

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2023

SC Court of Appeals

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

RESPONDENTS----APPELLEES

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

MOTION FOR A REHEARING

TO; THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,

HERE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND
ATTACHED:

(1) A COPY OF THE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL
JUSTICES, SENT TO CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS DATED JANUARY 23, 2023.

(2) A COPY OF THE APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES, SENT TO CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS DATED FEBRUARY 18, 2023.

(3) A COPY OF THE NOTICE OF FILING OF ORDER DENYING THE SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FILED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DATED JANUARY 9, 2023. BE ADVISED THAT THE PETITIONER(S) DID NOT RECEIVE NOTICE OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RULING UNTIL JANUARY 23, 2023 MAKING THE MOTION SEEKING REHEARING TIMELY BASED UPON THE TIME NOTICE WAS GIVEN TO THE PETITIONER(S).

(4) A COPY OF THE LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2023 SENT TO THE PETITIONER(S) BY MS. EMILY WALKER THAT THE PETITIONER(S) DID NOT EVEN RECEIVE UNTIL FEBRUARY 17, 2023 DEPLETING ANY JUST AND FAIR TIME TO PROPERLY RESPOND TO THE DEMANDS OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S CORRESPONDENCE.

(5) A COPY OF THE ORDER SENT TO THE PETITIONER(S) REGARDING CASE 19-2005 DATED ENTERED JANUARY 31, 2023 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FROM THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CASE.

(6) A COPY OF THE SUPPLEMENT TO CASE 22-5805 THAT WAS RECEIVED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BEFORE THIS CASE WAS PASSED TO THE JUSTICES ON JANUARY 6, 2023 BUT WAS BLOCKED FILING BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BY ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. SINCE THE CONSPIRING FEDERAL ACTORS BLOCKED FILING OF THIS DOCUMENT THAT WAS TIMELY SENT TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BEFORE THE COURT RULED? IT, IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PETITIONER(S), CAN BE HEARD ON THIS MOTION FOR REHEARING UNDER CASE 22-5805.

INSOMUCH, THE GROUNDS IN THE ATTACHED SUPPLEMENT PETITION AND OR BRIEF ARE INDEED BRIEF AND DISTINCT, IN LIGHT OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES AS PRESENTED WHERE THE GROUNDS ARE STATED WITHIN THE SUPPLEMENT BRIEF ON PAGES II & III OF THE SUPPLEMENT BRIEF, TO INCLUDE THE GROUNDS FOR SEEKING REHEARING WHICH ARE: (1) BEING

THAT THE SUPPLEMENT PETITION AND OR BRIEF WAS TIMELY AND APPROPRIATELY SUBMITTED IN LIGHT OF THE RECENT ACTION TAKEN BY THE U.S. CONGRESS, U.S. SENATE AND PRESIDENT BIDEN IN ESTABLISHING "THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT", THAT DID NOT EXIST AT THE TIME THE INITIAL PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS FILED. THE SUPPLEMENT PETITION AND OR BRIEF IN QUESTION SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN OBSTRUCTED REVIEW ONCE RECEIVED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PRIOR TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT CLERKS AND OR CASE MANAGER FORWARDING THIS CASE TO THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICES FOR REVIEW WHERE THAT BRIEF WAS RECEIVED BY THE COURT PRIOR TO JANUARY 6, 2023 WHEN THIS CASE WAS PASSED TO THE JUSTICES WHICH EXTREMELY PREJUDICED THE PETITIONERS IN SEEKING THIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

(2) THERE WAS A RECENT ACTION TAKEN ON THE PART OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WHERE THAT COURT REQUIRED THE PAYMENT OF FILING FEES FOR AN INDIGENT CONVICTED PERSON WHERE THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION PROHIBITS THIS ACTION REQUIRING THAT THE PETITIONER, CRAWFORD, BE GIVEN ACCESS TO THE COURTS WITHOUT THE REQUIRING OF THE PAYING OF FILING FEES DUE TO THE SUBSTANTIAL FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BEING ARGUED. THIS IS A RECENT ACTION THAT DID NOT EXIST AT THE TIME THE INITIAL PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS FILED IN THIS APPEAL.

