

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEAL

RECEIVED

DEC 19 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 FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO
VACATE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ORDER DENYING THE MOTION
TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DENIED ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2021;
MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION
TO ENTER IT DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO
WAIVE THE FILING FEES FOR THE SUBMITTING OF THIS MOTION;
MOTION TO RENEW THE MOTION TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR TO
PERMIT THE COURT TO RULE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASE 2021-000354


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

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND THE DOCUMENTS AND MOTIONS ATTACHED AND PREVIOUSLY FILED TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE.

THE APPELLANT IN THE ABOVE CAPTIONED MATTER MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER DENYING THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DENIED ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2021 ARGUING THIS ISSUE UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT CHALLENGING THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION TO ISSUE IT . SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AT ANY STAGE, CANNOT BE WAIVED BY THE APPELLANT AND THE COURT SHALL NOT FAIL TO TAKE NOTICE, WHICH CAN EVEN BE RAISED AFTER A FINAL ORDER HAS BEEN ISSUED IN THE CASE. AN ACTION FILED UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT IS FREE OF PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS SUCH AS TIMELINES OR ANY RULE THE CLERK WOULD ASSERT ESTABLISH A PROHIBITION. THEREFORE, THE CLERK IS REQUIRED TO FILE THE PLEADING BEFORE THE JUDGES FOR RULING. THE APPELLANT MOTION TO WAIVE ANY FILING FEES FOR THE FILING OF THIS DOCUMENT BASED UPON WHAT IS ARGUED WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS SUBMITTED WHERE THIS CASE DEALS WITH FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF FREE SPEECH, FREEDOM OF RELIGION AND ACCESS TO THE COURTS. CLAIMS AS IS ARGUED WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS SUBMITTED. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IS NOW REQUIRED BY DUE PROCESS LAW TO RULE ON THE DOCUMENT AND ITS MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS THAT IS ATTACHED TO IT. IT WAS AN EGREGIOUS ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT FOR THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS TO DENY THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS KNOWING GOOD AND WELL THAT ALL THE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS ARGUED WERE PRESENTED IN THIS CASE. THIS CLAIM IS BEING ARGUED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION WHERE YOUR ACTION PRODUCE UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION VOIDING THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THE APPELLANT MOVES TO VACATE THE DENIAL OF SEPTEMBER 2,

2021 FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION MOVING
TO WAIVE ANY FILING FEE FOR THE SUBMISSION OF THIS DOCUMENT.

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. There is a small, faint circular stamp or mark over the signature.

DECEMBER 14, 2022



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

December 07, 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:

The Court is in receipt of your motion for extension to pay the filing fee for your motion to recall remittitur. Your motion to proceed in forma pauperis was denied in this case on September 2, 2021 and any subsequent motions to proceed in forma pauperis will not be acted on. You must pay the filing fee for the motion for an extension within 15 days or no action will be taken on your extension motion.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "V. Claire Allen".

CLERK

cc: Christina Catoe Bigelow, Esquire

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

IN RE: CASE 2021-000354 AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE
MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS VIA YOUR LETTER DATED NOVEMBER
29, 2022.

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,

ATTACHED THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE LETTER THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
SENT THE APPELLANT DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2022.

(2) A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING
JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR AND MOTION TO
MOTION THEREFOR", [6] PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 1, 2022.

(3) A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING
JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESET BASE
UPON THE COURT'S NOVEMBER 7, 2022 LETTER OF NOTICE DUE TO LATE
SERVICE; MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO SUBSTANTIAL
FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS BASED UPON FREEDOM
OF RELIGION, FREE SPEECH AND ACCESS TO THE COURTS CLAIMS AND
MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", [8] PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2022.

INSOMUCH, THE APPELLANT OBJECTS TO THE WAY THE CLERK IS
HANDLING THIS APPEAL. YOU HAVE A MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS
BEFORE YOU THAT WAS NEVER RULED ON BY THE COURT OF APPEALS. YOU

