONE OF THE ISSUES INTENDED TO BE PLACED WITHIN THE INFORMAL BRIEF. DID THE DISTRICT COURT HAVE JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THE FINAL ORDER WHEN THE CASE WAS TIMELY SOUGHT LEAVE TO APPEAL UNDER RULE 73(c) BY BOTH OF US 4 TIMES BEFORE THAT COURT ISSUED A FINAL ORDER?, AND DID THE DISTRICT COURT ABUSE THEIR DISCRETION SEPARATING McCRAY FROM THE CASE WHEN HIS NAME APPEARED ON THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT AND HE SIGNED THE COMPLAINT ON THE NEXT PAGE DUE TO THERE BEING ROOM FOR ONLY ONE SIGNATURE IN THE SPACE THE DOCUMENT PROVIDED? THEREFORE, IT IS INDISPUTABLE THAT RON SANTA McCRAY IS INDEED A PARTY IN CASE 21-6275 CONCEALED BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND HIS NAME CAN APPEAR ON A PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO STAY CASE 21-6275 PENDING RULING OF CASE 20-7073 WHICH WOULD DIRECTLY IMPACT CASE 21-6275 FOR WHICH HE IS A PARTY. SINCE IN ACTS OF FRAUD THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGES CIRCUMVENTED RULING AND SENDING THE CASE UP AT THE TIMES WHEN APPEAL WAS SOUGHT UNDER RULE 73(c). ALL THAT IS REQUIRED IS THAT THE PETITIONERS SEND COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER WHICH WAS SPOLIATED, ALONG WITH THE OTHER REQUIRED ORDERS IN THE INITIAL FILING WHICH MS. WALKER IS FULLY AWARE OF BECAUSE ALL INDICATIONS POINT, DUE TO THE ADDITIONAL LIES TOLD BY HER, THAT SHE PLAYED A DIRECT PART IN THE SPOLIATION AND DESTRUCTION OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO ALLOW HER TO ARGUE THE

INJUSTICES SHE PRESENT NOW TO PREVENT THE CASE FROM MOVING FORWARD. WE OFFICIALLY MOTION THAT ANY OTHER ORDER NEED BE REPLACED BY US BE WAIVED AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN ALL REQUIRED ORDERS ELECTRONICALLY DUE TO THE FAULT NOT BEING THE PETITIONERS BUT ON AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE SUPREME COURT WHO HAVE SOMEHOW BEEN COMPROMISED BY THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WHO ARE POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS. THIS IS SOUGHT UNDER RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES, SPECIFICALLY, JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR.

IN ADDRESSING THE CLERK'S CONCERN ASSERTING RULE 29.1. MS. WALKER AGAIN IN ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IS MISREPRESENTING THE SUPREME COURT RULES AND FACTS OF THE PLEADING. THE PLEADING WAS NOT FILED UNDER RULE 29.1. FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI. THE REQUEST WAS FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION. THIS WAS FILED AS AN APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22 WHICH PROVIDE: AN APPLICATION TO AN INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE SHALL BE FILED WITH THE CLERK, WHO WILL TRANSMIT IT PROMPTLY (EMPHASIS ADDED) TO THE JUSTICE IF THE INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE HAS AUTHORITY TO GRANT THE SOUGHT RELIEF WHICH IN FURTHER ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE YOU FAILED TO DO. THE JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR HAS THE AUTHORITY TO GRANT THE RELIEF OF US SEEKING AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION INTO YOU AND YOUR COHORTS COMPROMISING THE INITIAL FILING AND HINDERING, OBSTRUCTING AND MAKING THE ATTEMPTS TO DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. 1985(2) AND 1985(3) AND DENY THE PETITIONERS THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. YOU CANNOT PREVENT JUDGE SOTOMAYOR FROM INVOKING HER DISCRETION TO GRANT THE RELIEF FOR THE SOUGHT INVESTIGATION AND YOUR REMOVAL AS A CASE MANAGER ON THIS CASE DUE TO THE OVERWHELMING DAMAGE YOU CAUSED IN THIS CASE MS. WALKER WORKING WITH THE DEFENDANTS TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. RULE 22 REQUIRES A JUSTICE DENYING THE APPLICATION FOR THE RELIEF SEEKING OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION AND YOUR REMOVAL MUST NOTE THE DENIAL THEREOF. NOT YOU THE CLERK. THE CLERK OR CASE MANAGER DOES NOT HAVE JUDICIAL POWER. YOUR ACTIONS VIOLATE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND

IS ILLEGAL. RULE 22 SAYS AN APPLICATION CAN BE MADE BY A LETTER TO THE JUSTICE WHICH YOU HAVE IN THE FORM OF THE LETTER TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR WHICH YOU WERE REQUIRED TO FORWARD IT TO HER PROMPTLY WHICH YOU UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE HAVE FAILED TO DO FURTHER PROVING AND ESTABLISHING YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND VIOLATE YOUR OATH OF OFFICE OPENING YOU UP TO SANCTIONS AND YOUR REMOVAL FROM THIS CASE WHICH THE PETITIONERS MAKE UNDER RULE 22. RULE 29.1 APPLIES TO PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI. NOT APPLICATIONS TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22. YOU ARE REQUIRED TO FORWARD THE PLEADING TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR UNDER RULE 22. PLEASE DO SO AND GET OFF THIS CASE. THE STATE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI IS ONLY ARGUING THE STATE CASE MATTERS, EVEN THE RIGHT TO TRANSFER THOSE STATE CASES PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407. THE MATERIALLY DISTINCT AND DIFFERENT ISSUES SOUGHT TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275 HAVE NOT BEEN PLACED BEFORE THE COURT YET NOR ARE WE TRYING TO DO SO VIA THE STATE PETITION. WE HAVE MOTIONED FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE FEDERAL PETITION DUE TO THE INJUSTICE CAUSED BY YOU MS. WALKER AND YOUR CONSPIRING PARTIES. RON SANTA McCRAY IS LEGALLY A PARTY AT BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL AND CASES. WE SEEK THAT THIS PLEADING BE FORWARDED TO JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR PURSUANT TO APPLICATIONS TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22.

RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron S McCray*

JONAH THE TISHBITE



DECEMBER 22, 2021

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

December 15, 2021

Lawrence L. Crawford  
#300839  
Lee CI  
990 Wisacky Hwy  
Bishopville, SC 29010

Dear Mr. Crawford:

1 The above-entitled petition for a writ of certiorari was postmarked November 30, 2021 and forwarded to the Clerk by Justice Sotomayor on December 14, 2021. The petition is returned herewith for the following reason(s):

2 The petition indicates that it seeks review of an order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina dated August 6, 2021; and that the order is attached under appendix A. However, no such order is attached. Appendix A, which was taped together upon receipt, includes a judgment of the Richland County Court of Common Pleas dated November 16, 2020 in case no. 2006CP4003567, and an order of the South Carolina Court of Appeals dated May 15, 2021 in case no. 2020-001667. Lawrence Crawford appears to be the only plaintiff and appellant, respectively, in each case.

3 The Clerk's records indicate that, on August 31, 2021, this Office received a submission postmarked August 26, 2021, which contained documents entitled: "Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Notice Seeking Leave to Petition for Writ of Cert; Motion for Leave to Seek Petition for Writ of Cert Jointly; Motion for an Extension of Time." The submission was construed, principally, as an application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of order(s) of the Supreme Court of South Carolina dated August 6, 2021, in case nos. 2020-001667, 2020-00974. We do not currently have the aforementioned order(s) in our possession as this Office does not retain copies of documents that are returned unfiled, and they are not included within the submission returned herein.

4 On September 15, 2021, the Clerk returned the documents received August 31, 2021, and stated: An application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari cannot be combined with any other filing. Please be advised that the Rules of the Court make no provision for the filing of an "affidavit of facts giving judicial notice", "notice seeking leave to petition for writ of cert", or "motion for leave to seek petition for writ of cert jointly." No motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari under Rule 12.4 is required.

5 Moreover, the petition indicates that a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit case nos. 20-7073 and 21-6275 are currently pending before this Court. No such petition(s) has been docketed. Our records indicate that a petition seeking review of no. 20-7073 was returned for corrections on September 15, 2021, and November 17, 2021. To date, a corrected petition has not been filed.

6 Attached as appendix G to the current submission appears to be a petition for a writ of certiorari dated October 7, 2021, seeking review of 1) the judgment of the fourth circuit in no. 20-7073, of which rehearing was denied on April 9, 2021, and 2) the fourth circuit's order dated September 21, 2021 in no. 21-6275. The Clerk has no record of receipt of this petition until now. Please be advised, however, that you cannot seek review of both of these orders in a single petition because the jurisdictional deadline to file for review of the first fell prior to the entry of the second. A second judgment sought to be reviewed cannot be added upon resubmission of a petition that is returned for corrections as happened on September 15, 2021. If you wish to separately seek review of the September 21, 2021 order of the fourth circuit in no. 21-6275, please promptly submit such a petition with a declaration of timely filing pursuant to Rule 29.2. However, while you may seek review of that order specifically, the case appears to still be pending before the court of appeals.

7 Also returned herewith is a document entitled "motion to advance the cause," postmarked November 16, 2021, and received November 23, 2021, as well as related correspondence forwarded from Justice Sotomayor on December 14, 2021.

8 Additionally, as stated in previous correspondence, it is unclear whether Ron Santa McCray is actually a party to the judgment(s) sought to be reviewed. It is impossible for the Clerk to make such a determination without copies of the orders required by Rule 14.1(i). As it pertains to the related fourth circuit cases, it appears that Mr. McCray is not a party to no. 20-7073, but has motioned to intervene in no. 21-6275. Please be advised that only parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is sought to be reviewed are deemed parties entitled to file documents in this Court, and that each petitioner must include a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and declaration of indigency if the docketing fee is not paid.

9 Please clarify and correct these ambiguities and deficiencies and resubmit the documents as soon as possible. Unless the corrected petition(s) are submitted to the Clerk within 60 days of the date of this letter, the petition(s) will not be filed. Please be advised that any document required or permitted to be presented to the Court or to a Justice must be filed with the Clerk, not addressed to a Justice. Rule 29.1.

A copy of the corrected petition(s) must be served on opposing counsel.

Sincerely,  
Scott S. Harris, Clerk  
By:   
Emily Walker  
(202) 479-5955

Enclosures

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

---

## ORDER

---

Pursuant to Rule 245, SCACR, and *Key v. Currie*, 305 S.C. 115, 406 S.E.2d 356 (1991), we decline to entertain the following matters in this Court's original jurisdiction:

1. *Lawrence Crawford v. State of South Carolina*, In re: Seeking Leave from the S.C. Supreme Court to Address the Blocking of Filing Application for Forensic D.N.A. Testing, dated June 29, 2020; In re: To Appealing the Final Order from Case 2020-001667 via Supplement Invoking the S.C. Supreme Court's Original Jurisdiction under Case 2020-000974, dated May 24, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2020-000974.
2. *Ron Santa McCray v. State of South Carolina*, Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Petition for a Writ of Certiorari; Notice and Motion to Act Pro Se; Motion for a Stay; Motion and Notice and a Reset on Any Timetable to Submit Brief and Other Related Documents and Motion to Motion therefor, dated November 20, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court, the S.C. Court of Appeals, the Berkeley County Common Pleas Court, the Chief Administrative Judge of Berkeley County, the S.C. Attorney General et. al., dated December 2, 2020; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Petition for Petition and or Motion to Amend the Caption of the Initial Filing; Petition to Invoke the S.C. Supreme Court's Jurisdiction; Petition for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief; Petitioner and or Motion to Challenge the Relevant Court(s) Jurisdiction and Recall the Remittitur Out of Time and Motion to Motion Therefor, dated December 2, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court with Exhibit, dated December 8, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court, the S.C. Attorney General, the Berkeley County Common Pleas Court, the Berkeley County Chief Administrative Judge, the 9th Circuit Solicitor's Office et. al. with Exhibit, dated February 23, 2021; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court with Exhibit, dated March 1, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to Supplement the Pleading Due to New Ruling Coming out of the S.C. Supreme Court and Motion to Motion therefor, dated April 3, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to Supplement the Pleadings under this Case and Motion to Motion therefor with Exhibit, dated April 24, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to File Objections as to Why the

Conditional Order Should not Become Final in Case 2019-CP-08-1992; Renewing the Petition to Invoke the S.C. Supreme Court's Original Jurisdiction; Renewing the Notice Seeking Leave to Appeal the Conditional Order Seeking Review under Torrence v. S.C. Dept. of Corrections; Motion to Challenge the Berkeley Common Please Court's Jurisdiction due to Continued Acts of Fraud upon the Court and Unconstitutional Action and Motion to Motion therefor, dated May 16, 2021; Letter and Exhibit received May 27, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2020-001615.

3. *Matthew Jamison v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to Chief Justice Beatty, received December 15, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001631.

4. *Glen K. LaConey v. Richland County Sheriff Leon Lott and the Richland County Sheriff's Department; Alan M. Wilson and the Office of the Attorney General; Joshua Koger, Jr., Esquire; William A. Hodge, Esquire; Clifton B. Newman; R. Know McMahon; Robert M. Madsen, Esquire; Jason Scott Chehoski, Esquire; Jocelyn Newman and Lori Pelzer, a.k.a. Lori L. Washington, Petition for Original Jurisdiction, dated June 18, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000649.*

5. *Karreem T. Wiley v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to Chief Justice Beatty, dated December 20, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001704.

6. *London Wooden v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to the Supreme Court, received December 29, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001705.

7. *Travis Lee Hamrick v. 7th Judicial Circuit General Sessions Court of Spartanburg, South Carolina*, Notice of Petition for Writ of Mandamus, dated January 4, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000016.

8. *Darrell Williams v. State of South Carolina*, Notice of Motion for Original Jurisdiction in State Supreme Court, dated January 8, 2021; Motion in Support of Notice for Original Jurisdiction, dated January 8, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000054.

John Beatty C.J.  
John K. Steele J.  
Haye L. Stearn J.

cc:

Lawrence L. Crawford  
Ron Santa McCray  
Matthew Jamison  
Glen K. LaConey  
Karreem T. Wiley  
London Wooden  
Travis Lee Hamrick  
Darrell Williams  
Lori Pelzer  
The Honorable Clifton Newman  
The Honorable Jocelyn Newman  
The Honorable Knox McMahon  
Alan Wilson, Attorney General  
Sheriff Leon Lott  
The Honorable Amy Kathryn West cox  
Dan Goldberg, Esquire  
H. Thomas Morgan Jr., esquire  
William A. Hodge, Esquire  
Jason Scott Chehoski, Esquire  
Joshua Koger Jr., Esquire  
Robert M. Madsen, Esquire  
Robert David Garfield, Esquire

*John Cannon Jr*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Joe Jones*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J.  
J.

Columbia, South Carolina

August 6, 2021

EXHIBIT, "THREAT TO SOVEREIGN'S SAFETY # 1"

~~FILE IN~~ FILE IN CASE

21A 425

14

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260  
LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.  
BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010


IN RE: CASES 21-1330 AND 2021-000354 ET. AL.,

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

THE ATTACHED PLEADING IS BEING FILED TO RECALL THE MANDATE  
IN CASE 21-1330 AND MOVE TO REINSTATE THAT APPEAL. ITS FILED TO  
SEEK STAY ON ANY REQUIREMENT TO PAY ANY FILING FEES IN CASE  
2021-000354 AND TO SEEK EXTENSION OF TIME RELATED THERETO. ALL  
PARTIES ARE SERVED. PLEASE FILE THE PLEADING IN THE APPLICABLE  
CASES INVOLVED PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE ET. AL.,

OCTOBER 11, 2021



IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 1st., 3rd., 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275; 19-2005 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE:  
RON SANTA McCRAY; YAHYA MUQUIT ET. AL.,

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

VS.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---


**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

---

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO RECALL THE MANDATE IN CASE 21-1330; MOTION TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-1330; MOTION TO RENEW THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER AND CLAIMS OF RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL

ESTOPPEL; MOTION TO STAY THE REQUIREMENT OF PAYING ANY FILING FEES UNDER CASE 2021-000354 DUE TO SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER AS TAG ALONG CASE; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER CASE 2021-000354 TO RESET TO PAY ANY REQUIRED FILING FEE UNTIL THE 3rd. CIRCUIT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT GIVES REVIEW PURSUANT TO THIS DOCUMENT AND THE SEEKING OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE 3rd. CIRCUIT, THE 1st. CIRCUIT, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, THE N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, THE MCKAY LAW FIRM, THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT, THE N.J. DISTRICT COURT, THE LAW FIRM OF DUBOSE-ROBINSON AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON OCTOBER 11, 2021. DUE TO SERVICE ON THE DISTRICT COURTS IT IS DEEMED FILED ON THAT DATE, HOUSTON V. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379 (U.S.1988).

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE



RON SANTA McCRAY



Ron Santa McCray

OCTOBER 11, 2021

2-of-7

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 1st., 3rd., 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275; 19-2005 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE:  
RON SANTA McCRAY; YAHYA MUQUIT ET. AL.,

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO  
RECALL THE MANDATE IN CASE 21-1330; MOTION TO REINSTATE  
THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-1330; MOTION TO RENEW THE MOTION  
TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT  
DANGER AND CLAIMS OF RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL  
ESTOPPEL; MOTION TO STAY THE REQUIREMENT OF PAYING ANY  
FILING FEE UNDER CASE 2021-000354 DUE TO SEEKING 28  
U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER AS TAG ALONG CASE; MOTION FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER CASE 2021-000354 TO RESET TO PAY  
ANY REQUIRED FILING FEE UNTIL THE 3rd. CIRCUIT AND U.S.  
SUPREME COURT GIVES REVIEW PURSUANT TO THIS DOCUMENT AND  
THE SEEKING OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

---

IN RE: CASES 21-1330 AND 2021-000354 ET. AL.,

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY,  
THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND ATTACHED:

(1) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD/OBSTRUCTION # 1". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE 3rd. CIRCUIT INFORMING THE APPELLANT(S) THAT THE 3rd. CIRCUIT HAS GRANTED THE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE MOTION AND DEMONSTRATE THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER. NOTE THAT IT IS DATED MAY 20, 2021.

(2) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD/OBSTRUCTION # 2". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS DATED JUNE 28, 2021 WHEN THE FIRST ATTEMPT OF OBSTRUCTION WAS MADE AND THE COURT TRIED TO UNJUSTLY CLAIM THE APPELLANTS FAILED TO PROSECUTE AND THE APPELLANTS HAD TO REBUT THE INJUSTICE.

(3) EXHIBIT, "MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS". THIS IS THE [12] PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS SUBMITTED AS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER DATED MAY 30, 2021. TAKE NOTICE THAT IT WAS FILED (10) DAYS LATER IN RESPONSE TO THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S DEMAND THAT THE APPELLANT FILE THE PLEADING AND MOTION TO DEMONSTRATE THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER.

(4) EXHIBIT, "ACCEPTANCE OF MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA

PAUPERIS". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED FROM THE 3rd. CIRCUIT ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE APPELLANT WAS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S PREVIOUS ORDER TO FILE THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER WHERE THEY HELD THAT DOCUMENT IN ABEYANCE PENDING THE SENDING OF THE (6) MONTH FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

(5) EXHIBIT, "ADDITIONAL DOCUMENT SUBMISSION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE ASKING ACCEPTANCE OF THE FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF THE (6) MONTH STATEMENT AGAIN DEMONSTRATING THAT THE APPELLANT WAS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S DEMANDS SENDING IN THE (6) MONTH FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

(6) EXHIBIT, "RES JUDICATA/ COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL. THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 21-6275 GRANTING THE RIGHT TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS IN THAT CASE BASED UPON THE SAME EXACT CLAIM OF THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER ARGUED BEFORE THE 3rd. CIRCUIT. IF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT GRANTED THE REQUEST TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS ON THE SAME EXACT CLAIM OF THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER?, WHICH THEY DID? THE APPELLANT EXERCISES HIS CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ON THE ISSUE OF FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS RELATED TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER.

THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO RECALL THE MANDATE. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-1330 TO ADDRESS THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE APPELLANT RENEWS HIS MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGERS EXERCISING ALL RIGHTS OF RES JUDICATA AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ON THIS ISSUE BY THE RULING EMERGING FROM THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SINCE THE SAME WAS GRANTED BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ON THE EXACT SAME CLAIM OF THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER THAT EXISTED AT THE TIME BOTH THE CASES WERE FILED AND STILL EXIST TODAY.

(7) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD ORDER". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE 3rd. CIRCUIT ON OCTOBER 1, 2021. LET THE APPELLANT PLACE ON THE RECORD EXACTLY WHAT IS GOING ON HERE RELATED TO THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION. THE N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY AND POTENTIALLY GOD KNOWS WHO OTHERS, CAME DOWN HERE TO SOUTH CAROLINA AND OR CALLED THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT ASKING FOR THE FILES AND PLEADINGS THAT WERE FILED UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 AND ITS RELATED CASES. HOW THE APPELLANT KNOWS THIS IS THAT HIS SISTER YAHDINA CALLED THAT COURT ASKING FOR A PASS ORDER IN CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 AND WAS INFORMED OF THE CHAOS AND SEEKING OF THE FILES THAT WAS GOING ON IN THE RICHLAND COURT WHERE THE PARTIES ARE CONSPIRING TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001. ONCE REVIEWING ALL THE DOCUMENTS PLACED BEFORE THAT STATE COURT, THE CONSPIRING PARTIES REALIZED THAT THE APPELLANT(S) WERE CORRECT. THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT DID MAKE A BACK DOOR APPEARANCE IN THAT CASE, CONCEALED THEIR APPEARANCE, FAILED TO TIMELY RESPOND GIVING WAY TO THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ASSERTED BY US BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY THE FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS CASE OUT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, WHICH SAID DEFAULT BINDS ALL STATES BY THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE. DUE TO THE MAGNITUDE OF THE DISCOVERY AND TO AID THE OTHER STATE COURTS CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS. THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S ONLY OPTION WAS TO CRIMINALLY ASSERT THAT THE APPELLANT(S) FAILED TO PROSECUTE TO PREVENT THESE MATERIAL FACTS FROM BEING ENTERED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD AND TO CIRCUMVENT RULING ON THE SUBMITTED PLEADINGS VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION PURSUANT TO 5 U.S.C. §§ 3331, 3333, AND 7311. STOP THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION HONORABLE JUDGES. RECALL THE MANDATE AND REINSTATE THIS APPEAL UNDER 21-1330 AND LET THIS CASE MOVE FORWARD. GET THEM DOCUMENTS THEY SENT DOWN TO THE STORAGE WAREHOUSE IN SOUTH CAROLINA TO CONCEAL THEM AND LETS GET IT ALL PLACED UPON THE COURT RECORD.

(8) EXHIBIT, "CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTI STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS". THIS IS A COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DATED OCTOBER 4, 2021 REGARDING CASE 2021-000354. THE APPELLANT IN THIS CASE MOTIONS FOR A STAY ON ANY REQUIREMENT TO PAY ANY ALLEGED FILING FEE UNTIL THE 3rd. CIRCUIT GIVES REVIEW BASED UPON THIS NOW SUBMITTED PLEADING DUE TO SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER OF THIS CASE AS A TAG ALONG CASE AND THE SEEKING OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO THESE MATTERS. A COPY OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PLEADING IS ATTACHED. 3rd. CIRCUIT AND N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY YOU WERE ALREADY SERVED YOUR COPY OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PLEADING. IMANI YOUR COPY OF THAT PLEADING WAS SERVED ON YOU AS WELL. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO PAY ANY FILING FEE UNDER CASE 2021-000354 TO RESET ONCE RULING FROM THE INVOLVED FEDERAL COURTS HAVE BEEN ISSUED.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE

RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron Santa McCray*

OCTOBER 2, 2021

Lawrence L. Crawford  
#300839  
Lee Correctional Institution  
990 Wisacky Highway  
P.O. Box 1000  
Bishopville, SC 29010

---

Exhibit  
Fraud / obstruction #1

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

**No. 21-1330**

Crawford v. Chief Jose Linares

To: Clerk

1) Motion by Appellant Lawrence Crawford for Judicial Notice and Extension of Time

---

The foregoing submission is construed as a motion for an extension of time to file a motion to proceed in forma pauperis with related PLRA forms and a motion demonstrating imminent danger. So construed, the motion is granted.

Appellant must file a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, along with an addendum to the affidavit in support of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, a completed form authorizing assessments to be made from his prison account, a certified prison account statement, and a motion demonstrating imminent danger of serious physical injury on or before June 10, 2021 within twenty-one (21) days from the date of this Order. Failure to file a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis with the supporting PLRA documents and imminent danger motion will result in dismissal of the appeal pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 3.3 and Misc. 107.1 without further notice.

For the Court,

s/ Patricia S. Dodszuweit  
Clerk

Dated: May 20, 2021  
PDB/cc: Lawrence L. Crawford  
Yahya Muquit

Exhibit

Fraud / Obstructions

# 2

22

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF  
CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,  
RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT  
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY AND LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY ON THIS DATE OF NOVEMBER 9, 2021, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED MOTION FOR INCLUSION AND TO WAIVE THE SUBMITTING OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ORDER ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE

SERVED, BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4th. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTER 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

(10) THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS AND

JUDGE NEWMAN 1701 MAIN STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(11) THE S.C. SUPREME COURT P.O. BOX 11330 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

(12) ATTORNEY D. SETTANA AT THE MCKAY LAW FIRM 1303 BLANDING STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(13) THE LAW FIRM OF DABOSE-ROBINSON 935 BROAD STREET CAMDEN, S.C. 29020.

(14) THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

WE DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

EXECUTED ON NOVEMBER 8, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,  
LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD



RON SANTA MCCRAY  
Ron & May

NO. 21A425

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

VS.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF  
CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,  
RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT  
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

MOTION FOR INCLUSION AND TO WAIVE THE  
SUBMITTING OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ORDER

IN RE: CRAWFORD AND McCRAY

TO: THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,

FROM WHAT THE PETITIONER(S) COMPREHEND THAT WHICH THE RULES REQUIRE. THE PETITIONER McCRAY MUST FILE A FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT FOR THIS PETITION AND FILING. IT IS ALSO REQUIRED THAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TO SUBMIT THE ORDER FROM ONE OF THE LOWER COURTS INVOLVED, SPECIFICALLY, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. REGARDING McCRAY, A FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT HAS ALREADY BEEN SUBMITTED WITHIN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FOR THE APPEALING OF CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT CLERK ONLY SENT THE PETITIONER McCARY ONE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT THOUGH THE COURT WAS AWARE OF THE PETITIONER'S INTENTION TO FILE TWO PETITIONS. THEY SENT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TWO SETS BUT NOT THE PETITIONER McCRAY. DUE TO S. CAROLINA INSTITUTIONAL ARBITRARY LOCKDOWNS. THE PETITIONER McCRAY WAS UNABLE TO MAKE COPY OF THE ONE FORM SENT TO HIM AND WAS FORCED TO SEND THAT ONE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS FORM IN WITH THE PETITION APPEALING CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4th. CIRCUIT PRESENTLY PENDING WITHIN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. THIS WAS ALSO COURT CLERICAL ERROR THAT PREJUDICED THE PETITIONER McCRAY


LEAVING HIM WITH ONE SET OF FORMS FOR TWO PETITIONS SOUGHT TO BE FILED. DUE TO THE INSTITUTION NOT ALLOWING THE PETITIONER McCRAY TO COPY THE FORM. THIS PRODUCES STATE INTERFERENCE OUT OF HIS CONTROL.

IN THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S CASE, THE FINAL ORDER ISSUED FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WAS SENT TO HIM, AND LIKE McCRAY, THE S.C. INSTITUTION WHERE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD IS HOUSED IS ALSO SUBJECT TO THE SAME ARBITRARY LOCKDOWNS DUE TO SHORTAGE OF STAFF. CRAWFORD HAD (10) DAYS TO GET THE PLEADING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHICH ESTABLISH CASE 2020--00974 AND WAS NOT ABLE TO OBTAIN A COPY OF THAT ORDER BEING FORCED TO SEND HIS ONLY COPY IN ORDER THAT THE FILING BE TIMELY. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD HAS MADE REPEATED ATTEMPTS AND EFFORTS TO OBTAIN AN ADDITIONAL COPY OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS FINAL ORDER ONLY TO BE MET WITH OBSTRUCTION AND LIES WHERE AT FIRST THEY SAID THEY WOULD SEND A COPY BUT DID NOT. THEN AFTERWARD STATED A FEE HAD TO BE PAID FOR A COPY WHERE CRAWFORD IS PRESENTLY INDIGENT. THE PETITIONER(S) FEEL THAT THIS IS BEING DONE BY THE STATE ACTORS TO CREATE A DEFICIENCY IN FILING TO THWART SUPREME COURT JUDICIAL REVIEW. THEREFORE, DUE TO THIS STATE INTERFERENCE, THE PETITIONERS MOTION THAT THE RECORD BE EXPANDED AND THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS APPLICATION SENT BY McCRAY FOR THE APPEAL OF CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BE USED IN THIS CASE BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT SINCE HIS FINANCIAL SITUATION HAS NOT CHANGED SINCE ITS FILING. WE ALSO MOTION TO WAIVE THE REQUIREMENT THAT THE ORDER FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS BE FILED IN THE RECORD SINCE A COPY OF IT IS FILED WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND ALL OTHER REQUIRED

ORDERS ARE ATTACHED IN APPENDIX---A. THE PETITIONER(S) PRAY THE COURT WILL GRANT THIS REQUEST..

RESPECTFULLY,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD



RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron Santa McCray*

NOVEMBER 8, 2021

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

December 16, 2021

Lawrence L. Crawford  
#300839  
Lee CI  
990 Wisacky Hwy  
Bishopville, SC 29010

RE: Crawford, et al. v. South Carolina  
SCSC Nos. 2020-000974, 2020-001615

Dear Mr. Crawford:

The documents pertaining to the above-referenced petition for a writ of certiorari were postmarked December 3, 2021, forwarded to the Clerk by Justice Sotomayor on December 16, 2021, and are returned herewith.