(3) ATTACHED THE COURT WILL FIND A COPY OF A RECENT ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 19-2005 OUT OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, THAT DID NOT EXIST AT THE TIME THE INITIAL PETITION IN THIS CASE WAS FILED, WITH THE PETITIONER, CRAWFORD'S NAME CLEARLY LISTED ON THE ORDER, DEMONSTRATING THAT CRAWFORD WAS INDEED INVOLVED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CASE WHICH IS COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT THE ISSUE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION WAS DEFAULTED ON WITHIN THE CRAWFORD STATE CASES THAT ARE THE SOURCE OF THIS APPEAL TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS PARTY TO THAT DEFAULT BY THEIR "BACK DOOR" APPEARANCE GIVING THE STATE COURT JURISDICTION OVER THEM. A COPY OF THE 3rd. CIRCUIT ORDER WAS PREVIOUSLY SERVED ON JUSTICE ROBERTS ATTACHED TO AN APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES. THIS

IS WHY THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD SOUGHT TO TIMELY INTERVENE IN THE BOSTON CASE WHERE THAT MOTION TO INTERVENE WAS CIRCUMVENTED BY EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT TAINTING AND CALLING INTO QUESTION ANY SUBSEQUENT REVIEW BY THE HIGHER COURTS. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT POSED A QUESTION TO THE PARTIES IN THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CASE PENDING BEFORE IT, WHICH WAS, "WHEN WILL AFFIRMATIVE ACTION NO LONGER BE NEEDED?" THIS IS A QUESTION THAT DID NOT EXIST AT THE TIME THE PETITIONERS FILED THE INITIAL PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN THIS APPEAL WHERE IN LIGHT OF THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, THE PETITIONER, CRAWFORD, IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS BY HIS CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, MUST BE PERMITTED TO ANSWER THE UNITED STATE SUPREME COURT'S QUESTION WHERE THE ISSUE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION WAS DEFAULTED ON WITHIN THE CRAWFORD STATE CASES RELIED UPON THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WAS PARTY TO THAT DEFAULT.

ADDITIONALLY, PURSUANT TO MOTIONING FOR REHEARING, THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DENIED THE PETITIONERS PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI BY ORDER DATED JANUARY 9, 2023 BUT THE PETITIONERS DID NOT RECEIVE NOTICE OF THAT RULING UNTIL JANUARY 23, 2023 MAKING THIS FILING TIMELY BASED UPON THE TIME NOTICE WAS ACTUALLY RECEIVED AND THE LETTER SENT TO THE PETITIONER(S) BY MS. EMILY WALKER DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2023 BEING PLACED IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON FEBRUARY 18, 2023. THE PETITIONER MOTION FOR REHEARING TO ALLOW THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO DISPOSE THIS CASE CONSISTENTLY WITH OTHER CASES INVOLVING ESSENTIALLY THE SAME LEGAL QUESTIONS SUCH AS THE U.S. CONGRESS NEW LEGISLATION PROVISIONS REGARDING THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT CHALLENGING ITS CONSTITUTIONALITY, AS ALSO 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 JURISDICTION BY THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS, 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.1988) AS IT PERTAINS TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION COMMITTED WITHIN CRIMINAL CASES AND WHETHER SUCH UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VOID THE COURTS' JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, AND 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 ILLEGAL CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT OF AN INDICTMENT(S) BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AS OPPOSED TO THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG AS THE LOWER COURTS HAVE MISTAKINGLY DONE, AND DUE TO THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASES RELIED UPON, 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294 OUT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, IS THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY TO BE LEGALLY AND RELIGIOUSLY CONSIDERED TO BE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS AS A "GRANT" HAVING RESTRICTIONS, AND WHICH THE UNITED STATES VIOLATED TO INCLUDE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE, THE 1st. AMENDMENT AND ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION TO ESTABLISH RELIGIOUS RIGHTS IN VIOLATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE; AND IN ORDER THAT THAT THERE MAY BE UNIFORMITY IN APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT OR THE NEW LEGISLATIVE STATUTE OR DECLARING IT UNCONSTITUTIONAL, THAT BEAR ON THESE PROCEEDINGS AND WITHIN THOSE CASES REFERRED TO, 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 THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CASE WHERE THE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION ISSUE IS ONE OF THE ISSUES THAT IS PART OF THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASES RELIED UPON, STILL PENDING ALSO VIA THE SEEKING REHEARING UNDER CASE 21-8066 AND BY THE OBSTRUCTION OF THE FILING THE SUPPLEMENT PETITION, IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS REHEARING MUST BE PERMITTED. DUE TO THE RECENT ACTION PURSUANT TO THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT AND WHERE IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND MAINTAINING THE UNIFORMITY OF THE COURT'S

