

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE
#300839 F5B. RM. 187
LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.
BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010

RECEIVED

NOV 28 2022

SC Court of Appeals

IN RE: CASE 2021-000354

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,

A COPY OF THE ATTACHED DOCUMENTS WERE RECENTLY SENT TO YOU FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECALLING THE REMITTITUR IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED CASE. IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION THEY ARE BEING SENT THIS SECOND TIME. PLEASE FILE THEM ACCORDINGLY FOR ADJUDICATION.

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

NOVEMBER 16, 2022

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

NOV 28 2022

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-000354

SC Court of Appeals

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

APPELLANT

Vs.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,


RESPONDENT

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 TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR ON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211 AND THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS VIA ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTERS 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221, BY U.S. MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX

ON NOVEMBER 1, 2022.

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 top right and several long, sweeping lines extending downwards and to the left.

NOVEMBER 1, 2022

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

NOV 28 2022

SC Court of Appeals

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-000354

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

APPELLANT

Vs.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,

RESPONDENT

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE;
MOTION TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR
AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASE 2021-000354 AND 2021ALJ040033AP FROM THE
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT.

TO; THE S.C. COURT OF APPEAL ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "CASE 22-5805 INITIAL NOTICE". THIS IS A COPY OF THE INITIAL SERVICE OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PLEADING THAT MAKE UP CASE 22-5805. NOTE THAT BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS LETTER ISSUED IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OBSTRUCTION DATED OCTOBER 13, 2022, FURTHER DEMONSTRATING THAT WE CANNOT GET JUST AND FAIR REVIEW WITHIN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA WARRANTING 1407 TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY WHERE THIS CASE IS SOUGHT AS A TAG ALONG CASE. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS CLEARLY, FRAUDULENTLY CLAIM THAT THEIR RECORDS DO NOT REFLECT AN APPEAL PENDING IN EITHER OF THE NAMES ON THE DOCUMENT.

(2) EXHIBIT, "CASE 22-5805 SECOND NOTICE". THIS IS A COPY OF THE NOTICE FORM AND DOCUMENT PROVING THAT THE CRAWFORD APPEAL HAS NOT ENDING WHICH IS THE FALSE JUSTIFICATION FOR THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS SENDING THE REMITTITUR DOWN TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT.

(3) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD REMITTITUR SEND # 1". THESE ARE SUBSEQUENT DOCUMENTS SENT TO THE APPELLANT BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. TAKE NOTICE THAT AFTER THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IN FRAUD UPON THE COURT ISSUED THE OCTOBER 13, 2022 LETTER FRAUDULENTLY STATING, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, THAT THERE WAS NO CASE PENDING BEFORE THEM IN THE APPELLANT'S NAME. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS THEN COME BACK BY THEIR OCTOBER 21, 2022 DATED LETTER AND THEN STATE AND ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THERE IS INDEED A CASE THAT EXIST BEFORE THEM IN THE APPELLANT'S CRAWFORD NAME (CASE 2021-000354) AND THAT DUE TO THE APPEAL BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BEING OVER AND OR DISMISSED, THE REMITTITUR IS NOW BEING SENT BACK DOWN TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT.

(4) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD REMITTITUR SEND # 2". THESE ARE COPIES OF VARIOUS PLEADINGS FILED BY THE APPELLATE CRAWFORD BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND OTHER FEDERAL COURTS INVOLVED, AS WELL AS LEGAL DOCUMENTS FILED BY McQUILLA, WILSON AND PARKER

RELATED TO CASE 21-8066.


INSOMUCH, THE APPELLANT OBJECTS AND MOTIONS TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR IN CASE 2021-000354 DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DECIDED NOT TO SEND THE REMITTITUR IN CASE 2021-000354 DOWN TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT, DUE TO THE APPELLANT HAVING A PENDING CASE BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT REGARDING THESE MATTERS. IF THIS IS THE CASE, WHICH OBVIOUSLY BY THE RECORD AND DOCUMENTS PRESENTED IT IS, WHERE THE CASE SAT BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS SINCE MARCH 1, 2002, MAINTAINING THE REMITTITUR IN THE COURT'S JURISDICTION, AND THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS CLEARLY STATES BY ITS OCTOBER 21, 2022 LETTER THAT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DENYING THE PETITION ON OCTOBER 3, 2022 WAS THE REASON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS SENT THE REMITTITUR IN THIS CASE BACK DOWN TO THE S.C. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT? THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IS IN ERROR AND ABUSED ITS DISCRETION IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED, REQUIRING THAT THE REMITTITUR BE RECALLED WHICH THE APPELLANT MOTIONS FOR. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS TO THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION WHICH IS ALSO CHALLENGE TO THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION TO DO SO UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, NOT THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG.