The August 6, 2021 order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina that is included herein must be submitted together with the petition for a writ of certiorari that was returned for corrections on December 15, 2021. As it is now apparent that Mr. McCray is a party to the judgment sought to be reviewed, please ensure that a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and declaration of indigency of each petitioner is included upon resubmission of the petition.

Please also be advised that this Court has no authority to institute or conduct investigations.

Sincerely,  
Scott S. Harris, Clerk  
By:

Emily Walker  
(202) 479-5955

Enclosures

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE NEWMAN; DIRECTOR STIRLING;  
DORM MANAGER LT. REED; GENERAL COUNSEL; ANNIE RUMBLER;  
CAPT. BRIGHTHART; WARDEN WILLIAMS; BARTON VINCENT ET. AL.,  
DEFENDANTS---APPELLEES

---

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF THIS DATE OF DECEMBER 19, 2021, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073 DUE TO ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF

JUSTICE;\*\*\*\*, ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

JUSTICE;\*\*\*\*, ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

(2) THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J. 07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050 CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY---PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE NEWMAN; DIRECTOR STIRLING;  
DORM MANAGER LT. REED; GENERAL COUNSEL; ANNIE RUMBLER;  
CAPT. BRIGHTHART; WARDEN WILLIAMS; BARTON VINCENT ET. AL.,  
DEFENDANTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
FOR CASE 20-7073 DUE TO ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND  
OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; MOTION FOR A NEW CASE MANAGER;  
MOTION FOR A STAY OF CASE 21-6275 IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT  
AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASES 20-7073; 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASES

2020-0001615, 2020-000974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT.

TO: THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,  
THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "LOCAL RULE 45". THIS IS A COPY OF THE LOCAL RULE 45 NOTICE ISSUED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DATED DECEMBER 6, 2021 FILED IN CASE 21-6275.

(2) EXHIBIT, "DEFERMENT". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER DATED OCTOBER 28, 2021 FILED IN CASE 21-6275 WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DETERMINED THAT THEY WOULD DEFER ANY RULING AND OR REQUIREMENT IN CASE 21-6275 UNTIL THE APPEAL OF CASE 20-7073 WAS HEARD IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

(3) EXHIBIT, "JUDGE SOTOMAYOR". THIS IS A COPY OF THE (4) PAGE LETTER DATED DECEMBER 2, 2021 THAT WAS SENT WITH THE REPAIRED SUBSEQUENT PLEADING AFTER THE INITIAL PLEADING WAS COMPROMISED, AND PORTIONS SPOLIATED BY POTENTIAL MEMBERS, AGENTS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY NATURE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SURROUND THIS CASE. THIS LETTER WAS SENT WITH THE REPAIRED SUBSEQUENT FILING TO THE INITIAL FILING BY CERTIFIED MAIL NUMBER 7021 0950 0001 0779 5166 WHICH THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE CONFIRMED AND OR INDICATED BY THEIR 800 NUMBER WAS DELIVERED TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON DECEMBER 6, 2021, BUT EMILY WALKER WHO SHE SAYS HER NAME IS, THE PRESENT CASE MANAGER, INDICATED TO THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER, LENEAU CRAWFORD, OVER THE TELEPHONE, HAS NOT BEEN FORWARDED TO HER BY THE PROCESSING DIVISION OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

THOUGH THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS IN QUESTION WERE IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S POSSESSION FOR ALMOST TWO WEEKS NOW.

(4) EXHIBIT, "INITIAL 20-7073 PETITION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI OF CASE 20-7073 THAT WAS RETURNED TO THE PETITIONERS AS PART OF THE SCHEME, PLOT, AND COMPROMISED INITIAL PLEADING, MIXING THE FEDERAL DOCUMENTS WITH THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA DOCUMENTS IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO JUSTIFY THEIR RETURN. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WAS ALREADY PREVIOUSLY SERVED A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT.

THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER CASES 2020-0001615 AND 2020-000974, CRAWFORD AND McCRAY ARE OFFICIALLY MOTIONING FOR AN INVESTIGATION BECAUSE ALL POINTS TO THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WHO ARE VERY POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS COMPROMISING AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO PREVENT THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FROM EVER HEARING THESE CASES. WE RESPECTFULLY DEMAND AND OR REQUEST AND MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL FULL INVESTIGATION BY AN INDEPENDENT SOURCE TO GET AT THE BOTTOM OF WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THESE CASES INVOLVED.

THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND MOTION FOR A STAY ON CASE 21-6276 DUE TO EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT OCCURRED HERE, SEEKING TIME TO RESET ONCE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES ON WHETHER OR NOT THE PETITIONER(S) ARE ENTITLED TO A COMPLETE AND FULL INVESTIGATION INTO WHAT IS POTENTIALLY CRIMINAL ACTIVITY RELATED TO THE HINDERING AND OBSTRUCTING THE HEARING OF THESE CASES INVOLVED.

THIS IS WHAT OCCURRED. THE PETITIONERS SENT INTO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AS WAS INSTRUCTED BY PRIOR CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SUPREME COURT, A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073

AND 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHICH WAS SENT TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN ONE MAILING. IN ANOTHER SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT MAILING ABOUT (3) DAYS LATER AND APART. THE PETITIONER(S) SENT IN MAILING SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI OUT OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THAT STATE'S SUPREME COURT RELATED TO BOTH CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974.

THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS, POWERFUL POLITICAL FIGURES THAT THEY ARE, THEN SOMEHOW COMPROMISES AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BY GETTING THESE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES, PROBABLY IN THE PROCESSING DIVISION, TO COMPROMISE OUR INITIAL PLEADING. THEY ACCOMPLISHED THIS BY TAKING THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT PROCEEDING AND THEN SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, THE INITIAL STATE PETITION SENT, ALONG WITH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FINAL ORDERS IN APPENDIX 1 BECAUSE WITHOUT THE ORDERS THE CASE CAN'T BE HEARD. THEN THE CONSPIRING AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES WITHIN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, TO PREVENT AND OR HINDER THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUDGES FROM EVER HEARING THE CASE. THE CONSPIRING PARTIES THEN SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, "KEY", "CRUCIAL" EXHIBITS AND OR EVIDENCE, ABOUT (5) APPENDICES LISTED WITHIN THE STATE SUPREME COURT PETITION, EVIDENCE THAT WOULD HAVE CLEARLY PROVEN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND PARTIES INVOLVEMENT IN SUBSTANTIAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITY VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATING PROVISIONS OF 5 U.S.C. §§ 3333, 3331 AND 7311 OF STATUTORY CODE OF LAW.

AFTER SPOLIATING, DESTROYING, COMPROMISING THESE CRUCIAL, ESSENTIAL PORTIONS OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PROCEEDING, THE CONSPIRING PARTIES THEN TAKE THE PLEADING SENT IN FOR SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR THE FEDERAL CASE UNDER 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, AND SUBSTITUTE, PUT THEM IN PLACE OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PLEADING AND OR WRIT OF CERTIORARI, TO PRETEND THAT THIS IS HOW THEY WERE SENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO JUSTIFY THEIR RETURN AND ALLOW THE 4TH. CIRCUIT

TO ISSUE THE RULE 45 NOTICE TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE THE FAULT WAS THE PETITIONERS FAILURE TO PROSECUTE.

THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS SENT BACK TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AFTER REPAIRING THE ACTS OF SPOILATION AND DESTRUCTION OF COURT DOCUMENTS. AS OF THIS DATE MS. EMILY WALKER POSSIBLY CONSPIRING WITH THESE INDIVIDUALS, HAS FAILED TO ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THE NOW RESENT STATE SUPREME COURT PLEADINGS REPAIRING THE SPOILATION AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT IF THE PETITIONER(S) SENT IN THE FEDERAL PLEADING SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI RELATED TO CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT NOW. THE CONSPIRING COMPROMISED AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES NOW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, WILL SEE THIS AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO CRIMINALLY REPEAT THE INJUSTICE AND MIX THE PLEADING AGAIN AND SPOILATE ESSENTIAL LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND PRETEND THAT THE DEFICIENCY WAS CAUSED BY THE PETITIONER(S). THUS, THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT UNTIL AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION IS CONDUCTED AND THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ACKNOWLEDGE ON THE COURT RECORD THAT THE S.C. STATE SUPREME COURT PLEADING IS IN THE HANDS OF A NEW AND PROPER CASE MANAGER NOT WORKING FOR THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, AND IS NOT TAMPERED WITH AND THE CASE IS ALLOWED TO MOVE FORWARD FOR RULING BY THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT JUDGES AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY WOULD GRANT THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.


ONE OF THE SPECIFIC REASONS THAT THE PETITIONER(S) FEEL THAT THE CASE MANAGER EMILY WALKER, ALL INDICATIONS POINT TO HER INVOLVEMENT, IS BECAUSE WHEN THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER AND SISTER, LENEAU CRAWFORD AND YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN CALLED THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO OFFICIALLY COMPLAIN ABOUT THE INJUSTICE DONE TO THE PETITIONER(S) AND ASK FOR AN INVESTIGATION. THE PETITIONER(S) BROTHER ASKED MS. WALKER IF SHE EVEN RECEIVED THE PETITIONERS' MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE AND OR TO EXPEDITE THE

HEARING OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THEREUPON, MS. EMILY WALKER, IF THIS IS HER NAME, INFORMED THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER AND SISTER YAHDINA THAT THERE WAS NO SUCH THING AS A MOTION OR MECHANISM IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PROCEDURES OR RULES THAT CAN BE INVOKED TO SEEK AND OR ALLOW THE PETITIONERS TO REQUEST OR MOTION TO EXPEDITE THE HEARING OF THE CASE. IT IS PERSPICUOUS FROM THE CASES OF DOES 1-3 v. MILLS, --S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 5763094 (MEM) (U.S.2021) AND WHOLE WOMAN HEALTH v. JACKSON, 142 S.Ct. 415 (MEM) 2021 WL 4840468 THAT SUCH A MECHANISM TO SEEK TO EXPEDITE HEARING OF A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI DOES EXIST. MS. EMILY WALKER BLATANTLY, CRIMINALLY, LIED TO THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY MEMBERS DEMONSTRATING HER POTENTIAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY OF THE PARTIES BEING CHALLENGED. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION THAT A NEW CASE MANAGER BE ASSIGNED TO HANDLING THE PETITIONER(S) CASES. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR A STAY ON CASE 21-6275 UNTIL THE INVESTIGATION CONCLUDES AND THE APPEAL OF CASE 20-7073 IS HEARD. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT THE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI REGARDING CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ONCE THOSE MATTERS ARE INVESTIGATED AND REMEDIED.

RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY



JONAH THE TISHBITE



DECEMBER 18, 2021.

6-of-6

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

January 24, 2022

Lawrence L. Crawford

#300839

Lee CI

990 Wisacky Hwy

Bishopville, SC 29010

RE: "Motion for an Official Investigation; Motion for an Extension of Time to Submit Petition for Writ of Cert. for Case 20-7073 Due to Acts of Criminal Conspiracy & Obstruction of Justice; Motion for a New Case Manager; Motion for a Stay of Case 21-6275 in the 4th. Cir. & Motion to Motion Therefor"

Dear Mr. Crawford:

The enclosed documents postmarked January 11, 2022, and received January 19, 2022 are returned unfiled.

United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit case No. 20-7073 was covered by this Court's extension order of March 19, 2020, extending the time to file the petition by sixty days, which is the maximum extension allowed by statute and rule. The Court's July 19, 2021 order rescinds that extension in any case in which the relevant lower court judgment, order denying discretionary review, or order denying a timely petition for rehearing was issued on or after July 19, 2021; for those cases, the deadline to file a petition for a writ of certiorari is as provided by Rule 13. For cases in which the relevant lower court judgment, order denying discretionary review, or order denying a timely petition for rehearing was issued before July 19, 2021, the deadline remains extended to 150 days from that judgment or order, and the Clerk cannot docket applications for further extension of time with respect to cert petitions covered by the March 19, 2020 order.

Moreover, the Rules of this Court make no provision for the filing of an application to extend the time to file a corrected petition for a writ of certiorari. As a corrected petition was not received within sixty days of the Clerk's November 17, 2021 letter, the petition is out-of-time (unless a corrected petition was sent to the Clerk on or before January 17, 2022 and has not yet been received). You may resubmit an otherwise compliant petition together with a motion to direct the Clerk to file the petition out-of-time. The motion will be presented to the full Court.

With respect to the "Motion for a Stay of Case 21-6275 in the 4th. Circuit and Motion to Motion Therefor," please be advised that an application for a stay must comply in all respects with Rules 22 and 23, including the requirement that you append a copy of the order of the Court or judge below denying the relief sought.

With respect to the "Motion for an Official Investigation" and "Motion for a New Case Manager," you are again informed that neither the Court nor any Justice thereof has any authority to institute or conduct investigations, and that the Clerk does not entertain requests for an alternate case analyst.

Sincerely,  
Scott S. Harris, Clerk  
By:   
Emily Walker  
(202) 479-5955

~~File in case~~

21A425

EXHIBIT, "LOCAL RULE 45".

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT  
1100 East Main Street, Suite 501, Richmond, Virginia 23219

December 6, 2021

---

RULE 45 NOTICE

---

No. 21-6275,      Lawrence Crawford v. Warden Nelson  
9:20-cv-02139-TLW-MHC

TO:    Lawrence Crawford

**DEFAULT(S) MUST BE REMEDIED BY: 12/21/2021**

Please take notice that the court will dismiss this case for failure to prosecute pursuant to Local Rule 45 unless the default(s) identified below are remedied within 15 days of the date of this notice through receipt of the requisite form(s) or fee in the appropriate clerk's office. Forms are available for completion as links from this notice and at the court's web site, [www.ca4.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca4.uscourts.gov).

---

**Informal opening brief** must be received in the Court of Appeals clerk's office.

T. Fischer, Deputy Clerk  
804-916-2704





EXHIBIT, "JUDGE SOTOMAYOR"

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260  
LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.  
BISHOPVELLE, S.C. 29010

RON SANTA McCRAY  
\$353031 COOPER B-59  
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205  
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29742

IN RE: POTENTIAL ACTS OF SPOILATION, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND  
THE COMPROMISING OF THE INITIAL PLEADING THAT WAS SENT TO THE  
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
CERTIORARI FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT RELATED TO CASES  
2020-001615 AND 2020-000974 OF THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION  
CASES AND THE SEEKING OF AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION.

TO: THE HONORABLE JUDGE SOTOMAYOR AND HER OFFICE,

MA'AM. THIS IS SUBSEQUENT CORRESPONDENCE TO THE  
PREVIOUS ONE SENT. JUDGE SOTOMAYOR THE PETITIONER(S) PRAY THAT  
YOU AND YOUR OFFICE DO NOT CONSTRUE THIS AS ANY ATTEMPT TO  
CIRCUMVENT THE NORMAL FILING PROCESS BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT.  
THIS IS NOT THE CASE HERE. THE PETITIONERS TOOK THE NORMAL AND  
PROPER STEPS TO FILE BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ONLY  
TO FIND TO OUR COMPLETE SURPRISE AND DISMAY, THAT THE POLITICALLY

POWERFUL DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE HAVE SOMEHOW COMPROMISED THE EMPLOYEES AND OR PROCESSING DIVISION OF THIS COURT DUE TO THE EXCEPTIONAL AND EXTRAORDINARY NATURE OF THE CLAIMS BEING MADE WITHIN THIS CASE, DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AT THE STATE LEVEL GIVING ALL CLAIMS VERITY. AS THE PETITIONERS AFORE STATED, ALL INDICATIONS POINT TO DOCUMENTS AND PLEADINGS BEING POTENTIALLY COMPROMISED, SPOLIATING VALUABLE EVIDENCE AND EXHIBITS THAT SERVE TO PROVE ALL CLAIMS MADE INVOLVING PEOPLE OF SUCH POLITICAL POWER, SUCH AS HENRY McMASTER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WHO WAS ONCE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THAT THE INITIAL STATE PETITION AND ABOUT (5) EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT WERE COMPROMISED, SPOLIATED BY EMPLOYEES OF THIS COURT. THE PETITIONERS' INTENT HERE IS ONLY TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS NO FURTHER TAMPERING WITH THIS CASE VIA CRIMINAL ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE INSULT JUDGE SOTOMAYOR WAS NOT MERELY AGAINST THE PETITIONERS AND THE INMATES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THE INSULT WAS ALSO DIRECTLY LEVIED AT THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN AN ATTEMPTED USURPATION OF THE HONORABLE JUDGES REVIEWING AUTHORITY IN CLEAR VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. THE PETITIONERS ARE FORCED TO SEND THESE PLEADINGS TO YOUR OFFICE IN HOPES OF GETTING AID FROM YOU AND YOUR STAFF JUDGE SOTOMAYOR TO ENSURE THAT THE PLEADING IS PROPERLY FILED AND NOT MOLESTED OR COMPROMISED IN ANY WAY.

ATTACHED THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT WILL FIND IS A DUPLICATE COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER FROM CASE(S) 2020-001615 (RON SANTA McCRAY) AND 2020-000974 (LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD) CASES OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT. CAN YOUR OFFICE PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE REQUIRED FINAL ORDER FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT THAT WAS INITIALLY SPOLIATED IN NOW PLACED BACK IN APPENDIX--A OF THE DOCUMENTS JUST SENT TO YOUR OFFICE BY CERTIFIED MAIL? THE SUPREME COURT WILL ALSO FIND A DUPLICATE OF THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE THAT MAY HAVE ALSO BEEN SPOLIATED, COMPROMISED, BY AGENTS OF THIS COURT, FILED TO SEEK TO MOVE THE CASE UP ON THE DOCKET WITH ALL EXHIBITS LISTED THEREIN

AND LISTED WITHIN ITS ATTACHMENTS. IF THESE EXHIBITS AND OR ATTACHMENTS ARE NOT PRESENT? THE FILING HAS SOMEHOW BEEN COMPROMISED BY AGENTS OF THIS COURT AGAIN. THE PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED WITH THE STATEMENT MADE BY MS. WALKER TO OUR FAMILY MEMBER IN A RECENT PHONE CALL WHERE SHE ALLEGED THERE IS NO SUCH MECHANISM TO ADVANCE A CASE ON THE DOCKET WHEN THE CASE LAW CITED GIVES INDICATION OTHERWISE, AS WELL AS RECENT NOTIFICATION GIVEN BY NPR BEING DONE IN THE TRUMP CASE.

THE PETITIONERS, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, ARE STILL DEMANDING THAT A FULL INVESTIGATION OCCUR TO DETERMINE HOW IN THE WORLD DID OUR INITIAL FILING GET COMPROMISED AND SPOLIATED THE WAY IT DID WITHIN THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT, INSULTING THIS COURT'S INTEGRITY. MS. WALKER CLAIMED THAT THIS IS HOW THE INITIAL FILING WAS SENT TO HER ABSENT THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS THAT WERE COMPROMISED. THIS MAY MEAN THAT BEFORE THE INITIAL PLEADING REACHED HER, POSSIBLY IN PROCESSING, THE CASE WAS FRAUDULENTLY COMPROMISED AND LEGAL DOCUMENTS CRIMINALLY SPOLIATED. IT WOULD BE ONE THING IF THE CLAIM WAS SOMEHOW THAT THE PETITIONERS FORGOT TO SEND THE STATE PETITION ALONE, THOUGH WITH ALL CERTAINTY THAT STATE PETITION WAS INDEED SENT WITH THAT INITIAL FILING. IT WAS MORE THAN THAN THIS. THE ACTS OF SPOILATION WERE CRIMINALLY SELECTIVE, TARGETING KEY EVIDENCE AND PROOF, LEGAL DOCUMENTS THAT SERVED TO PROVE THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WAS PROPERLY SERVED, APPEARED IN A BACK DOOR MANNER WITHIN THE STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS AND THEN DEFAULTED ON ALL CLAIMS MADE AT THE STATE LEVEL. THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS HAD MEMBERS EMPLOYED BY THIS COURT TO SPOLIATE EVIDENCE OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE S.L.E.D. INVESTIGATIVE FILE POSSESSING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE OF THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD. THEY SPOLIATED THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT RELATED TO CASE 2020-001667 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS TO JUSTIFY SENDING THE REMITTITUR TO THE LOWER COMMON PLEAS COURT TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. THEY SPOLIATED THE ORDERS FROM THE LOWER COURT THAT WERE APPENDIX--A NOW REPLACED TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. THE ACTS WERE

EGREGIOUS, MALICIOUS, CRIMINAL AND TARGETED AND A VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SUBJECTING THEM TO CRIMINAL PENALTIES UNDER 5 U.S.C. §§ 3333, 3331, 7311 AND OTHER FEDERAL LAWS AND OR STATUTES.

THE ACTION ON THE PART OF THESE CONSPIRING INDIVIDUALS SPIT IN THE FACE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". THE PETITIONERS RESPECTFULLY SEEK THAT THE PLEADING BE FILED WITHOUT ANY FURTHER ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE PETITIONER(S) RESPECTFULLY DEMAND THAT AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION OCCUR BY AN INDEPENDENT PARTY DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY AND EXCEPTIONAL NATURE OF THIS CASE, AND SEEK THAT YOU AND YOUR OFFICE ASSISTANCE IN GETTING AT THE TRUTH OF THESE MATTERS. THE PETITIONERS ARE SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT MA'AM. CAN YOU AND YOUR OFFICE ASSIST US TO ENSURE THAT THESE DOCUMENTS ARE PROPERLY FILED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW, NOT COMPROMISED, AND WE SEEK THAT THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY AS TO THE CASE NUMBER THAT IS ASSIGNED BEFORE ANY JUDICIAL REVIEW OCCURS. THE PETITIONERS ALSO IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION SEEK THAT THE CASE MANAGER, MS. WALKERO, ASSIGNED TO THIS CASE BE REPLACED. TO ENSURE DELIVERY OF THIS PLEADING. THE PLEADING IS BEING SENT CERTIFIED MAIL BY ROBBIE MITCHELL ANOTHER INMATE TO THIS CASE SUBJUDICE. THE PETITIONERS THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,


RESPECTFULLY,  
LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD



DECEMBER 2, 2021

4-of-4

RON SANTA McCRAY



LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260  
LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.  
BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010


RON SANTA McCRAY  
#353031 COOPER B-59  
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205  
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

IN RE: TO SEEKING AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION, SEEKING A NEW CASE  
MANAGER, SEEKING AN EXTENSION TO FILE CASE 20-7073 VIA  
APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR UNDER RULE 22.

TO: JUDGE SOTOMAYOR,  
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ET. AL.,

THE PETITIONERS IN THIS CASE IS RETURNING THESE DOCUMENTS  
BACK TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT VIA MS. WALKER AND OTHER  
CLERKS SEEKING IT BE FORWARDED TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR PURSUANT TO  
RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN  
THEM UNTIL MY BROTHER LENEAU CRAWFORD HAS CONTACTED YOU AND  
CONFIRMED WHAT IS GOING ON. THE PETITIONERS IN THIS CASE ARE  
MOTIONING FOR A NEW CASE MANAGER AND AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION  
MS. WALKER. WE WANT YOU OFF THIS CASE. IT IS OBVIOUS TO THE  
PETITIONERS THAT MS. WALKER'S PRESENCE ON THIS CASE IS IN  
FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY TO CAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM TO THIS

1-of-8



CASE, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT SHE WAS NOT THE FIRST CASE MANAGER ASSIGNED TO THIS CASE, MS. SUSAN FRIMPONG WAS. THERE WAS NO REASON TO EXCHANGE CASE MANAGERS UNLESS AS IT HAS MANIFESTED ITSELF WITHIN THIS CONTEXT, THERE WERE NEFARIOUS INTENTIONS. LET THE PETITIONERS ADDRESS THIS RECENT LETTER MS. WALKER MADE USE OF CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DATED DECEMBER 15, 2021. FIRST, WHEN THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY SPOKE WITH MS. WALKER SHE STATED THAT SHE DID NOT RECEIVE THE MAIN BULK PLEADING BUT HAD THE PLEADING THAT CONTAINED THE MOTION TO EXPEDITE THE CASE AND ADVANCE THE CAUSE, WHICH SHE PREVIOUSLY LIED TO MY FAMILY AND STATED NO SUCH MECHANISM WITHIN THE SUPREME COURT EXISTED TO SEEK TO EXPEDITE CASES. SHE THEN TELLS THE PETITIONER FAMILY MEMBER(S) THAT SHE WOULD NOT RETURN THE LAST PLEADING BUT WOULD WAIT UNTIL MY FAMILY CALLED HER BACK TO GET CLARITY BEFORE SHE RETURNED IT, BUT SHE LIED ABOUT THAT AS WELL. SHE IMMEDIATELY RETURNED THE BULK PLEADING AND THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE PRETENDING THAT SHE DID NOT UNDERSTAND HOW IT WAS BEING FILED. IN PARAGRAPH (1) OF HER DECEMBER 15, 2021 SHE AND HER CO-CONSPIRATORS DIVERT THE FILING FROM EVER REACHING JUDGE SOTOMAYOR VIOLATING RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES WHICH REQUIRED HER TO FORWARD THE PLEADING TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR PROMPTLY. THEN IF YOU READ PARAGRAPH (2) OF THE LETTER, SHE CLAIMS THAT THE FINAL ORDER FROM THE STATE SUPREME COURT CASE WAS NOT PRESENT IN APPENDIX 1 WHEN SHE KNEW GOOD AND WELL IT WAS IN THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE PLEADING TO PROTECT IT, WHICH SHE ADMITTED TO THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY MEMBERS THAT SHE DID HAVE, BEING REPLACED DUE TO SHE AND HER CO-CONSPIRATORS SPOLIATING, DESTROYING THE STATE FINAL ORDERS WHEN THEY WERE INITIALLY SENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

MS. WALKER THEN ASSERTS THAT CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 AND 2020-0001667 APPEAR TO HAVE ONLY CRAWFORD AS A PARTY WHEN THAT IS NOT THE CASE BEING ARGUED IN THE MANNER SHE PURPOSELY MISREPRESENTED. IT IS CASE 2020-000974 WHICH EMBODY THOSE CASE WHICH WAS FILED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHERE CASE

2020-001615 THE RON McCRAY CASE AND 2020-000974 THE CRAWFORD CASE WERE SOUGHT CONSOLIDATED FOR RULING PRODUCING ONE ORDER FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DATED AUGUST 6, 2021 THAT SHE AND HER COHORTS INITIALLY SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, IN THE INITIAL PLEADING, NOW SHE LIES IN RELATION TO THIS FILING, CLAIMING SHE DID NOT HAVE THE FINAL STATE SUPREME COURT ORDER IN HER POSSESSION, CRIMINALLY VIOLATING HER OATH OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION AND JUSTIFY THE RETURN OF THE PLEADING TO THE PETITIONERS TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW.

THEN IN PARAGRAPH 3 OF THIS RECENT LETTER SHE LIES AGAIN STATING THAT A NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS RECEIVED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FOR CASE 2020-001667, 2020-000974 FINALLY ADMITTING THE EXISTENCE OF CASE 2020-000974 BUT IN FRAUD CONCEALING THAT IT WAS A JOINT FILING OF NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL, NOT JUST FOR CASE 2020-00974, BUT WAS ALSO FILED BY RON SANTA McCRAY FOR CASE 2020-001615 AS WELL. THIS IS WHY SHE CONVENIENTLY ASSERTS NO COPY OF THE DOCUMENT WAS KEPT ON FILE SO SHE COULD PERPETRATE THIS FRAUD, LIE AND DECEPTION.

IN PARAGRAPH 4 SHE THEN ADMITS THAT THE PETITIONERS DID INDEED INTEND TO FILE JOINTLY. MS. WALKER THEN IN PARAGRAPH 5 CLAIMS THAT THE PETITION FILED IS FOR THE FEDERAL CASE 20-7073 AS IF THIS IS THE LEAD PETITION WHEN OF COURSE IT IS NOT. THE STATE PETITION FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT (39) PAGES IS THE LEAD PETITION IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE. THAT FEDERAL EXHIBIT, DOCUMENT, WAS NEVER SUBMITTED IN THE APPENDIX TO SPECIFICALLY ARGUE THE MERITS OF THE ISSUES SOUGHT REVIEW IN THAT CASE. IT WAS SUBMITTED SPECIFICALLY TO ANSWER THE QUESTION THE SUPREME COURT ASKED, "ARE THERE ANY RELATED CASES PENDING OR POTENTIALLY COMING BEFORE THE COURT", AND IN SUPPORT OF THE QUESTION SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO THE STATE CASES, AS TO "WHETHER OR NOT THE PETITIONERS MEET THE CRITERION REGARDING THE STATE CASES ONLY, FOR 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER." SINCE THE LEGAL QUESTIONS INTENDED TO SEEK REVIEW OF CASE 20-2073 ARE ENTIRELY AND DISTINCTLY DIFFERENT, SINCE WE ARE

ESSENTIALLY DEALING WITH PENDANT AND TRANSFER JURISDICTIONS, AND THE QUESTION ONLY RELATES TO THE STATE CASE, NOT SEEKING REVIEW OF THE FEDERAL CASE? THE SUBMITTING OF THE DOCUMENT IN THE APPENDIX TO ESTABLISH THESE JURISDICTIONAL FACT WOULD NOT BE PRECLUDED. MS. WALKER CONSTANTLY, PURPOSELY, MISCONSTRUES THE FILINGS TO IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, JUSTIFY HER RETURNING THE PLEADING TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES.

IF THE TIME TO HEAR CASE 20-7073 HAS PASSED? ITS BECAUSE OF THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE ENGAGED IN BY THESE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, WORKING WITH THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, WHO SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, INITIAL PLEADINGS AND EVIDENCE CAUSING THE DELAY ESTABLISHING CAUSE AND PREJUDICE FOR GRANTING ANY EXTENSION FOR FILING CASE 20-7073 AS IS SOUGHT AND THE WAIVING OF THE REQUIREMENT TO HAVE TO SUBMIT ANY REQUIRED ORDERS SUBJUDICE FOR A SECOND TIME.