DECISION HELD WITHIN CASES LIKE McQUIGGINS 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 THIS CASE PRODUCED BY POTENTIALLY RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED, ALSO THE OBERFELL CASE REGARDING SAME SEX MARRIAGE. THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE WOULD MAKE UNFAIR THE STRICT APPLICATION OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RUIING NOT TO GRANT THE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI, ESPECIALLY SINCE THE CLERKS AND OR CASE MANAGER IN QUESTION OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BLOCKED BY FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THE FILING AND HEARING OF THE SUPPLEMENT PETITION THAT WAS RECEIVED BY THE SUPREME COURT BEFORE THE CASE WAS PASSED TO THE JUSTICES ON JANUARY 6, 2023, GONDECK v. PAN AM WORLD AIRWAYS, INC., 382 U.S. 25, 86 S.Ct. 153(U.S.1965).

THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT DENYING THE PETITION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A RULING ON THE MERITS WHICH EXTREMELY PREJUDICE THE PETITIONER(S) REGARDING SEEKING RESOLUTION OF THEIR DUE PROCESS MATTERS WITHIN THE STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS BELOW. THE CONTROVERSY STILL EXIST AND WILL NOT GO AWAY DUE TO THERE BEING NO RULING ON THE MERITS WITHIN ANY OF THE LOWERS COURTS INVOLVED, STATE AND FEDERAL, WHERE THESE MATTERS ARE PRESENTLY BEING ARGUED AND PENDING WITHIN THE STATES OF FLORIDA, SOUTH CAROLINA, DELAWARE, MISSOURI, OHIO AND NEW JERSEY CLEARLY ESTABLISHING NOT JUST MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION; BUT ALSO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S AUTHORITY AND OR ABILITY TO HEAR THESE MATTERS IN IT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR REHEARING TO ALLOW THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO FULLY ADDRESS THE MERITS AND DETERMINE WHETHER ITS RULINGS AND PRINCIPLES REGARDING THE CASES AND LEGISLATIVE STATUTE AFOREMEBNTIONED RELATED TO SAME SEX MARRIAGE APPLY UNIFORMILY TO ALL STATES OR IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ALSO RELATED TO PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES OR APPLY BASED UPON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ARGUED, 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(S) ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE(S) 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 AND UNIFORMITY, IN BOTH, STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS REGARDING THESE SUBSTANTIAL RIGHTS SECURED BY THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE, THE F.S.I.A., THE 1st. AMENDMENT, ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONST. AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, ALSO THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE STATUTE REQUIRE CHAIN OF CUSTODY FORMS AND TESTIMONY TO ESTABLISH THE CHAIN IN DRUG CASES IN SOUTH CAROLINA AS THE STATUTE REQUIRES, OR WHETHER THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BEING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION BASED UPON THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASES RELIED UPON, CAN THE STATE COURTS AND OR U.S. CONGRESS VIOLATE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND EXPAND OR FORCE CONSTRUCT THE RELEVANT STATUTE(S), OR CAN CONGRESS ESTABLISH A RELIGIOUS RIGHT GIVING IT TO SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHRITES IN VIOLATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE AND THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION, AND IF THERE IS CONSENTUAL SEX BETWEEN A 14 AND 16 YEAR OLD CAN THE STATE HOLD A JUVENILE FOR OVER 2 YEARS UNTIL HE REACHES 18 YEARS OLD AND THEN TRY HIM AS AN ADULT AND THEN REQUIRE THAT HE REGISTER AS A SEX OFFENDER FOR THE REMAINDER OF HIS LIFE IN VIOLATION OF THE RELEVANT CHILD STATUTES ARGUED, OR ATTACH A LIFETIME SEX REGISTRY TO A KIDNAPPING OFFENSE THAT DID NOT INVOLVE ANY ATTEMPTED SEXUAL ACTION OR CONDUCT AND THE STATE COURTS HOLDING THESE LEGAL ISSUES IN LIMBO FOR OVER 16+ YEARS IN VIOLATION OF THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS CLAUSE, GROUNDS THAT ARE CLEAR AND DISTINCT WITHIN THE FILING, 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); DOE v. SNYDER, 449 F.Supp.3d. 719 (E.D.Mich.2020); THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT OF 2023; 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 OR FORFEITED. THUS, WHEN IT CEASE TO EXIST, THE ONLY THING LEFT FOR THE COURTS TO DO IS ANNOUNCE IT AND DISMISS THE CAUSE OF CONVICTION AGAINST THE PETITIONER(S) FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, OR RENDER VOID THE U.S. CONGRESS ACTIONS IN ESTABLISHING THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT, ALSO DUE TO THE SEPARATION OF POWERS VIOLATIONS, WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, EVEN AFTER A FINAL ORDER HAS BEEN ISSUED IN THE CASE, OR AFTER THE U.S. CONGRESS ESTABLISHED THE RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT IN VIOLATION OF THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM THE STATE CASES RELIED UPON, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT WE HAVE FRAUD UPON THE COURTS AND POTENTIALLY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ITSELF WHERE THE CLERKS AND OR CASE MANAGER BLOCKED THE HEARING AND OR ADJUDICATION OF THE SUPPLEMENT PETITION ATTACHED HEREWITH ALSO DUE TO THE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS MADE. THESE SUBSTANTIAL SEPARATION OF POWERS VIOLATIONS, 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. THIS IS ONE OF THE CRUCIAL CONTROVERSIES THAT MUST BE SETTLED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR A REHEARING. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTION IS VOID AND CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO BE THE BASIS OF CONFINEMENT. 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 DETERMINATIONS ON THESE SUBSTANTIAL LEGAL QUESTIONS. 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..

