

23A781

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

JAN 18 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE
#300839 KCI HD-134
4848 GOLD MINE HWY.
KERSHAW, S.C. 29067

IN RE: SEEKING APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES, TO JUSTICE ROBERTS PURSUANT TO RULE 22, AS IT PERTAINS TO CASE 22-7096 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.

TO: CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS,

FOR THE RECORD. APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES CLERK. PLEASE DO NOT CONSTRUE THIS APPLICATION AS THAT WHICH RELATES TO MATTERS PLACE WITHIN ANY PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED PETITION THAT WAS DENIED. THESE ARE RELATIVELY NEW MATTERS THAT DID NOT EXIST AT THE TIME ANY ALLEGED PRIOR PETITION WAS FILED BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT. PLEASE FORWARD THIS APPLICATION TO CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS. I AM ASSUMING THAT HE IS STILL THE JUSTICE OVER THE 4TH. CIRCUIT.

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS SIR, HOW ARE YOU? WELL I HOPE? SIR PLEASE LOOK AT THIS ATTACHED DOCUMENT RELATED TO CASE 22-7096 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. I AM RESPECTFULLY ASKING THAT YOU PLEASE EXCUSE, AND THE REQUIREMENT BE WAIVED THAT I ATTACH A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT PANEL AS ALWAYS WITH THE STATE PARTIES INVOLVED. WE HAVE THESE STATE ACTORS CONTINUALLY CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE TO KEEP THE LAW LIBRARY AT THE INSTITUTION CLOSED, ALLOWING INMATES ACCESS ONLY TWO DAYS A MONTH AND DENY LEGAL COPIES. I AM CONCERNED AND DON'T WANT TO SEND MY ONLY COPY

1-of-3

RECEIVED

JAN 25 2024

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S RECENT RULING AND IF TIME COMES FOR ME TO FILE PETITION BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT. I NOT HAVE IT FOR THAT PURPOSE. I AM ASKING THAT YOU PLEASE WAIVE THIS REQUIREMENT SIR IF SUCH EXIST.

CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS SIR, SINCE WHEN IN ALL HIGH HEAVEN DO A COURT OF APPEAL ASSERT THAT IT DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION, EVEN IN ITS LIMITED CAPACITY OVER A REMAND ORDER THAT IT HAS ISSUED FROM ITS OWN COURT? IT IS THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S OWN REMAND ORDER CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS. CASE LAW CLEARLY STATES THAT ALL APPELLATE COURTS AROUND THIS NATION RETAIN PARTIAL AND OR LIMITED JURISDICTION OVER ANY REMAND ORDER THAT IS ISSUED FROM ITS COURTS. SO WHAT IN THE WORLD IS THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DOING IN CLEAR ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE DOING ASSERTING THAT THEY DO NOT HAVE JURISDICTION TO ADDRESS VIOLATIONS OF THE MANDATE RULE BASED UPON A REMAND ORDER THAT THEY ISSUED FROM THEIR VERY OWN COURT?

HOW LONG CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS? HOW LONG SIR WILL YOU ALLOW THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES TO ENGAGE IN THESE EGREGIOUS INJUSTICES VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, IN HOW THEY TREAT THE APPLICANT'S DUE PROCESS MATTERS AS THEY APPEAR BEFORE THAT COURT? SIR, I HAVE A CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO PROCEEDING NOT SUBJECT TO UNLAWFUL BIAS AND PREJUDICE TO SEEK AND SEEK THAT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT RULE ON WHETHER THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT VIOLATED THE MANDATE RULE BASED UPON THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S MAY 1, 2023 DETERMINATION TO ENSURE THAT THE ISSUE IS PROPERLY PRESERVED IN CASE I HAVE TO BRING IT BEFORE THIS COURT. PLEASE INTERVENE CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS AND INSTRUCT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO STOP THE INJUSTICE, INVOKE THEIR LIMITED JURISDICTION TO ENTERTAIN THIS ISSUE, WHICH THEY DO INDISPUTABLY HAVE, TO ALLOW ME TO PROPERLY PRESERVE THIS ISSUE FOR POTENTIALLY ANY NEEDED FURTHER APPELLATE REVIEW.