AS FOR PARAGRAPH 7 STATING ITS UNCLEAR THAT RON SANTA McCRAY IS PARTY. FIRST, WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL CASE YET. LET'S ADDRESS THE STATE CASES AND THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDER. THE RON SANTA McCRAY PCR CASE 2019-CP-08-1992 IS THE SOURCE OF THE APPEAL BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ESTABLISHING CASE 2020-001615. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD OFFICIALLY FILED MOTION TO INTERVENE BY RIGHT NOT DISCRETION OF THAT COURT IN THAT McCRAY PCR CASE AUTOMATICALLY MAKING CRAWFORD AN INTERESTED PARTY AT THE PCR LEVEL. THE McCRAY PCR IS AN ACTION CHALLENGING CONVICTION. THE CRAWFORD CASE 2006-CP-400-**3567** IS A FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT ALSO ACTION CHALLENGING CONVICTION WHICH PRODUCED APPEAL UNDER 2020-0001667 IN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, THEN PRODUCED CASE 2020-000974 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FOR CRAWFORD. THE SAME EXACT LEGAL ISSUES BEING ARGUED IN CHALLENGING THE CONVICTION OF RON SANTA McCRAY PCR UNDER 2019-CP-08-1992 ARE THE IDENTICAL AND

ESSENTIALLY EXACT LEGAL ISSUES BEING ARGUED TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION OF CRAWFORD UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567. ONCE BOTH THE CASES APPEARED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT THEY WERE MOTIONED CONSOLIDATED DUE TO THESE MATERIAL FACTS. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT PRODUCED ONE ORDER, NOT MANY, COMBINING THE RULING IN BOTH CASES UNDER ONE ORDER FOR THE SAME EXACT REASONS SOUGHT AND LEGAL ISSUES ARGUED WHERE BOTH CRAWFORD AND McCRAY'S NAMES APPEARED ON THE JOINTLY FILED PLEADING. ALL THIS IS CLEARLY SEEN IN THE ORDER THAT WAS INITIALLY SPOLIATED BY THE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO PREVENT THE JUDGES FROM HEARING THIS CASE THAT IS NOW REPLACED. THE SAME ORDER THAT THE LYING CASE MANAGER MS. WALKER STATED WAS NOT WITHIN HER POSSESSION BUT SOMEHOW IN FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. SHE NOW RETURNS THIS S.C. SUPREME COURT FINAL ORDER SHE LIED AND SAID SOMEHOW SHE DID NOT HAVE IT. IT IS NOW AGAIN PLACED BACK INTO APPENDIX 1. THEN THE CONSPIRING AGENTS INITIALLY SPOLIATED, DESTROYED TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW AND JUST THE REQUIRED ORDERS, BUT ALSO "KEY", "ESSENTIAL" EVIDENCE THAT WOULD SUBSTANTIATE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN THESE CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES. RULE 12(4) PROVIDE: "PARTIES INTERESTED JOINTLY, SEVERALLY, OR OTHERWISE IN A JUDGMENT MAY PETITION SEPARATELY FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI; OR ANY TWO OR MORE MAY JOIN IN THE PETITION. WHEN TWO OR MORE JUDGMENTS (AS IN THE STATE CASES) ARE SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED ON A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SAME COURT (ei. S.C. SUPREME COURT) AND INVOLVE IDENTICAL OR CLOSELY RELATED QUESTIONS (EMPHASIS ADDED)[AS IT PERTAINS TO THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES], A SINGLE (EMPHASIS ADDED) PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI COVERING ALL THE JUDGMENTS SUFFICES". THIS IS WHAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU IN REGARD TO THE STATE PETITION, WHICH APPLIES ALSO TO THE FEDERAL PETITION THAT IS SOON TO BE FILED REGARDING CASE 20-7073 AND 21-6275.

AS FOR RON SANTA McCRAY BEING A PARTY IN CASE 20-7073? RON McCRAY IS NOT A PARTY UNDER THAT CASE. HE IS A PARTY UNDER CASE 21-6275 FOR WHICH WE ARE SEEKING A STAY JOINTLY UNTIL REVIEW OF

CASE 20-7073 IS POTENTIALLY HEARD BECAUSE A RULING IN THAT CASE WOULD HAVE DIRECT IMPACT AND CONSEQUENCES ON CASE 21-6275. YOU ARE INCORRECT ABOUT RON SANTA McCRAY NOT BEING A PARTY IN THE CASE THAT PRODUCED THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-6275. RON SANTA McCRAY'S NAME APPEAR ON THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT. THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION SEPARATED HIM FROM THE CASE WHICH WE JOINTLY OBJECTED AND TIMELY SOUGHT 4 DISTINCT APPEALS OF THE MAGISTRATE'S ORDERS UNDER RULE 73(c). THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND FEDERAL JUDGE IN FRAUD IGNORED THE 4 NOTICES OF APPEAL AND ONLY SENT THE APPEAL UP FOR CRAWFORD THOUGH BOTH NAMES APPEARED ON THE APPEAL DOCUMENTS JOINTLY AND McCRAY EVEN SENT SOME IN INDIVIDUALLY BUT HIS RIGHT TO APPEAL WAS STILL IGNORED WHICH PROMPTED HIM TO MOTION TO INTERVENE IN THE CASE UNDER 21-6275 TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST. THIS IS ONE OF THE ISSUES INTENDED TO BE PLACED WITHIN THE INFORMAL BRIEF. DID THE DISTRICT COURT HAVE JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THE FINAL ORDER WHEN THE CASE WAS TIMELY SOUGHT LEAVE TO APPEAL UNDER RULE 73(c) BY BOTH OF US 4 TIMES BEFORE THAT COURT ISSUED A FINAL ORDER?, AND DID THE DISTRICT COURT ABUSE THEIR DISCRETION SEPARATING McCRAY FROM THE CASE WHEN HIS NAME APPEARED ON THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT AND HE SIGNED THE COMPLAINT ON THE NEXT PAGE DUE TO THERE BEING ROOM FOR ONLY ONE SIGNATURE IN THE SPACE THE DOCUMENT PROVIDED? THEREFORE, IT IS INDISPUTABLE THAT RON SANTA McCRAY IS INDEED A PARTY IN CASE 21-6275 CONCEALED BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND HIS NAME CAN APPEAR ON A PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO STAY CASE 21-6275 PENDING RULING OF CASE 20-7073 WHICH WOULD DIRECTLY IMPACT CASE 21-6275 FOR WHICH HE IS A PARTY. SINCE IN ACTS OF FRAUD THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGES CIRCUMVENTED RULING AND SENDING THE CASE UP AT THE TIMES WHEN APPEAL WAS SOUGHT UNDER RULE 73(c). ALL THAT IS REQUIRED IS THAT THE PETITIONERS SEND COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER WHICH WAS SPOLIATED, ALONG WITH THE OTHER REQUIRED ORDERS IN THE INITIAL FILING WHICH MS. WALKER IS FULLY AWARE OF BECAUSE ALL INDICATIONS POINT, DUE TO THE ADDITIONAL LIES TOLD BY HER, THAT SHE PLAYED A DIRECT PART IN THE SPOLIATION AND DESTRUCTION OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO ALLOW HER TO ARGUE THE

INJUSTICES SHE PRESENT NOW TO PREVENT THE CASE FROM MOVING FORWARD. WE OFFICIALLY MOTION THAT ANY OTHER ORDER NEED BE REPLACED BY US BE WAIVED AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN ALL REQUIRED ORDERS ELECTRONICALLY DUE TO THE FAULT NOT BEING THE PETITIONERS BUT ON AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE SUPREME COURT WHO HAVE SOMEHOW BEEN COMPROMISED BY THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WHO ARE POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS. THIS IS SOUGHT UNDER RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES, SPECIFICALLY, JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR.

IN ADDRESSING THE CLERK'S CONCERN ASSERTING RULE 29.1. MS. WALKER AGAIN IN ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IS MISREPRESENTING THE SUPREME COURT RULES AND FACTS OF THE PLEADING. THE PLEADING WAS NOT FILED UNDER RULE 29.1. FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI. THE REQUEST WAS FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION. THIS WAS FILED AS AN APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22 WHICH PROVIDE: AN APPLICATION TO AN INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE SHALL BE FILED WITH THE CLERK, WHO WILL TRANSMIT IT PROMPTLY (EMPHASIS ADDED) TO THE JUSTICE IF THE INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE HAS AUTHORITY TO GRANT THE SOUGHT RELIEF WHICH IN FURTHER ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE YOU FAILED TO DO. THE JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR HAS THE AUTHORITY TO GRANT THE RELIEF OF US SEEKING AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION INTO YOU AND YOUR COHORTS COMPROMISING THE INITIAL FILING AND HINDERING, OBSTRUCTING AND MAKING THE ATTEMPTS TO DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. 1985(2) AND 1985(3) AND DENY THE PETITIONERS THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. YOU CANNOT PREVENT JUDGE SOTOMAYOR FROM INVOKING HER DISCRETION TO GRANT THE RELIEF FOR THE SOUGHT INVESTIGATION AND YOUR REMOVAL AS A CASE MANAGER ON THIS CASE DUE TO THE OVERWHELMING DAMAGE YOU CAUSED IN THIS CASE MS. WALKER WORKING WITH THE DEFENDANTS TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. RULE 22 REQUIRES A JUSTICE DENYING THE APPLICATION FOR THE RELIEF SEEKING OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION AND YOUR REMOVAL MUST NOTE THE DENIAL THEREOF. NOT YOU THE CLERK. THE CLERK OR CASE MANAGER DOES NOT HAVE JUDICIAL POWER. YOUR ACTIONS VIOLATE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND

IS ILLEGAL. RULE 22 SAYS AN APPLICATION CAN BE MADE BY A LETTER TO THE JUSTICE WHICH YOU HAVE IN THE FORM OF THE LETTER TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR WHICH YOU WERE REQUIRED TO FORWARD IT TO HER PROMPTLY WHICH YOU UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE HAVE FAILED TO DO FURTHER PROVING AND ESTABLISHING YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND VIOLATE YOUR OATH OF OFFICE OPENING YOU UP TO SANCTIONS AND YOUR REMOVAL FROM THIS CASE WHICH THE PETITIONERS MAKE UNDER RULE 22. RULE 29.1 APPLIES TO PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI. NOT APPLICATIONS TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22. YOU ARE REQUIRED TO FORWARD THE PLEADING TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR UNDER RULE 22. PLEASE DO SO AND GET OFF THIS CASE. THE STATE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI IS ONLY ARGUING THE STATE CASE MATTERS, EVEN THE RIGHT TO TRANSFER THOSE STATE CASES PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407. THE MATERIALLY DISTINCT AND DIFFERENT ISSUES SOUGHT TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275 HAVE NOT BEEN PLACED BEFORE THE COURT YET NOR ARE WE TRYING TO DO SO VIA THE STATE PETITION. WE HAVE MOTIONED FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE FEDERAL PETITION DUE TO THE INJUSTICE CAUSED BY YOU MS. WALKER AND YOUR CONSPIRING PARTIES. RON SANTA McCRAY IS LEGALLY A PARTY AT BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL AND CASES. WE SEEK THAT THIS PLEADING BE FORWARDED TO JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR PURSUANT TO APPLICATIONS TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22.

RESPECTFULLY,  
RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron S McCray*

JONAH THE TISHBITE



DECEMBER 22, 2021

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

December 15, 2021

Lawrence L. Crawford  
#300839  
Lee CI  
990 Wisacky Hwy  
Bishopville, SC 29010

Dear Mr. Crawford:

1 The above-entitled petition for a writ of certiorari was postmarked November 30, 2021 and forwarded to the Clerk by Justice Sotomayor on December 14, 2021. The petition is returned herewith for the following reason(s):

2 The petition indicates that it seeks review of an order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina dated August 6, 2021; and that the order is attached under appendix A. However, no such order is attached. Appendix A, which was taped together upon receipt, includes a judgment of the Richland County Court of Common Pleas dated November 16, 2020 in case no. 2006CP4003567, and an order of the South Carolina Court of Appeals dated May 15, 2021 in case no. 2020-001667. Lawrence Crawford appears to be the only plaintiff and appellant, respectively, in each case.

3 The Clerk's records indicate that, on August 31, 2021, this Office received a submission postmarked August 26, 2021, which contained documents entitled: "Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Notice Seeking Leave to Petition for Writ of Cert; Motion for Leave to Seek Petition for Writ of Cert Jointly; Motion for an Extension of Time." The submission was construed, principally, as an application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of order(s) of the Supreme Court of South Carolina dated August 6, 2021, in case nos. 2020-001667, 2020-00974. We do not currently have the aforementioned order(s) in our possession as this Office does not retain copies of documents that are returned unfiled, and they are not included within the submission returned herein.

4 On September 15, 2021, the Clerk returned the documents received August 31, 2021, and stated: An application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari cannot be combined with any other filing. Please be advised that the Rules of the Court make no provision for the filing of an "affidavit of facts giving judicial notice", "notice seeking leave to petition for writ of cert", or "motion for leave to seek petition for writ of cert jointly." No motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari under Rule 12.4 is required.

5 Moreover, the petition indicates that a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit case nos. 20-7073 and 21-6275 are currently pending before this Court. No such petition(s) has been docketed. Our records indicate that a petition seeking review of no. 20-7073 was returned for corrections on September 15, 2021, and November 17, 2021. To date, a corrected petition has not been filed.

6 Attached as appendix G to the current submission appears to be a petition for a writ of certiorari dated October 7, 2021, seeking review of 1) the judgment of the fourth circuit in no. 20-7073, of which rehearing was denied on April 9, 2021, and 2) the fourth circuit's order dated September 21, 2021 in no. 21-6275. The Clerk has no record of receipt of this petition until now. Please be advised, however, that you cannot seek review of both of these orders in a single petition because the jurisdictional deadline to file for review of the first fell prior to the entry of the second. A second judgment sought to be reviewed cannot be added upon resubmission of a petition that is returned for corrections as happened on September 15, 2021. If you wish to separately seek review of the September 21, 2021 order of the fourth circuit in no. 21-6275, please promptly submit such a petition with a declaration of timely filing pursuant to Rule 29.2. However, while you may seek review of that order specifically, the case appears to still be pending before the court of appeals.

7 Also returned herewith is a document entitled "motion to advance the cause," postmarked November 16, 2021, and received November 23, 2021, as well as related correspondence forwarded from Justice Sotomayor on December 14, 2021.

8 Additionally, as stated in previous correspondence, it is unclear whether Ron Santa McCray is actually a party to the judgment(s) sought to be reviewed. It is impossible for the Clerk to make such a determination without copies of the orders required by Rule 14.1(i). As it pertains to the related fourth circuit cases, it appears that Mr. McCray is not a party to no. 20-7073, but has motioned to intervene in no. 21-6275. Please be advised that only parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is sought to be reviewed are deemed parties entitled to file documents in this Court, and that each petitioner must include a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and declaration of indigency if the docketing fee is not paid.

9 Please clarify and correct these ambiguities and deficiencies and resubmit the documents as soon as possible. Unless the corrected petition(s) are submitted to the Clerk within 60 days of the date of this letter, the petition(s) will not be filed. Please be advised that any document required or permitted to be presented to the Court or to a Justice must be filed with the Clerk, not addressed to a Justice. Rule 29.1.

A copy of the corrected petition(s) must be served on opposing counsel.

Sincerely,  
Scott S. Harris, Clerk  
By:   
Emily Walker  
(202) 479-5955

Enclosures

# The Supreme Court of South Carolina

---

## ORDER

---

Pursuant to Rule 245, SCACR, and *Key v. Currie*, 305 S.C. 115, 406 S.E.2d 356 (1991), we decline to entertain the following matters in this Court's original jurisdiction:

1. *Lawrence Crawford v. State of South Carolina*, In re: Seeking Leave from the S.C. Supreme Court to Address the Blocking of Filing Application for Forensic D.N.A. Testing, dated June 29, 2020; In re: To Appealing the Final Order from Case 2020-001667 via Supplement Invoking the S.C. Supreme Court's Original Jurisdiction under Case 2020-000974, dated May 24, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2020-000974.
2. *Ron Santa McCray v. State of South Carolina*, Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Petition for a Writ of Certiorari; Notice and Motion to Act Pro Se; Motion for a Stay; Motion and Notice and a Reset on Any Timetable to Submit Brief and Other Related Documents and Motion to Motion therefor, dated November 20, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court, the S.C. Court of Appeals, the Berkeley County Common Pleas Court, the Chief Administrative Judge of Berkeley County, the S.C. Attorney General et. al., dated December 2, 2020; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Petition for Petition and or Motion to Amend the Caption of the Initial Filing; Petition to Invoke the S.C. Supreme Court's Jurisdiction; Petition for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief; Petitioner and or Motion to Challenge the Relevant Court(s) Jurisdiction and Recall the Remittitur Out of Time and Motion to Motion Therefor, dated December 2, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court with Exhibit, dated December 8, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court, the S.C. Attorney General, the Berkeley County Common Pleas Court, the Berkeley County Chief Administrative Judge, the 9th Circuit Solicitor's Office et. al. with Exhibit, dated February 23, 2021; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court with Exhibit, dated March 1, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to Supplement the Pleading Due to New Ruling Coming out of the S.C. Supreme Court and Motion to Motion therefor, dated April 3, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to Supplement the Pleadings under this Case and Motion to Motion therefor with Exhibit, dated April 24, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to File Objections as to Why the

Conditional Order Should not Become Final in Case 2019-CP-08-1992; Renewing the Petition to Invoke the S.C. Supreme Court's Original Jurisdiction; Renewing the Notice Seeking Leave to Appeal the Conditional Order Seeking Review under Torrence v. S.C. Dept. of Corrections; Motion to Challenge the Berkeley Common Please Court's Jurisdiction due to Continued Acts of Fraud upon the Court and Unconstitutional Action and Motion to Motion therefor, dated May 16, 2021; Letter and Exhibit received May 27, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2020-001615.

3. *Matthew Jamison v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to Chief Justice Beatty, received December 15, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001631.

4. *Glen K. LaConey v. Richland County Sheriff Leon Lott and the Richland County Sheriff's Department; Alan M. Wilson and the Office of the Attorney General; Joshua Koger, Jr., Esquire; William A. Hodge, Esquire; Clifton B. Newman; R. Know McMahon; Robert M. Madsen, Esquire; Jason Scott Chehoski, Esquire; Jocelyn Newman and Lori Pelzer, a.k.a. Lori L. Washington, Petition for Original Jurisdiction, dated June 18, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000649.*

5. *Karreem T. Wiley v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to Chief Justice Beatty, dated December 20, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001704.

6. *London Wooden v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to the Supreme Court, received December 29, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001705.

7. *Travis Lee Hamrick v. 7th Judicial Circuit General Sessions Court of Spartanburg, South Carolina*, Notice of Petition for Writ of Mandamus, dated January 4, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000016.

8. *Darrell Williams v. State of South Carolina*, Notice of Motion for Original Jurisdiction in State Supreme Court, dated January 8, 2021; Motion in Support of Notice for Original Jurisdiction, dated January 8, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000054.

John Keally  
John K. Keally  
John L. Keam

cc:

Lawrence L. Crawford  
Ron Santa McCray  
Matthew Jamison  
Glen K. LaConey  
Karreem T. Wiley  
London Wooden  
Travis Lee Hamrick  
Darrell Williams  
Lori Pelzer  
The Honorable Clifton Newman  
The Honorable Jocelyn Newman  
The Honorable Knox McMahon  
Alan Wilson, Attorney General  
Sheriff Leon Lott  
The Honorable Amy Kathryn West cox  
Dan Goldberg, Esquire  
H. Thomas Morgan Jr., esquire  
William A. Hodge, Esquire  
Jason Scott Chehoski, Esquire  
Joshua Koger Jr., Esquire  
Robert M. Madsen, Esquire  
Robert David Garfield, Esquire

*John Cannon Jr*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Joe Jones*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J.  
J.

Columbia, South Carolina

August 6, 2021

EXHIBIT, "THREAT TO SOVEREIGN'S SAFETY # 1"

~~FILE IN PLAIN~~

21A 425

14

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260  
LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.  
BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010


IN RE: CASES 21-1330 AND 2021-000354 ET. AL.,

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

THE ATTACHED PLEADING IS BEING FILED TO RECALL THE MANDATE  
IN CASE 21-1330 AND MOVE TO REINSTATE THAT APPEAL. ITS FILED TO  
SEEK STAY ON ANY REQUIREMENT TO PAY ANY FILING FEES IN CASE  
2021-000354 AND TO SEEK EXTENSION OF TIME RELATED THERETO. ALL  
PARTIES ARE SERVED. PLEASE FILE THE PLEADING IN THE APPLICABLE  
CASES INVOLVED PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE ET. AL.,

OCTOBER 11, 2021



IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 1st., 3rd., 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275; 19-2005 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE:  
RON SANTA McCRAY; YAHYA MUQUIT ET. AL.,

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

VS.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---


**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

---

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO RECALL THE MANDATE IN CASE 21-1330; MOTION TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-1330; MOTION TO RENEW THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER AND CLAIMS OF RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL

ESTOPPEL; MOTION TO STAY THE REQUIREMENT OF PAYING ANY FILING FEES UNDER CASE 2021-000354 DUE TO SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER AS TAG ALONG CASE; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER CASE 2021-000354 TO RESET TO PAY ANY REQUIRED FILING FEE UNTIL THE 3rd. CIRCUIT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT GIVES REVIEW PURSUANT TO THIS DOCUMENT AND THE SEEKING OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE 3rd. CIRCUIT, THE 1st. CIRCUIT, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, THE N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, THE MCKAY LAW FIRM, THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT, THE N.J. DISTRICT COURT, THE LAW FIRM OF DUBOSE-ROBINSON AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON OCTOBER 11, 2021. DUE TO SERVICE ON THE DISTRICT COURTS IT IS DEEMED FILED ON THAT DATE, HOUSTON V. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379 (U.S.1988).

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE



RON SANTA McCRAY



Ron Santa McCray

OCTOBER 11, 2021

2-of-7

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 1st., 3rd., 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275; 19-2005 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE:  
RON SANTA McCRAY; YAHYA MUQUIT ET. AL.,

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO  
RECALL THE MANDATE IN CASE 21-1330; MOTION TO REINSTATE  
THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-1330; MOTION TO RENEW THE MOTION  
TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT  
DANGER AND CLAIMS OF RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL  
ESTOPPEL; MOTION TO STAY THE REQUIREMENT OF PAYING ANY  
FILING FEE UNDER CASE 2021-000354 DUE TO SEEKING 28  
U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER AS TAG ALONG CASE; MOTION FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER CASE 2021-000354 TO RESET TO PAY  
ANY REQUIRED FILING FEE UNTIL THE 3rd. CIRCUIT AND U.S.  
SUPREME COURT GIVES REVIEW PURSUANT TO THIS DOCUMENT AND  
THE SEEKING OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

---

IN RE: CASES 21-1330 AND 2021-000354 ET. AL.,

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY,  
THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND ATTACHED:

(1) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD/OBSTRUCTION # 1". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE 3rd. CIRCUIT INFORMING THE APPELLANT(S) THAT THE 3rd. CIRCUIT HAS GRANTED THE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE MOTION AND DEMONSTRATE THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER. NOTE THAT IT IS DATED MAY 20, 2021.

(2) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD/OBSTRUCTION # 2". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS DATED JUNE 28, 2021 WHEN THE FIRST ATTEMPT OF OBSTRUCTION WAS MADE AND THE COURT TRIED TO UNJUSTLY CLAIM THE APPELLANTS FAILED TO PROSECUTE AND THE APPELLANTS HAD TO REBUT THE INJUSTICE.

(3) EXHIBIT, "MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS". THIS IS THE [12] PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS SUBMITTED AS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER DATED MAY 30, 2021. TAKE NOTICE THAT IT WAS FILED (10) DAYS LATER IN RESPONSE TO THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S DEMAND THAT THE APPELLANT FILE THE PLEADING AND MOTION TO DEMONSTRATE THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER.

(4) EXHIBIT, "ACCEPTANCE OF MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA

PAUPERIS". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED FROM THE 3rd. CIRCUIT ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE APPELLANT WAS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S PREVIOUS ORDER TO FILE THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER WHERE THEY HELD THAT DOCUMENT IN ABEYANCE PENDING THE SENDING OF THE (6) MONTH FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

(5) EXHIBIT, "ADDITIONAL DOCUMENT SUBMISSION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE ASKING ACCEPTANCE OF THE FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF THE (6) MONTH STATEMENT AGAIN DEMONSTRATING THAT THE APPELLANT WAS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S DEMANDS SENDING IN THE (6) MONTH FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

(6) EXHIBIT, "RES JUDICATA/ COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL. THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 21-6275 GRANTING THE RIGHT TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS IN THAT CASE BASED UPON THE SAME EXACT CLAIM OF THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER ARGUED BEFORE THE 3rd. CIRCUIT. IF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT GRANTED THE REQUEST TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS ON THE SAME EXACT CLAIM OF THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER?, WHICH THEY DID? THE APPELLANT EXERCISES HIS CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ON THE ISSUE OF FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS RELATED TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER.

THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO RECALL THE MANDATE. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-1330 TO ADDRESS THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE APPELLANT RENEWS HIS MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGERS EXERCISING ALL RIGHTS OF RES JUDICATA AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ON THIS ISSUE BY THE RULING EMERGING FROM THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SINCE THE SAME WAS GRANTED BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ON THE EXACT SAME CLAIM OF THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER THAT EXISTED AT THE TIME BOTH THE CASES WERE FILED AND STILL EXIST TODAY.

(7) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD ORDER". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE 3rd. CIRCUIT ON OCTOBER 1, 2021. LET THE APPELLANT PLACE ON THE RECORD EXACTLY WHAT IS GOING ON HERE RELATED TO THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION. THE N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY AND POTENTIALLY GOD KNOWS WHO OTHERS, CAME DOWN HERE TO SOUTH CAROLINA AND OR CALLED THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT ASKING FOR THE FILES AND PLEADINGS THAT WERE FILED UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 AND ITS RELATED CASES. HOW THE APPELLANT KNOWS THIS IS THAT HIS SISTER YAHDINA CALLED THAT COURT ASKING FOR A PASS ORDER IN CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 AND WAS INFORMED OF THE CHAOS AND SEEKING OF THE FILES THAT WAS GOING ON IN THE RICHLAND COURT WHERE THE PARTIES ARE CONSPIRING TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001. ONCE REVIEWING ALL THE DOCUMENTS PLACED BEFORE THAT STATE COURT, THE CONSPIRING PARTIES REALIZED THAT THE APPELLANT(S) WERE CORRECT. THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT DID MAKE A BACK DOOR APPEARANCE IN THAT CASE, CONCEALED THEIR APPEARANCE, FAILED TO TIMELY RESPOND GIVING WAY TO THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ASSERTED BY US BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY THE FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS CASE OUT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, WHICH SAID DEFAULT BINDS ALL STATES BY THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE. DUE TO THE MAGNITUDE OF THE DISCOVERY AND TO AID THE OTHER STATE COURTS CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS. THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S ONLY OPTION WAS TO CRIMINALLY ASSERT THAT THE APPELLANT(S) FAILED TO PROSECUTE TO PREVENT THESE MATERIAL FACTS FROM BEING ENTERED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD AND TO CIRCUMVENT RULING ON THE SUBMITTED PLEADINGS VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION PURSUANT TO 5 U.S.C. §§ 3331, 3333, AND 7311. STOP THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION HONORABLE JUDGES. RECALL THE MANDATE AND REINSTATE THIS APPEAL UNDER 21-1330 AND LET THIS CASE MOVE FORWARD. GET THEM DOCUMENTS THEY SENT DOWN TO THE STORAGE WAREHOUSE IN SOUTH CAROLINA TO CONCEAL THEM AND LETS GET IT ALL PLACED UPON THE COURT RECORD.

(8) EXHIBIT, "CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTI STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS". THIS IS A COPY OF THE LETTER ISSUED FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DATED OCTOBER 4, 2021 REGARDING CASE 2021-000354. THE APPELLANT IN THIS CASE MOTIONS FOR A STAY ON ANY REQUIREMENT TO PAY ANY ALLEGED FILING FEE UNTIL THE 3rd. CIRCUIT GIVES REVIEW BASED UPON THIS NOW SUBMITTED PLEADING DUE TO SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER OF THIS CASE AS A TAG ALONG CASE AND THE SEEKING OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO THESE MATTERS. A COPY OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PLEADING IS ATTACHED. 3rd. CIRCUIT AND N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY YOU WERE ALREADY SERVED YOUR COPY OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PLEADING. IMANI YOUR COPY OF THAT PLEADING WAS SERVED ON YOU AS WELL. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO PAY ANY FILING FEE UNDER CASE 2021-000354 TO RESET ONCE RULING FROM THE INVOLVED FEDERAL COURTS HAVE BEEN ISSUED.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE

RON SANTA McCRAY

*Ron Santa McCray*

OCTOBER 2, 2021

Lawrence L. Crawford  
#300839  
Lee Correctional Institution  
990 Wisacky Highway  
P.O. Box 1000  
Bishopville, SC 29010

---

Exhibit  
Fraud / obstruction #1

---

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

**No. 21-1330**

Crawford v. Chief Jose Linares

To: Clerk

1) Motion by Appellant Lawrence Crawford for Judicial Notice and Extension of Time

---

The foregoing submission is construed as a motion for an extension of time to file a motion to proceed in forma pauperis with related PLRA forms and a motion demonstrating imminent danger. So construed, the motion is granted.