THE PETITIONER(S) DO HEREBY DECLARE AND OR CERTIFY UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE GROUNDS ARE LIMITED TO INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT OR TO OTHER SUBSTANTIAL GROUNDS NOT PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED. WE CERTIFY THAT THE PETITION AND OR MOTION FOR REHEARING IS PRESENTED IN GOOD FAITH AND NOT FOR DELAY.

RESPECTFULLY,
RON SANTA McCRAY



JONAH THE TISHBITE



FEBRUARY 18, 2023

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

February 8, 2023

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

RE: Crawford, et al. v. SC
SCSC No. 2021-001245
No: 22-5805

Dear Mr. Crawford:


The petition for rehearing in the above-entitled case was postmarked January 27, 2023 and received February 7, 2023 and is herewith returned for failure to comply with Rule 44 of the Rules of this Court. The petition must briefly and distinctly state its grounds and must be accompanied by a certificate stating that the grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

You must also certify that the petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay.

The petition for rehearing should be explicitly and exclusively be titled as such and may not be combined with any other motion or pleading.

Please correct and resubmit as soon as possible. Unless the petition is submitted to this Office in corrected form within 15 days of the date of this letter, the petition will not be filed. Rule 44.6.

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.

RECEIVED

MAR 10 2023

SC Court of Appeals

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

RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

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

MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE
FOR REHEARING
MOTION TO POLL THE JUSTICES
MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME

TO; THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,

THE SUPREME COURT VIA A LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2023 GAVE


THE PETITIONERS (15) DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THE LETTER TO CURE THE DEFICIENCIES SPECIFIED IN HER CORRESPONDENCE DATED FEBRUARY 8, 2023 AND THEREUPON RETURN THE PLEADING. THE PETITIONERS MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME AND SEEK THAT THE (15) DAY TIME PERIOD SPECIFIED IN THE COURT'S FEBRUARY 3, 2023 LETTER BE EXTENDED UNTIL MARCH 3, 2023. THE PETITIONERS DIDN'T EVEN RECEIVE THE COURT LETTER INDICATING TIMELINE TO RESPOND UNTIL FEBRUARY 17, 2013 ON A FRIDAY. MONDAY IS A HOLIDAY. THIS MEANS THAT THE RESPONSE WILL NOT EVEN BE CLOCKED STAMPED RECEIVED BY THE INSTITUTION UNTIL FEBRUARY 21, 2023 BEING PLACED IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON FEBRUARY 18, 2023. THE PETITIONERS WERE NEVER ACTUALLY GIVEN (15) DAYS TO RESPOND IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE COURT'S NOTICE NEVER REACHED THEM UNTIL FEBRUARY 18, 2023, [11] DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THE LETTER AND ARRIVED ON A HOLIDAY WEEKEND MAKING IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE MAILING TO GO OUT UNTIL FEBRUARY 21, 2023 [2] DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION OF THE [15] DAYS GIVEN BY THE SUPREME COURT LETTER IN QUESTION. THEREFORE, THE PETITIONERS MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME OF AN ADDITIONAL [10] DAYS TO ALLOW THE MAILING TO REACH THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. ALSO SEE ATTACHED APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES SENT TO JUSTICE ROBERTS TO ADDRESS THIS MATTER.