THE COURT IS IN ERROR. THE APPELLANT'S PETITION BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS STILL PENDING UNDER CASE 22-5805 AND WAS NOT DENIED OCTOBER 3, 2022 AS THE COURT OF APPEALS FRAUDULENTLY ALLEGED, WHICH THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WAS CLEARLY GIVEN NOTICE OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FILING ESTABLISHING CASE 22-5805, OR THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WOULD HAVE NOT PRODUCED ITS OCTOBER 13, 2022 LETTER ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DID INDEED RECEIVE NOTICE BUT FRAUDULENTLY CLAIMED THAT THE APPELLANT HAD NO CASE STILL WITHIN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION.

THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IS IN ERROR. THE CASE THAT WAS DENIED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON OCTOBER 3, 2022 WAS NOT THE APPELLANT'S CASE, BUT WAS THE CASE FILED BY THE PETITIONERS ARTHUR McQUILLA, ORLANDO PARKER AND DARNELL WILSON WHICH IS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED BY EXHIBIT, "FRAUD REMITTITUR SEND # 2" WHERE THAT CASE IS STILL BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT VIA APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE AND THE SEEKING OF A REHEARING OF CASE 21-8066, THE PETITION DENIED OCTOBER 3, 2022 WHICH CLEARLY WAS NOT THE APPELLANT UNDER CASE 2021-000354 CASE. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS AND MOTION TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR UNDER CASE 2021-000354 AND THE CASE BE STAYED AND OR HELD IN ABEYANCE UNTIL UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT REVIEW CONCLUDES UNDER CASE 22-5805 WHICH IS THE APPELLANT'S CASE BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT STILL PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS SENT THE REMITTITUR, NOT THE CASE THAT WAS DENIED ON OCTOBER 3, 2022 WHICH THE INJUSTICE IS COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT THE CASE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IN ERROR THOUGHT WAS THE APPELLANT'S IS STILL PENDING ANY WAY BY THOSE PARTIES SEEKING REHEARING IN THE CASE.

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonah The Tishbite', is written over the typed name. The signature is highly cursive and overlaps the typed text.

NOVEMBER 1, 2022

02/11

CASE DOCKET NO. 22-5805

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

RECEIVED

NOV 28 2022

SC Court of Appeals

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF
CORRECTIONS; THE UNITED STATES ET. AL.,
RESPONDENT(S)---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,

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 ON THIS DATE OCTOBER 31, 2022,
AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29, OF A PETITION SEEKING WRIT
OF CERTIORAI AND RELATED DOCUMENTS RELATED TO CASE 22-5805 ON THE
PARTIES AGAIN, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ACKNOWLEDGING THEIR
SERVICE BY THE ATTACHED LETTER DATED OCTOBER 13, 2022, AND THE

U.S. SUPREME COURT LETTER AND ATTACHMENT DATED OCTOBER 11, 2022, ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDING OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, THIS SECOND TIME, 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.

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


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

(12) THE LAW FIRM OF DuBOSE-ROBINSON 935 BROAD STREET
CAMDEN, S.C. 29021.


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

EXECUTED OCTOBER 31, 2022.

RESPECTFULLY,
RON SANTA McCRAY



JONAH THE TISHBITE



EXHIBIT, "CASE 22-5805 SECOND NOTICE".

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF
CORRECTIONS; THE UNITED STATES ET. AL.,
RESPONDENT(S)---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,

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 ON THIS DATE OCTOBER 31, 2022,
AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29, OF A PETITION SEEKING WRIT
OF CERTIORAI AND RELATED DOCUMENTS RELATED TO CASE 22-5805 ON THE
PARTIES AGAIN, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ACKNOWLEDGING THEIR
SERVICE BY THE ATTACHED LETTER DATED OCTOBER 13, 2022, AND THE

U.S. SUPREME COURT LETTER AND ATTACHMENT DATED OCTOBER 11, 2022, ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDING OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, THIS SECOND TIME, 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.