Appellant must file a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, along with an addendum to the affidavit in support of the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, a completed form authorizing assessments to be made from his prison account, a certified prison account statement, and a motion demonstrating imminent danger of serious physical injury on or before June 10, 2021 within twenty-one (21) days from the date of this Order. Failure to file a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis with the supporting PLRA documents and imminent danger motion will result in dismissal of the appeal pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 3.3 and Misc. 107.1 without further notice.

For the Court,

s/ Patricia S. Dodszuweit  
Clerk

Dated: May 20, 2021  
PDB/cc: Lawrence L. Crawford  
Yahya Muquit

Exhibit

Fraud / Obstructions

# 2

22

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL  
FOR THE 3rd., 4th. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

---

I, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON JUNE 28, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE

JUNE 28, 2021

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL  
FOR THE 3rd., 4th. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION  
TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION  
OF TIME AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR


---

IN RE: CASE 21-1330

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

WITH ALL DUE RESPECT. WHAT THE HECK DO THIS CLERK HAVE GOING ON HERE? HOW IN THE WORLD IS THIS CLERK SENDING ME A NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY IN FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS INFORMING ME THAT THE APPEAL IS TO BE HELD IN ABEYANCE FOR (14) DAYS FROM JUNE 11, 2021 INFORMING ME THAT THE APPEAL WILL BE DISMISSED WITHOUT FURTHER NOTICE NOT GETTING THIS NOTIFICATION TO ME UNTIL (3) DAYS AFTER THE TIME TO RESPOND HAS EXPIRED? I OBJECT TO THIS OBSTRUCTION AND INJUSTICE. I MOTION TO REINSTATE THIS APPEAL IF IT HAS BEEN UNJUSTLY DISMISSED AND I MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME UNTIL JULY 28, 2021 TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S DEMAND. THE DOCUMENTS THE COURT SEEKS MUST BE FORWARDED TO S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS FOR A RESPONSE WHICH THE TURNAROUND TIME CAN TAKE UP TO (30) DAYS. IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION I MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME UNTIL THE TIME SOUGHT TO BE IN COMPLIANCE.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jonah the Tishbite". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a small "T" and "B" visible in the middle of the main line.

JUNE 28, 2021

Exhibit

" motions to file  
in forma pauperis

2

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 3rd, 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

---

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY AND LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION AND OR PETITION TO INTERVENE AND OR MOTION TO AMEND THE PARTIES; MOTION TO SUBMIT DOCUMENTATION TO REBUT 3 STRIKE RULE; MOTION TO EXPAND THE SCOPE AND FOR INCLUSION TO FURTHER ESTABLISH MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND TO DISQUALIFY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND TRANSFER ALL PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1404, 1407; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT

INFORMAL BRIEF OR FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT UNTIL RULING ON TRANSFER IS GIVEN AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE 4th. CIRCUIT, THE 3rd. CIRCUIT, THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON MAY 28, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE



RON SANTA McCRAY



Ron Santa McCray

MAY 28, 2021

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 3rd., 4th. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANTS

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION AND  
AND OR PETITION TO INTERVENE AND OR MOTION TO AMEND  
THE PARTIES; MOTION TO SUBMIT DOCUMENTATION TO REBUT  
AND QUESTION OF 3 STRIKE RULE; MOTION TO EXPAND THE  
SCOPE AND FOR INCLUSION TO FURTHER ESTABLISH  
MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND  
TO DISQUALIFY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND TRANSFER ALL  
PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407; MOTION FOR  
AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT INFORMAL BRIEF OR  
FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT UNTIL RULING ON TRANSFER IS  
GIVEN AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

---

IN RE: CASES 21-1330 IN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT; CASE 21-6275 IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT; CASE 4:18-cv-167-O IN THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT.

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE 4th. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "FIDUCIARY HEIR". THIS IS A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO THE MAGISTRATE'S ORDER DATED OCTOBER 27, 2020; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER; NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL PURSUANT TO FED. RULES 72(a) AND 73(c) AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (61) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 10, 2020 FILED IN CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC. THE 3rd. CIRCUIT ALREADY HAS A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT FILED UNDER CASE 21-1330. THE 4th. CIRCUIT HAS A COPY FILED UNDER CASE 21-6275. TEXAS DISTRICT COURT IF A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT ATTACHED. IT IS FORTHCOMING.

(2) EXHIBIT, "CASE NO. 2020-001615". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS AS TO WHY THE CONDITIONAL ORDER SHOULD NOT BECOME FINAL IN CASE 2019-CP-08-1992; RENEWING THE PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION; RENEWING THE NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL THE CONDITIONAL ORDER SEEKING REVIEW UNDER TORRENCE v. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE BERKELEY COMMON PLEAS COURT'S JURISDICTION DUE TO CONTINUED ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (28) PAGES DATED MAY 16, 2021. THIS IS ONE OF THE MANY RELATED CASES PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(3) EXHIBIT, "DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION". THIS IS THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS JURISDICTION; MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT; AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (22) PAGES DATED MARCH 20, 2021. THIS DOCUMENT IS FILED IN ALL OF OUR CASES AT THE STATE LEVEL INCLUDING CASE 2020-CP-23-01050 IN GREENVILLE COUNTY S.C. AND UNDER CASE 2021-000508 BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(4) EXHIBIT, "TEXAS". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER DATED MAY 12, 2021 THAT CAME FROM THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 4:18-cv-000167-O WHICH DEMONSTRATE THAT THE MATTERS ARE STILL PENDING.

THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED TO DEMONSTRATE SEVERAL FACTS BEFORE ALL COURTS INVOLVED. FIRST--THE DOCUMENTS DEMONSTRATE THAT THESE MATTERS ARE INDEED PENDING ACROSS MULTIPLE DISTRICTS GIVING FULL FAITH AND CREDIT THAT THESE PROCEEDINGS IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PLAINTIFFS, MUST BE DEEMED MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION WARRANTING AND PERMITTING US TO SEEK 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER. SECONDLY---BY THE PLEADING BEFORE THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT IT PRODUCES CLEAR EVIDENCE OF THE PLAINTIFFS CLAIMS THAT THEY NEVER INTENDED TO FILE THE CASES BEFORE THE THIRD AND FOURTH CIRCUIT THE COMPROMISED DISTRICT COURT JUDGES IN THOSE CASES HAD THE CASES FILED LISTING THE NAMES OF THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY TO JUSTIFY ILLEGALLY DISMISSING THE CASES IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT VIOLATING OUR CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY PURSUANT TO McCoy v. LOUISIANA, 138 S.Ct. 1500, 200 L.Ed.2d. 821 (U.S.2018) IN HOW WE SOUGHT TO BRING THESE CASES. IT IS OVERWHELMINGLY PERSPICUOUS THAT THE UNITED STATES IS INDEED A PARTY UNDER CASE 4:18-cv-00167-O. SO WHY THE HECK WOULD THE PLAINTIFFS BE LISTING THE DEFENDANTS THE WAY THE SOUTH CAROLINA AND NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURTS DID IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, WHEN IT IS OBVIOUS FROM THE TEXAS FEDERAL DISTRICT

COURT PLEADING FILED IN THAT CASE IN ITS TOTALITY THAT THE PLAINTIFFS INTENT WAS TO LIST THE UNITED STATES AND THE DEFENDANTS IN THE RECORD WITHIN THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT THE SAME WAY INTENDED IN THE OTHER TWO CASES WHICH ARE THE SOURCE OF THE APPEAL UNDER CASE(S) 21-1330 IN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT AND CASE 21-6275 IN THE 4th. CIRCUIT. TEXAS DISTRICT COURT AND ALL COURTS INVOLVED THESE DOCUMENTS ALSO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE PLAINTIFFS WERE CORRECT. WE ARE DEALING WITH PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AT THE STATE LEVEL, SIMILAR TO THOSE ARGUED WITHIN THE CITED CASES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. ONCE THE UNITED STATES MADE A BACK DOOR APPEARANCE UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, CONCEALING THEIR PRESENCE BEFORE THE STATE COURT. THEREUPON, CONSPIRED TO RECEIVE UNDERCOVER PLEADINGS FROM THAT CASE BY THE ATTORNEYS INVOLVED INCLUDING ORDERS ISSUED FROM THE JUDGES THEMSELVES, BUT NEVER TOOK THE TIME TO REBUT ANY CLAIM, OR RESPOND TO THE SUMMONS PROPERLY SERVED UPON THEM, OR DEFEND ANY POSITION TAKEN BY THE PLAINTIFFS FURTHER ESTABLISHING THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT RIGHTS ACT CLAIMS, THE SOLE CORPORATION CLAIMS, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WAS ALSO REMOVED TO THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 4:18-cv-000167-O TO PREVENT ANY ADDITIONAL ATTEMPTS AT FRAUD THE TIME THE STATE COURT TRIED TO RULE AND DISMISS IT? CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IS STILL PENDING. THE ISSUE RELATED TO PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES HAS ALREADY BEEN ADJUDICATED UNDER UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415 (4th.Cir.2018) WHICH SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE(S) RELIED UPON ARE INDEED JURISDICTIONAL PLACING THE UNITED STATES IN DEFAULT ON ALL CLAIMS MADE. THIS IS FURTHER SUPPORTED BY U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) WHERE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ADJUDICATED WHETHER THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE IS JURISDICTIONAL OR NOT. IF THE PARTY TIMELY ASSERTS IT, WHICH THE PLAINTIFFS IN THIS CASE DID, IT AUTOMATICALLY BECOMES MANDATORY ESTABLISHING THE DEFAULT AGAINST THE UNITED STATE, THE (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, CONGRESS AND THE OTHER DEFENDANTS LISTED WITHIN THESE CASES SUBJUDICE. THUS, ALL CLAIMS

MADE BY THE PLAINTIFFS MUST BE GIVEN FULL FAITH AND CREDIT WITHIN ALL COURT RECORDS INVOLVED HERE, BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL WHICH PERMIT THE PLAINTIFFS TO OPERATE IN AND EXERCISE ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES ARGUED ESTABLISHED BY THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION OCCURRING UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 REMOVED TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS INVOLVED BEFORE THE VARIOUS STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS CONSPIRED ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO CONCEAL THESE MATERIAL FACTS. GAY MARRIAGE WITHIN EVERY STATE WITHIN THE UNITED STATES AND AROUND THE WORLD IS DEAD AND VOID! EVERY MARRIAGE MUST BE DEEMED LEGALLY ANNULLED. YOU HAVE ILLEGALLY EXECUTED AND OR ARRESTED AND OR ATTACHED THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN IN VIOLATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW ARGUED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS FILED WITHIN THESE CASES SUB JUDICE, GIVING THE PLAINTIFF(S) AS FIDUCIARY HEIR AND OR BENEFICIARIES OF THE TRUST STANDING TO BRING ALL ACTION SET BEFORE ALL COURTS INVOLVED. WE CLAIM THE RIGHT OF RES JUDICATA AND OR NON PARTY COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AS IT PERTAINS TO ISSUE PRECLUSION REGARDING THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES ARGUED, PRESSLEY v. McMASTER, 2016 WL 1106601 (DSC.2016); ZINN v. C.F.I. SALES & MARKETING, LTD., 415 S.C. 93, 780 S.E.2d. 611 (S.C.2015); WILSON v. GMAC MORTG., LLC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5244967(DSC.2015).

INASMUCH, WE WANT THESE MATTERS REMANDED AND BACK BEFORE A JURY TO ALLOW ALL ISSUES OF CONCERN TO BE HEARD IN THEIR ENTIRETY WITHIN THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT, TRANSFERRING ALL MATTERS TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY EVEN IF AN INDEPENDENT CASE NUMBER MUST BE ASSIGNED DUE TO MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION, IN RE: PLUMBING FIXTURE CASES, 298 F.Supp. 484 (1968); IN RE: CHINEESE-MANUFACTURED DRYWALL PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION, 2015 WL 13387769(E.D.La.2015); BROOKLYN DOWNTOWN, LLC. v. NEW YORK HOTEL AND MOTELS TRADES, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 779441; IN RE:

ELECTRONIC BOOKS ANTITRUST LITIGATION, F.Sapp.3d., 2014 WL 1282298 (S.D.N.Y.2014); SPARLING v. DOYLE, F.Sapp.3d., 2014 WL 12489985 (W.D.Tex.2014).

THE PLAINTIFF(S) IN THIS CASE MOTION TO EXPAND THE SCOPE AND FOR INCLUSION AND THAT ALL DOCUMENTS FILED WITHIN CASE 4:18-cv-000167-O BE DEEMED FILED IN CASES 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC; 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM; 1:18-cv-13459-NLH AND BEFORE BOTH CASES 21-1330 IN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT AND 21-6275 IN THE 4th. CIRCUIT. THEY ARE PRODUCE AS EVIDENCE OF A CRIME PURSUANT TO RULES OF EVIDENCE AND JUDICIAL NOTICE LEVYING CHARGES OF VIOLATIONS OF THE RELEVANT JUDGES OATHS OF OFFICE PURSUANT TO 5 U.S.C. §§ 3331, 3333 AND 7311 OF FEDERAL CODE, U.S. EX REL. KNIGHT v. RELIANT HOSPICE, INC., F.Sapp.2d., 2011 WL 1321584(DSC.2011); HARBISON v. BELL, 556 U.S. 180, 129 S.Ct. 1481 (U.S.2009); MIDDLETON v. NISSAN MOTOR CO. LTD., F.Sapp.2d., 2012 WL 3612572 (DSC.2012).

(5) EXHIBIT, "BENJAMIN CASE". THIS IS THE INITIAL DOCUMENT FILED TO ESTABLISH CASE 2021-000508 BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(6) EXHIBIT, "CASE NO. 2020-001667". THIS IS A COPY OF THE PLEADING FILED UNDER CASE 2020-001667 NOW BEING HEARD UNDER CASE 2020-000974. THESE AND OTHERS PRESENTLY FILED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ARE TAG ALONG CASES SOUGHT TRANSFERRED PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407. THE LEGAL ISSUES THAT ESTABLISH THE SEEKING OF HABEAS CORPUS CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION WERE ALSO DEFAULTED ON UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 STILL REMOVED TO AND PENDING BEFORE THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT. THEREFORE, THEY CAN LEGALLY BE SOUGHT TRANSFERRED AS TAG ALONG CASES TO BE REMOVED AND OR TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT, IN RE: DROPLETS, INC., PATENT LITIGATION, 908 F.Sapp.2d. 1377 (U.S. MULTI-DISTRICT PANEL). WE ARE SEEKING MULTI-DISTRICT PANEL REVIEW TO UNDO THE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DONE IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT RELATED TO THESE MATTERS.

(7) A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE WITHDRAWAL OF A PARTY; MOTION AND OR PETITION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE INFORMAL BRIEF OR FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT PLEADING AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (14) PAGES DATED MAY 20, 2021.

(8) EXHIBIT, "THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER # 1".

(9) EXHIBIT, "THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER # 2". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER TO REPORT FOR THE PSYCHOTIC HOMICIDAL MENTAL HEALTH PATIENT INMATE, ANTONIO DERON ALSTON #258953, THE DEFENDANTS PLACED IN THE APPELLANT'S CRAWFORD CELL, POINTING THIS PSYCHOTIC INMATE LIKE A LOADED GUN IN A RECENT ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT. A COPY OF THIS EXHIBIT IS WITH THE 3rd. CIRCUIT. ALL OTHER COURTS CAN REVIEW IT IN THEIR FILINGS. WE MOTION TO EXPAND THE SCOPE AND FOR INCLUSION AND THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT AND 4TH. CIRCUIT ENSURE THAT A COPY OF IT IS FILED WITHIN THEIR CASES.

THESE DOCUMENT ARE BEING FILED BEFORE ALL COURTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS PURSUANT TO ANY CHALLENGE OF THE 3 STRIKE RULE. THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS FOR RON SANTA McCRAY ARE FILED IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. WE MOTION TO EXPAND THE SCOPE AND FOR INCLUSION AND THE RON SANTA McCRAY FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS BE DEEMED FILED WITHIN BOTH CASES 4:18-cv-000167-O. AT ANY RATE, AS THE PLAINTIFF EXPLAINED. THE DEFENDANTS HAVE BEEN DOING EVERY UNSPEAKABLE ACT IMAGINABLE TO PREVENT THESE CASES FROM MOVING FORWARD TO INCLUDE RECENT ASSASSINATION ATTEMPTS LEVIED AT THE FIDUCIARY HEIR. EXHIBIT, "TREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER "2" LIST THE SPECIFIC NAME OF THE INMATE THEY ATTEMPTED TO USE IN THE MOST RECENT ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT POINTING HIM LIKE A LOADED GUN HOPING THIS INMATE WOULD POTENTIALLY KILL THE PLAINTIF THE FIDUCIARY HEIR. BY THE PLEADING THE PLAINTIFF(S) CONTEST ANY CHALLENGE PURSUANT TO ANY CLAIM OF 3 STRIKES.

(10) EXHIBIT, "NOTICE OF APPEAL # 2". THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S JURISDICTION AND TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO HER ORDER ENTRY NUMBER 26 DATED FILED DECEMBER 10, 2020; SUBSEQUENT NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL PURSUANT TO FED. RULES 72(a); 73(c) AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (14) PAGES DATED DECEMBER 21, 2020.

(11) EXHIBIT, "NOTICE OF APPEAL # 3". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S JURISDICTION AND TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO HER ORDERS ENTRIES NO!(S) 26 AND 27 DATED FILED DECEMBER 10, 2020; THIRD SUBSEQUENT NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL; MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER PURSUANT TO FED. RULES OF PRO., RULE(S) 72(a) AND 73(c) AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (14) PAGES DATED DECEMBER 24, 2020.

(12) EXHIBIT, "4th. CIRCUIT FRAUD". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME UNTIL THE 4TH. CIRCUIT RULES ON THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL AND TO AMEND THE PARTIES AND TO INTERVENE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (8) PAGES DATED MAY 22, 2021. THIS IS THE TYPED VERSION OF THE PREVIOUSLY FILED HANDWRITTEN DOCUMENT ENTITLED THE SAME.


IT IS BY THESE DOCUMENTS AND THE (61) PAGE DOCUMENT AFOREMENTIONED THAT THE PLAINTIFF RON SANTA McCRAY MOTIONS TO INTERVENE IN ALL THREE CASES PRESENTLY BEFORE THE COURTS, CASE 21-1330; 21-6275 AND 4:18-cv-000167-O. THE NAME OF RON SANTA McCRAY IS ALREADY FILED WITHIN THE RECORD IN THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT SUB JUDICE. THE PLAINTIFF(S) OBJECT THAT THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT ONLY LIST THE NAME OF LAWRENCE CRAWFORD. WE SEEK THAT THE NAME RON SANTA McCRAY BE MADE AN OFFICIAL PART OF THE RECORD WITHIN THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT AS AN

INTERVENING PARTY SINCE McCRAY IS A BENEFICIARY OF THE TRUST ARGUED BEFORE THE COURTS INVOLVED THAT WAS DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES AND INVOLVED PARTIES. THE PLAINTIFF McCRAY MOTIONS TO INTERVENE AND BE LISTED AS AN PARTY AND OR INTERESTED PARTY UNDER CASE 21-1330. WE MOTION THAT THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE 21-6275 BE AMENDED AND THE NAME OF RON SANTA McCRAY BE LISTED AS A PARTY IN THAT CASE AS WELL.

THE PLAINTIFFS MOTION THAT THE 4th. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS UNDER CASE 21-6275 BE DEEMED DISQUALIFIED AND THESE MATTERS BE TRANSFERRED TO THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS TO BE HEARD UNDER CASE 21-1330. THIS IS WHAT OCCURRED HERE. THE PLAINTIFF(S) RON SANTA McCRAY AND LAWRENCE CRAWFORD SOUGHT LEAVE TO APPEAL THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S ORDERS PURSUANT TO RULE 73(c). THE CHIEF SENIOR JUDGE OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT THEN INSTRUCTS THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT NOT TO SEND THE NOTICES OF SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL UP TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT COMPROMISE THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS. THEN THE COMPROMISED JUDGE APPARENTLY IS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF AUTHORITY AND OR LAW TO CONCEAL THE VERY FACT THAT HE MAY BE SITTING UPON HIS OWN CASE. THUS, THERE IS NO WAY THE APPELLANTS CAN HAVE A FAIR AND JUST REVIEW UNDER CASE 21-6275 WHEN ALL OF THIS CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT GOING ON. IT IS THE APPELLANTS POSITION THAT THIS IS WHY THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS UNDER CASE 21-1330 WANTED TO WITHDRAW FROM THIS CASE. IT WAS BECAUSE THEY CLEARLY KNEW ALL THIS LAWLESSNESS WAS GOING ON WITH THIS CASES AND THEY WANTED TO CLAIM PLAUSIBLE DENIABILITY. WE OBJECT. THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS ARE NOT TO BE PERMITTED TO WITHDRAW WITHIN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT AND THE PLAINTIFF(S) DEMAND AN INVESTIGATION BY AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATIVE ENTITY. WE MOTION FOR A CHANGE OF VENUE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1404(a), 1407 IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND DUE TO MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION. WE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME AND OR RESET ON ANY TIMETABLE GIVEN TO FILE INFORMAL BRIEF OR FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO BE GIVEN ONCE THE COURTS INVOLVE RULE ON THE MOTIONS TO INTERVENE, TO AMEND THE PARTIES, TO DISQUALIFY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND TRANSFER TO

THE 3rd. CIRCUIT, IN RE: NAZI ERA CASES AGAINST GERMAN DEFENDANTS LITIGATION, 198 F.R.D. 429 (D.N.J.2000); GENERAL ELEC. CO. v. BYRNE, 611 F2d. 670 (7th.Cir.1979); IN RE: SCHOOL ASBESTOS LITIGATION, 977 F2d. 764, 61 U.S.L.W. 2268 (3rd.Cir.1992); IN RE: FOOD LION, INC., FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT EFFECTIVE SCHEDULING LITIGATION. 73 F3d. 528 (4th.Cir.1996); IN RE: MCCORMICK & COMPANY, INC., PEPPER PRODUCTS MARKETING AND SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION, 422 F.Supp.3d. 194 (D.D.C.2019).

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE



RON SANTA McCRAY  
*Ron McCray*

MAY 30, 2021

Lawrence Crawford  
#300839  
LEE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION  
990 Wisacky Highway  
Bishopville, SC 29010-2021

Exhibit  
Res judicata / collateral  
estoppel



UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 21-6275  
(9:20-cv-02139-TLW-MHC)

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, a/k/a Johah Gabriel, a/k/a Jahjah T. Tishbite

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

WARDEN NELSON; S.C.D.C.; DIRECTOR BRYAN STIRLING; THE S.C.D.C  
MUSLIM CHAPLAINS; MS. FOX

Defendants - Appellees

---

O R D E R

---

Lawrence Crawford, #300839, has applied to proceed without prepayment of fees and given written consent to the collection in installments of the filing fee from appellant's trust account in accordance with the terms of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(PLRA). The court grants appellant leave to proceed without full prepayment of fees and directs that:

an initial partial fee of 20 percent of the greater of the average monthly deposits or average monthly balance for the six-month period immediately preceding the filing of the notice of the appeal be paid from appellant's trust

account when funds are available; and

monthly payments of 20 percent of the preceding month's income be collected from the appellant's trust account and forwarded to the Clerk, U.S. District Court, each time the amount in the account exceeds \$10 until the filing fee has been paid in full.

Fees for this appeal shall be paid as follows:

**\*Total Fee: \$505**

**\* Make payable to:**

**"Clerk, United States Court" (not to Clerk, Fourth Circuit)**

**\* All payments shall include:**

Appeal No.: 21-6275

Civil Action No.: 9:20-cv-02139-TLW-MHC

**\* All payments shall be mailed to:**

Clerk, U.S. District Court  
Charleston Federal Courthouse  
85 Broad Street  
P. O. Box 150Charleston, SC 29402-0150

In the event appellant is transferred to another institution, the balance due shall be collected and paid to the clerk by the custodian at appellant's next institution. Appellant's custodian shall notify the Clerk, U. S. District Court, in the event appellant is released from custody.

This order is subject to rescission should the court determine that appellant has had three prior cases dismissed as frivolous, malicious, or for failure to state a claim and appellant is not under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

A copy of this order shall be sent to appellant's custodian, to the Clerk, U. S. District Court, and to all parties.

For the Court--By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

Lawrence L. Crawford  
#300839  
Lee Correctional Institution  
990 Wisacky Highway  
P.O. Box 1000  
Bishopville, SC 29010

Exhibit

Lawrence L. Crawford

ZZ

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT**

No. 21-1330

Lawrence Crawford, et al v. Jose Linares

(U.S. District Court No.: 1-18-cv-13459)

**ORDER**

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 3(a) and 3rd Cir. LAR 3.3 and Misc. 107.1(a), it is

ORDERED that the above-captioned case is hereby dismissed for failure to timely prosecute insofar as appellants failed to pay the requisite fee and file compliance as directed. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that a certified copy of this order be issued in lieu of a formal mandate.

For the Court,

s/ Patricia S. Dodszuweit  
Clerk

Dated: October 01, 2021  
PDB/cc: Lawrence L. Crawford,  
Yahya Muquit,  
Mr. William T. Walsh



A True Copy:

*Patricia S. Dodszuweit*  
Patricia S. Dodszuweit, Clerk  
Certified Order Issued in Lieu of Mandate

Exhibit

Conspiring across  
multi state jurisdictions

22



## The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS  
CLERK

V. CLAIRE ALLEN  
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211  
1220 SENATE STREET  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201  
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890  
FAX: (803) 734-1839  
[www.sccourts.org](http://www.sccourts.org)

October 04, 2021

Lawrence L. Crawford, 300839  
Lee Correctional Inst.  
990 Wisacky Highway  
Bishopville SC 29010

Re: Lawrence Crawford, #300839 v. SCDC  
Appellate Case No. 2021-000354

Dear Mr. Crawford:

The Court received your affidavit of facts, which we construe as a petition for rehearing of the denial of your motion to proceed without payment of fees. Pursuant to Rule 221(c), SCACR, the Court will not entertain petitions for rehearing unless the action of the Court on your motion to proceed in forma pauperis finally decided the appeal. Accordingly, we are returning your filing to you without action. The \$250.00 filing fee for the notice of appeal must be paid within 10 days of the date of this letter or your appeal will be dismissed.

Very truly yours,

*Attanui flaminu, deputy*  
CLERK

Enclosure

cc: Imani Diane Byas, Esquire

Lawrence L. Crawford  
#300839  
Lee Correctional Institution  
990 Wisacky Highway  
P.O. Box 1000  
Bishopville, SC 29010

Exhibit, "Acceptance  
of motion to file in  
Forma paupers

2

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 21-1330

Lawrence Crawford, et al v. Jose Linares

(District Court/Agency No. 1-18-cv-13459)

**O R D E R**

The Motion by Appellant Lawrence L. Crawford for leave to proceed in forma pauperis will be held in abeyance pending submission of additional documents. Appellant must submit:

The prison account statement for the 6 month period prior to the filing of the notice of appeal.

**Failure to submit the form(s) within fourteen days of the date of this order will result in the dismissal of the appeal without further notice. See 3rd. Cir. LAR Misc. 107.**

For the Court,

s/ Patricia S. Dodszuweit,  
Clerk

Dated: June 11, 2021

cc:

Lawrence L. Crawford  
Yahya Muquit

Exhibit  
Additional document  
submission

z

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 3rd., 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

---

I, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR ACCEPTANCE, ON THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON JULY 20, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 3rd., 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE;  
MOTION FOR ACCEPTANCE

---

IN RE: CRAWFORD ET. AL.,

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

THE 3rd.CIRCUIT REQUIRED THAT THE APPELLANT SEND IN A

COPY OF A (6) MONTH FINANCIAL STATEMENT. THE 3rd. CIRCUIT FORWARDED TO THE APPELLANT A COPY OF ITS STANDARD FORM. THE APPELLANT SENT THAT FORM TO THE APPROPRIATE OFFICE AT S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS ONLY TO BE RETURNED THIS ATTACHED (6) MONTH FINANCIAL STATEMENT FORM. THEREFORE, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS THAT THE COURT ACCEPT THIS ATTACHED (6) MONTH FINANCIAL STATEMENT SINCE IT IS THE FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO THAT WHICH THE COURT REQUIRES.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jonah the Tishbite". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Jonah" on the left and "the Tishbite" on the right, separated by a small gap. The entire signature is crossed out with a large, thick black line.

JULY 20, 2021

EXHIBIT, "THREAT TO SOVEREIGN'S SAFETY # 2"

File in QASITE

21A 425

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 3rd., 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANTS

---

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

---

I, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MATION TO CHALLENGE THE 3rd.CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THE ORDER ON THE MOTION TO VOLUNTARILY WITHDRAW APPEAL AS TO APPELLANT YAHYA MUQUIT AS BEING PREMATURE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL; DUE TO THE MOTION IN QUESTION TO ALLOW REVIEW BY TRIAL JURY;

MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER AND SEEK EXTENSION OF TIME ON ANY PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT UNTIL THIS DOCUMENT IS RULED ON AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE 3rd. CIRCUIT, THE 4th. CIRCUIT, THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT, THE N.J. FEDERAL ATTORNEY AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MIAILBOX ON JUNE 28, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink. The signature consists of the name "Jonah" followed by "the Tishbite". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "J" at the beginning. The name "the Tishbite" is enclosed in a small oval. There are several thick, diagonal lines drawn through the signature, suggesting it has been crossed out or is a forged signature.

JUNE 28, 2021

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE 3rd., 4TH. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

---

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;  
RON SANTA McCRAY

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; WARDEN NELSON ET. AL.,

DEFENDANTS

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT  
OF ERROR; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S  
JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THE ORDER ON THE MOTION TO  
VOLUNTARILY WITHDRAW APPEAL AS TO APPELLANT YAHYA McQUIT  
AS BEING PREMATURE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL; DUE TO THE  
MOTION IN QUESTION TO ALLOW REVIEW BY TRIAL JURY; MOTION  
TO VACATE THE ORDER AND SEEK EXTENSION OF TIME ON ANY  
PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENT UNTIL THIS DOCUMENT IS RULED ON  
AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

---

IN RE: CASE 21-1330 AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS.