ATTACHED THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WILL FIND, A COPY OF THE PREVIOUSLY SENT "MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE FOR REHEARING", [5] PAGES DATED JANUARY 23, 2023. IT IS BY THIS ATTACHED DOCUMENT THAT THE PETITIONERS RE-NEW THE PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE FOR SEEKING THE REHEARING AND BY THIS DOCUMENT, THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION TO POLL THE JUSTICES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT SINCE THE CASE MANAGER REQUIRED THAT THE PETITIONER(S) SEVER THE MOTION TO POLL THE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICES FROM THE INITIAL INTENDED TO BE FILED MOTION FOR REHEARING. PER MS. WALKER'S FEBRUARY 8, 2023 LETTER. SHE REQUESTED THAT ANY ATTACHED PLEADING BE SEVERED FROM THE ACTUAL MOTION FOR REHEARING. BUT THERE WAS NOTHING IN HER FEBRUARY 8, 2023 LETTER THAT INDICATED THAT THE PLEADING INTENDED TO BE FILED CANNOT BE SOUGHT SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT OF THE ACTUAL MOTION FOR REHEARING. THEREFORE, BY


THIS PLEADING THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE FOR
THE REHEARING AND MOTION TO POLL THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT
JUSTICES FOR THE PURPOSE OF SEEKING SAID REHEARING.

RESPECTFULLY,

RON SANTA McCRAY



JONAH THE TISHBITE



FEBRUARY 18, 2023

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

RECEIVED
MAR 10 2023
SC Court of Appeals

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

RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

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

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T.
TISHBITE, RON SANTA McCRAY ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE
HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY ON THIS DATE OF FEBRUARY 18,
2023, PLACED IN INSTITUTION MAILBOX OVER HOLIDAY WEEKEND TO BE
PICKED UP BY INSTITUTION OFFICERS ON FEBRUARY 21, 2023, AS
REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED

MOTION FOR REHEARING WITH ITS ATTACHMENTS IN SUPPORT OF IT, AND AN INDEPENDENT COPY OF A MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE, MOTION TO POLL THE JUSTICES, MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDING OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX AS STATED, 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. 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 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 FEBRUARY 18, 2023.

RESPECTFULLY,
RON SANTA McCRAY



JONAH THE TISHBITE

LAWRENCE L Crawford
#300039 PSD Rm 133
LEE CT 990 WISACKY HWY
Bishopville SC 29010



RECEIVED
MAR 10 2023
SC Court of Appeals

SC Court of
Appeals
P.O. Box 11629
Columbia, SC 29211
AMR