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


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

(12) THE LAW FIRM OF DuBOSE-ROBINSON 935 BROAD STREET
CAMDEN, S.C. 29021.


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

EXECUTED OCTOBER 31, 2022.

RESPECTFULLY,
RON SANTA McCRAY



JONAH THE TISHBITE



Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

October 11, 2022

Mr. Lawrence Crawford
Prisoner ID #300839
Lee CI
990 Wisacky Hwy
Bishopville, SC 29010

Re: Lawrence Crawford, et al.
v. South Carolina
No. 22-5805

Dear Mr. Crawford:


The petition for a writ of certiorari in the above entitled case was filed on September 15, 2022 and placed on the docket October 11, 2022 as No. 22-5805.

A form is enclosed for notifying opposing counsel that the case was docketed.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

by


Emily Walker
Case Analyst

Enclosures

WAIVER

Supreme Court of the United States

No. 22-5805

Lawrence Crawford, et al.
(Petitioners)

v.

South Carolina
(Respondent)

I DO NOT INTEND TO FILE A RESPONSE to the petition for a writ of certiorari unless one is requested by the Court.

Please check the appropriate box:

- I am filing this waiver on behalf of all respondents.
- I only represent some respondents. I am filing this waiver on behalf of the following respondent(s):

Please check the appropriate box:

- I am a member of the Bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. (Filing Instructions: File a signed Waiver in the Supreme Court Electronic Filing System. The system will prompt you to enter your appearance first.)
- I am not presently a member of the Bar of this Court. Should a response be requested, the response will be filed by a Bar member. (Filing Instructions: Mail the original signed form to: Supreme Court, Attn: Clerk's Office, 1 First Street, NE, Washington, D.C. 20543).

Signature _____

Date: _____

(Type or print) Name _____

Mr. Ms. Mrs. Miss

Firm _____

Address _____

City & State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Email _____

A COPY OF THIS FORM MUST BE SENT TO PETITIONER'S COUNSEL OR TO PETITIONERS IF *PRO SE*. PLEASE INDICATE BELOW THE NAME(S) OF THE RECIPIENT(S) OF A COPY OF THIS FORM. NO ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OR COVER LETTER IS REQUIRED.

cc:

Supreme Court of the United States

Lawrence Crawford, et al.
(Petitioners)

v.

No. 22-5805

South Carolina
(Respondent)

To _____ Counsel for Respondent:

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN pursuant to Rule 12.3 that a petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-entitled case was filed in the Supreme Court of the United States on September 15, 2022, and placed on the docket October 11, 2022. Pursuant to Rule 15.3, the due date for a brief in opposition is Thursday, November 10, 2022. If the due date is a Saturday, Sunday, or federal legal holiday, the brief is due on the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday or federal legal holiday.

Beginning November 13, 2017, parties represented by counsel must submit filings through the Supreme Court's electronic filing system. Paper remains the official form of filing, and electronic filing is in addition to the existing paper submission requirement. Attorneys must register for the system in advance, and the registration process may take several days. Further information about the system can be found at <https://www.supremecourt.gov/filingandrules/electronicfiling.aspx>.

Unless the Solicitor General of the United States represents the respondent, a waiver form is enclosed and should be sent to the Clerk only in the event you do not intend to file a response to the petition.

Only counsel of record will receive notification of the Court's action in this case. Counsel of record must be a member of the Bar of this Court.

Mr. Lawrence Crawford
Lee CI
990 Wisacky Hwy
Bishopville, SC 29010

NOTE: This notice is for notification purposes only, and neither the original nor a copy should be filed in the Supreme Court.

EXHIBIT, "FRAUD REMITTITUR SEND # 1".



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

October 21, 2022

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:

Upon review of the Supreme Court of the United States online docket, we note your petition was denied on October 3, 2022. The remittitur is being sent simultaneously with this letter.

Very truly yours,

V. Claire Allen

CLERK

cc: Christina Catoe Bigelow, Esquire
Jana E. Shealy



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

October 21, 2022

The Honorable Jana E. Shealy
Edgar A. Brown Building
1205 Pendleton Street
Suite 224
Columbia SC 29201

REMITTITUR

Re: Lawrence Crawford, #300839 v. SCDC
Lower Court Case No. 2021ALJ040033AP
Appellate Case No. 2021-000354

Dear Clerk of Court:

The above referenced matter is hereby remitted to the lower court or tribunal. A copy of the judgment of this Court is enclosed.