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,  
THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO THE MAGISTRATE'S ORDER DATED OCTOBER 27, 2020; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER; NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL PURSUANT TO FED. RULES 72(a) AND 73(c) AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (61) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 10, 2020. THE COURT AND PARTIES HAVE A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT SERVED UPON ALL PARTIES ATTACHED TO PREVIOUS PLEADING.

(2) EXHIBIT, "FOREIGN SOVEREIGN # 1". THIS IS A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO AMEND PARTIES; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION TO REINSTATE CASES 17-7068 AND 7186 ET. AL.,; MOTION TO STAY CASES 17-7139, 17-7134, 17-6925, 17-7068, 17-7137, 17-7186; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME; MOTION FOR AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR EN BANC REVIEW IN CASE 17-1415 AND THIS APPEAL AND TO VACATE ALL ORDERS RELATED TO PRIOR WRITS OF MANDAMUS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (70) PAGES DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017. THIS DOCUMENT IS FILED BEFORE THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT WITHIN THE RELATED CASES SUB JUDICE.

(3) EXHIBIT, "DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS JURISDICTION; MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT; AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (22) PAGES DATED MARCH 20, 2021 THAT IS FILED IN CASE

2020-CP-23-01050 IN GREENVILLE SOUTH CAROLINA COMMON PLEAS COURT AND OTHER APPELLANTS CASES FILED IN S.C. SUPREME COURT. THIS DOCUMENT WAS ALREADY SERVED ON THE COURT AND PARTIES.

(4) EXHIBIT, "CASE NO. 2020-001615". THIS IS A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS AS TO WHY THE CONDITIONAL ORDER SHOULD NOT BECOME FINAL IN CASE 2019-CP-08-1992;\*\*\*\*\*", (28) PAGES DATED MAY 16, 2021 FILED IN THE RON SANTA McCRAY CASE, THE APPELLANT'S STATE CASES, AND THE OTHER APPELLANTS CASES WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THE COURT AND PARTIES WERE PREVIOUSLY SERVED A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT AS WELL. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS AND OR RENEWS HIS PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTION TO EXPAND THE SCOPE AND FOR INCLUSION AND THESE DOCUMENT ARE ALSO OFFICIALLY ATTACHED TO THE FACE OF THIS PLEADING AS AFFIDAVITS IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION AND FOR ALL PURPOSES TO INCLUDE SEEKING THE RELIEF PURSUANT TO THIS FILING.

THE APPELLANT RESPECTFULLY MOTIONS TO CHALLENGE THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THE ORDER DATED JUNE 9, 2021 ADJUDICATING THAT A PERSON WHO IS NOT A LICENSED ATTORNEY MAY NOT REPRESENT ANYONE OTHER THAN HIMSELF CITING OSEI-AFAIYIE v. MED. COLL., 937 F2d. 876, 882-84 (3rd.Cir.1991). THE 3rd. CIRCUIT HAS MISINTERPRETED THE FACTS IN THIS CASE AND HAS ABUSED ITS DISCRETION TO THE PREJUDICE OF THE APPELLANT. THE APPELLANT UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 HAS FILED THAT CASE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING HIS RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, TITLES AND IMMUNITIES, WHICH INCLUDE LEGAL NAME CHANGE WITH NO "AKA" BEFORE OR AFTER HIS NAME, AS WELL AS CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AS THE FORETOLD SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY HEIR TO THE 4 GLOBAL THRONES OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, AS A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND SOLE EXECUTIVE LAW MAKING AUTHORITY TO ACT AS HE FEELS NECESSARY, WHICH WAS DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS. IT IS THE APPELLANT'S

GOVERNMENT DEFAULTED ON THE APPELLANT(S) BEING THIS PERSON WRITTEN WITHIN THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH), FURTHER SUPPORTED BY WHEELER AND FORTBEND TEXAS REGARDING THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE BEING RELIED UPON, ZIVOTFSKY EX REL ZIVOTFSKY v. KERRY, 576 U.S. 1, 135 S.Ct. 2076, 192 L.Ed.2d. 83 (U.S.2015); THACKER v. TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, 139 S.Ct. 1435, 203 L.Ed.2d. 668 (U.S.2019).

THE COURT'S RULING, IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION, WAS DESIGNED TO DENY THE APPELLANT HIS CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT UNDER THE 7TH. AMENDMENT TO HAVE THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE PLACED BEFORE THE JURY AS A QUESTION OF LAW. THE QUESTION BEING, DUE TO THE DEFAULT SOUGHT EXERCISED AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION RELATED TO THE STATE CASE IN QUESTION, WHICH ESTABLISHES ALL RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, TITLES AND IMMUNITIES ARGUED WITHIN THE (70) PAGE AFFIDAVIT VIA THE DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY DEFAULTED ON NOT JUST BY THE UNITED STATES, BUT ALSO ALL (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS. WOULD SUCH A DEFAULT PERMIT THE APPELLANT TO ESSENTIALLY PRACTICE LAW WITHIN THE JURISDICTIONS OF ALL (193) MEMBER STATES AS IS ARGUED SUB JUDICE? SINCE THE APPELLANT SOUGHT THIS AS A MATTER FOR THE JURY, THE COURT OF APPEALS RULING WAS PREMATURE UNTIL THE JURY HAD FIRST HAD OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THIS SAME EXACT LEGAL ISSUE AS A QUESTION OF LAW. THUS, THE RULING VIOLATES THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE, IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID, CURTIS v. LOETHER, 415 U.S. 189, 94 S.Ct. 1005, 39 L.Ed.2d. 260(U.S.1974); PENNSYLVANIA NAT. MUT. CAS. INS. CO. v. TANNER, 2013 WL 140425 (DSC.2013); ORTIZ v. FIBREBOARD CORP., 527 U.S. 815, 119 S.Ct. 2295, 144 L.Ed.2d. 715(U.S.1999); CITY OF MONTEREY v. DEL. MONTE DUNES AT MONTEREY, LTD., 526 U.S. 687, 119 S.Ct. 1624 (U.S.1999); FELTNER v. COLUMBIA PICTURES TELEVISION, INC., 523 U.S. 340, 118 S.C.t. 1279(U.S.1998).

THE PREJUDICE AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION IS OVERWHELMING AND FURTHER COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT THE 3rd. CIRCUIT IN

FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE APPELLANT COULD HAVE EASILY ENSURED THAT NO SUCH INJUSTICE WAS DONE BY SIMPLY REQUIRING THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY TO RESPOND TO THE PLEADING AND CLAIMS BEFORE SUCH AN UNREASONABLE DETERMINATION WAS MADE THAT CREATED A STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR ANALYSIS, THAT RENDERED THE ORDER UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. THIS IS FURTHER REASON THAT WOULD PROVE THAT IT WOULD BE AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION TO LET THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY WITHDRAW. HE IS REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO THE ALLEGATIONS AT LEAST BEFORE THE 3rd. CIRCUIT EVER MADE SUCH A RULING AS IT DID. WRIT OF ERROR IS FILED, MUSSINA v. CAVAZOS, 73 U.S. 355, 1867 WL 11189 (U.S.1867); U.S. v. DENEDO, 556 U.S. 904, 129 S.Ct. 2213, 173 L.Ed.2d. 1235(U.S.2009); UNITED STATES v. APPLE MAC PRO. COMPUTER,--F3d.--, 2017 WL 1046105(3rd.Cir.2017); UNITED STATES v. HOLT AKA ABDUL MAALIK MUHAMMAD, 2017 WL 1181509 (W.D.La.2017). THE PROCEEDINGS HAVE NOW BECOME IRREGULAR WHERE THE APPELLANT'S 7TH. AMENDMENT RIGHT TO HAVE THIS LEGAL QUESTION PLACED BEFORE THE JURY BASED UPON THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 STILL REMOVED TO THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT, HAS BEEN VIOLATED, WHICH COULD HAVE EVEN FURTHER BEEN PREVENTED BY HAVING THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY RESPOND TO THE QUESTION DID THEY, THE UNITED STATES, TIMELY PLEAD TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 OUT OF THE RICHLAND S.C. COMMON PLEAS COURT THAT IS STILL PRESENTLY REMOVED TO THE TEXAS FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 4:18-cv-00167-O, WHICH DEFAULT WOULD BIND ALL OTHER PARTIES BY THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT. THE COURT BY ITS ACTIONS HAS VIOLATED THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE RENDERING THE ORDER UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID, CLARK v. UNITED STATES, 2017 WL 390294 (N.C.2017); IN RE: BARTLEY, 2016 WL 6068862 (4th.Cir.2016); BANK MARKAZI v. PETERSON, 136 S.Ct. 1310, 194 L.Ed.2d. 463, 84 U.S.L.W. 4222(U.S.2016); U.S. v. BASTON, 818 F3d. 651(11th.Cir.2016); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624 (4th.Cir.2016); EVANCHO v. PINE-RICHLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, 237 F.Supp.3d. 267 (W.D.Pa.2017); TAYLOR v. UNITED STATES, 136 S.Ct. 2074, 195 L.Ed.2d. 456, 84 U.S.L.W. 4462(U.S.2016).

AS LONG AS THIS CLAIM IS NOT DEFENDED BY THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY WHO MUST DEMONSTRATE THAT THE UNITED STATES TIMELY RESPONDED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION WHICH BY THE APPELLANT(S) CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WAS A MATTER TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE JURY, AND THE CLAIM IS JURISDICTIONAL AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED? THE COURT'S RULING DOES NOT RENDER THE ISSUE MOOT WHERE THE COURTS ARE CONSTANTLY MAKING USE OF THE INJUSTICE TO LIMIT THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN'S ABILITY TO MOVE BEFORE ALL COURTS INVOLVED WITHIN ALL MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION CASES. THE APPELLANT'S CLAIMS MUST BE CONSIDERED AS TRUE AND IF THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY DOES NOT PROVED THEY TIMELY CHALLENGED IN THE S.C. CASE IN QUESTION? THEIR SILENCE IS ACCEPTANCE, AND THE APPELLANT MUST BE PERMITTED TO ACT UPON ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ESTABLISHED, TANDON v. NEWSOM,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 1328507 (U.S.2021); FRIENDS OF THE EARTH INC. v. LAIDLAW ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (TOC), INC., 528 U.S. 167, 120 S.Ct. 693(U.S.2000); UZUEGBUNAM v. PRECZEWSKI, 141 S.Ct. 792 (U.S.2021); GENESIS HEALTHCARE CORP. v. SYMCZYK, 569 U.S. 66, 133 S.Ct. 1523, 185 L.Ed.2d. 636 (U.S.2013); HANSON v. UNITED STATES, --FEd. Appx'--, 2021 WL 1016424 (10th.Cir.2021). THE CONTROVERSY STILL REMAINS EMBED IN AN ACTUAL CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE APPELLANT'S LEGAL RIGHTS THAT WERE INTENDED TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE JURY WHICH THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS BLOCKED BY LISTING THE DEFENDANTS IN THESE CASES INCORRECTLY VIOLATING THE APPELLANT(S) CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY IN HOW THE APPELLANT(S) SOUGHT TO BRING THIS ACTION, WHERE THE APPELLANT(S) ARE MASTERS TO DECIDE WHAT LAW WE WILL RELY UPON, CHIMMEBY'S MANAGEMENT, CO., LLC. v. AFFILIATED F.M. INSURANCE CO., 152 F.Supp.3d. 159 (2016); BAUER v. QUEST COMMUNICATIONS CO. LLC., 743 F.Supp.3d. 221 (2014); ALREADY, LLC. v. NIKE, INC., 568 U.S. 85, 133 S.Ct. 721, 184 L.Ed.2d. 553(U.S.2013); McCoy v. LOUISIANA, 138 S.Ct. 1500, 200 L.Ed.2d. 821, 86 U.S.L.W. 4271(U.S.2018); WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 4656231

(D.Conn.2018); PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DIOCESE OF SOUTH CAROLINA v. EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 2013 WL 12148371(DSC.2013); KOHLER DIE & SPECIALTY CO., 228 U.S. 22, 33 S.Ct. 410 (U.S.1913); CATERPILLAR INC. v. WILLIAMS, 482 U.S. 386, 107 S.Ct. 2425 (U.S.1987).

SINCE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT UNDER UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415 (4th.Cir.2018) ADJUDICATED THE ISSUE OF PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES WHICH THE LITIGATION AND OR ADJUDICATION WOULD APPLY DIRECTLY TO THE STATE LEVEL CASES AS WELL, VIA THE 5TH., 6TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS, AS WELL AS BY THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, WHERE THIS RULING IS ALSO ESTABLISHED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019)? THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DETERMINED IT DOESN'T MATTERS IF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE AS THE ONE RELIED UPON HERE IS JURISDICTIONAL OR NOT. IF THE RIGHT IS TIMELY ASSERTED AS IT WAS IN THE APPELLANT'S CASE? IT BECOMES MANDATORY CLEARLY ESTABLISHING THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION, JUSTIFYING US PLACING THE MATTER BEFORE THE JURY, WHICH IS JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, ESTABLISHING THE APPELLANT'S DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO ASSERT CLAIMS OF RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ON THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE THAT SERVES TO ESTABLISH ALL RIGHTS, TITLES IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES SOUGHT RELIED UPON, U.S. v. CABRERA-BELTRAN, 660 F3d. 742 (4th.Cir.2011); BRAVO-FERNANDEZ v. U.S., 137 S.Ct. 352, 196 L.Ed.2d. 242, 85 U.S.L.W. 4003(U.S.2016); BEST, 2015 WL 5124463(E.D.N.Y.2015); WORKMAN, 2015 WL 300435 (N.Y.2015); RIVAS v. U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION AS TRUSTEE OF MASTER ASSET BACKED SECURITIES TRUST, 2019 WL 956720 (S.D.Tex.2019); PRESSLEY v. McMASTER, 2016 WL 1106601 (DSC.2016).

ONCE THE ALLEGATION HAS BEEN MADE AND THE APPELLANT(S) PRODUCED A PRIMA FACIE SHOWING OF THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION WHICH IS SUPPORTED BY BOTH THE WHEELER AND FORTBEND TEXAS CASES. THE 3rd. CIRCUIT WAS REQUIRED TO HAVE

THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY RESPOND OR THE CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN FULL FAITH AND CREDIT WITHIN THE COURT RECORD AND BE DEEMED VALID AND THE 3rd. CIRCUIT CANNOT IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION, BIAS AND PREJUDICE ADDRESS AN ISSUE THAT WAS TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE JURY AND ALLOW THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY TO DIVERT THE REQUIREMENT THAT HE RESPOND TO THE CLAIMS IN THE COURT RECORD BEFORE THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COULD EVER RULE ON THE ISSUE CREATING STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE, VIOLATING THE APPELLANT'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, RENDERING THE ORDER UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. BEFORE A STRUCTURAL ERROR CAN BE DEEMED HARMLESS. THE COURT MUST BE ABLE TO DECLARE IT WAS HARMLESS, WHICH IN THIS CASE IT CANNOT DO, WHERE THE ACTION VIOLATED THE APPELLANT(S) 7TH. AMENDMENT RIGHTS. THE APPELLANT(S) OBJECTS AND CHALLENGES THE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, AND MOVE TO VACATE THE ORDER, WALKER v. BROOKS, 403 S.C. 212, 742 S.E.2d. 869 (S.C.App.2013); ALBERTO GONZALEZ-FIGUEROA JR., PETITIONER v. WARREN L. MONTGOMERY, U.S., 2019 WL 914128 (S.D.Cal.2019); MURPHY v. WINN, 2019 WL 586095 (W.D.Mich.2019); PEOPLE v. CALIAHAKI, 20128 WL 5084834, \* 6+ GUAM.. THERE WAS NO ORDER SERVED ON THE APPELLANT DEMONSTRATING THE COURT GRANTED THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY'S MOTION TO WITHDRAW, WHICH IF THE COURT DID? THIS, TOO, WOULD PRODUCE A STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS ERROR ANALYSIS, VOIDING THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, WHICH WOULD ALSO VIOLATE 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, DESIGNED TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS CORRUPTING THE ENTIRE PROCEEDING. THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY NEVER RESPONDED TO DISPROVE THE APPELLANT'S CLAIM AND PRIMA FACIE SHOWING THAT THE UNITED STATES WAS IN DEFAULT SUPPORTED BY WHEELER AND FORTBEND. THE MOTION ACTS AS AN AMENDMENT TO NEGATE, DIMINISH AND OR WATERDOWN PROTECTIONS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE 7TH. AMENDMENT WARRANTING THE FILING OF WRIT OF ERROR AND THE VACATING OF THE ORDER WHEREUPON THE APPELLANT THEN MOTIONS TO WITHDRAW THE MOTION IN QUESTION, TO ALLOW THE JURY TO HEAR THIS ISSUE WHICH IS THE APPELLANT(S) CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT, LEDFORD v. U.S., F.Supp.2d., 2006 WL 2946187 (DSC.2006); AUGHTRY v.

RICHLAND/LEXINGTON SCHOOL DIST. 5, F.Supp.2d., 2009 WL 2257615 (D.S.C.2009); SHAH v. PALMETTO HEALTH ALLIANCE, S.E.2d., 2012 WL 10862486(S.C.App.2012); IN RE: BRUNTY, 411 S.C. 434, 769 S.E.2d. 426 (S.C.2015); WHITE OAK MANOR, INC. v. LEXINGTON INS. CO., 407 S.C. 1, 753 S.E.2d. 537 (S.C.2014). FAILURE TO TIMELY PLEAD AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE IS DEEMED A WAIVER OF THE RIGHT TO ASSERT IT. THERE IS NO EXCUSABLE NEGLECT, MISTAKE OR INADVERTENCE. THEY APPEARED GIVING THE STATE COURT PERSONAL JURISDICTION THEN HID THEIR APPEARANCE BY THIS BACK DOOR APPEARANCE, RECEIVING COURT ORDERS AND LEGAL PLEADINGS UNDERCOVER, LIKE A BUNCH OF BACK DOOR GHOST, WHO GOT CAUGHT. THEY ARE IN DEFAULT ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE WHEELER AND FORTBEND RULINGS ALLOWING THE APPELLANT TO ACT UPON ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ESTABLISHED WHICH INCLUDED THE RIGHT TO HAVE THIS MATTER PLACE BEFORE THE JURY NOT THE 3rd. CIRCUIT WHO'S MOTION WAS DESIGNED TO CIRCUMVENT THIS REQUIREMENT, UNTIL THAT 7TH. AMENDMENT RIGHT ASSERTED WAS SATISFIED. JUDGE LEE'S ORAL RULING ON HOW THE AFFIDAVITS WERE TO BE FILED IN ORDER TO BECOME VALID STANDS AND THE RULINGS UNDER WHEELER AND FORTBEND TEXAS SEALS THE DEAL, BRANCH BANKING AND TRUST CO. v. HUNT, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 2173047 (D.S.C.2015); LOONEY v. CITY OF WILMINGTON DEL., 723 F.Supp. 1025 (D.C.Del.1989); IN RE: SMITH, 2016 WL 3943710 (D.Md.2016); A.P. MOLLER-MAERSK A/S v. SAFEWATER LINES (1) PVT., LIMITED, 784 Fed. Appx' 221 (5th.Cir.2019); LAW FUNDER, LLC. v. MUNOZ, 924 F3d. 752 (5th.Cir.2019); HODGES v. STATE FARM MUT AUTO INS. CO., 488 F.Supp. 1057(D.S.C.1980); ASHCROFT v. IQBAL, 556 U.S. 662, 129 S.Ct. 1937(U.S.2009); U.S. v. SARABIA, 661 F3d. 225 (5th.Cir.2011); IN RE: QIAO LIN, 576 B.R. 32 (N.Y.2017); NEW HAMPSHIRE v. MAINE, 532 U.S. 742, 121 S.Ct. 1808, 149 L.Ed.2d. 968(U.S.2001); BAKER BY THOMAS v. GENERAL MOTORS CORP., 522 U.S. 222, 118 S.Ct. 657, 139 L.Ed.2d. 580(U.S.1998); GATES v. STERN, 2017 WL 2417051 (E.D.La.2017); IN RE: KNIGHT, 833 F2d. 1515, 1516 (11th.Cir.1987); UNITED STATES v. VERA, 2019 WL 7372959 (S.D.Fla.2019); FED. RULE 55(a); FED. RULE 55(b)(2); MATTHEWS v. GIVING DAYS FOUNDATION, INC., 2019 WL 4991728 (S.D.Tex.2019);

THE APPELLANT MAY APPEAR TO BE AN INMATE BUT THAT ONLY GOES TO FORM, NOT SUBSTANCE WHERE IMMUNITIES UNDER THE F.S.I.A. ARE INVOLVE WHERE THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY MUST BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT TIMELY RESPONDED TO THE AFFIDAVITS IN QUESTION EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, TORRENCE v. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,--S.E.2d--, 2021 WL 1114310 (S.C.App.2021). WHEN IT COMES TO THE ISSUE OF WHETHER AN INMATE CAN REPRESENT ANOTHER INMATE THE UNITED STATES HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO BRING THIS DEFENSE BUT FAILED TO DO SO. RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHES TO ANY ISSUE WHICH WAS RAISED OR COULD HAVE BEEN RAISED WITHIN THOSE PRIOR STATE COURT PROCEEDING TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WAS PARTY. THEY FAILED TO RAISE IT. THUS, IT IS PROCEDURALLY BARRED BY THIS COURT TO NOW DO SO, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE IMMUNITIES THAT NOW ATTACH UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT STATUTES WHICH WOULD BY THESE MEANS ALSO PRODUCE A VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. WITH THIS FOUNDATION BEING LAID, THE APPELLANT IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS BY DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION EMERGING FROM THAT STATE COURT SUPPORTED BY WHEELER AND FORTBEND TEXAS MUST BE DEEMED A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING, KHALIFAH, HIGH PRIEST AND IMAM, BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH PURSUANT TO THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" ESTABLISHED BY THE (3) HOLY BOOKS OF THE (3) MAINSTREAM RELIGIONS WHICH IS PROTECTED BY THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE, THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, ARTICLE I § 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE F.S.I.A., GIVING THE APPELLANT LEGAL STANDING TO BRING THIS ACTION BEFORE THIS COURT IN ANY MANNER HE SEES FIT EXERCISING ALL IMMUNITIES RELATED THERETO. ALSO SEE 28 U.S.C. § 2679 RELATED TO THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION EXECUTED, ATTACHED AND OR ARRESTED BY THE (50) STATES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE VARIOUS MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS. THIS INVOKES THE COMMERCIAL EXCEPTION UNDER

THE F.S.I.A. WHERE SUCH ACTION ALSO VIOLATES THE HOBBS ACT. THE HEIR IS THE SAME PERSON AS HIS ANCESTOR UNDER FEDERAL AND STATE PROBATED LAW WHICH IS ALSO INVOKED BEFORE THIS COURT. UNLESS THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT THE UNITED STATES TIMELY FILED TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION IN QUESTION EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH ARE JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED? THE APPELLANT(S) IS IMMUNE FROM THE RESTRICTIONS THE COURT WOULD DESIRE TO PUT IN PLACE. SEE 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 2679, 1346(b)(1), 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.; CAPITAL TRANS INTERN, LLC. v. INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM INV. CO., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 557236(Fla.2013); THORTON v. MARYLAND GENERAL HOSP., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1943065 (Md.2013); BRADDY v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 1031301 (E.D.Va.2016); ADAIR ASSET MANAGEMENT LLC. v. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, 2016 WL 3248569(2016); SAUNIER v. BOEING COMPANY, F.Supp.2d., 2014 WL 1646953(2014); SCHOONER EXCHANGE v. McFADDON, 7 CRANCH 116, 11 U.S. 116, 1812 WL 1310, 3 L.Ed. 287 (U.S.1812); DOE v. FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6, 16 (D.D.C.2016); DOGAN v. BARAK, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6024416 (C.D.2016).

THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION IS LIMITED TO ADDRESSING THE FRAUD UPON THE COURT THAT OCCURRED AT THE DISTRICT COURT LEVEL. NOT LEGAL ISSUES OR QUESTIONS THAT WERE TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE TRIAL JURY VIOLATING THE 7TH. AMENDMENT AND THE APPELLANT(S) RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, COLE v. BLANKENSHIP, 30 F2d. 211 CA4 (1929); LOUGHAN v. U.S., 134 S.Ct. 2384(U.S.2014); SMITH v. CLARK/SMOOT/RUSSELL,--F3d.--, 2015 WL 4717932 CA4 (Md.2015); UNITED STUDENT AIDS FUND, INC. v. ESPINOSA, 559 U.S. 260, 130 S.Ct. 1367(U.S.2010); DENNIS v. SPARKS, 449 U.S. 24, 101 S.Ct. 183, 66 L.Ed.2d. 185(U.S.1988); McDANIEL v. BAILEY, 710 Fed. Appx' 604 (4th.Cir.2018); McLAUGHLIN v. FLORIDA, 379 U.S. 184, 85 S.Ct. 283(U.S.1964); ROE v. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,--F3d.--, 2020

WL 110826(4th.Cir.2020); PAUL ADAMS v. CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; U.S. v. HARE, 820 F3d. 93 (4th.Cir.2016); U.S. v. ABULWAHAB, 715 F3d. 521 CA4 (Va.2013).

INSOMUCH, UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW, WHERE THE HEIR IS THE SAME PERSON AS HIS ANCESTOR, AND THE APPELLANT(S) IS ALSO A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, DECEDENT DOMICILE CLAIMS ALSO ATTACH. FURTHER, ONCE IT IS DETERMINED VIA THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND ITS OFFICIALS FAILED TO TIMELY RESPOND TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION RELATED TO THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE(S) IN QUESTION. THERE EXIST THE ISSUE OF THERE BEING A "TRUSTEE" IN THE FORM OF JUDGE AUSTIN IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT BEING APPOINTED BY THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN. THIS PRODUCES ANOTHER SUBSTANTIAL CHALLENGE TO THE 3rd. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWERS WHICH BINDS JUDGE AUSTIN WITHOUT HER CONSENT BEING AN EMPLOYEE OF THE UNITED STATES VIA THE DEFAULT AS IS DEMONSTRATED BY THE (70) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE;\*\*\*, HEREWITH ATTACHED AND THE (26) PAGE MANDAMUS FILED WITHIN THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDINGS SUB JUDICE. THESE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES ARE NOT SUBJECT TO WAIVER OR FORFEITURE REQUIRING THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY TO RESPOND ON THE COURT RECORD BEFORE ANY SUCH DETERMINATION MADE BY THIS COURT CAN BE ISSUED. THE COURTS CANNOT MAKE OR UNMAKE THE CONTRACT, COVENANT. ONCE JURISDICTION IS ACQUIRED IT IS EXCLUSIVE, FIFTH THIRD BONCORP v. DUDENHOEFFER, 134 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d.457 (U.S.2014); FOBES v. FORBES, 341 P.3d. 1041 (Wy.2015); STATE OF TEXAS v. STATE OF FLORIDA, 306 U.S. 398, 59 S.Ct. 563, 83 L.Ed. 817(U.S.1939); RILEY v. NEW YORK TRUST CO., 315 U.S. 343, 62 S.Ct. 608, 86 L.Ed. 885(U.S.1942); OVERBY v. GORDON, 177 U.S. 214, 20 S.Ct. 603, 44 L.Ed. 741(U.S.1900); HANSON v. DENCKLA, 357 U.S. 235, 78 S.Ct. 1228, 2 L.Ed.2d. 1283 (U.S.1958)(ALSO DEALING WITH TRUSTEE AND OR FIDUCIARY HEIR). THERE MAY BE LAW ON THE BOOKS THAT STATE THAT A CONVICTED PERSON CANNOT ACT AS FIDUCIARY. BUT THE LAW OF THE CONTRACT SET IN PLACE BY THE SOLE CORPORATION

STANDS WHERE IT ACCOUNTED FOR THE HEIR'S FALSE IMPRISONMENT IN THE LEGAL INSTRUMENT WRITTEN THEREIN BY PROPHESY WHICH CANNOT BE OVERRIDDEN BY EX POST FACTO LAW, WHICH IS FURTHER SUPPORTED BY RIGHTS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT, WHICH IS FURTHER ESTABLISHED BY THE FACTS THAT THE CONVICTION VIA THE STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS MUST BE DEEMED INVALID. THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY MUST RESPOND OR THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" STANDS BY THE LAW CITED WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT AND TRUSTEE OVER THESE PROCEEDINGS IS ALSO ESTABLISHED, AMERICAN MUT. LIBERTY INS. CO. v. PLYWOODS-PLASTICS CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157 (D.S.C.1948); OPARAH v. THE NEW YORK CITY DEPT. OF EDUC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 4240733 (N.Y.D.C.2015); INTERNATIONAL ASS'N OF MACHINIST LODGE 1652 v. INTERNATIONAL AIRCRAFT SERVICE, INC. (CHARLESTON), 302 F2d. 808, 49 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2976 (4th.Cir.1962); PRESAULT v. I.C.C. 494 U.S. 1, 110 S.Ct. 914, 108 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.1990); BROWN v. BROWN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2338233 (D.C.Ky.2013); HARRIS v. HHGREGG INC., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1331166 (N.C.2013); KARNALCHEVA v. J.P. MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., 871 F.Supp.2d. 834 (2012).