DO NOT POSSESS JUDICIAL POWER OR AUTHORITY TO ADJUDICATE A FILING FEE TO THIS CASE ONCE A PROPERLY FILED MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS IS PLACED BEFORE THE COURT WITHOUT THE COURT OF APPEALS REGISTERING A JUDICIAL RULING ON THIS MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2022. THE COURT MAY HAVE RULED BASED UPON CASE 2006-CP-400-3567. BUT THERE IS NO OFFICIAL RULING ON THIS NOW SUBMITTED MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS BASED UPON THIS NOVEMBER 22, 2022 SUBMITTED DOCUMENT. THE COURT OF APPEALS IS AGAIN CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW ILLEGALLY USING YOU CLERKS AS GATEKEEPERS WITH THE FRAUDULENT INTENT TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE CLERICAL ERROR AS OPPOSE TO FRAUD INVOLVING THE COURT JUDGES, ESSENTIALLY INVESTING YOU CLERKS WITH JUDICIAL POWER LIKE A LEGISLATOR IN VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE WHICH YOU AND THE CONSPIRING JUDGES ARE VOID OF ALL JURISDICTION TO DO STRIPPING YOU OF IMMUNITY. THE OBVIOUS INTENT HERE IS TO PREVENT ANY SUBSEQUENT S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW ON THE FAILURE TO GRANT THE MOTION. YOU HAVE NO AUTHORITY TO MAKE JUDICIAL DECISION HERE AND THERE IS NO OFFICIAL RULING BY THE COURT OF APPEALS ON THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS NOW PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT AS DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRES. RULE 220 PROVIDE: THE APPELLATE COURT "SHALL" MAKE ITS DECISIONS IN WRITING BY PUBLISHED OPINIONS OR MEMORANDUM OPINIONS, WITH ANY CONCURRING OR DISSENTING OPINIONS ATTACHED. IN EVERY DECISION RENDERED BY THE APPELLATE COURT JUDGES, EVERY POINT IS TO BE DISTINCTLY STATED IN THE CASE WHICH IS NECESSARY FOR A DECISION. THIS DID NOT OCCUR HERE WHICH YOU AS A CLERK CANNOT RENDER REQUIRING THAT YOU FORWARD THE MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL RULING ON THE COURT RECORD.


WHEN CERTAIN FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS ARE INVOLVED, AS THEY ARE IN THIS CASE, SUCH AS FREEDOM OF RELIGION, FREE SPEECH AND ACCESS TO THE COURTS BEING ARGUED SIMULTANEOUSLY, THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES THAT AN INDIGENT BE ALLOWED ACCESS TO THE COURT, MARTIN v. STATE, 321 S.C. 533, 471 S.E.2d. 134(S.C.App.1995); KENNEDY v. BREMEATON SCHOOL DISTRICT, 142 S.Ct. 2407, 213 L.Ed.2d. 755 (U.S.2022).

WHEN INDIGENT FILES MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND COMPLAINT DOES NOT APPEAR TO FIT WITHIN STATUTORY OR CONSTITUTIONAL EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT OF FILING FEE, CLERK "[M]UST", "[M]UST" (EMPHASIS ADDED), IT IS NOT WITHIN YOUR DISCRETION TO ACT IN THE CONTRARY STRIPPING YOU OF IMMUNITY WHERE YOU ARE NOT A JUDGE TO OVERRIDE A JUDGE, YOU "[M]UST" SUBMIT MOTION TO JUDGE FOR RULING AS TO WHETHER COMPLAINT FITS WITHIN STATUTORY EXCEPTION OR CONCERNS FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS THAT REQUIRE WAIVING OF FILING FEE, MARTIN v. STATE SUPRA.; ALEXANDER v. WILSON, S.E. Rptr., 2022 WL 853799(S.C.App.2022); McFADDEN v. DUNLAP, F.Supp., 2016 WL 4993406 (DSC.2016)(EXHAUSTION NOT NECESSARY); ADAMS v. RICHLAND COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, S.E. Rptr., 2022 WL 389652 (S.C.App.2022); MICHAU v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, S.E.2d., 2006 WL 7286094(S.C.App.2006).

THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT TOOK THE OPPORTUNITY TO REMIND ALL CLERKS OF THEIR MINISTERIAL DUTY TO DOCKET FILINGS IRRESPECTIVE OF POTENTIAL FLAWS THAT MAY EXIST, MILLER v. STATE, 377 S.C. 99, 102, 659 S.E.2d. 492, 493 (S.C.App.2008)(IT IS NOT WITHIN THE CLERK OF COURT'S AUTHORITY TO REFUSE TO PERFORM HIS OR HER DUTY BASED UPON HIS OR HER OPINION THAT A FILING LACKS MERIT, OR DON'T FALL WITHIN THE EXCEPTION OF THE STATUTE IN THIS CASE OR IS UNTIMELY."). THIS DUTY IS NOT DISCRETIONARY. SEE C.J.S. COURTS § 335(2021). UNLESS SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED BY A STATUTE OR A COURT RULING ON THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2022 WHICH YOU DON'T HAVE, A CLERK OF COURT MAY NOT EXERCISE ANY JUDICIAL POWER RESERVED FOR A JUDGE WHICH BY YOUR ACTIONS YOU ARE DOING STRIPPING YOU OF ALL IMMUNITY OPENING YOU UP TO LEGAL ACTION BEING LEVIED AGAINST YOU. ID.(THE CLERK CANNOT WITHOUT EXPRESSED CONSTITUTIONAL OR STATUTORY AUTHORITY, EXERCISE ANY JUDICIAL FUNCTIONS WHICH BY YOU ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION AND FRAUD YOU ARE DOING). YOU ARE REQUIRED TO FORWARD THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS TO THE APPROPRIATE JUDGES FOR A RULING ON THE MOTION DATED NOVEMBER 22, 2022 BEFORE YOU CAN EVER LEGALLY INSTRUCT ME THAT A \$50 FILING FEE IS TO BE ENFORCED UNDER THESE

CIRCUMSTANCES. PLEASE FORWARD THE MOTION TO THE JUDGES FOR A
RULING, BARNES v. STATE,--S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL 2306725
(S.C.App.2021).

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonah The Tishbite', is written over a circular stamp. The signature is highly stylized and overlaps the stamp.

DECEMBER 10, 2022

CC: THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT
LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD
S.C.D.C. GENERAL COUNSEL
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE 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 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 be 'Jonah The Tishbite', written in a cursive style with a large circular flourish at the end.

NOVEMBER 1, 2022

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE 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 be 'Jonah The Tishbite', written over a horizontal line.

NOVEMBER 1, 2022

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-000354

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE

APPELLANT

Vs.

THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,

RESPONDENTS


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 TO RESET BASED UPON THE COURT'S NOVEMBER 7, 2022 LETTER OF NOTICE DUE TO LATE SERVICE; MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO SUBSTANTIAL FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS BASED UPON FREEDOM OF RELIGION, SPEECH AND

ACCESS TO THE COURTS CLAIMS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE
S.C. COURT OF APPEALS 1220 SENATE STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201,
THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS AND ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS AT
S.C.D.C. GENERAL COUNSEL, HEADQUARTERS 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING
IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON NOVEMBER 22, 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 on the right side. The name "Jonah" is written in a smaller, more legible script than the rest of the signature.

NOVEMBER 22, 2022

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-000354

APPEAL FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE

APPELLANT

Vs.

THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,

RESPONDENTS

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR
AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESET BASED UPON THE COURT'S
NOVEMBER 7, 2022 LETTER OF NOTICE DUE TO LATE SERVICE;
MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO SUBSTANTIAL
FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS BASED UPON
FREEDOM OF RELIGION AND ACCESS TO THE COURTS CLAIM AND
MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASE 2021-000354 ET. AL.,

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

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE LETTER SENT TO THE APPELLANT BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DATED NOVEMBER 7, 2022.

PER THIS ATTACHED LETTER. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS STATED THAT THE APPELLANT HAD (10) DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THE LETTER TO PAY AN ASSERTED \$50 FILING FEE. THAT WOULD HAVE GAVE THE APPELLANT UNTIL NOVEMBER 17, 2022 TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE COURT'S REQUEST. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESET BECAUSE THE APPELLANT DID NOT EVEN RECEIVE THIS LETTER OF NOTICE UNTIL NOVEMBER 18, 2022 A DAY PAST ANY TIMELINES TO BE IN COMPLIANCE TO THE LETTER OF NOTICE IN QUESTION. THEREFORE, IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE APPELLANT. THE TIMELINE TO BE IN COMPLIANCE TO THE COURT OF APPEALS LETTER OF NOTICE MUST START FROM THE DATE IT WAS RECEIVED BY THE APPELLANT WHICH WAS NOVEMBER 18, 2022. THIS WOULD HAVE GIVEN THE APPELLANT UNTIL NOVEMBER 28, 2022 MAKING THIS RESPONSE TIMELY DUE TO THE COURT OF APPEALS LATE SERVICE OF THE LETTER OF NOTICE.