Very truly yours,

V. Claire Allen

CLERK

Enclosure

cc: Lawrence L. Crawford, 300839
Christina Catoe Bigelow, Esquire

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Lawrence Crawford, #300839, Appellant,


v.


South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.


Appellate Case No. 2021-000354

ORDER

Appellant has filed a motion to reinstate this appeal, which we construe as a petition to rehear the dismissal. After careful consideration, the Court is unable to discover that any material fact or principle of law has been either overlooked or disregarded, and hence, there is no basis for granting a rehearing. Accordingly, the petition for rehearing is denied.

 C. J.

 J.

 J.

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Lawrence L. Crawford, 300839

Imani Diane Byas, Esquire

FILED
Mar 01 2022

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

Lawrence Crawford, #300839, Appellant,

v.

South Carolina Department of Corrections, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2021-000354

The Honorable Shirley C. Robinson
Trial Court Case No. 2021ALJ040033AP

ORDER

Appellant has failed to submit the notice of appeal filing fee, as required by Rule 203 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules and the Court's Order dated December 3, 2021. Accordingly, this matter is dismissed. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b), SCACR.

FOR THE COURT

BY

V. Claire Allen

CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:
Lawrence L. Crawford, 300839
Imani Diane Byas, Esquire

FILED
Jan 07 2022

EXHIBIT, "FRAUD REMITTITUR SEND # 2".

2

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON; ORLANDO PARKER; ARTHUR McQUILLA

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; THE
UNITED STATES ET. AL.,

RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON, ORLANDO PARKER, ARTHUR
McQUILLA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A
COPY ON THIS DATE OCTOBER 20, 2022, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT
RULE 29, WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL
JUSTICE ON JUSTICE ROBERTS, THE MOTION FOR REHEARING ON THE U.S.
SUPREME COURT, AND ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDING OR THAT
PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED,
INCLUDING THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, S.C.
29211, BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENT(S)
IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM AS

M

MENTIONED.

WE DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THE FOREGOING IS TRUE
AND CORRECT EXECUTED OCTOBER 20, 2022.

RESPECTFULLY,

CHRISTOPHER D. WILSON

Christopher Wilson

ORLANDO PARKER

Orlando Parker

ARTHUR McQUILLA

Arthur McQuilla

CASE DOCKET NO. 21-8066

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON; ORLANDO PARKER; ARTHUR McQUILLA

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; THE
UNITED STATES ET. AL.,

RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE SEEKING TO SUSPEND
THE ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

IN RE: CASE 21-8066

TO: THE HONORABLE JUSTICE ROBERTS,

SIR, HERE ATTACHED THE JUSTICE WILL FIND A COPY OF THE
APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES THAT WAS SENT IN BY THE
PETITIONERS LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AND RON SANTA McCRAY DATED
OCTOBER 8, 2022 RELATED TO WHAT IS NOW CASE 22-5805. THE
PETITIONERS UNDER CASE 21-8066 RESPECTFULLY SEEK THAT THE

HONORABLE JUSTICE CONSTRUE THE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE FILED BY CRAWFORD AND McCRAY ALSO AS AN APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONERS UNDER CASE 21-8066 ALONG WITH THIS DOCUMENT AS AN APPLICATION TO SUSPEND THE ORDER DENYING THE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI UNDER CASE 21-8066 TO ALLOW THE PETITIONERS TO FILE MOTION FOR REHEARING, A COPY OF WHICH IS HEREWITH ATTACHED TO THIS APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE. THE MERITS OF THE CLAIMS WERE NEVER ACTUALLY ADJUDICATED IN FULL BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND IT IS THE PETITIONER'S POSITION THAT THE QUESTIONS ARE SUBSTANTIAL AND THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF THE COURT CHANGING ITS CHANGING ITS POSITION TO ENSURE THE UNIFORMITY OF ITS HOLDINGS REGARDING THE CASES REFERRED TO WITHIN THE MOTION FOR REHEARING. THEREFORE, WE SEEK THAT THE COURT SUSPEND THE ORDER DENYING THE GRANTING OF THE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO ALLOW THE PETITIONERS OPPORTUNITY TO SEEK REHEARING OF THESE MATTERS ALSO DUE TO THEY STILL BEING BEFORE THE COURT UNDER CASE 22-5805.

RESPECTFULLY,

CHRISTOPHER D. WILSON

Christopher Wilson

ORLANDO PARKER

Orlando Parker

ARTHUR McQUILLA

Arthur McQuilla

OCTOBER 20, 2022

CASE DOCKET NO. 21-8066

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON; ORLANDO PARKER; ARTHUR McQUILLA

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; THE
UNITED STATES ET. AL.,

RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

MOTION FOR REHEARING

IN RE: CASE 21-8066

TO: THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,

THE PETITIONERS IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED MATTER MOTION
FOR A REHEARING. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DENIED THE
PETITIONERS PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI. THE PETITIONERS
MOTION FOR REHEARING TO ALLOW THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO
DISPOSE OF CONSISTENTLY WITH TWO OTHER CASES INVOLVING
ESSENTIALLY THE SAME LEGAL QUESTION SUCH AS FORTBEND COUNTY,

TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) AND UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415(4th.Cir.2018) AS IT PERTAINS TO PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AS TO WHETHER WHEN THEY ARE TIMELY ASSERTED IS IT MANDATORY ACROSS ALL JURISDICTIONS, STATE AND FEDERAL, AND NOT MERELY WITHIN FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS AND MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 577 U.S. 190, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599 (U.S.2016) AND STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998) AS IT PERTAINS TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION COMMITTED WITHIN CRIMINAL CASES AND WHETHER SUCH UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VOIDS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, ARE THERE INDEED ESSENTIALLY TWO PRONGS TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG AND LEGISLATIVE PRONG, AND SHOULD SUCH LEGAL ISSUES AS FATAL INDICTMENT DEFECTS OR CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT OF AN INDICTMENT BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AS OPPOSED TO THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG; AND IN ORDER THAT THERE MAY BE UNIFORMITY IN APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED WITHIN THOSE CASES, U.S. v. OHIO POWER CO., 363 U.S. 98, 77 S.Ct. 652, 1 L.Ed.2d. 683(U.S.1957).

THE MATTERS ARE STILL BEFORE THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 22-5805. THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND MAINTAINING THE UNIFORMITY OF THE COURT'S DECISION HELD WITHIN CASES LIKE McQUIGGIN v. PERKINS, 569 U.S. 383, 133 S.Ct. 1924, 185 L.Ed.2d. 1019(U.S.2013) AND IN RE: DAVIS, 557 U.S. 952, 130 S.Ct. 1 (MEM), 174 L.Ed.2d. 614(U.S.2009) WHERE THERE IS AN ACTUAL INNOCENCE CLAIM ATTACHED TO THESE PROCEEDINGS AS SEEN UNDER CASE 22-5805 PRODUCED BY POTENTIALLY RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED. THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE WOULD MAKE UNFAIR THE STRICT APPLICATION OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RULING NOT TO GRANT THE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI, GONDECK v. PAN AM WORLD AIRWAYS, INC., 382 U.S. 25, 86 S.Ct. 153(U.S.1965).

THE HONORABLE COURT SIMPLY DENYING THE PETITION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A RULING ON THE MERITS WHICH EXTREMELY PREJUDICE THE PETITIONS REGARDING SEEKING RESOLUTION OF THEIR DUE PROCESS

MATTERS WITHIN THE STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS BELOW. THE PETITIONERS MOTION FOR REHEARING TO ALLOW THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT TO FULLY ADDRESS THE MERITS AND DETERMINE WHETHER ITS RULINGS AND PRINCIPLES REGARDING THE CASES AFOREMENTIONED APPLY UNIFORMLY TO ALL PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES, WHETHER IT BE AT STATE OR FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, AND WHETHER OR NOT THERE ARE INDEED TWO PRONGS TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG AND CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG, AND WHETHER FATAL INDICTMENT DEFECTS AND CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT OF THE INDICTMENT ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AS OPPOSED TO THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG. DUE TO THE SUBSTANTIAL NEED TO HAVE LEGAL CLARITY, IN BOTH, STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS REGARDING THESE SUBSTANTIAL RIGHTS SECURED BY THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, ALSO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER IF THE STATUTES REQUIRE CHAIN OF CUSTODY FORMS AND TESTIMONY TO ESTABLISH THE CHAIN, CAN THE STATE COURTS VIOLATE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND EXPAND OR RECONSTRUCT THE RELEVANT STATUTE, AND IF THERE IS CONSENTUAL SEX BETWEEN A 14 AND 16 YEAR OLD CAN THE STATE HOLD THE JUVENILE UNTIL HE REACHES 18 YEARS OLD THEN REQUIRE THAT HE REGISTER AS A SEX OFFENDER FOR THE REMAINDER OF HIS LIFE, OR ATTACH A LIFE TIME SEX REGISTRY TO AN OFFENSE THAT DOESN'T INVOLVE A SEX CRIME AND THE STATE COURT HOLDING THESE LEGAL ISSUES IN LIMBO FOR OVER 15+ YEARS, THERE IS A REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD OF THE COURT CHANGING ITS POSITION AND GRANTING CERTIORARI, POWELL v. KEEL, 433 S.C. 457, 860 S.E.2d. 344(S.C.App.2021); RICHARD v. ARIZONA, 434 U.S. 1323, 98 S.Ct. 8, 54 L.Ed.2d. 34(U.S.1977); CAHILL v. NEW YORK N.H. & H.R. CO., 351 U.S. 183, 76 S.Ct. 758, 100 L.Ed. 1075(U.S.1956); AMERICAN LEGION v. AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION, 139 S.Ct. 2067 (U.S.2019).

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IS THE POWER TO DECLARE LAW, WHETHER IT BE UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL/DUE PROCESS PRONG OR THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. THEREFORE, IT CANNOT BE WAIVED AND OR FORFEITED. THUS, WHEN IT CEASE TO EXIST,

THE ONLY THING LEFT FOR THE COURT TO DO IS ANNOUNCE IT AND DISMISS THE CAUSE OF CONVICTION AGAINST THE PETITIONERS WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, EVEN AFTER A FINAL ORDER HAS BEEN ENTERED INTO THE CASES, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT WE HAVE FRAUD UPON THE COURT GOING ON WITHIN THE STATE COURTS INVOLVED THAT IS ATTACHED TO THE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS MADE. THESE SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS AND CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERRORS ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, NOT THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG THAT THE COURTS IN THE PAST IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION HAVE ADJUDICATED THESE MATTERS UNDER. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTION IS VOID. DUE TO THE REPEATED INCONSISTENCIES GOING ON IN BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS ACROSS THE NATION THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT MUST GIVE THE COURTS GREATER CLARITY TO PREVENT MANIFEST INJUSTICE AND MAINTAIN UNIFORMITY OF JUDICIAL DETERMINATION ON THESE SUBSTANTIAL LEGAL QUESTION. A REHEARING IS REQUIRED TO ADDRESS THESE MATTERS, STATE v. GENTRY 2005 (SOUTH CAROLINA); STATE v. LANGFORD 2012 (SOUTH CAROLINA); SEBELIUS v. AUBURN REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, 133 S.Ct. 817, 184 L.Ed.2d. 627, 81 U.S.L.W. 4053(U.S.2013); GRUPO DALAFLUX v. ATLAS GLOBAL L.P., 541 U.S. 567, 124 S.Ct. 192, 158 L.Ed.2d. 866(U.S.2004); ARBAUGH v. Y & H CORP., 546 U.S. 500, 126 S.Ct. 1235 (U.S.2006); HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+ U.S..

RESPECTFULLY,

CHRISTOPHER D. WILSON

Christopher Wilson

ORLANDO PARKER

Orlando Parker

4-of-4

ARTHUR McQUILLEN

Arthur McQuillen

OCTOBER 20, 2022

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD

300839 FSB Rm 187

LEE CT 990 WISACKY Hwy

Bishopville, SC 29010



THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HAS NOT GUARANTEED THIS ITEM, THEREFORE, THE DEPARTMENT DOES NOT ASSUME LIABILITY FOR ITS WRITTEN CONTENTS.

RECEIVED

NOV 2 5 2022

SC Court of Appeals

SC COURT of Appeals

P.O. Box 11629

Columbia, SC 29211