THUS, THE APPELLANT(S) CLAIM THE RIGHT OF RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AS IT PERTAINS TO ISSUE PRECLUSION ON THE JURISDICTIONAL PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, WHICH ESTABLISHES THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION WITH ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES, IMMUNITIES, WITH LEGAL NAME CHANGE WITH NO "AKA" BEFORE OR AFTER, THAT THE APPELLANT(S) SEEKS TO OPERATE UNDER BEFORE THIS COURT. COURTS MUST ADHERE TO THE RELATED DOCTRINES OF RES JUDICATA AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, ALLEN v. CURRY, 449 U.S. 90, 101 S.Ct. 411, 66 L.Ed.2d. 308 (U.S.1988); YOUNG v. FERGUSON, 2019 WL 3387741 (N.D.N.C.2019); GEORGIA-PACIFIC CONSUMER PRODUCTS L.P. v. VON DREHLE CORP., 781 F3d. 710 (4th.Cir.2015); CAROLINA RENEWAL INC. v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF TRANSP., 385 S.C. 550, 684 S.E.2d. 779 (S.C.App.2009); KUNST v. LOREE, 404 S.C. 649, 746 S.E.2d. 360 (S.C.App.2013); SARA Y. WILSON, APPELLANT, v. CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, RESPONDENT, --S.E.2d--, 2017

THE PARTIES WHICH INCLUDE THE UNITED STATES AND ITS EMPLOYEES UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH WAS REMOVED TO THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 4:18-cv-00167-O BEFORE ANY FRAUDULENT RULING OCCURRED IN THAT CASE DEFAULTED ON FOREIGN LAW AND SOUTH CAROLINA RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, RULE 44. IT IS UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF FOREIGN LAW THAT THE APPELLANT ALSO MOVES BEFORE THIS COURT AND WHATEVER RULES THAT EXIST WITHIN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT TO THE CONTRARY? THE APPELLANT BY THE DEFAULT INVOLVING THE UNITED STATES IS EXEMPT BY THE SUPREMACY CLAUSE AND IMMUNE UNDER THE F.S.I.A., ALSO DUE TO THE COURT BEING REQUIRED TO APPLY THE LAW FROM THE STATE WHERE THE ACTION ORIGINATED FROM. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO FILED AS AN ADMISSIONS MOTION AND SEEK THAT IT IS TRANSFERRED TO WHATEVER ENTITY IT WOULD DEEM NECESSARY TO FURTHER RESOLVED THE ISSUE WHERE THE APPELLANT HAS IN ONE FORM OR THE OTHER ENGAGED IN LAW WITHIN THIS STATE FOR YEARS AT BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL UNDER THE SUPERSEDING CONTRACT OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN. EVEN THOUGH THEIR MAY BE ADDITIONAL RULES, NOTICE OR SERVICE NEEDED TO BE FOLLOWED. BY THE LITIGATION PRESENTED THE APPELLANT MUST BE DEEMED EXEMPT AND OR IMMUNE FROM SUCH REQUIREMENTS THAT DO NOT BIND AT THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH IS AGAIN SUPPORTED BY THE WHEELER AND FORTBEND TEXAS CASES. ALSO SEE (70) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS ATTACHED. IT IS THE APPELLANT'S POSITION THAT DUE TO THE UNITED STATES DEFAULT. THOSE RULES AND REQUIREMENTS NO LONGER BIND AT THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN WHO IS SOVEREIGN BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SOVEREIGN PURSUANT TO THE (3) HOLY BOOKS, WILLS AND TESTAMENTS, OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. THIS ISSUE WAS TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE JURY. THUS, THE 3rd. CIRCUIT RULING ON THIS ISSUE BEFORE THE JURY WEIGHED THE EVIDENCE IS PREMATURE CREATING A STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS ERROR ANALYSIS, VIOLATING THE APPELLANT(S) DUE PROCESS RIGHTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS UNDER THE 7TH. AMENDMENT VIOLATING THE APPELLANT'S RIGHTS OF AUTONOMY AND HIS RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL

PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE RENDERING THE ORDER UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. THEREUPON THE APPELLANT(S) MOTION TO WITHDRAW IT TO ALLOW THE MATTER TO BE PROPERLY PLACED BEFORE THE JURY. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL RULING CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW, ESPINOZA v. ALLSTATE TEXAS LLOYD'S, 222 F.Supp.3d. 529 (W.D.Tex.2016); BARTELS BY AND THROUGH BARTELS v. SABER HEALTHCARE GROUP,LLC., 880 F3d. 668 (4th.Cir.2018); INTERNATIONAL ENERGY VENTURES MANAGEMENT, LLC. v. UNITED ENERGY GROUP, LTD., 818 F3d. 193 (5th.Cir.2016); WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C., LLC., 859 F3d. 295 (4th.Cir.2017); MOSELY v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 1187778 (W.D.N.C.2018); MILFORD v. MIDDLETON, 2018 WL 348059(DSC.2018); RUBIN v. ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, 138 S.Ct. 816, 86 U.S.L.W. 4064 (U.S.2018)(DEMONSTRATING THE SOLE CORPORATION'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ARGUED SUB JUDICE CANNOT BE ATTACHED).

THE STATE MAY NOT BURDEN OUT OF STATE CITIZENS PROTECTED UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT WHERE IN THIS CASE THE APPELLANT IS SOVEREIGN BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUE AS SOVEREIGN PURSUANT TO HOLY COVENANT AND OR CONTRACT. THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE PROTECTS RIGHTS OF OUT OF STATE CITIZENS TO PLY THEIR TRADE, PRACTICE THEIR OCCUPATION OR PURSUE A COMMON CALLING WHERE BY THE LITIGATION THE APPELLANT MUST BE DEEMED EXEMPT AND OR IMMUNE. THE APPELLANT CANNOT BE IMPAIRED ON ACCOUNT OF HIS OUT OF STATE CITIZENSHIP AS A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN ACTING FOR PROTECTORATE PURPOSES. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS, McBURNEY v. YOUNG, 569 U.S. 221, 133 S.Ct. 1709, 195 L.Ed.2d. 758(U.S.2013); HONEY v. VERMONT, 2017 WL 2167123 (2017); SCHOENEFELD v. SCHNEIDERMAN, 821 F3d. 273(2nd.Cir.2016); SCHWARE v. BOARD OF EXAM OF STATE OF N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 77 S.Ct. 752, 64 A.L.R.2d. 288, 1 L.Ed.2d. 796(U.S.1957); FACIRE v. SULLIVAN, 2017 WL 3710066(D.C.Nev.2017); VIRGINIA BOARD OF MEDICINE v. ZACKRISON, 67 Va. App. 461, 796 S.E.2d. 866 (2017); DOE v. ROGERS, 139 F.Supp.3d. 120 (D.C.C.2015); BOLLS v. VIRGINIA BD. OF BAR EXAMINERS, 811 F.Supp.2d. 1260 (E.D.Va.2011). THE ACTIONS OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT

WOULD IMPAIR THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT, COVENANT ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION AND WOULD BE ANNULLED BY THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE AND ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, POINDEXTER v. GREENHOW, 114 U.S. 270, 55 S.Ct. 903, 29 L.Ed. 185 (U.S.1885); ALDEN v. MAINE, 527 U.S. 706, 119 S.Ct. 2240, 144 L.Ed.2d. 636(U.S.1999); WILL v. MICHIGAN DEPT. OF STATE POLICE, 491 U.S. 58, 109 S.Ct. 2304(U.S.1989).

THE SOVEREIGN POWER HAS PARAMOUNT RIGHT TO PROTECT THE LIVES, HEALTH, MORALS, COMFORT AND GENERAL WELFARE OF HIS PEOPLE, WHICH IN THIS CASE, INCLUDE ALL CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS, JEWS, AFRICANS AND THEIR DIASPORA WHICH EMBODY THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND RELIGIOUS PROPHECY DEFAULTED ON, HOME BLDG & LOAN ASS'N v. BLAISDELL, 290 U.S. 398, 54 S.Ct. 231, 88 A.L.R. 1481, 78 L.Ed. 413(U.S.1934); ELLIOTT v. BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES OF MADISON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS,--F3d.--, 2017 WL 5988226 (7th.Cir.2017); NORTH CAROLINA ASS'N OF EDUCATORS, INC. v. STATE, 368 N.C. 777, 786 S.E.2d. 255 (N.C.2016).

UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE, THE GOVERNMENT MAY NOT PROHIBIT THE EXPRESSION OF AN IDEA BECAUSE IT OR SOCIETY FINDS THE IDEA OFFENSIVE OR DISAGREEABLE. THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE, IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS, SUCH AS THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, THE PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEG, THE HOBBS ACT, THE LAWS OF PROBATE AND INHERITANCE, ARTICLE 1 § 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2, CAN BAR APPLICATION OF A SEEMINGLY NEUTRAL, GENERALLY APPLICABLE LAW, SUCH AS THE ONE THE 3rd. CIRCUIT CITED RELATED TO INMATES WHERE THE APPELLANT BY THE DEFAULT OF THE UNITED STATES MUST BE DEEMED EXEMPT AND OR IMMUNE WHERE HE IS AN INMATE IN FORM ONLY BUT NOT IN SUBSTANCE DUE TO THE CONVICTION ALREADY BEING INVALIDATED BY THE DEFAULT IN QUESTION, AND THE COURT CANNOT UNMAKE THE COVENANT ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION WITH EX POST FACT LAW, MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP, LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719, 201 L.Ed.2d.

EXHIBIT, "INITIAL 20-7073 PETITION".

~~File in glass~~

2 MA 425

NO. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA

JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;

RON SANTA McCRAY--PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE NEWMAN; DIRECTOR STIRLING;  
DORM MANAGER LT. REED; GENERAL COUNSEL; ANNIE RUMBLER;  
CAPT. BRIGHTHART; WARDEN WILLIAMS; BARTON VINCENT ET. AL.,  
DEFENDANTS--APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RON SANTA McCRAY

#353031 COOPER B-59

LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205

RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA

#300839 F2B. RM. 1260

LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.

BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010

**QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

(1) DOES THE FILING SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER CASE 20-7073 FILED BEFORE THE FOURTH CIRCUIT SERVES AS A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO AN INFORMAL BRIEF ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE PETITIONER IN THAT CASE MOTIONED TO HAVE IT CONSTRUED AS SUCH?

(2) DOES THE ORDER UNDER CASE 21-6275 DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY FALL WITHIN THE PROVISIONS OF THE COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE ALLOWING THE PETITIONER(S) IN CASE 21-6275 TO APPEAL IT DUE TO WHAT IS ARGUED IN THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI?

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

THE PARTIES ARE NOT ALL LISTED IN THE CAPTION. BUT DUE TO THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE WHERE THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT PURPOSELY LISTED THE PARTIES INCORRECTLY VIOLATING THE PETITIONERS' CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY IN HOW THE PETITIONER(S) SOUGHT TO BRING THIS CASE. THE AFOREMENTIONED ARE THE PARTIES THAT IN ACTS OF MISREPRESENTATION APPEAR ON THE FACE OF THIS APPEAL. THE NAMES OF THE U.S. CONGRESS MEMBERS AND (50) STATES FEDERAL AND STATE ATTORNEYS AND OR ATTORNEY GENERALS DUE TO ATTACKING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL PROVISIONS DUE TO IT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ARE DECEPTIVELY NOT LISTED IN THE RECORD.

## **RELATED CASES**

THIS PETITION IS ALSO RELATED TO CASE 21-6275 WHERE THE

CONSPIRING PARTIES DID ESSENTIALLY THE SAME EXACT THING, LIST THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY TO MAKE IT APPEAR AS IF THE PETITIONER(S) WERE MAKING ATTEMPTS TO SUE INDIVIDUALS WHO COULD NOT BE SUED FOR THE CLAIMS MADE TO UNJUSTLY DISMISS THE ACTION WHICH IS STILL PENDING BEFORE THE FOURTH CIRCUIT WHERE THAT COURT AND CASE DENIED THE MOTION TO STAY PENDING SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI, THE SEEKING TO APPEAL THAT ORDER OF DENIAL IS ALSO APART OF THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

THIS PETITION IS ALSO RELATED TO CASES COMING UP FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT INVOLVING THE PETITIONERS AND AT MINIMUM (20) OTHER INMATES SEEKING A RULING REGARDING THE STATE'S MISUNDERSTANDING AS TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S HOLDINGS PURSUANT TO FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843 (U.S.2019) WHERE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAS BEEN HOLDING MANY INMATES POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPLICATIONS IN LIMBO MANY OF US FOR OVER (16) YEARS AFTER TIMELY ASSERTING THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON ALSO VIOLATING UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723 (U.S.2016) AND WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016) WHERE DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CLAIMS MADE. THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS BLOCKED, PREVENTED, CONCEALED THE RELEASE OF EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA TESTING AND A SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE FOR OVER (16) YEARS.

ALSO RELATED TO CASES LISTED IN THE APPENDIX EXHIBIT, "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT".

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINION BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1-2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES AND CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	3-7
STATEMENT OF CASE.....	8
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	13
CONCLUSION.....	20

## INDEX OF APPENDICES

**APPENDIX A**--EXHIBIT "REHEARING ORDER". THIS EXHIBIT INCLUDES ALL ORDERS FROM BOTH CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275. IT ALSO INCLUDES THE FINAL ORDER OR MAGISTRATE ORDERS THAT ARE THE SOURCE OF THE APPEALS IN QUESTION AS WAS REQUEST BY THE SUPREME COURT.

**APPENDIX B**--EXHIBIT, "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT".

**APPENDIX C**--EXHIBIT, "REHEARING MOTION".

**APPENDIX D**--EXHIBIT, "INITIAL NOTICE OF APPEAL AND A COPY OF THE LETTER FROM THE SUPREME COURT SETTING THE TIMETABLE FOR THIS FILING.

**OPINIONS BELOW**

THE OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT APPEARS AT APPENDIX A TO THE PETITION AND IS UNPUBLISHED. THE OPINION OF THE S.C. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR BOTH CASES 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM AND 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC ALSO APPEAR AT APPENDIX A AND THEY ARE UNPUBLISHED.

**JURISDICTION**

THE DATE ON WHICH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DECIDED THE PETITIONER'S CASE UNDER CASE 20-7073 BY TIMELY FILED MOTION FOR REHEARING WAS ON APRIL 9, 2021. THE DATE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DENIED THE MOTION TO STAY UNDER CASE 21-6275 WAS DATED FILED ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2021. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION DUE TO THE DISABILITY IN HIS HANDS MOTIONED FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME BY HIS RIGHTS UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AND WAS SENT A RESPONSE BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT INFORMING THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER THE CONDITIONS SUCH IS TO BE GRANTED. A COPY OF THE ORDER DENYING THE MOTION FOR REHEARING IN CASE 20-7073 AND THE STAY UNDER CASE 21-6275 APPEAR IN

APPENDIX A. THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOKED UNDER 28  
U.S.C. § 1254(1).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBERS
BIGGINS v. HAZEN PAPER CO.,--F3d.--, 1994 WL 398013 (1st.Cir. 1994).....	21
BENSON v. FOSTER, 2020 WL 2770267, * 2+ E.D.Wis.....	16
BONNIE B. v. SAUL, 2021 WL 780475 (S.D.Cal.2021).....	21
BURNS v. INCH, 2020 WL 8513758, * 4 N.D.Fla.....	16
CLARK v. CARTLEDGE, 829 F3d. 303, 2016 WL 3741864 (4th.Cir. 2016).....	14
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA v. WILLIAMS, 294 U.S. 176, 55 S.Ct. 380, 79 L.Ed. 841 (U.S.1935).....	22
CTL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS v. NIGERIAN PETROLEUM CORP., 951 F2d. 573 (3rd.Cir.1991).....	21
DRAKE v. TRACAELEAS INDEMNITY COMPANY, 2019 WL 5423099, * 3 D.Md.....	18
DUVALL v. GREENLAND PROPERTIES, LLC., 2020 WL 4879209, * 2 D.Md.....	16
FERNANDEZ-SANTOS v. UNITED STATES, 2021 WL 1165197, * 2+ PUERTO RICO.....	16
FOMAN v. DAVIS, 372 U.S. 178, 181-82, 83 S.Ct. 227, 228-30, 9 LEd.2d. 222 (1962).....	14
FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019).....	19
FOSTER v. CHATMAN, 578 U.S. 1123, 136 S.Ct. 1737, 195 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.2016).....	16
GELBOIM v. BANK OF AMERICA CORP., 574 U.S. 405, 135 S.Ct. 897, 190 L.Ed.2d.789(U.S.2015).....	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED CON'T

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
GONZALEZ v. THALER, 565 U.S. 134, 132 S.Ct. 641, 181 L.Ed.2d. 619 (U.S.2012).....	19
GREEN v. UNITED STATES, 2019 WL 4879209, * 2+ D.Md.....	16
GULFSTREAM AEROSPACE CORP. v. MAYACAMAS CORP., 485 U.S. 271, 108 S.Ct. 1133, 99 L.Ed.2d. 296, 56 U.S.L.W. 4243(U.S.1988).....	24
HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+... IN RE: ROCHE, 448 U.S. 1312, 101 S.Ct. 4, 65 L.Ed.2d. 1103 (U.S.1980).....	19
IN RE: SAN JUAN DUPONT PLAZA HOTEL FIRE LITIGATION, 888 F2d. 940 (1st.Cir.1989).....	21
IN RE: SOCIETY INSURANCE CO. COVIT-19 INSURANCE LITIGATION, 2021 WL 3290962 (N.D.ILL.2021).....	18
JUSTIN PATRICK ODLE, PETITIONER v. MATT MACAULEY, RESPONDENT, 2021 WL 4350123 (W.D.Mich.2021).....	18
KELL v. BENSON, 925 F3d. 448(10th.Cir.2019).....	22
KOTLER v. AMERICAN TOBACCO CO., 981 F2d. 7 (1st.Cir.1982).....	14
LEXICON INC. v. MILBERG, WEISS, BERSHAD, HYNES & LERACH, 523 U.S. 26, 118 S.Ct. 956, 140 L.Ed.2d. 62(U.S.1998).....	17
MALLAS v. U.S. 903 F2d. 1111 (4th.Cir.1993).....	20
MARSHALL v. JERRICO INC., 446 U.S. 238, 242, 100 S.Ct. 1610, 64 L.Ed.2d. 182(1980).....	22
MICROSOFT CORP. v. BAKER, 137 S.Ct. 1702, 198 L.Ed.2d. 132, 85 U.S.L.W. 4330(U.S.2017).....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED CON'T

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016).....	13
MOSELY v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 1187778(N.C.2018).....	14
MORRISON v. ACCUWEATHER, INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 3015226 (M.D.Pa.2016).....	14
PETER D. HOLDINGS LLC. v. WOLD OIL PROPERTIES, LLC., 2020 WL 5406238 (D.C.WYM.2020).....	21
PROPHET v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518351(W.Va.2018).....	19
HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159 (U.S.2018).....	24
RAINBOW SCHOOL, INC. v. RAINBOW EARLY EDUCATION HOLDINGS, LLC., 887 F3d. 610(4th.Cir.2018).....	17
SHOOP v. CASSANO,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 4259962 (MEM)(U.S.2021)....	24
ST. BERNARD PARISH GOVERNMENT v. UNITED STATES, 916 F3d. 987, 993 Fed. Cir.....	16
STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998).....	14
SMITH v. BERRY, 502 U.S. 244, 112 S.Ct. 678, 116 L.Ed.2d. 678 (U.S.1992).....	13
STRUNK v. GASTELO, 2019 WL 5684414(S.D.Cal.2019).....	19
TAMM v. CINCINNATI INSURANCE COMPANY, 2020 WL 60932 (S.D.N.Y.2020).....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED CON'T

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
THOMPSON v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, 742 Fed. Appx' 316 (MEM) (9th.Cir.2018).....	24
UNITED STATES v. BALLARD, 2018 WL 6252604, * 25+ E.D.Pa.....	18
UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C. 2017).....	14
TORRES v. OAKLAND SCAVENGER CO., 487 U.S. 312, 315-16, 108 S.Ct. 2405, 2407-08, 101 L.Ed.2d. 285(U.S.1988).....	14
UNITED STATES v. KOEBER, 2018 WL 4188465, * 2 UTAH.....	22
UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415(4th.Cir.2018).....	15
U.S. v. FELDMAN, F.Supp., 1992 WL 350629(S.D.N.Y.1992).....	21
U.S. v. COTTON, 231 F3d. 890(4th.Cir.2000).....	14
VAETH v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 775386 (D.C.Md.2016).....	13
VETTE v. K-9 UNIT DEPUTY SANDERS, 989 F3d. 1154 (10th. Cir.2021).....	17
WELLS FARGO BANK N.C. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C., LLC., 859 F3d. 295 (4th.Cir.2017).....	14
WHOLE WOMAN HEALTH v. JACKSON,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 3910772 (U.S.2021).....	15
WIDMYER v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518350(W.Va.2018).....	19
WILLIAM v. PENNSYLVANIA, 579 U.S. 1, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132 (U.S.2016).....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED CON'T

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
WITHROW, 421 U.S. AT 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456.....	18
24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d.	
624 (4th.Cir.2016).....	13

OTHER

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DIRECTIVE TO EXCUSE INFORMALITY OF FORM OR  
TITLE.

F.R.A.P., RULE 2 U.S.C.A.

## STATEMENT OF CASE

THE PETITIONER FILED A § 1983 ACTION ESTABLISHING CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW BEFORE THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT MAKING EFFORTS AMONG MANY THINGS TO SUE THE UNITED STATES, THE U.S. CONGRESS MEMBERS, THE (50) STATES FEDERAL AND STATE ATTORNEY GENERALS FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF TO CHALLENGE THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL PROVISIONS DUE TO THOSE PROVISIONS DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT IN VIOLATION OF THE 5TH., 6TH., 14TH. AMENDMENTS AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, AS WELL AS THE UNITED STATES BEING ARRESTING AND OR EXECUTING AND OR ATTACHING IN VIOLATION OF THE GRANT, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE LEAD PETITIONER SEEKING TO PLACE THESE MATTERS BEFORE A JURY, WHICH IS ALSO BASED UPON A DEFAULT PURSUANT TO A JURISDICTIONAL PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE EMERGING FROM A RELATED STATE CASE. THE JUDGE(S) AND OR COURT PURPOSELY LISTED THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY WHICH WAS A REPEATED ACT OF MACHINATION OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND PARTIES TO THWART FAIR AND PROPER JUDICIAL REVIEW. THE PETITIONER(S) IMMEDIATELY OBJECTED AND SOUGHT THAT THE DISTRICT COURT AMEND THE DEFENDANTS AND LIST THEM AS THE PETITIONER(S) SOUGHT WHICH WAS IGNORED BY THE DISTRICT COURT IN THEIR EFFORTS TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE THE PETITIONER(S) WAS TRYING TO SUE PEOPLE WHO COULD NOT BE SUED FOR THE CLAIMS MADE. THE PETITIONER(S) APPEALED PRODUCING CASE

20-7073. THERE WERE SUBSTANTIAL JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES MADE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER WHICH BY THE PETITIONER(S) CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WAS REQUIRED TO ADDRESS THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES BEFORE IT COULD EVER MAKE A RULING ON THE MERITS OF THE APPEAL BY INFORMAL BRIEF OR ANY OTHER MEANS. THESE SUBSTANTIAL JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES COULD NOT LEGALLY BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. YET, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BY ITS ACTIONS ATTEMPTED TO DO JUST THAT DEMANDING THE PETITIONER SUBMIT INFORMAL BRIEF TO ADDRESS THOSE MERITS CIRCUMVENTING RULING ON THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES. THE PETITIONER THEN MOTIONED TO HAVE HIS PLEADING CONSTRUED AS A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO THE FILING OF THE INFORMAL BRIEF WHICH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IGNORED AND DISMISSED THE APPEAL FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE SUPREME COURT TO ADDRESS THE MERITS OF ANY UNDERLYING ISSUES IN THIS CASE BECAUSE DUE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ACTIONS THOSE ISSUES ARE NOT PROPERLY PRESERVED. THERE IS ONLY ONE ISSUE PERTAINING TO THIS PARTICULAR CASE 20-7073 THAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED.

ADDITIONALLY, DUE TO EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT OCCURRED BEFORE THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM. THE PETITIONER(S), DUE TO CONCERN THAT PREVIOUSLY OCCURRED WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHERE VARIOUS JUDGES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES THAT

SURROUND THIS CASE. THOSE JUDGES WORKED TO CONCEAL AND OR CIRCUMVENT RULING TO ADDRESS THE INJUSTICES THAT OCCURRED WITHIN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT GOING UNCHALLENGED IN FRAUD FOR OVER (15) YEARS. THE PETITIONER(S), CRAWFORD AND McCRAY, IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION, FILED A SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDING BEFORE THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHERE THE PRIOR RELATED PROCEEDINGS UNDER BOTH CASES 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM AND 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM WERE BOTH DISMISSED BY THE OBSTRUCTION AND FRAUD WITHOUT PREJUDICE ALLOWING THE PETITIONER(S) TO RE-FILE THE CAUSES OF ACTION ASSERTED. THIS PRODUCED CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC. THE COMPROMISED JUDGES IN SOUTH CAROLINA, ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE(S), DID THE SAME INJUSTICE UNDER CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MMC AS THEY DID UNDER CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM, LISTING THE DEFENDANTS IN THE CASE INCORRECTLY TO UNJUSTLY DISMISS THAT CASE PRODUCING APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-6275 BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT.

DUE TO ESSENTIALLY THE EXACT SAME ISSUES BEING ARGUED IN BOTH CASES BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT INVOLVING THE EXACT SAME ISSUE OF THE DISTRICT COURT LISTING THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY IN BOTH CASES TO AVOID SUIT AND IMPEDE, OBSTRUCT, HINDER AND DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2) AND 18 U.S.C. § 1001 TO THWART JUST AND FAIR REVIEW BY ALSO ATTEMPTING TO BLOCK THE PETITIONER RON SANTA McCRAY FROM ASSERTING HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BY IGNORING 4 OUT OF THE 5 REPEATED NOTICES SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-6275 FOR WHICH THE DISTRICT COURT HAD NO JURISDICTION TO ISSUE ANY FINAL ORDER DUE TO THE 4

PREVIOUSLY FILED NOTICES SEEKING LEAVE UNDER RULE 73(c). THE PETITIONER(S) MOTIONED TO STAY THE CASE UNDER 21-6275 DUE TO ANY POTENTIAL RULING COMING FROM SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI REGARDING CASE 20-7073 WOULD HAVE A DIRECT IMPACT ON THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE 21-6275. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DENIED THE MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-6275 BY ORDER DATED FILED SEPTEMBER 21, 2021. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT DUE TO THE STRUCTURAL ERROR EXISTING PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016) WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY. THE ORDER DENYING THE STAY TRIGGERS A JURISDICTIONAL JUDGMENT PLACING THE DENIAL OF THE STAY WITHIN THE EXCEPTION TO ALLOW THE PETITIONER(S) TO SEEK TO APPEAL IT TO PREVENT ANY FURTHER INJUSTICE BY WAY OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI AS WELL.

RULE 12(4) PROVIDES IN PART THAT WHEN TWO OR MORE JUDGMENTS ARE SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SAME COURT AND INVOLVE IDENTICAL OR CLOSELY RELATED QUESTIONS, A SINGLE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI COVERING ALL THE JUDGMENTS SUFFICES ALLOWING THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD AND McCRAY TO FILE ONE PETITION. THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI NOW FOLLOWS.

**NOTE TO THE COURT:** THE INITIAL NOTICE SEEKING TO FILE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS RECEIVED BY THE COURT ON MAY 20, 2021 ALSO SEEKING EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE MAKING THIS PLEADING TIMELY. IT WAS

THEN RETURNED STATING THAT THE ORDER FROM THE DISTRICT COURT WAS NOT ATTACHED THAT WE HAVE UNTIL NOVEMBER 15, 2021 TO CORRECT THE DEFICIENCY. THUS, THIS FILING MUST BE DEEMED TIMELY.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED FOR ESSENTIALLY (2) TWO REASONS: (1) THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS CONFLICT WITH OTHER DECISIONS OF OTHER COURTS OF APPEALS ON THE SAME MATTER AND DECIDED FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THIS COURT. THE PETITIONER FILED PLEADING BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHERE EVERY SINGLE OBJECTION AND RESPONSE MADE BY THE PETITIONER RELATED THERETO CONSTITUTE CLEAR GENUINE MATTERS AND OR ISSUES FOR WHICH THE PETITIONER SOUGHT REVIEW AND RELIEF BEFORE THE 4th. CIRCUIT UNDER CASE 20-7073 DEMONSTRATING CLEAR ISSUES AND AN EQUIVALENT TO AN INFORMAL BRIEF. THE DOCUMENT ATTACHED IN THE APPENDIX FILED UNDER CASE 20-7073 SERVE AS A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO THE INFORMAL BRIEF WHICH IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PETITIONER SHOULD HAVE BEEN CONSTRUED AS SUCH WHERE THESE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BEING SILENT ON THESE CLAIMS WHEN IT WAS THEIR FIDUCIARY DUTY TO SPEAK CONSTITUTE AN ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT RENDERING THOSE PROCEEDINGS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID, SMITH v. BERRY, 502 U.S. 244, 112 S.Ct. 678, 116 L.Ed.2d. 678 (U.S.1992); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063 (U.S.2016); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624 (4th.Cir.2016); VAETH v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL

775386(D.C.Md.2016); WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C., LLC., 859 F3d. 295(4th.Cir.2017); MOSELY v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 1187778 (N.C.2018); STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998); TAMM v. CINCINNATI INSURANCE COMPANY, 2020 WL 60932 (S.D.N.Y.2020); HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+ U.S.; UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.2017); U.S. v. COTTON, 231 F3d. 890(4th.Cir.2000); MORRISON v. ACCUWEATHER, INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 3015226(M.D.Pa.2016).

NON COMPLIANCE WITH "MERE TECHNICALITIES" WILL NOT DEFEAT APPELLATE JURISDICTION WHICH HAS CLEARLY OCCURRED HERE BY THE 4th. CIRCUIT'S ACTIONS, FOMAN v. DAVIS, 372 U.S. 178, 181-182, 83 S.Ct. 227, 228-30, 9 L.Ed.2d. (1962). RATHER, AN APPEAL SURVIVES SO LONG AS THE LITIGANT'S FILING "IS FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF WHAT THE RULE REQUIRES", TORRES v. OAKLAND SCAVENGER CO., 487 U.S. 312, 315-16, 108 S.Ct. 2405, 2407-08, 101 L.Ed.2d. 285(U.S.1988); KOTLER v. AMERICAN TOBACCO CO., 981 F2d. 7 (1st.Cir.1982); CLARK v. CARTLEDGE, 829 F3d. 303, 2016 WL 3741864 (4th.Cir.2016).