IF YOU CHOOSE NOT TO ASSIST ME IN THIS MATTER SIR, WHICH I PRAY THAT YOU DO INTERVENE. I RESPECTFULLY RESERVE THE RIGHT TO

SUBMIT THIS APPLICATION BEFORE ANOTHER JUSTICE OF MY CHOOSING FOR THE SAKE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". BE BLESSED, HAVE A PROSPEROUS NEW YEAR, AND I THANK YOU IN ADVANCE SIR.

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jonah The Tishbite". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name.

JANUARY 16, 2024

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

DOCKET NO. 22-7096

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE,

APPELLANT

AND

RON SANTA McCRAY,

INTERVENOR

Vs.

WARDEN AT LIEBER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

DEFENDANT

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 AN EXTENSION OF TIME AND OR RESET SEEKING TO STAY AND OR RECALL

1-of-9

LEGAL

CRAWFORD-300839

THE MANDATE IF NEEDED; MOTION TO OBJECT TO RULING OF PANEL;
MOTION FOR REHEARING EN BANC; MOTION FOR § 1407 TRANSFER DUE TO
FRAUD UPON THE COURT, ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND
ALL INVOLVED PARTIES, BY U.S. MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, BY
DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON JANUARY 13, 2024.
THIS TYPED VERSION OF THE PREVIOUS HAND WRITTEN (18) PAGE
DOCUMENT DATED DATED JANUARY 13, 2024 IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX
ON JANUARY 17, 2024. 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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jonah The Tishbite". The signature is highly stylized and cursive, with a large circular flourish at the end.

JANUARY 17, 2024

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

DOCKET NO. 22-7096

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE,

APPELLANT

AND

RON SANTA McCRAY,

INTERVENOR

Vs.

WARDEN AT LIEBER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

DEFENDANT

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME AND OR RESET SEEKING TO STAY AND OR
RECALL THE MANDATE IF NEEDED; MOTION TO OBJECT TO RULING OF PANEL
; MOTION FOR REHEARIN EN BANC; MOTION FOR § 1407 TRANSFER
DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

THIS IS THE TYPED VERSION OF THE 18 PAGE HAND WRITTEN DOCUMENT
DATED JANUARY 13, 2024

TO: THE FOURTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

HERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF EXHIBIT, "MANDATE RULE VIOLATION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE PLEADING DOCUMENT NUMBER 24 FILED MAY 25, 2023 FILED WITH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.

THE APPELLANT OBJECTS AND MOTIONS FOR REHEARING EN BANC DUE TO DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT REQUIRED THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT TO MAKE A RULING PURSUANT TO RULE 4(a)(6) BY THE MANDATE RULE. THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT ON MAY 1, 2023 VIOLATED THAT MANDATE RULE VOIDING ITS JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG AND OR ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, CORRUPTING ANYTHING THAT COULD HAVE COME FROM THAT COURT SUBSEQUENTLY AND IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S FRAUD VIA ENTRY NUMBER 105. THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT FAILED TO EVEN SERVE COPY OF THAT RESPONSE ON CRAWFORD AS DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRED WHERE CRAWFORD HAD TO FIND OUT ABOUT ENTRY NUMBER 105 THROUGH RON SANTA MCCRAY WHO WAS SERVED A COPY OF THE PLEADING AT ANOTHER INSTITUTION IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW ALSO VOIDING THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, CROSS-SOUND FERRY SERVS., INC. v. I.C.C., 834 F.3d. 327, 339(C.A.D.C.1991); CITY OF OCALA, FLORIDA v. ROJAS, 598--U.S.--, 2023 WL 2357328 (U.S.2023); WILKINS V. UNITED STATES, --S.Ct.--, 2023 WL 2655449 (U.S.2023)(REGARDING PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599(U.S.2016); STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1988). FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING THAT IT ENTERS, INCLUDING ANY SUBSEQUENT RULING BEYOND ENTRY

NUMBER 105 IN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT RECORD, MYLES v. DOMINOS PIZZA, LLC., 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.2017); WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C., LLC., 859 F.3d. 295(4th.Cir.2017).

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ABUSED ITS DISCRETION ACCEPTING ANYTHING ELSE OUT OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT ONCE THAT COURT CLEARLY VIOLATED AND EXPANDED THE REMAND ORDER WHICH WAS NEVER ADDRESSED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT PANEL IMPLICATING FRAUD AND A VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE REQUIRING REHEARING EN BANC WHERE EVEN FAILURE TO REVIEW WOULD NOT GIVE ANY RIGHT OF RES JUDICATA OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL VIA THE FRAUD, MARBURY v. MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F.3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016); VAETH v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 775306(D.C.Md.2016). I OBJECT.

ONCE THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT VIOLATED THE TERMS OF THE REMAND ORDER BY ITS ENTRY FILED MAY 1, 2023 THAT COURT MUST BE DEEMED IN FORFEITURE AND OR WAIVER REQUIRING ALSO SANCTIONS BY THE PETITIONER'S RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS PROTECTED BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. THE RIGHT TO INTERVENE BY THE FRAUD AND VIOLATION OF THE MANDATE RULE MUST BE ESTABLISHED. THERE IS NOTHING IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT'S RULING, DOCUMENT NUMBER 105, THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT ANY DETERMINATION PURSUANT TO FED. R. App. 4(a)(6) WAS COMPLIED WITH ONCE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT REMANDED THE CASE PRIOR TO THE FILING OF DOCUMENT NUMBER 105 THAT 4TH. CIRCUIT REMAND OCCURRING ON APRIL 24, 2023. FORFEITURE AND WAIVER ARE ESTABLISHED BY THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT VIOLATING THE TERMS OF THE REMAND ORDER, WELLNESS INTERN, 135 S.Ct. 1932; IN RE: MILLENIUM LAB HOLDINGS II LLC., 575 B.R. 252 (D.Del.2017); IN RE: IMERYS TALC AMERICA INC., --F.4TH.--, 2022 WL 2350264(3rd.Cir.2022); MORGAN v. SUNDANCE INC., 142 S.Ct. 1708 (U.S.2022); HAMER v. NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF CHICAGO, 138 S.Ct. 13 (U.S.2017); UNITED STATES v. CAMERO-CASTANEDA, 2021 WL 3979406(E.D.N.C.2021).

UNDER THE MANDATE RULE, THE DISTRICT COURT, ON REMAND FROM

AN APPELLATE COURT, MUST IMPLEMENT BOTH THE LETTER AND SPIRIT OF THE MANDATE, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE APPELLATE COURT'S RULING, AND NO SUCH TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE APPELLATE COURT'S RULING OCCURRED ON MAY 1, 2023 BY THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S DETERMINATION, GEORGE v. BARCROFT, 2022 WL 42473, * 1 9th. Cir.(Or.).

UNDER THE "RULE OF MANDATE", WHICH IS SIMILAR TO BUT BROADER THAN, THE LAW OF CASE DOCTRINE, A DISTRICT COURT THAT HAS RECEIVED THE MANDATE OF AN APPELLATE COURT CANNOT VARY OR EXAMINE THE MANDATE FOR ANY PURPOSE OTHER THAN EXECUTING IT WHICH THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT BLATANTLY DISREGARDED TO THE PREJUDICE OF THE APPELLANT ALSO DISREGARDING THE AUTHORITY OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MANDATE, WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT RETAINS PARTIAL JURISDICTION OVER THE MANDATE ORDER NO MATTER WHAT, BY THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S MAY 1, 2023 DETERMINATION IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT FURTHERING OUR JUSTIFICATION FOR SEEKING § 1407 TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY ALSO DUE TO THESE MATTERS EXISTING BEFORE PRESENTLY 3 DISTRICT COURTS, OHIO, KENTUCKY AND SOUTH CAROLINA AT PRESENT. THE ACTIONS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT IMPLICATE JUSTIFIED CLAIMS OF RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED AS IS ARGUED WITHIN THE PLEADINGS PRODUCING A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT HAS INDEED RISEN TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL ESTABLISHING STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION AB INITIO, WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899 (U.S.2016); BURRELL v. U.S., 467 F.3d. 160 (2nd.Cir.2006); IN RE: TERRORISM ATTACK ON SEPT. 11, 2001, 2021 WL 1164087 (S.D.N.Y.2021); YIEN-KOO KNIG v. WANG, F.Supp., 2017 WL 2656451 (S.D.N.Y.2017).

FURTHER, IF THERE WAS OR IS ANY ADDITIONAL RULING THAT CAME FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT OTHER THAN THAT WHICH OCCURRED ON MAY 1, 2023 WHICH THAT COURT FAILED TO SERVE CRAWFORD COPY AND NOTICE OF THAT DECISION? THIS TOO, VIOLATES DUE PROCESS LAW. LIKE THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT NEVER SERVED CRAWFORD ITS DECISION DENYING THE MOTION TO INTERVENE. THAT COURT NEVER NOTIFIED OR SERVED CRAWFORD ITS MAY 1, 2023 RULING OR ANY OTHER

RULING OCCURRING SUBSEQUENT TO THE MAY 1, 2023 RULING WHICH DEFINITELY WAS NOT IN COMPLIANCE TO THE MANDATE RULE. A FUNDAMENTAL COMPONENT OF DUE PROCESS IS THAT LAWS WHICH REGULATE PERSONS OR ENTITIES MUST GIVE FAIR NOTICE OF CONDUCT THAT IS FORBIDDEN OR REQUIRED. THERE WAS NO RULE 4(a)(6) DETERMINATION MADE IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT MAY 1, 2023 RULING. NOR WAS IT, THE DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO INTERVENE OR ANY SUPPOSED RULING SUBSEQUENT TO MAY 1, 2023 SERVED ON THE APPELLANT, VOIDING THEIR JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND FRAUD WHERE THE DISTRICT COURT PLACED SUCH ALLEGED SERVICE ON THE DOCUMENT BUT IN FRAUD GAVE A FALSE IMPRESSION COPY WAS MAILED TO CRAWFORD WHEN IT WAS NOT. WE NOW HAVE 3 SEPARATE INDEPENDENT INCIDENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS CLAIM. THE NOTICE OF DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO INTERVENE, THE MAY 1, 2023 RULING, AND ACCORDING TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SOME OTHER ALLEGED RULING OCCURRING NOW? NONE OF THESE RULINGS WERE SERVED DIRECTLY ON THE APPELLANT AS DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRES. NOR CAN IT BE PROVEN THE APPELLANT ACTUALLY RECEIVED THEM WHICH THE APPELLANT EMPHATICALLY DENIES, WHICH THE INSTITUTION MAILING RECORDS WOULD PROVE, WHICH THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT CLEARLY ACKNOWLEDGED UPON BRINGING IT TO THEIR ATTENTION OR THEY WOULD HAVE CHALLENGED IT ON THE RECORD THEN AND WOULD HAVE NEVER SENT THE APPEAL UP TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IN THE FIRST PLACE. NONE OF THIS WAS ADDRESSED IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S MAY 1, 2023 RULING THAT IS VOID DUE TO IT VIOLATING THE MANDATE RULE, PRODUCING FORFEITURE AND WAIVER AND ESTABLISH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S LIMITED JURISDICTION TO HEAR VIOLATIONS OF A REMAND ORDER THAT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ITSELF ISSUED. TO STATE THE CONTRARY IS LUDICROUS WITH ALL DUE RESPECT TO THE COURT, U.S. CONST. AMEND 5; EDGAR v. HAINES, 2 F.4TH. 298 (4th.Cir.2021); F.C.C. v. FOX TELEVISION STATIONS, INC., 567 U.S. 239, 253, 132 S.Ct. 2307, 183 L.Ed.2d. 234(2012); MANNING v. CALDWELL, 930 F.3d. 264, 272 (4th.Cir.2019).

NOTICE OF TIME TO RESPOND MUST BE ACTUALLY SERVED ON A PARTY FOR IT TO BE LEGALLY BINDING. NO SUCH SERVICE OCCURRED NO MATTER WHAT THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT IN THEIR FRAUD AND

OBSTRUCTION ASSERT. RULE GOVERNING RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT ON THE BASIS THAT THE JUDGMENT IS VOID APPLIES IN INSTANCES WHERE THE JUDGMENT IS PREMISED EITHER ON A CERTAIN TYPE OF JURISDICTIONAL ERROR OR A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS THAT DEPRIVES A PERSON OF NOTICE OR AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD WHICH BOTH HAVE OCCURRED IN THIS CASE BY THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S ACTIONS, UNITED STUDENT AID FUNDS, INC. v. ESPINOSA, 559 U.S. 260, 130 S.Ct. 1367, 176 L.Ed.2d. 158(U.S.2010); IN RE: BOZEMAN, 57 F.4TH. 895 (11th.Cir.2023); IN RE: MATTER OF NOVOA, 690 Fed. Appx' 223 (5th.Cir.2017).

A PROSPECTIVE PARTY CANNOT BE FAIRLY REQUIRED TO ANSWER OR RESPOND TO A DUE PROCESS RIGHT BY WAY OF TIMELINES IF NOTICE OF SUCH TIMELINES WERE NOT YET SERVED UPON HIM WHICH OCCURRED IN THIS CASE. ESSENCE OF DUE PROCESS IS REQUIREMENT THAT PERSON IN JEOPARDY OF SERIOUS LOSS OF A RIGHT TO BE GIVEN NOTICE OF CASE AND TIMELINES AGAINST HIM WHICH NO SUCH NOTICE TO THE APPELLANT OCCURRED, AND THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT VIOLATED THE MANDATE RULE CORRUPTING ANYTHING ELSE THAT COULD HAVE POSSIBLY CAME FROM THAT COURT, PLACING THAT COURT IN FORFEITURE AND OR WAIVER ESTABLISHING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO RULE 4(a)(6), ESPECIALLY SINCE ITS A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF LAW THAT THE APPEALS COURTS AROUND THE NATION MAINTAIN PARTIAL AND OR LIMITED JURISDICTION OVER THEIR REMAND ORDERS TO ENSURE THEIR FULL COMPLIANCE, WHICH IN THIS CASE, NO SUCH FULL COMPLIANCE OCCURRED WITHIN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS, MOTIONS TO STAY AND OR RECALL THE MANDATE IF NECESSARY, MOTION FOR A REHEARING EN BANC, AND THIS SHALL BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE MULTI DISTRICT LITIGATION PANEL DUE TO RECENT FILINGS RELATED TO THAT COURT SEEKING § 1407 TRANSFER OF ALL THESE MATTERS WHERE CASE 1:22-cv-01204-TLW-SVH IS SOUGHT AS A TAG ALONG CASE PURSUANT TO § 1407, NELSON v. ADAMS U.S.A., INC., 529 U.S. 460, 120 S.Ct. 1579, 147 L.Ed.2d. 530(U.S.2000); POTOMAC INSULATION & DRYWALL, LLC. v. CAPITOL MACHINE INTERNATIONAL, LLC., 2018 WL 11318743(N.D.Fla.2018)(NO WAIVER OCCURRED BY MY RIGHT TO SEEK APPEAL WHERE THERE IS SUFFICIENT SERVICE OR NOTICE OF CONSEQUENCES.); ELDRIDGE v. MATTHEWS, 424 U.S. 319, 96 S.Ct. 893,

47 L.Ed.2d. 18(U.S.1976); M.H. v. JEPPESON, 2023 WL 4080542 (D.IDAHO.2023); EATON v. TOWN OF TOWNSEND, 2023 WL 3319786, * 8 1st.Cir.(Mass.); FREIN v. PENNSYLVANIA STATE POLICE, 47 F.4TH. 247, 257+ 3rd.Cir.(Pa.). 4TH. CIRCUIT JURISDICTION IS ESTABLISHED BY VIOLATION OF THE MANDATE RULE. ALL APPELLATE COURTS RETAIN LIMITED JURISDICTION OVER THEIR REMAND ORDERS AND CAN ADDRESS VIOLATIONS OF THE MANDATE RULE WITHIN THEIR LIMITED JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO THE VERY REMAND ORDER THAT THE COURT OF APPEALS ISSUED.

INSOMUCH, THE PETITIONER RECEIVED THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S DECISION ON JANUARY 10, 2024. THUS, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME AND RESET ON THE TIME TO RESPOND TO GIVE ME (14) DAYS TO SEEK REHEARING EN BANC UNTIL JANUARY 24, 2024. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ISSUED A REMAND ORDER ON APRIL 24, 2023. THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT VIOLATED THE MANDATE RULE ON MAY 1, 2023 BY ITS ENTRY NUMBER 105. THE APPELLANT TIMELY CHALLENGED THAT VIOLATION OF THE MANDATE RULE BY DOCUMENT NUMBER 24 IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT RECORD. THIS GIVES THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JURISDICTION AND NO FURTHER INQUIRY NEED TO BE MADE TO ADDRESS VIOLATION OF THE MANDATE RULE EVEN IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S LIMITED JURISDICTION. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ISSUED THE REMAND. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT HAS LIMITED JURISDICTION TO ADDRESS VIOLATIONS OF ITS REMAND ORDER OR IT PRODUCES FRAUD UPON THE COURT. SEE DOCUMENT NUMBER 24 IN THE COURT OF APPEALS RECORD.

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonah The Tishbite', with a stylized flourish at the end.

JANUARY 13, 2024.