ADDITIONALLY, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS FOR THE WAIVER OF HIM BEING REQUIRED TO PAY THE ALLEGED \$50 FILING FEE BECAUSE SUCH A REQUIREMENT WOULD BE IN BLATANT DEFIANCE TO UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT THAT WITHIN NUMEROUS CASES DETERMINED WHERE CERTAIN FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS LIKE THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT RELATED TO FREE SPEECH, FREEDOM OF RELIGION AND ACCESS TO THE COURTS ARE INVOLVED WHICH THEY ARE RELATED TO THE APPELLANT BEING REQUIRED TO USE THE S.C.D.C. KIOSK SYSTEM IN VIOLATION OF HIS RELIGIOUS BELIEF, WHICH ATTACH TO FREE SPEECH WHERE THEY FORCE ME TO SPEAK THROUGH THIS MEDIUM, WHICH ALSO DIRECTLY ATTACHE TO MY ACCESS TO THE COURTS RELATED TO THE

ABILITY TO EXHAUST STATE ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES. THE U.S. CONSTITUTION REQUIRES THAT AN INDIGENT INMATE BE ALLOWED TO ACCESS THE COURT, MARTIN v. STATE, 321 S.C. 533, 471 S.E.2d. 134 (S.C.App.1995); KENNEDY v. BREMEATON SCHOOL DISTRICT, 142 S.Ct. 2407, 213 L.Ed.2d. 755(U.S.2022).

THE FREE EXERCISE AND FREE SPEECH CLAUSE OF THE 1st. AMENDMENT WORK IN TANDEM: WHERE THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE PROTECTS RELIGIOUS EXERCISE, WHETHER COMMUNITIVE OR NOT, SUCH AS IT PERTAINS TO THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS REQUIRING ME TO MAKE USE OF THE KIOSK IN VIOLATION OF MY RELIGIOUS BELIEFS WHEN THERE IS CLEARLY ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE AVAILABLE BY ALLOWING ME TO USE THE REQUEST TO STAFF MEMBER FORMS WHERE THIS WOULD NOT SUBSTANTIALLY BURDEN THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, THE FREE SPEECH CLAUSE PROVIDES OVERLAPPING PROTECTION FOR EXPRESSIVE RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES, DOE v. CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES, --F.Supp.3d.--, 2022 WL 3083439 (D.Md.2022); DOE NO. 1 v. ATTORNEY GENERAL OF INDIANA, --F.Supp.3d.--, 2022 WL 5237133 (S.D.IND.2022); KENNEDY v. BREMERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT, 142 S.Ct. 2407, 213 L.Ed.2d. 755(U.S.2022).

UNDER THE SECOND STEP OF THE PICKERING-GARCETTI FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING A PERSON'S CLAIMS THE GOVERNMENT, S.C.D.C., VIOLATED THE INMATE'S FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE RIGHTS UNDER THE 1st. AMENDMENT, THE GOVERNMENT MAY SEEK TO PROVE THAT ITS INTEREST AS THE S.C.D.C. CORRECTIONS OUTWEIGH THE INMATE'S RIGHTS OF FREEDOM OF RELIGION. BUT IN THIS CASE, THEY CANNOT DEMONSTRATE SUCH, WHERE THEY MAINTAIN A SECOND ALTERNATIVE METHOD TO PROTECT THEIR INTEREST IN THE FORM OF ALLOWING THE USE OF THE STAFF REQUEST FORMS, KINGMAN v. FREDERICKSON, 40 F.4th. 597, 601+, 7th. Cir.(Wis.); DiMARCO v. BOROUGH OF SAINT CLAIR, 2022 WL 6685296, * 9+ M.D.Pa..

UNDER THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, A GOVERNMENT ENTITY NORMALLY MUST SATISFY AT LEAST STRICT SCRUTINY,

SHOWING THAT ITS RESTRICTIONS ON THE INMATE'S PROTECTIVE RIGHTS SERVE A COMPELLING INTEREST AND ARE NARROWLY TAILORED TO THAT END WHICH IN THIS CASE S.C.D.C. BY REQUIRING ME TO MAKE USE OF THE KIOSK WHEN THERE IS ANOTHER READILY AVAILABLE MEANS AVAILABLE THAT WOULD ALLOW THEM TO MEET THAT INTEREST, THE GOVERNMENT FAILS TO MEET THIS BURDEN IN THAT REGARD, HAREWOOD-BEY v. BIDEN, 2022 WL 3353480, * 6+, S.D.N.Y.; MATTER OF A.C., --N.E.3d.--, 2022 WL 12166236 (IND.2022). LAW OR S.C.D.C. POLICIES THAT REGULATE OR OUTLAW CONDUCT BECAUSE IT IS RELIGIOUSLY MOTIVATED, AND FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE PROTECTS AGAINST LAWS OR POLICIES THAT IMPOSE SPECIAL DISABILITIES ON BASIS OF RELIGIOUS STATUS OR BELIEFS, ILLINOIS BIBLE COLLEGES ASSOCIATION v. ANDERSON, 870 F3d. 631 (7th.Cir.2017). THE CONSTITUTION COMMITS GOVERNMENT ITSELF TO RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE, AND UPON EVEN SLIGHT SUSPICION THAT PROPOSALS FOR STATE INTERVENTION, EVEN BY WAY OF S.C.D.C. POLICIES, PRESENT AN ANIMOSITY TO RELIGION IN THIS CASE, OR DISTRUST OF ITS PRACTICE, ALL OFFICIALS MUST PAUSE TO REMEMBER THEIR OWN HIGH DUTY TO THE CONSTITUTION AND THE RIGHTS IT SECURES, MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COM'N., 138 S.Ct. 1719, 201 L.Ed.2d. 35 (U.S.2018).


WHERE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS ARE CONCERNED OR INVOLVED AS THEY ARE HERE RELATED TO FREEDOM OF RELIGION, FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND ACCESS TO THE COURTS AS IT PERTAINS TO REQUIRING THE APPELLANT TO USE THE KIOSK AS OPPOSED TO STAFF REQUEST FORMS, THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES THAT THE INDIGENT INMATE BE ALLOWED ACCESS TO THE COURT WITHOUT THE OPPOSING OF THE NORMALLY REQUIRED \$50 FILING FEE. FREEDOM OF RELIGION IS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT. FREEDOM OF SPEECH IS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT REQUIRING ME TO SPEAK THROUGH THIS MEDIUM. ACCESS TO THE COURTS IS A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT PREVENTING MY EXHAUSTION OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES UNLESS I VIOLATE MY RELIGIOUS BELIEF BY FORCING ME TO MAKE USE OF THE KIOSK SYSTEM. IF GOVERNMENT ACTIONS (ie. S.C.D.C. REQUIRING ME TO USE THE KIOSK IN VIOLATION OF MY RELIGIOUS BELIEFS WHERE BY MY RELIGIOUS BELIEF IT IS A "MARK OF THE BEAST SYSTEM.), INTERFERE WITH FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, LIKE FREEDOM OF SPEECH OR RELIGION AND ACCESS TO THE

COURTS, ARE SUBJECT TO HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY WHERE S.C.D.C.'S ACTIONS IMPLICATE A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT, WORD SEED CHURCH v. VILLAGE OF HAZEL CREST, 533 F.Supp.3d. 637(N.D.ILL.2021).

THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE, WHICH APPLIES TO THE STATES UNDER THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT, PROTECTS RELIGIOUS OBSERVERS AGAINST UNEQUAL TREATMENT AND AGAINST LAWS THAT IMPOSE SPECIAL DISABILITIES ON THE BASIS OF RELIGIOUS STATUS OR BELIEFS. DISQUALIFYING THE APPELLANT FROM ACCESS TO THE GRIEVANCE PROCESS BY REQUIRING USE OF THE KIOSK WHEN THERE IS ANOTHER READILY AVAILABLE METHOD WHICH CAN BE PERMITTED TO BE USED WHERE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS ARE CONCERNED, IMPOSES A PENALTY ON THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION AND FREE SPEECH THAT TRIGGERS THE MOST EXACTING SCRUTINY UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT REQUIRING THE WAIVING OF FILING FEES BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS TO PERMIT REVIEW BEFORE THE STATE COURTS. THE FREE EXERCISE INQUIRY ASKS WHETHER GOVERNMENT HAS PLACED A SUBSTANTIAL BURDEN ON THE OBSERVATION OF A CENTRAL RELIGIOUS BELIEF WHERE BY THE 3 MAINSTREAM MONOTHEISTIC RELIGIONS THE APPELLATE VIEWS THESE SYSTEMS AS "MARK OF THE BEAST SYSTEMS" PRODUCING A PROHIBITION AGAINST THEIR USAGE, OR PRACTICE AND, IF SO, WHETHER A COMPELLING GOVERNMENT INTEREST JUSTIFIES THE BURDEN WHICH IT DOES NOT SINCE THE INMATE CAN BE PERMITTED TO MAKE USE OF STAFF REQUEST FORMS WITHOUT ANY SUBSTANTIAL INJURY OR BURDEN UPON THE STATE GOVERNMENT. THIS BURDEN MUST BE MORE THAN MERE INCONVENIENCE TO RISE TO THE LEVEL OF A CONSTITUTIONAL INQUIRY WHERE IN THIS CASE THE ACTION PRODUCES A CLEAR PROHIBITION AS IS DETERMINED BY RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE OF THE 3 MAINSTREAM MONOTHEISTIC RELIGIONS, ALSO PREVENTS THE PLAINTIFF FROM EXHAUSTION OF AVAILABLE STATE REMEDIES WHICH ALSO PRODUCE AN ACCESS TO THE COURTS CLAIM. THUS, THE \$50 FILING FEE OR ANY OTHER SUCH RELATED FILING FEES MUST BE WAIVED DUE TO FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS VIOLATION. THIS IS A HYBRID-FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS CLAIM OF FREE SPEECH, ACCESS TO THE COURTS AND FREEDOM OF RELIGION BEING FORCED TO USE THE KIOSK SYSTEM TO SPEAK TO ADDRESS MY GRIEVANCES, MARTIN v. STATE, 321 S.C. 533, 471 S.E.2d. 134 (S.C.App.1995); ESPINOZA v. MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, 140 S.Ct. 2246, 207 L.Ed.2d.

679(U.S.2020); SALEH v. GOMEZ, 2021 WL 2473803 (N.D.ILL.2021);
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF FAMILY AND LIFE ADVOCATES v. SCHNEIDER, 484
F.Supp.3d. 596 (E.D.ILL.2020). THEREFORE, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS
TO WAIVE ALL FILING FEES REQUIRED BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AS
DUE PROCESS LAW AND THE U.S. CONSTITUTION REQUIRES.

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jonah The Tishbite". The signature is written in a cursive style and is partially obscured by a large, circular scribble or stamp in the center. There are several long, sweeping horizontal lines extending from the signature across the page.

NOVEMBER 22, 2022



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

November 07, 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 reviewing your motion to recall remittitur, the following deficiency has been noted under the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), and any deficiency must be corrected within ten (10) days of the date of this letter or your motion will not be considered:

- The required filing fee has not been submitted. The correct filing fee is \$50.00.

Very truly yours,


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

November 29, 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:

The Court is in receipt of your "Motion to Recall Remittitur" that was filed on November 4, 2022 and again on November 28, 2022. The Court sent a deficiency letter on November 7, 2022 stating a \$50.00 motion fee is required before the motion can be processed. To date, the Court has not received the motion fee. Based upon the failure to pay the motion filing fee, we decline to rule upon the motion to recall remittitur.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "V. Claire Allen".

CLERK

cc: Christina Catoe Bigelow, Esquire

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEAL

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-000354

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

APPELLANT

Vs.

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2022

SC Court of Appeals

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 VACATE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ORDER DENYING THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DENIED ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2021; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION TO ENTER IT DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO WAIVE THE FILING FEE FOR THE SUBMITTING OF THIS MOTION; MOTION TO RENEW THE MOTION TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR TO PERMIT THE COURT TO RULE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA,

S.C. 29211, ON THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT WITH IT ATTACHMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON DECEMBER 14, 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 on the right side. Below the main signature, there are two small, separate handwritten marks that look like the number "5" or a similar symbol.

DECEMBER 14, 2022

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

IN RE: CASE 2021-000354 AND YOUR LETTER DATED DECEMBER 7, 2022.

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2022


SC Court of Appeals

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,

PER YOUR LETTER DATED DECEMBER 7, 2022 I AM SENDING THIS RESPONSE AND MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER DENYING THE MOTION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT CHALLENGING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION TO ISSUE IT WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, CANNOT BE WAIVED AND OR FORFEITED AND CAN BE RAISED EVEN AFTER A FINAL ORDER HAS BEEN ISSUED IN THE CASE. THIS REQUIRES YOU TO FORWARD THE MOTION TO THE JUDGES FOR A RULING. THANK YOU IN ADVANCE.

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and lines, with a circled initial 'JT' in the center.

DECEMBER 14, 2022



IM5 STAGE
\$002.88⁹

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD
#300839 FSB Rm 107
LEE CIL 990 WISACKY HWY
Bishopville SC 29010

RECEIVED
DEC 19 2022
SC Court of Appeals

SC COURT OF APPEALS
PO BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SC 29211

9121