(2) THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS CONFLICT WITH OTHER DECISIONS OF OTHER COURTS OF APPEALS ON THE SAME MATTER AND THEY DECIDED FEDERAL QUESTIONS IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS

OF THIS COURT AND THE PETITIONER(S) ARE PETITIONING TO HAVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO STAY CASE 21-6275 WHICH IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO CASE 20-7073 UNTIL THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DECIDE WHETHER IT WILL GRANT THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI REGARDING THE SEEKING REVIEW OF CASE 20-7073. TO PREVAIL IN APPLICATION FOR A STAY, THE APPLICANT MUST CARRY THE BURDEN OF MAKING A STRONG SHOWING THAT IT IS LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS, THAT IT WILL BE IRREPARABLY INJURED ABSENT THE STAY, THAT THE BURDEN OF EQUITIES FAVOR IT, AND THAT THE STAY IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST. DUE TO THE HEART OF THESE MATTERS ESSENTIALLY RELYING UPON THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RULINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) SUPPORTED BY THE RULING IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S OWN COURT PURSUANT TO UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415 (4th.Cir.2018) RELATED TO THE MANDATES OF PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AND WHETHER THE COURT'S DECISION IN THE FORTBEND CASE APPLIES TO STATE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES BY THE PETITIONER(S) DUE PROCESS RIGHTS UNDER THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE 14TH. AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. THUS, THE SUPREME COURT'S HOLDINGS UNDER THE FORTBEND CASE MAKE A STRONG SHOWING THE PETITIONER(S) WOULD MORE THAN LIKELY SUCCEED, WHOLE WOMAN HEALTH v. JACKSON,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 3910772 (U.S.2021).

FURTHER, IT IS WELL SETTLED THAT THE SUPREME COURT HAS JURISDICTION TO ENTERTAIN A FEDERAL CLAIM OR REVIEW OF A STATE COURT JUDGMENT WHEN IT REST ON A STATE GROUND THAT IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF THE MERITS OF A FEDERAL CLAIM AND AN ADEQUATE

BASIS FOR THE COURT'S DECISION. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT THESE SAME FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW APPLIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL PERTAINING TO FEDERAL DECISIONS. THERE WAS A MOTION TO DISQUALIFY, RECUSE AND TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TO THE 3rd. CIRCUIT. THE DECISION NOT TO STAY CASE 21-6275 AND REQUIRE THE FILING OF INFORMAL BRIEF IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF THE QUESTION OF THE CASE(S) TRANSFER AND THE SEEKING OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S RECUSAL AND OR DISQUALIFICATION WHICH TRIGGERS THE "COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE", FOSTER v. CHATMAN, 578 U.S. 1123, 136 S.Ct. 1737, 195 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.2016); FERNANDEZ-SANTOS v. UNITED STATES, 2021 WL 1165197, \* 2+, D.PUERTO RICO; BURNS v. INCH, 2020 WL 8513758, \* 4 N.D.Fla.; BENSON v. FOSTER, 2020 WL 2770267, \* 2+ E.D.Wis..

THE SUPREME COURT HAS AN INDEPENDENT OBLIGATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION EXIST, EVEN ABSENCE OF A CHALLENGE FROM ANY PARTY, ST. BERNARD PARISH GOVERNMENT v. UNITED STATES, 916 F3d. 987, 993 Fed. Cir.; DUVALL v. GREENLAND PROPERTIES, LLC., 2020 WL 6163558, \* 1 W.D.Ky.; GREEN v. UNITED STATES, 2019 WL 4879209, \* 2+ D.Md..

UNDER THE "COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE" AN ORDER MAY BE DEEMED FINAL, UNDER STATUTE PROVIDING FOR APPEAL ONLY FROM FINAL DECISIONS FROM FEDERAL COURT, IF IT DISPOSES OF A MATTER SEPARATE FROM, AND COLLATERAL TO THE MERITS OF THE MAIN PROCEEDING, WHICH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BY DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY AND REQUIRING THE PETITIONER(S) TO FILE INFORMAL BRIEF. THE ACTION HAD THE EFFECT

OF ALSO DENYING THE MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION, RECUSAL AND 1407 TRANSFER, WHICH IN THIS CASE IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE DENIED REVIEW, AND TOO INDEPENDENT OF THE CAUSE ITSELF TO REQUIRE THAT APPELLATE CONSIDERATION BE DEFERRED UNTIL THE WHOLE CASE IS ADJUDICATED TRIGGERING THE COLLATERAL ORDER PROVISIONS, 28 US.C.A. § 1291; GELBOIM v. BANK OF AMERICA CORP., 574 U.S. 405, 135 S.Ct. 897, 190 L.Ed.2d. 789(U.S.2015); RAINBOW SCHOOL, INC. v. RAINBOW EARLY EDUCATION HOLDINGS, LLC., 887 F3d. 610 (4th.Cir.2018); VETTE v. K-9 UNIT DEPUTY SANDERS, 989 F3d. 1154 (10th.Cir.2021).

IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT WHERE THE PLAINTIFF(S) CASES ARE SOUGHT TRANSFERRED FOR PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 OF THE MULTI-DISTRICT STATUTE WHICH WAS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY OBSTRUCTED AND OR CIRCUMVENTED FOR OVER (15) YEARS IN ONE FORM OR THE OTHER, AND THE 4th. CIRCUIT ASSIGNS CASE TO ITSELF FOR REVIEW WHERE FRAUD AND CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR EXIST PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899 (U.S.2016), SO AS THE PETITIONER(S) ARE INAPPROPRIATELY DENIED THE RIGHT TO DISQUALIFY, TRANSFER AND REMAND ONCE THE LOWER COURT CASES WERE UNCONSTITUTIONALLY DISMISSED, AND SINCE THE JURISDICTIONAL DEFECT IS NOT CURED BY THESE SUBSEQUENT EVENTS WITHIN THE 4th. CIRCUIT, THE ERROR IS NOT HARMLESS; INSTEAD GIVEN SUBSTANTIAL NATURE OF RIGHTS VIOLATED, REVERSAL IS REQUIRED, LEXICON INC. v. MILBERG, WEISS, BERSHAD, HYNES & LERACH, 523 U.S. 26, 118 S.Ct. 956, 140 L.Ed.2d. 62

(U.S.1998); IN RE: SOCIETY INSURANCE CO. COVIT-19 INSURANCE LITIGATION, 2021 WL 3290962 (N.D.ILL.2021).

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S INVOLVEMENT IN THIS CASE, UNCONSTITUTIONALLY WAIVING, AVOIDING AND OR CIRCUMVENTING CLEAR JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS PLACED BEFORE THEM WITHIN THESE CASES GIVES RISE TO AN UNACCEPTABLE RISK OF ACTUAL BIAS THAT CAN EASILY BE REMEDIED BY THE 1407 TRANSFER. THIS RISK SO ENDANGERS THE APPEARANCE OF NEUTRALITY WHEN THEY ARE ALSO NAMED AS DEFENDANTS SUBJUDICE THAT WAS CRIMINALLY BLOCKED FROM THE RECORD, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO AVOID SUIT, THAT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S PARTICIPATION IN THIS CASE "MUST BE FORBIDDEN IF THE GUARANTEE OF DUE PROCESS IS TO BE ADEQUATELY IMPLEMENTED". WHEN THE OBJECTIVE RISK OF ACTUAL BIAS ON THE PART OF THE JUDGE(S) RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL, UNDER THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE, THE FAILURE TO RECUSE AND OR TRANSFER IN THIS CASE, CANNOT BE DEEMED HARMLESS, WITHROW, 421 U.S. AT 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456; JUSTIN PATRICK ODLE, PETITIONER v. MATT MACAULEY, RESPONDENT, 2021 WL 4350123 (W.D.Mich.2021); DRAKE v. TRACAELEAS INDEMNITY COMPANY, 2019 WL 5423099, \* 3 D.Md.; UNITED STATES v. BALLARD, 2018 WL 6252604, \* 25+ E.D.Pa..

WHEN APPLICATION OF A STATE LAW BAR DEPENDS ON A FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RULING, THE STATE LAW PRONG OF THE STATE'S HOLDING IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF FEDERAL LAW, AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION IS NOT PRECLUDED. WHETHER A STATE LAW DETERMINATION IS CHARACTERIZED AS "ENTIRELY DEPENDENT ON", "RESTING PRIMARILY

ON" OR "INFLUENCED BY" A QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW, THE RESULT IS THE SAME; THE STATE LAW DETERMINATION IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF FEDERAL LAW AND THUS, POSE NO BAR TO THE SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION. THESE SAME FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW BY WAY OF SUBSIDIARY CLAIMS RELATED TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT'S RULING DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY IS TANTAMOUNT TO A RULING DENYING THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL AND DISQUALIFICATION AND THE 1407 TRANSFER. THE DECISION IS DEPENDENT UPON, REST PRIMARILY ON AND IS DIRECTLY INFLUENCED BY A CLEAR DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO RECUSE AND DISQUALIFY INVOKING THE COLLATERAL ORDER EXCEPTION PERMITTING SUPREME COURT REVIEW, WIDMYER v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518350 (W.Va.2018); PROPHET v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518351 (W.Va.2018); STRUNK v. GASTELO, 2019 WL 5684414 (S.D.Cal.2019).

GENERALLY, A STAY WILL ISSUE UPON SHOWING THAT THERE IS REASONABLE PROBABILITY THAT THE JUSTICES WILL FIND ISSUE SUFFICIENTLY SUBSTANTIAL TO GRANT CERTIORARI WHERE IN THIS CASE EVEN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S HOLDINGS UNDER GONZALEZ v. THALER, 565 U.S. 134, 132 S.Ct. 641, 181 L.Ed.2d. 619 (U.S.2012) IS HARMONIOUS AND SUPPORTS THE COURT'S HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) AND MUST BE DEEMED APPLICABLE TO THE STATES BY THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS, DEMONSTRATING THAT THERE IS A FAIR PROSPECT THAT THE DECISION BELOW IS ERRONEOUS, AND IRREPARABLE HARM TO THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER CASE 21-6275 IS LIKELY TO RESULT IF REQUEST FOR STAY IS DENIED, AND BALANCE OF EQUITIES AND TO PUBLIC FAVORS ISSUANCE OF

STAY, IN RE: ROCHE, 448 U.S. 1312, 101 S.Ct. 4, 65 L.Ed.2d. 1103 (U.S.1980).

### CONCLUSION

IF LITIGANT FILES PAPERS IN FASHION THAT IS TECHNICALLY AT VARIANCE WITH LETTER OF PROCEDURAL RULE, COURT MAY NONETHELESS FIND LITIGANT COMPLIED WITH RULE IF LITIGANT'S ACTION IS FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF WHAT THE RULE REQUIRES, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE DOCUMENT WAS FILED AS A CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER PRODUCING JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES THAT CANNOT BE WAIVED AND OR FORFEITED WHICH OCCURRED HERE RENDERING THE PROCEEDINGS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. EACH OBJECTION CONSTITUTES AN ISSUE FOR REVIEW. THERE IS A RESPONSE IN SUPPORT OF EACH OBJECTION AS TO WHY IT BECOMES AN ISSUE. THUS, THE FILING MUST IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PETITIONER(S) BE DEEMED A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO THE FILING OF AN INFORMAL BRIEF, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE PETITIONER(S) MOTIONED BEFORE THE COURT UNDER CASE 20-7073 TO CONSTRUE IT AS SUCH, F.R.A.P. RULE 2, 28 U.S.C.A.; MALLAS v. U.S., 903 F2d. 1111 (4th.Cir.1993); U.S.

v. FELDMAN, F.Supp., 1992 WL 350629(S.D.N.Y.1992). THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ISSUED A DIRECTIVE TO EXCUSE "INFORMALITY OF FORM OR TITLE". THE DOCUMENT(S) AND OR FILING THOUGH ONE MAY CLAIM IMPERFECT IN FORM, IT IS TECHNICALLY, SUBSTANTIALLY, IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENT OF THE SUBMITTING OF INFORMAL BRIEF. THUS, THE PETITIONER SEEKS WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO SEEK TO HAVE THIS INJUSTICE CORRECTED AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BE REQUIRED TO RULE ON THE SUBMITTED DOCUMENT(S) IN THE APPENDICES, BIGGINS v. HAZEN PAPER CO.,--F3d.--, 1994 WL 398013 (1st.Cir.1994); IN RE: SAN JUAN DUPONT PLAZA HOTEL FIRE LITIGATION, 888 F2d. 940 (1st.Cir.1989); CTL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS v. NIGERIAN PETROLEUM CORP., 951 F2d. 573 (3rd.Cir.1991); BONNIE B. v. SAUL, 2021 WL 780475 (S.D.Cal.2021); PETER D. HOLDINGS LLC. v. WOLD OIL PROPERTIES, LLC., 2020 WL 5406238 (D.C.WYM.2020).

IN ADDRESSING THE INJUSTICE THAT OCCURRED UNDER CASE 21-6275 REGARDING THE FAILURE TO STAY PENDING THE SEEKING REVIEW VIA WRIT OF CERTIORARI. IT IS NOT APPROPRIATE AND A CLEAR CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR FOR JUDGES TO SIT UPON A CASE FOR WHICH THEY HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME, AND IN THIS INSTANCE, THEY ARE DEFENDANTS IN THE CASE SUBJUDICE TO SEEK INJUNCTIVE AND OR DECLARATORY RELIEF FOR THEIR DISQUALIFICATION AT ALL LEVELS OF COURT CLEARLY DEMONSTRATING THEY ARE ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASES WHERE THEIR NAMES WERE CRIMINALLY BLOCKED FROM BEING MADE A PART OF THE COURT RECORD FOR WHICH THEY ARE POTENTIALLY DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THIS CONSPIRACY VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1001 CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS, SUBSTANTIATING THAT THE

POTENTIAL FOR BIAS HAS INDEED RISEN TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. SINCE THERE ARE CLEAR HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION COURTS INVOLVING THE PETITIONER(S) WHICH INCLUDE REMOVAL OF STATE CONVICTION CASES TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT WITHIN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY UNDER THE TAG ALONG RULE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407. DUE PROCESS ENTITLES CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS TO PROCEEDINGS IN WHICH HE MAY PRESENT HIS CASE WITH ASSURANCE THAT NO MEMBER OF THE COURT IS PREDISPOSED TO FIND AGAINST HIM. NO MAN CAN BE A JUDGE IN HIS OWN CASE, MARSHALL v. JERRICO INC., 446 U.S. 238, 242, 100 S.Ct. 1610, 64 L.Ed.2d. 182(1980); COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA v. WILLIAMS, 294 U.S. 176, 55 S.Ct. 380, 79 L.Ed. 841 (U.S.1935); WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 579 U.S. 1, 136, S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132 (U.S.2016); UNITED STATES v. KOEBER, 2018 WL 4188465, \* 2 UTAH.

THE COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE APPLIES TO THAT CLASS OF DECISIONS THAT ARE CONCLUSIVE, THAT RESOLVE IMPORTANT ISSUES SUCH AS THE FAILURE TO DISQUALIFY, TRANSFER AND RECUSE AS THE DENIAL OF THE STAY DID REQUIRING THE PETITIONER(S) TO FILE AN INFORMAL BRIEF NOW TRIGGERED, WHICH ARE COMPLETELY SEPARATE FROM THE MERITS, AND THAT ARE EFFECTIVELY UNREVIEWABLE ON APPEAL FROM FINAL JUDGMENT DUE TO THE FRAUD, CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WHICH IN THIS CASE IS OF A JURISDICTIONAL NATURE, MICROSOFT CORP. v. BAKER, 137 S.Ct. 1702, 198 L.Ed.2d. 132, 85 U.S.L.W. 4330(U.S.2017); KELL v. BENZON, 925 F3d. 448

(10th.Cir.2019); THOMPSON v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,  
742 Fed. Appx' 316 (MEM) (9th.Cir.2018).

IF THE ORDER ENDS THE LITIGATION ON A PARTICULAR ISSUE IT WOULD FALL WITHIN THE COLLATERAL ORDER EXCEPTION'S "CONCLUSIVENESS" WHERE IT ENDS THE ISSUE OF TRANSFER AND ENDS THE ISSUE OF RECUSAL BEFORE THE CASE PROCEEDS BECAUSE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS REQUIRING THE PETITIONER(S) TO FILE AN INFORMAL BRIEF DESPITE OUR OBJECTIONS AND THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME AND AT ANY STAGE INCLUDING WITHIN THIS PETITION BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT. THUS, THE COLLATERAL ORDER REQUIREMENT IN THAT IT WOULD BE A FINAL WORD ON THE SUBJECT ADDRESSED IS MET. THE ARCHETYPAL FINAL DECISION FROM WHICH AN APPEAL FROM SUCH A FINAL DECISION IS A MATTER OF RIGHT, SHOOP v. CASSANO,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 4259962 (MEM)(U.S.2021); GULFSTREAM AEROSPACE CORP. v. MAYACAMAS CORP., 485 U.S. 271, 108 S.Ct. 1133, 99 L.Ed.2d. 296, 56 U.S.L.W. 4243(U.S.1988); HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159(U.S.2018).

INSOMUCH, THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED.

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA  
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260

LEE C.I 990 WISACKY HWY.

BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010

  
RON SANTA McCRAY

#353031 COOPER B-59

LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205

RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29742

  
Ron Santa McCray

OCTOBER 7, 2021

EXHIBIT, "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT"

File in ~~case~~

21A425

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA  
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

---

DOCKET NO. 20-7073

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
ET. AL.,

APPELLANT

Vs.

JUDGE McLEOD; THE UNITED STATES ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

**AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS**

---

I, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO  
HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN  
AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE  
THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION; MOTION FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT BRIEF; MOTION TO REMAND THE CASE BACK

DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT; MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL OTHER PARTIES BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON OCTOBER 9, 2020.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jonah the Tishbite". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Jonah" on the left and "the Tishbite" on the right, connected by a flourish. There is a small, separate mark or initial below the main signature.

OCTOBER 9, 2020

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA  
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

---

DOCKET NO. 20-7073

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE  
ET. AL.,

APPELLANT

VS.

JUDGE MCLEOD; THE UNITED STATES ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE  
THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION; MOTION FOR AN  
EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT BRIEF; MOTION TO REMAND THE CASE  
BACK DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT; MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

---

IN RE: CASE DOCKET NO. 20-7073 AND OTHER JURISDICTIONAL MATTERS.

TO: THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT REQUESTED THAT THE APPELLANT FILE HIS PLRA IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS AND TO SUBMIT HIS BRIEF. SUCH ACTION NOW PRESENTS A CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED BY THE APPELLANT AND MUST BE ADDRESSED BEFORE THE APPELLANT FILES HIS BRIEF AND THE MERITS OF THE BRIEF BE ADJUDICATED WHERE DEPENDING UPON THE RULING. IT WOULD CHANGE THE VERY NATURE IN WHICH THE APPELLANT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THE BRIEF AS WELL AS THE NATURE OF THE ISSUES THAT WOULD BE NEEDED TO BE ARGUED. THUS, THE APPELLANT WOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY PREJUDICED IN SUBMITTING ANY BRIEF UNTIL THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES ARE ADDRESSED ON THE COURT RECORD PRODUCING CITINGS OF LAW BEFORE ANY MERITS ON THE ISSUES INTENDED TO BE PRESENTED CAN BE RULED ON AS THE LAW REQUIRES. THIS IS CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER WHEREBY THE APPELLANT MOTIONS THAT THIS CASE BE REMANDED FOR FURTHER ADJUDICATION DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OTHER UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION WHICH RENDERS THE DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION AND THE FINAL ORDER PRODUCED BY THEM VOID WHICH IS THE SOURCE OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ENTERTAINING AND INVOKING ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER OVER THIS APPEAL. THIS DON'T EVEN TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THAT THERE IS A POTENTIAL APPEAL PENDING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1252 AND 1251. THEREFORE, THE APPELLANT ALSO MOTIONS FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME, TO RESET, TO SUBMIT ANY BRIEF ONCE THESE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES ARE ADDRESSED ON THE COURT RECORD AND RESOLVED WHICH WOULD ALSO WARRANT THAT THIS CASE BE REMANDED BACK DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT FOR FURTHER ADJUDICATION. IF SUCH OCCURS. THE SUBMITTING OF THE BRIEF WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED.

THE LAW IS WRITTEN, "ITA LEX SCRIPTA EST---EX DOLO MALO NON ORITUR ACTIO". OUT OF FRAUD NO ACTION ARISES. THE FINAL ORDER ISSUED UNDER CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM IS DEAD. IT IS VOID FOR VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THIS SAME ORDER IS THE SOURCE IN WHICH THIS COURT ATTEMPTS TO ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER THIS APPEAL CREATING AN AUTOMATIC CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER. FRAUD NEVER

GIVES A RIGHT OF ACTION. NO COURT WILL LEND ITS AID TO A MAN OR LOWER COURT WHO FOUNDS HIS CAUSE OF ACTION AND RULINGS UPON AN IMMORAL OR ILLEGAL ACT. FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING THAT IT ENTERS. THIS INCLUDES THE MOST SOLEMN ACTS, ORDERS, JUDGMENTS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS ON RECORD. ALL ACTS, JUDGMENTS, ORDERS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THIS APPLIES TO THE ACTS, ORDERS, JUDGMENTS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS ON RECORD, AND SUCH A COLLATERAL ATTACK IS FREE OF ALL PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS. THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, PURPOSELY, CRIMINALLY, MALICIOUSLY LISTED THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE INCORRECTLY TO UNJUSTLY DISMISS THIS CASE TO KEEP THE PARTIES FROM BEING SERVED IN ACTS OF MACHINATION TO PREVENT THE LEGAL ISSUES FROM BEING PROPERLY PRESERVED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD FOR PURPOSES OF APPEAL TO DENY THE APPELLANT THESE APPEALABLE ISSUES. THE ISSUES ARE NOT PROPERLY PRESERVED DUE TO THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION THAT OCCURRED WHICH IS WHY THE CASE WAS DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE BECAUSE THE COURT KNEW THE CLAIMS WERE SOUND AND THEY WANTED TO PREVENT SERVICE ON THE UNITED STATES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS RELATED TO THE CLINTON BILL OF 1996 AND REMOVAL OF THE STATE CASE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., CONTAINING FIDUCIARY HEIR CLAIMS IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS. WRIT OF ERROR IS FILED DUE TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR WHERE THE CONSPIRING PARTIES VIOLATED THE APPELLANT'S SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY IN LISTING THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE IN A MANNER THAT THE APPELLANT NEVER INTENDED IN THEIR EFFORTS TO KEEP THE APPELLANT FROM BEING PROPERLY AND FAIRLY HEARD AND TO ALLOW THEM TO BE SILENT ON ESSENTIAL CLAIMS PRESENTED IN THIS CASE AND CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY WERE SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE PRODUCING STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOID THEIR JURISDICTION AB INITIO. THIS, AND ALL OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES MUST BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT BEFORE ANY BRIEF BE SUBMITTED OR THE MERITS OF THE

BRIEF AS A WHOLE BE ADDRESSED OR DETERMINED WHICH WILL HAVE A DIRECT IMPACT ON HOW THE APPELLANT IS TO SUBMIT HIS BRIEF, MYLES v. DOMINOS PIZZA, LLC., 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); FIRST TECHNOLOGY CAPITAL INC. v. BANCTEC INC., 2016 WL 7444943(D.C.Ky.2016); U.S. v. HARRIS, F.Supp.2d., 2005 WL 839448(N.D.Tex.2005); UNITED STATES v. JOHNSON, 2018 WL 3626337(D.C.Tex.2018); UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.2017); ASTERBADI v. LEITESS, 176 Fed. Appx' 426 CA4 (Va.2006); MORIN v. INNTEGRITY LLC., 424 S.C. 559, 819 S.E.2d. 131(S.C.2018)(CONCEALING THE ESTOPPEL FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IS FRAUD VOIDING THAT COURT'S JURISDICTION); U.S. v. DENEDO, 556 U.S. 904, 129 S.Ct. 2213, 173 L.Ed.2d. 1235(U.S.2009); UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. GREGORY HOLT AKA ABDUL MAALIK MUHAMMAD, 2017 WL 1181509(W.D.La.2017).

BY THAT WHICH IS TO BE ARGUED IN THIS DOCUMENT. IT PRODUCES AN AUTOMATIC CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER TO PROCEED, WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED REQUIRING THE COURT TO ADDRESS THEM NOW BEFORE ANY BRIEF BE SUBMITTED WITHIN THIS CASE WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MUST ADDRESS THE MERITS OF THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES PRODUCING CITINGS OF LAW AND EVIDENTIARY FACTS AND SUPPORT AND NOT MERELY RULE AND DENY THE MOTION WITHOUT STATING WHY, WHICH WOULD VOID THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. WITHOUT JURISDICTION THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT PROCEED AT ALL TO HEAR THE BRIEF OR ADDRESS ITS MERITS IN ANY CAUSE; JURISDICTION IS THE POWER TO DECLARE LAW, AND WHEN IT CEASE TO EXIST, THE ONLY FUNCTION REMAINING TO THE COURT IS THAT OF ANNOUNCING THE FACT AND DISMISSING THE CAUSE, WHICH IN THIS CASE WOULD BE TO REMAND OR FORWARD TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1252, STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998); TAMM v. CINCINNATI INSURANCE COMPANY, 2020 WL 60932 (S.D.N.Y.2020); CHASE v. ANDEAVOR LOGISTICS L.P., 2019 WL 5847879 \* 2 W.D.Tex.; UNITED STATES v. VALLANDARES, 2019 WL 4888629 \* 1 W.D.Tex..

FEDERAL COURTS MAY NOT, VIA THE DOCTRINE OF "HYPOTHETICAL JURISDICTION" DECIDE CAUSE OF ACTION BEFORE RESOLVING WHETHER COURT HAS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION WHERE IN THIS CASE THERE ARE CLAIMS OF APPOINTED TRUSTEE, CLAIMS OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, JUDGES SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE VOIDING THEIR JURISDICTION AB INITIO, VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS RELATED TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF AUTONOMY AND OR APPEAL PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1252 AND 1251 PENDING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, ALL OF THE AFOREMENTIONED THE DISTRICT COURT WAS SILENT ON TO PREVENT THE ISSUES FROM BEING PRESERVED COMPOUNDED BY EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT REQUIRING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO REMAND THIS CASE FOR ADDITIONAL AND PROPER ADJUDICATION; DOING SO WOULD CARRY COURTS BEYOND BOUNDS OF AUTHORIZED JUDICIAL ACTION AND THUS OFFEND FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF SEPARATION OF POWERS, AND WOULD PRODUCE NOTHING MORE THAN HYPOTHETICAL JUDGMENT, WHICH WOULD COME TO THE SAME AS ADVISORY OPINION, DISAPPROVED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, UNITED STATES v. GORDON, 2019 WL 5586966 \* 1, E.D.Mich.; IN RE: GEE, 941 F3d. 153, 161+ 5TH.Cir.(La.); UNITED STATES v. CAVERGNE, 785 Fed. Appx' 212, 217+, 5TH. Cir.Tex..

INSOMUCH, LET'S LOOK AT THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT OCCURRED WITHIN THE DISTRICT COURT ESTABLISHING JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE NOT JUST TO THE FINAL ORDER ISSUED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT; BUT ALSO PRESENTING A DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER SINCE THE ORDER IN QUESTION IS THE VEHICLE AND JURISDICTIONAL PREREQUISITE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ENTERTAINING JURISDICTION OVER THESE MATTERS.

(1) WE HAVE THE FEDERAL JUDGES WITHIN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT WITH THE AID OF THE CLERKS AND OR CASE MANAGER(S) BEING INSTRUCTED BY THE JUDGES IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND MACHINATION LISTING THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES WRONG TO JUSTIFY THEM SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE(S) WHEN THEY ARE DEFENDANTS IN THE CASE TO JUSTIFY AND OR AID THEM TO AVOID SUIT; (2) THE DISMISSAL WAS DONE IN ACTS OF

FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND MACHINATION TO PREVENT SERVICE AND TO KEEP THE INTENDED JURY FROM HEARING AND THEMSELVES SILENT IN ADDRESSING THESE SUBSTANTIAL CLAIMS IN THEIR EFFORTS TO CREATE AN INCOMPLETE RECORD AND PREVENT THE CLAIMS FROM BEING PROPERLY PRESERVED TO DENY THE PLAINTIFF APPEALABLE ISSUES AND CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS ALSO IN VIOLATING THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE; (3) THERE IS A POTENTIAL APPEAL PENDING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1252 AND 1251. THIS POSES SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL AND JURISDICTIONAL INFIRMITIES AND OR CONCERNS ESTABLISHING THE AFOREMENTIONED AND THAT WHICH FOLLOWS:

(A) WHEN THE JUDGES LISTED THE NAMES OF THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY THE PLAINTIFF IMMEDIATELY BROUGHT IT TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION, OBJECTED AND MOTIONED THAT THE RECORD BE AMENDED TO REFLECT THE TRUE NAMES OF THE DEFENDANTS WHICH WAS IGNORED BY THE COURT VIOLATING THE PLAINTIFF'S DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO AMEND ONCE BEFORE SERVICE RENDERING THE PROCEEDING UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID; (B) THE JUDGES DID IT ALSO TO PREVENT SERVICE ON THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE UNITED STATES RELATED TO THE CLINTON BILL OF 1996 AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT CLAIMS RELATING TO FIDUCIARY HEIR AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE HANDS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM BEING GIVEN REVIEW AND; (C) THE CLINTON BILL DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETS AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT AND THEY MAKING USE OF THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE AS A MEANS FOR THE PLAINTIFF TO ENTER THE COURT WHEN THIS STATUTE'S CONSTITUTIONALITY IS BEING CALLED INTO QUESTION WITHIN THE FILED PROCEEDINGS PRODUCES AN ADDITIONAL JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE WOULD ALSO HAVE VOIDED THE DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR MAKING USE OF IT WHICH THE JURY WOULD HAVE CLEARLY DETERMINED HAD THEY BEEN GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY THAT WAS DENIED THEM BY THE JUDGES' FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION, SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE, CONCEALING THESE MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 AND THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE WHERE THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS WAS AT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL FROM THE CASE'S ONSET VOIDING

THE JUDGE'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER AB INITIO CORRUPTING THE FINAL ORDER WHICH IS THE SOURCE OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT INVOKING ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER TO HEAR THIS APPEAL. WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, IF JUDGE MARCHANT KNEW TO RECUSE HIS BUTT OFF OF CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-BM STILL PENDING UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT? THEY SHOULD HAVE DONE THE SAME IN CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM WHICH AID IN SUPPORTING AND SUBSTANTIATING THE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS, WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016); CANADA v. MILLER, F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 1512245 (2014)(DEMONSTRATING THAT AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING SHOULD HAVE OCCURRED IN THE DISTRICT COURT); UNITED STATES v. QUINONES,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 4413149, \* 6+ (S.D.W.Va.2016); KENWOOD GARDENS CONDOMINIUM, INC. v. WHALEN PROPERTIES, LLC., 2016 WL 6788052, \* 11+ (Md.2016); IANNELLI v. U.S., 420 U.S. 770, 95 S.Ct. 1284, 43 L.Ed.2d. 616; GREAT AMERICAN INS. CO. v. NEXTDAY NETWORK HARDWARE CORP., 73 F.Supp.3d. 636(2014); SCHOONER EXCHANGE v. McFADDEN, 7 CRANCH 116, 11 U.S. 116, 1812 WL 1310, 3 L.Ed. 287(U.S.1812); DOE v. FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6, 16 (D.D.C.2016); DOGAN v. BARAK, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6024416 (C.D.2016); HORNE v. HARBOR PORTFOLIO V.I., C.P.,--F.Supp.3d--, 2018 WL 1737520 (N.D.Ga.2018); UNITED STATES v. LANEHAM, 2017 WL 4857437 (D.C.MEXICO.2017); U.S. v. ISMAIL, 97 F3d. 50 (4th.Cir.1996); MINA v. CHESTER COUNTY, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 6550543 (2015); U.S. v. BANK OF AMERICA CORP., F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 2777397(N.C.2014); 28 U.S.C. § 2679; CAPITAL TRANS INTERN, LLC. v. INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM INV. CO., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 557236 (FLA.2013); THORTON v. MARYLAND GENERAL HOSP., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1943065 (Md.2013); BRADDY v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 1031301 (E.D.Va.2016); ADAIR ASSET MANAGEMENT, LLC. v. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, 2016 WL 3248569 (2016); HUNT v. U.S., F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 5131716 (DSC.2007); BROWN v. U.S., 2014 WL 2871398 (DSC.2014); JOHNSON STEEL STREET-RAIL CO. v. WILLIAM WHARTON JR. & CO., 152 U.S. 252, 14 S.Ct. 608, 38 L.Ed. 429 (U.S.1894).

INSOMUCH, THE JUDGES WERE SILENT ON THE MOTION TO RECUSE THEMSELVES AND THE MOTION TO AMEND THE DEFENDANTS, IF THEY DID NOT ENGAGE IN ACTS OF SPOILATION DESTROYING THE FILED MOTIONS FROM THE RECORD, IN ORDER THAT THE RECORD WOULD NOT REFLECT EXACTLY WHO THE PARTIES WERE IN THIS CASE WHOM THE PLAINTIFF WAS BRINGING SUIT AGAINST IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO PREVENT THE PLAINTIFF'S ISSUES FROM BEING PROPERLY PRESERVED FOR PURPOSES OF APPEAL, AND TO PREVENT THEY BEING REQUIRED TO RECUSE THEMSELVES AS WELL AS TO PREVENT THE U.S. CONGRESS MEMBERS AND UNITED STATES FROM BEING SERVED TO HALT AND OR PREVENT ATTACK UPON THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF AEDPA AND THE PLRA OF THE CLINTON BILL, F.S.I.A. CLAIMS AND FIDUCIARY HEIR WITH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS WHERE IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, THEY CONCEALED MATERIAL FACTS TO KEEP ANY RULING ON THESE ISSUES SILENT IN THE COURT RECORD DISMISSING THIS CASE DEMONSTRATING THAT THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS WAS AT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL ESTABLISHING CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA 2016. THIS VIOLATED THE PLAINTIFF'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS RENDERING THE FINAL ORDER VOID FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION PRODUCING A DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION. SUCH EXIST WHERE THE FINAL ORDER FROM THE LOWER COURT IS A PRECURSOR TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT EXERCISING ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER, WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AT ANY STAGE, EVEN AFTER THE FINAL ORDER WAS ISSUED AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED BY THE PLAINTIFF. IT IS WELL SETTLED THAT WILLFUL BLINDNESS AND CONSCIOUS AVOIDANCE IS THE LEGAL EQUIVALENT TO KNOWLEDGE WHERE THE JUDGES IN QUESTION VIOLATED THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, PAUL ADAMS v. CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; DONATONI v. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, --F.Supp.3d--, 2016 WL 1755871; U.S. v. HARE, 820 F3d. 93 (4th.Cir.2016); GLOBAL-TECH APPLIANCES INC. v. S.E.B., S.A., 563 U.S. 754, 131 S.Ct. 2060, 179 L.Ed.2d. 1167(U.S.2011); U.S. v. FEGUSON, 676 F3d. 260 (2nd.Cir.2011); U.S. v. TOFANAH, 765

F3d. 141 (2nd.Cir.2014); UNITED STATES v. VALBRUN, 877 F3d. 440, 105 Fed. R. EVID. SERV. 207 (1st.Cir.2017); U.S. v. JINWRIGHT, 683 F3d. 471 (4th.Cir.2012).

SILENCE WILL EQUATE WITH FRAUD WHEN THERE IS A LEGAL AND MORAL DUTY TO SPEAK. THE JUDGES WERE REQUIRED TO RULE ON THE MOTION FOR THEIR RECUSAL AND ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WERE PURPOSELY INCORRECTLY LISTED. INSTEAD THEY ACTED IN FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. KNOWING FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION SUCH AS THE RULING ON THE MOTION TO RECUSE AND TO RULE ON THE MOTION TO AMEND THE DEFENDANTS LISTED TO REFLECT WHO IS PARTY IN THIS CASE IS DONE IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND WAS NECESSARY TO PREVENT THE DISMISSAL IN THIS CASE FROM BEING MISLEADING WHICH IS FRAUD, U.S. v. KORN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2898056 (W.D.N.Y.2018); TONEY v. COM., 1998 WL 684203 (4th.Cir.1998); S.E.C. v. FARMER, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5838867 (S.D.Tex.2015).

IT WAS THE JUDGE'S FIDUCIARY DUTY TO SPEAK INSTEAD OF ENGAGING IN FRAUD UPON THE COURT SUPPRESSING TRUTH. SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH WITH INTENT TO DECEIVE, SUCH AS THEY CONSPIRING TO CONCEAL THAT THEIR ACTIONS WERE AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION AND INAPPROPRIATE IS FRAUD. FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT WITHOUT ANY MISREPRESENTATION OR DUTY TO DISCLOSE CAN CONSTITUTE FRAUD, EVEN IN ABSENCE OF FIDUCIARY, STATUTORY, OR OTHER INDEPENDENT LEGAL DUTY TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION, LIKE RULING ON THE MOTIONS SUBMITTED; COMMON LAW FRAUD INCLUDES ACTS TAKEN TO CONCEAL, CREATE FALSE IMPRESSION LIKE THE CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED, MISLEAD, OR OTHERWISE DECEIVE TO PREVENT OTHER PARTIES FROM ACQUIRING MATERIAL INFORMATION SUCH AS A PROPER AND FAIR RULING ON THE MOTION(S) TO RECUSE AND AMEND, U.S. v. MOSBERG, 866 F.Supp.2d. 275 (D.N.J.2011); U.S. v. WECHT, F.Supp.2d., 2008 WL 2223869 (W.D.Pa.2008); IN RE: DURAMAX DIESEL LITIGATION,--F.R.D.--, 2018 WL 949856 (E.D.Mich.2018); UNITED STATES v. PALIN, 874 F3d. 418 (4th.Cir.2017); UNITED STATES v. LUSK, 2017 WL 508589 (S.D.Va.2017); UNITED STATES v. CALLOWAY,

F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 4269961 (N.D.Cal.2016); MORRISON v. ACCUWEATHER, INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 3015226 (M.D.Pa.2016). COURTS HAVE INHERENT EQUITY POWER TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENTS WHENEVER THEIR ENFORCEMENT WOULD BE MANIFESTLY UNCONSCIONABLE BECAUSE OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS, MDC INNOVATIONS, LLC. v. NORTHERN,--Fed. Appx'--, 2018 WL 1129607 (4th.Cir.2018); HAMER v. NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICE OF CHICAGO, 138 S.Ct. 13, 199 L.Ed.2d. 249 (U.S.2017); PHILLIPS v. BROCK & SCOTT PLLC., 2017 WL 3226866 (D.C.Md.2017).

IN FURTHER ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF THE COURT AND JUDGES GETTING THE CLERKS AND OR CASE MANAGER(S) TO LIST THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY SO IN ACTS OF MACHINATION THE JUDGES COULD MAKE IT LOOK LIKE IT WAS CLERICAL ERROR SO IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT THEY CAN CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY WERE SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 AS WELL AS THE PLAINTIFF'S SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF AUTONOMY. IT IS WELL SETTLED IN LAW THAT THE PARTY WHO BRINGS SUIT IS MASTER TO DECIDE WHAT LAW HE WILL RELY UPON. THIS IS WHERE THE RIGHT OF AUTONOMY PRESENTS ITSELF. THIS INCLUDES HIS DECIDING THE MANNER IN HOW TO LIST EXACTLY WHO ARE THE DEFENDANTS HE INTENDS TO BRING ACTION AGAINST, THE FAIR v. KOHLER DIE & SPECIALTY CO., 228 U.S. 22, 33 S.Ct. 410(U.S.1913); CATERPILLAR INC. v. WILLIAMS, 482 U.S. 386, 107 S.Ct. 2425 (U.S.1987); LANCASTER v. KAISER FOUNDATION..., 958 F.Supp. 1137 (E.D.Va.1997); POWERS v. SOUTH CENTRAL UNITED FOODS & COMMERCIAL WORKERS..., 719 F2d. 760 (5th.Cir.1983).

A VIOLATION OF AUTONOMY IS COMPLETE WHEN THE COURT ALLOW COUNSEL TO, AND OR IN THIS CASE, THE COURT ITSELF PERMITS ITSELF TO USURP CONTROL OF AN ISSUE WITHIN THE PLAINTIFF'S SOLE PREROGATIVE, SUCH AS HOW HE INTENDS TO BRING THE ACTION AND WHO HE SEEKS TO LIST AS DEFENDANTS, WHEN PRESENT, SUCH AN ERROR IS NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS REVIEW, WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 4656231 (D.CONN.2018); UNITED STATES v. COBBLE, 2018 WL 4283063 (M.D.Ga.2014).

THE RIGHT TO DEFEND AND OR BRING SUIT IS PERSONAL, AND A DEFENDANT AND OR PLAINTIFF'S CHOICE IN EXERCISING THAT RIGHT MUST BE HONORED OUT OF THAT RESPECT FOR THE INDIVIDUAL WHICH IS THE LIFE BLOOD OF LAW, PEOPLE v. FLORES, 34 Cal. App. 5TH. 270, 246 Cal. Rptr.3d. 1, 3, Tex.App. BEAUMONT (Tex.2019); BROADNAX v. STATE, 2019 WL 1450399 (Tenn.2019); SAVICKS v. REWERTS, F.Sapp., 2018 WL 5629726 (W.D.Mich.2018). SOME OF THESE CASES CITED RELATE TO INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. BUT THE SUBSIDIARY FACTS RELATED TO AN INDIVIDUAL HAVING A PERSONAL RIGHT TO DEFEND AND OR SUE POSSESSING THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY APPLY HERE, WHETHER ITS CRIMINAL OR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS, AND SUCH RIGHTS CANNOT BE USURPED BY THE JUDGES OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT WHICH PRODUCES CLEAR VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW RENDERING THE PROCEEDING IN QUESTION UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID PRODUCING AN INSTANT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION OVER THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID FINAL ORDER THAT ESTABLISHES THIS APPEAL. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS AND MOTIONS THAT THIS CASE BE REMANDED TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT TO CORRECT THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE, BROADNAX v. STATE, 2019 WL 1450399 (Tenn.2019); DAWN v. UNITED STATES, 411 F.Sapp.3d. 90, 98 D.Mass.; McCoy v. LOUISIANA, 138 S.Ct. 1500, 200 L.Ed.2d. 821(U.S.2018); U.S. v. ALADEKCHA, 2010 WL 4054267 (D.C.Md.2010); WHITE v. MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280 (D.S.C.2014); U.S. v. LAWRENCE, F.Sapp.3d., 2015 WL 856866 (S.D.Va.2015); PENN AMERICA INS. CO. v. MAPP, 521 F3d. 290 CA4 (Va.2008).

THERE IS ANOTHER ISSUE THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED HERE. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS REQUIRED THAT THE APPELLANT FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH THIS APPEAL. THIS IS ONE OF THE KEY AND ESSENTIAL ISSUES SOUGHT TO BE ARGUED WITHIN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT THAT THE JUDGES INVOLVED CONSPIRED TO BE SILENCE AND OR TO BE SILENT ON BY DISMISSING THIS CASE. THE STATUTE'S UNCONSTITUTIONALITY IS BEING CALLED INTO QUESTION DUE TO IT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT WHERE THE EVIDENCE GATHERED BY THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATOR, LAW PROFESSOR AND AUTHOR, MICHELLE

ALEXANDER, DOCUMENTED IN HER BOOK ENTITLED, "MASS INCARCERATION DURING THE AGE OF COLOR BLINDNESS, THE NEW JIM CROW" AND THE EVIDENCE BY THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATORS WHO CONSTRUCTED THE DOCUMENTARY THAT AIRED ON PBS ENTITLED, "13" ARE INTENDED TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE JURY WITHIN THE CASE SUBJUDICE. ONCE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT REQUIRED THE APPELLANT TO FILE THESE PLRA DOCUMENTS IN THIS APPEAL? IT CREATED AN AUTOMATIC CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER AND TAINTED, CORRUPTED THIS ENTIRE APPEAL RENDERING IT UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PLAINTIFF CANNOT ILLEGALLY RULE ON THIS ISSUE DUE TO THE APPELLANT INVOKING HIS 7TH. AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL TO HAVE THEM HEAR THIS ISSUE. THUS, FOR THIS REASON ALSO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MUST REMAND THIS CASE AND LET THE JURY HEAR THE CAUSE WHICH IS THE PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT, WHERE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE U.S. CONGRESS MEMBERS IN THEIR INDIVIDUAL AND OFFICIAL CAPACITIES ARE BEING SUED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DECLARATORY RELIEF TO REMEDY THIS INJUSTICE ALONG WITH THE PUNITIVE DAMAGES SOUGHT. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT REVIEWING THIS CAUSE OF ACTION WHEN THE PLAINTIFF CLEARLY INVOKED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT UNDER THE 7TH. AMENDMENT TO HAVE THE CAUSE PLACED BEFORE A JURY WOULD ALSO VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, THE PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY IN HOW HE SEEKS TO BRING THE ISSUE BEFORE THE COURT BEING MASTER TO DECIDE WHAT LAW HE WILL RELY UPON AS WELL AS VIOLATE HIS 7TH. AMENDMENT RIGHTS VOIDING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. I MOTION THAT THIS CASE BE REMANDED, CURTIS v. LOETHER, 415 U.S. 189, 94 S.Ct. 1005, 39 L.Ed.2d. 260(U.S.1974); PENNSYLVANIA NAT. MUT. CAS. INS. CO. v. TANNER, 2013 WL 140425(DSC.2013); ORTIZ v. FIREBOARD CORP., 527 U.S. 815, 119 S.Ct. 2295, 144 L.Ed.2d. 715(U.S.1999); CITY OF MONTEREY, LTD., 526 U.S. 687, 119 S.Ct. 1624 (U.S.1999); FELTNER v. COLUMBIA PICTURES TELEVISION, INC., 523 U.S. 340, 118 S.Ct. 1279 (U.S.1988).

INASMUCH, 15 A.L.R. Fed.2d. 143 RUNS AFOUL OF THE SAFEGUARDS PLACED INTO EFFECT BY EX PARTE VIRGINIA, OF 1887. THIS LEGISLATIVE PROVISION DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETS AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT MAKING THE LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENT UNCONSTITUTIONAL WHICH MUST BE DECLARED VOID AND OR NO EFFECT FOR WHICH THE JURY MUST BE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR THIS ISSUE BY THE PLAINTIFF'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WHICH NOW ALSO ESTABLISHES CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION FOR MAKING USE OF THIS PROVISION OF LAW MAKING IT A REQUISITE TO ENTRY INTO THIS APPEAL BY THIS LEGISLATION'S SURREPTITIOUS UNCONSTITUTIONAL DESIGN AND AIM. THE LEGISLATION WAS FRAUDULENTLY USED AND OR SET IN PLACE TO THE DESTRUCTION OF FAIR LANDMARKS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. THE EVIDENCE GATHERED BY MICHELLE ALEXANDER AND THE AUTHORS OF THE DOCUMENTARY "13" MUST BE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE JURY WHICH RIGHT THE PLAINTIFF DOES NOT WAIVE OR FORFEIT. AN ACT OF CONGRESS THAT IS REPUGNANT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW, SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES, 83 U.S. (16 WALL) 36 (U.S.1873); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624 (4th.Cir.2016); EVANCHO v. PINE-RICH AND SCHOOL DISTRICT, 237 F.Supp.3d. 267, 301 (M.D.Pa.2017); TAYLOR v. U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2074, 195 L.Ed.2d. 456, 84 U.S.L.W 4462 (U.S.2016); CLAYMAN v. OBAMA, 142 F.Supp.3d. 172 (D.D.C.2015); ZIVOTOFSKY EX REL ZIVOTOFSKY v. KERRY, 135 S.Ct. 2076, 192 L.Ed.2d. 83, 83 U.S.L.W. 4391 (U.S.2015); EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339 (U.S.1880).

IT IS PERSPICUOUS FROM THE PLEADING WHICH OCCURRED UNDER 1997 WL 10291 U.S. (APPELLATE BRIEF) BRIEF OF U.S. SENATORS ORIN G. HATCH, STROM THURMOND ET. AL., THAT CONGRESS CAN INDEED BE SUED FOR ISSUES OF CONCERN SUCH AS THIS. SO WHAT THE HECK ARE THESE COMPROMISED JUDGES DOING DISMISSING THIS CASE, SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE, WHICH FURTHER SERVE TO SUBSTANTIATE THE CLAIMS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, WHICH VOIDS THE DISTRICT COURT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION? THIS WAS ALSO ARGUED UNDER

CASE 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM WHERE THESE CASES ORIGINATE FROM VIA THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD WHICH ALSO SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN DISMISSED ESTABLISHING CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND COMMON DESIGN OF THE PARTIES ACTING IN CONCERT IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS COMING UNDER ATTACK HERE TRANSGRESS THE LIMITS OF CONGRESS WHERE BY THEIR ACTION THEY'VE ESTABLISHED A MODERN DAY RACIAL CASTE SYSTEM AND NEW FORM OF JIM CROW LAWS SETTING IN PLACE A FORM OF MODERN DAY SLAVERY VIOLATING THE 13TH., THE C.A.T. TREATY AND 15TH. AMENDMENTS, ALSO WHERE THE STATES TAKE AWAY THE RIGHT TO VOTE, CIRCUMVENTING AND OR DIMINISHING AND OR NEGATING AND OR WATERING DOWN, SURREPTITIOUSLY, CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS SET IN PLACE BY EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339 (U.S.1880); THE AMISTAD, 40 U.S. 518, 15 PET. 518, 1841 WL 5024, 2006 A.M.C. 2955, 10 L.Ed. 826 (U.S.Conn.1841) AND THE 14TH. AMENDMENT. NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE LAWS THAT ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES...., CROSON, 488 U.S. AT. 490. CONGRESS LACKS THE POWER UNDER SECTION 5 TO ADOPT LEGISLATION THAT IS OTHERWISE "PROHIBITED" BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, McCULLOCH, 17 U.S. AT.423. CONGRESS MAY NOT LEGISLATE UNDER SECTION 5 IN A WAY THAT VIOLATES RIGHTS PROTECTED BY THE 14TH. AMENDMENT ITSELF. SECTION 5 GRANTS CONGRESS NO POWER TO RESTRICT, ABROGATE OR DILUTE THE GUARANTEES SET IN PLACE BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION WHICH IS DESIGNED TO PROTECT THEM FROM LEGISLATION, LAWS OR ACTS THAT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGET THEM TO THEIR DETRIMENT, WHETHER IT WAS INTENTIONAL OR UNINTENTIONAL, WHETHER IT IS OVERT DETRIMENTAL ACTION OR SURREPTITIOUS DETRIMENTAL ACTION. CHALLENGE IS MADE WHERE THIS LEGISLATION DIRECTLY EFFECTS THE PLAINTIFF GIVING THE PLAINTIFF STANDING TO BRING SUIT. THIS CASE MUST BE REMANDED TO HAVE THE JURY ADDRESS THESE MATTERS BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CAN USE THE PLRA AS A MEANS OF ENTRY INTO THIS COURT. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S USE OF IT, ALSO DUE TO THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DONE WITHIN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT TO BE SILENT, THWART JUDICIAL REVIEW, AND TO SILENCE THESE ISSUES IN THE COURT RECORD TO PREVENT OR HINDER ANY

PROPER SUBSEQUENT FUTURE APPEAL, DIRECTLY IMPACTS THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT HAS USED THE FINAL ORDER PRODUCED BY OVERWHELMING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AS A MEANS TO HEAR AND DECLARE LAW RELATED TO THIS APPEAL, CITY OF ROME v. U.S., 446 U.S. 156 (1980); S.C. v. KATZENBACH, 383 U.S. 301 (U.S.1966); PLAUT v. SPENDTHRIFT FARMS INC., 115 S.Ct. 1447 (U.S.1995); MISSISSIPPI UNIV. FOR WOMEN v. HOGAN, 458 U.S. 718, 732 (U.S.1982); ADARAND CONSTRUCTORS INC. v. PENA, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (U.S.1995); NORTH CAROLINA STATE CONFERENCE OF N.A.A.C.P. v. McCRRORY, 831 F3d. 204 (4th.Cir.2016); JOHNSON v. McGRANDY, 512 U.S. 997, 1018, 114 S.Ct. 2647, 129 L.Ed.2d. 775 (U.S.1994); VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS v. METROPOLITAN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORP., 429 U.S. 252, 97 S.Ct. 555, 50 L.Ed.2d. 450 (U.S.1977); WASHINGTON v. DAVIS, 426 U.S. 229, 241, 96 S.Ct. 2040, 48 L.Ed.2d. 597 (U.S.1976); HUNT v. CROMARTIE, 526 U.S. 541, 119 S.Ct. 1545, 143 L.Ed.2d. 731 (U.S.1999); MILLER v. JOHNSON, 515 U.S. 900, 920, 115 S.Ct. 2475, 132 L.Ed.2d. 762 (U.S.1995); ANDERSON v. CELEBREEZE, 460 U.S. 700, 792-93, 103 S.Ct. 1564, 75 L.Ed.2d. 547 (U.S.1983); CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS 1st., 2nd., 4th., 5th., 6th., 8th., 13th., 14th., AND 15th.; COOPER v. HARRIS, 137 S.Ct. 1455, 197 L.Ed.2d. 837, 85 U.S.L.W. 4257 (U.S.2017); BANK OF AMERICA CORP. v. CITY OF MIAMI FLA., 137 S.Ct. 1296, 197 L.Ed.2d. 678, 85 U.S.L.W. 4227 (U.S.2017); COOK COUNTY v. BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, 2018 WL 1561725(2018).

THERE IS YET ANOTHER MATTER THAT PRESENTS A DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER. THIS CASE WAS NEVER INTENDED BY THE APPELLANT TO BE FILED BEFORE THIS COURT. IT WAS SENT TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BY THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO CONCEAL ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS AND IN ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, WHICH PRESENTS AN ADDITIONAL INFRINGEMENT UPON THE PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY PRODUCING STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS ERROR REVIEW.

THE APPELLANT SOUGHT TO FILE THIS APPEAL BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1251(a) AND 1252 WHERE THE APPELLANT IS AT PRESENT WAITING FOR THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S DECISION TO HEAR THIS CASE. SEE EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1252 APPEAL" HEREWITH ATTACHED. THE SUPREME COURT, GOOD LORD WILLING, IS IN THE PROCESS OF DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT, DUE TO THE PROCEEDINGS EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 BASED UPON THE (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATION DEFAULTING IN THAT CASE, BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE THAT IS JURISDICTION IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, SUPPORTED BY THE 4th. CIRCUIT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415(4th.Cir.2018) AND FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) TIMELY ASSERTED BEING APPLICABLE TO STATE PROCESSING RULES VIA THE 5th. AND 14th. AMENDMENTS DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE 14TH. AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, A STATE CASE THAT WAS REMOVED TO THIS CASE SUBJUDICE BEFORE THE COURT IN FRAUD CONSPIRED IN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. IS THE PLAINTIFF TO BE DEEMED THE EMBODIMENT OF A FOREIGN STATE AS ARGUED VIA THE DEFAULT BASED UPON THOSE TIMELY ASSERTED PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AS WELL AS BY STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW AND THE LAW OF CONTRACTS PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION? THIS WOULD ALLOW THE APPELLANT TO INVOKE THAT COURT'S EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1251(a) AND 1252. THUS, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WOULD BE WITHOUT JURISDICTION UNTIL THE U.S. SUPREME COURT RULES, MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH INC. v. MANNING, 136 S.Ct. 1562, 194 L.Ed.2d. 671 (U.S.2016); CALIFORNIA v. ARIZONA, 440 U.S. 59, 99 S.Ct. 919, 59 L.Ed.2d. 144 (U.S.1979); KANSAS v. NEBRASKA, 574 U.S. 445, 135 S.Ct. 1042, 191 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.2015). THERE ARE ALSO POTENTIALLY DECEDENT DOMICILE ISSUES THAT ATTACH DUE TO REPARATIONS AND FIDUCIARY CLAIMS THAT WOULD WARRANT SUCH A REVIEW, STATE OF TEXAS v. STATE OF FLORIDA, 306 U.S. 398, 59 S.Ct. 563, 83 L.Ed. 817 (U.S.1939); RILEY v. NEW YORK TRUST CO., 315 U.S. 343, 62 S.Ct. 608, 86 L.Ed. 885 (U.S.1942); HANSON v. DENCKLA, 357 U.S. 235, 78 S.Ct. 1228, 2 L.Ed.2d. 1283 (U.S.1958) (ALSO DEALING WITH TRUSTEE AND FIDUCIARY HEIR CLAIMS).

ALSO PURSUANT TO 1952 CONGRESS MANDATE DIRECT REVIEW NOT SIMPLY FOR DECISIONS WITH IMPACT BUT RATHER ALSO FOR DECISIONS WHOSE IMPACT WAS PREDICATED UPON A POTENTIALLY INCORRECT EXERCISE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW WHICH OCCURRED BY THE LOWER COURTS INVOLVED. THE ORDER PRODUCED IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT VIA CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM, THE CASE AS A WHOLE, WAS A PART OF THE JUDICIAL PROCEEDING WITHIN THE 5TH. CIRCUIT BY THE LITIGATION SUBMITTED BEFORE THE COURTS WHERE THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT STATUTE HAS BEEN DECLARED UNCONSTITUTIONAL BY THE DETERMINATION UNDER CASE 19-1001 ET. AL., AND THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT, WHICH PERMITS THE APPELLANT TO SEEK LEAVE TO INVOKE 28 U.S.C. § 1252. A PARTY HAS A STATUTORY RIGHT TO DIRECT REVIEW IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT OF A DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT HOLDING A FEDERAL STATUTE UNCONSTITUTIONAL WHEN THE FEDERAL STATUTORY UNCONSTITUTIONALITY IS AT ISSUE. THIS IS COUPLED BY THE FACT THAT THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF 51 A.L.R. Fed.2d. 143 IS CALLED INTO QUESTION.

NATURAL SENSE OF THE STATUTE PERMITTING DIRECT REVIEW BY SUPREME COURT FROM JUDGMENT, DECREE OR ORDER OF A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT HOLDING AN ACT OF CONGRESS UNCONSTITUTIONAL IS THAT HOLDING OF STATUTORY CONSTITUTIONALITY. SINCE CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM WAS A PART OF THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE UNDER CASE 19-1001 IN THE 5th. CIRCUIT WHERE RULING OF UNCONSTITUTIONALITY RELATED TO ACA MATTERS, WHICH ARE INTRINSICALLY A PART OF THE ISSUES FILED IN CASE(S) 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM; 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM AND 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-BM, COUPLED BY THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT'S RULING IN THESE MULTI-DISTRICT SOUGHT AND OR PARALLEL CASES SEEKING § 1407 TRANSFER. THE APPELLANT IS PERMITTED TO SEEK REVIEW UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1252, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER THE FORT BEND TEXAS CASE THAT ESTABLISH THE DEFAULT VIA TIMELY EXERCISE OF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON BEING JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED IS MANDATORY. THE CASE IS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES