

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

CASE DOCKET NO. 2025-001856

RECEIVED
NOV 07 2025
SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM THE COUNTY OF KERSHAW
IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING
CASE NO. 2004-GS-28-00385

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

APPELLANT(S)-PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE COUNTY OF KERSHAW,

RESPONDENTS-APPELLES

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO
REINSTATE THE APPEAL; MOTION TO STAY AND OR RECALL THE
REMITITTUR IF NECESSARY; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT
OF APPEALS JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT
TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IN THEIR USE OF RULE 207
RELATED TO THE ORDERING OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS AND
MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

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

IF SOMEHOW THIS APPEAL HAS BEEN DISMISSED OR THE REMITTITUR SENT DOWN TO THE LOWER COURT. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO REINSTATE THIS APPEAL IF NECESSARY AND MOTION TO STAY AND OR RECALL THE MANDATE AND OR REMITTITUR IF NECESSARY DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE.

THE CLERK OF COURT ISSUED A LETTER DATED OCTOBER 14, 2025 GIVING THE APPELLANT CERTAIN INSTRUCTIONS WHICH READ:

"DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: THIS WILL ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF YOUR FILINGS WE RECEIVED ON OCTOBER 2, 2025. WE ARE RETURNING YOUR FILINGS OF THE APPELLATE BRIEF AND RECORD ON APPEAL AS THEY HAVE BEEN UNTIMELY FILED.(THE APPELLATE BRIEF IS THE FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND SHOULD HAVE BEEN CONSTRUED AS SUCH). WITHIN TEN DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS LETTER, YOU MUST FILE A COPY OF THE LETTER SHOWING THAT YOU HAVE TIMELY ORDERED THE TRANSCRIPT FROM THE COURT REPORTER. IF YOU HAVE NOT TIMELY ORDERED THE TRANSCRIPT, YOU MUST SERVE AND FILE A MOTION REQUESTING PERMISSION TO ORDER THE TRANSCRIPT OUTSIDE OF THE FILING DEADLINES SET BY RULE 207 OF SCACR, ALONG WITH A COPY OF YOUR LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE COURT REPORTER. BE SURE TO COPY THE COURT, THE OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION AND OPPOSING COUNSEL WITH ALL CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING THE TRANSCRIPT. THE ADDRESS OF THE COURT ADMINISTRATION IS AS FOLLOWS: SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION 1220 SENATE STREET, SUITE 200 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201. YOU MUST ADVISE THE COURT OF THE STATUS OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITHIN (10) DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS LETTER, OR YOUR APPEAL WILL BE DISMISSED".

THE APPELLANT OBJECTS TO THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN ACTS OF MACHINATION TO THWART JUST AND FAIR REVIEW BY THE COURT AND STATE ACTORS INVOLVED. ATTACHED THE COURT WILL FIND: A COPY OF THE ENVELOPE THAT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEAL SENT ITS LETTER DATED OCTOBER 14, 2025 IN AND OTHER PLEADING THAT WAS CONTAINED THEREIN. ACCORDING TO THE POST MARK ON THE ENVELOPE, IT IS INDEED

DATED OCTOBER 14, 2025 AS THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS LETTER SEEM TO INDICATE. THIS IS NOT THE MACHINATION, FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. IT IS COMMON KNOWLEDGE THAT THE COURT ARE GIVEN THEIR OWN PERSONAL POSTAL MARKER MACHINES DUE TO THE LARGE VOLUME OF MAIL THEY HAVE GOING OUT. NOW LOOK AT THE STAMP IN WHICH IT WAS SUPPOSEDLY RECEIVED BY EVANS INSTITUTION WHERE THE APPELLANT CURRENTLY RESIDE. ACCORDING TO THE EVANS C.I. STAMP, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS OCTOBER 14, 2025 LETTER AND RETURNED DOCUMENTS ARRIVED AT THE INSTITUTION ON OCTOBER 21, 2025 WITH ONLY 3 DAYS REMAINING TO BE IN COMPLIANCE, AND THEN THE STATE ACTORS, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND MACHINATION TO THWART JUST AND FAIR REVIEW, THEN INSTRUCTED EVANS C.I. CO-CONSPIRATORS TO NOT EVEN RELEASE THE MAILING TO THE PETITIONER UNTIL NOVEMBER 3, 2025 PLACING THE APPELLANT WAY BEYOND THE TIME THAT WAS REQUIRED FOR THE APPELLANT TO RESPOND. SINCE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS HAVE THEIR OWN POST MARKING MACHINE POTENTIALLY GIVEN TO THEM BY THE U.S. POST OFFICE. ALL INDICATION POINT TO THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS HOLDING THE PLEADING BEFORE SENDING IT SEVERAL DAYS IN EFFORTS TO PUSH THE APPELLANT PAST ANY PROSCRIBED TIMELINES TO RESPOND. IT DOESN'T TAKE 7 DAYS FOR CORRESPONDENCE TO REACH EVANS C.I. FROM RICHLAND COUNTY S.C.. ONCE AT EVAN C.I., APPARENTLY ARRIVING ON OCTOBER 21, 2025. THE STATE THEN INSTRUCTS EVANS C.I. TO NOT RELEASE THE COURT'S OCTOBER 14, 2025 LETTER AND DOCUMENTS TO THE APPELLANT UNTIL NOVEMBER 3, 2025 MAKING IT LITERALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE APPELLANT TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS INSTRUCTION VOIDING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. SEE PLEADINGS ATTACHED TO THE PREVIOUSLY SENT IN PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS.

INSOMUCH, THE APPELLANT UNDER RULE 207 IS GIVEN (30) DAYS TO SEEK THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT AND FILE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI. THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL HEARING BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY GENERAL SESSIONS COURT OCCURRED ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2025. A NOTICE OF APPEAL WAS IMMEDIATELY FILED THE NEXT DAY WHICH TOOK AT

LEAST A COUPLE OF DAYS BEFORE IT WAS PROCESSED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. LET'S SAY UNTIL SEPTEMBER 16, 2025. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS VIA ITS LETTER DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2025, INFORMED THE APPELLANT THAT THE CASE WAS NOW FILED BEFORE THE COURT UNDER CASE 2025-001856. THIS MEANS IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE APPELLANT, HE WAS TO BE GIVEN (30) DAYS FROM THAT NOTICE TO FILE HIS PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND TO SEEK THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT. IF THE COURT WOULD TAKE NOTICE OF THE [55] PAGE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO FILE APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS; MOTION TO SEEK AND ORDER THE RELEASE OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS IN FORMA PAUPERIS FOR PURPOSES OF APPEAL AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", DATED OCTOBER 7, 2025 WHICH WAS SERVED ON THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE LOWER COURT AND THE S.C. OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION. IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THE REQUEST FOR THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS IN FORMA PAUPERIS WAS TIMELY MADE WITHIN THE (30) DAYS AS RULE 207 REQUIRES. THE FACT THAT THE APPELLATE BRIEF IS CLOCKED STAMPED RECEIVED BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS OCTOBER 2, 2025 WHICH IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE APPELLANT MUST BE CONSTRUED AS A "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT" TO A PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI. THIS DEMONSTRATING THAT THERE IS NO NEED TO SEEK THE TRANSCRIPT OUTSIDE OF THE FILING DEADLINES OR FOR THE FILING OF PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI SINCE THE APPELLATE BRIEF ACTS AS A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT. THE APPELLATE BRIEF AS FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS FILED AND TRANSCRIPT WAS SOUGHT AND OR FILED WITHIN (30) DAYS AS THE RULE REQUIRED. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS TO ANY CLAIM OTHERWISE.

AS FOR THE SUBMITTING OF THE FORMAL PETITION SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI, IF THE COURT WOULD REQUIRE THIS. THERE WAS ALSO A MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO DO THIS TIMELY FILED ONCE THE LOWER COURT RULES ON THE OBTAINING OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO THE APPELLANT'S INDIGENCE AND NEED OF THE TRANSCRIPTS TO BE IN COMPLIANCE TO THIS SUBSTANTIAL RULE. IF THIS CASE HAS BEEN DISMISSED, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL. IF THE REMITTUR HAS NOT BEEN SENT DOWN, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO STAY IT, AND IF IT HAS BEEN SENT DOWN, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO RECALL IT. STOP THIS FRAUD

UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRACY, MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. FOR THE RECORD, THIS IS NOT THE FIRST TIME THAT THE STATE ACTORS ATTEMPTED SIMILAR ACTS. THIS IS NOT AN ISOLATED INCIDENT OF MAIL TAMPERING. THESE UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS ARE ALSO BEING CURRENTLY ARGUED BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURTS INVOLVED DEMONSTRATING THIS IS NOT A CONCLUSORY CLAIM WHERE THE CONSPIRING STATE ACTORS ENGAGED IN SIMILAR PRACTICES AND ACTIVITY. THE DOCUMENTS THAT THE CLERK RETURNED VIA HER OCTOBER 14, 2025 ARE BEING RETURNED TO THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ATTACHED TO THE FACE OF THIS PLEADING AS EVIDENCE AND APPENDICES TO ESTABLISH A COMPLETE RECORD AND THE CLAIM OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, MACHINATION TO THWART JUST AND FAIR REVIEW AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. SEE THE DOCUMENTS RETURNED ALONG WITH THE COURT'S OCTOBER 14, 2025 LETTER.

FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING THAT IT ENTERS. A JUDGMENT OR ACTION PROCURED BY FRAUD MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED. THIS APPLIES TO ALL JUDGMENTS, ACTS, ORDERS, DECREES OF ALL COURTS ON RECORD, INCLUDING THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. A COPY OF THIS PLEADING IS BEING SERVED ON THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE COURT ADMINISTRATION OFFICE AS YOUR PREVIOUS LETTER REQUIRED. PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS IS FILED TO REQUIRE THE LOWER COURT TO RULE ON THE RELEASE OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS IN FORMA PAUPERIS. I ASK THAT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS RULE ON THE PREVIOUSLY RECEIVED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE FORMAL PETITION ONCE THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS ARE RELEASED TO THE APPELLANT. SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH WITH THE INTENT TO DECEIVE IS FRAUD. FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT (HOLDING LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO PUSH ME PAST THE TIME TO RESPOND) WITHOUT ANY MISREPRESENTATION OR DUTY TO DISCLOSE WOULD CONSTITUTE FRAUD, EVEN IN ABSENCE OF FIDUCIARY DUTY, STATUTORY OR OTHERWISE INDEPENDENT LEGAL DUTY TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION (LIKE TIMELINES TO RESPOND UNTIL AFTER THE TIME HAS PASSED), COMMON LAW FRAUD INCLUDES ACTS TAKEN TO CONCEAL (THE APPELLANT'S REQUIREMENT TO TIMELY RESPOND), CREATE A FALSE IMPRESSION (LIKE YOU WERE GIVING ME TIMELY NOTICE OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE COURT BUT HELD THE NOTICE TO PUSH ME PASSED THE DEADLINE), MISLEAD OR OTHERWISE DECEIVE TO PREVENT THE APPELLANT FROM ACQUIRING MATERIAL

INFORMATION (LIKE A PROPER RULING ON HIS APPEAL), IN RE: DURAMAX DIESEL LITIGATION,--F.R.D.--, 2018 WL 949856 (E.D.Mich.2018); UNITED STATES v. PALIN, 874 F.3d. 418 (4th.Cir.2017); UNITED STATES v. LUSK, 2017 WL 508589 (S.D.Va.2017); UNITED STATES v. CALLOWAY, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 4269961(N.D.Cali.2016); MDL INNOVATIONS, LLC. v. NORTHERN,--Fed. Appx'--, 2018 WL 1129607 (4th.Cir.2018); HAMER v. NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES OF CHICAGO, 138 S.Ct. 13, 199 L.Ed.2d. 249(U.S.2017); UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263 (4th.Cir.2017); IN RE: GENESYS DATA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., 204 F.3d. 124 (4th.Cir.2000); MYLES v. DOMINO'S PIZZA, LLC., 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); FIRST TECHNOLOGY CAPITAL, INC. v. BANCTEC, INC., 2016 WL 7444943(D.C.Ky.2016); McCLAIN v. 1st. SECURITY BANK OF WASHINGTON, 2016 WL 8504775(W.D.Wash.2016).

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IS THE POWER TO DECLARE LAW, WHETHER IT BE UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OR THE STATUTORY ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. THEREFORE, IT CANNOT BE WAIVED AND OR FORFEITED AND CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, EVEN ON APPEAL AND TO PREVENT THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE THAT HAS CURRENTLY OCCURRED WITHIN THIS COURT AS IS ARGUED TO PREVENT THE DISMISSAL OF THIS APPEAL BY UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND MAIL TAMPERING ON THE PART OF THE STATE, PAVONNE v. AMERICAN CONTRACT SYSTEMS, INC., 2025 WL 2977640(M.D.Fla.2025); HUNTSVILLE SENIOR SERVICES v. ALABAMA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH, 645 F.Supp.3d. 1254(N.D.Ala.2022); HENSELEY v. CITY OF CHARLOTTE, 2023 WL 2533083 (W.D.N.C.2023); B.R. v. F.C.S.B., 17 F.4TH. 485(4th.Cir.2021); STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998); al-SUYID v. HIFTER, 139 F.4TH. 368 (4th.Cir.2025). THE MERE CLAIM THAT RIGHTS EXIST UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHERE THE PARTIES CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN ACTS OF MACHINATION TO PUSH ME PAST THE TIME FRAME TO RESPOND TO DISMISS THE APPEAL ON A TECHNICALITY IS SUFFICIENT REASON TO STAY AND OR RECALL THE REMITTITUR AND GRANT THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

TO REQUIRE THE LOWER COURT TO IMMEDIATELY RULE ON THE FILING OF APPEAL AND OBTAIN THOSE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS IN FORMA PAUPERIS, STOP RECKLESS ECONOMIC INSTABILITY BY DEMOCRATS v. FEDERAL ELECTION COMM'S., 814 F.3d. 221 (4th.Cir.2016); WESTMINSTER NURSING CENTER v. COHEN, 2017 WL 5632661 (E.D.N.C.2017); FIRST PROTECTION INSURANCE COMPANY v. LEWIS EDWARD O'LEARY, 2025 WL 1936566 (4th.Cir.2025)(THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS STATED IN NO UNCERTAIN TERMS THAT THE COURTS ARE NOT FREE TO SIMPLY ASSUME THAT THEY POSSESS SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND THEN PROCEED TO DECIDE THE MERITS OF THE ISSUES BEFORE THEM OR DISMISS THIS APPEAL WHEN THEIR JURISDICTION REMAINS IN DOUBT)[THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE PLACE THIS CASE BEYOND THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION TO DISMISS THIS APPEAL]; JEFFERIES v. PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, 2025 WL 590433 (D.Md.2025); KOKKONEN v. GUARDIAN LIFE INS. CO. OF AMERICA, 144 S.Ct. 1673(U.S.1994)(COURTS, ALL COURTS, STATE AND FEDERAL, ONLY POSSESS POWER BY "CONSTITUTION" (EMPHASIS ADDED) AND STATUTE WHICH IS NOT TO BE EXPANDED BY JUDICIAL DECREE. IT IS PRESUMED THAT THE CAUSE LIES OUTSIDE, BEYOND, THE COURT'S "CONSTITUTIONAL" JURISDICTION, AND THE BURDEN OF ESTABLISHING THE CONTRARY IS UPON THE STATE AND RESPONDENT TO DEMONSTRATE OTHERWISE WHERE THESE ADDITIONAL ACTS OF MACHINATION FURTHER GOES TOWARDS ESTABLISHING THE APPELLANT'S CLAIM OF DEFAULT, FORFEITURE AND WAIVER ON THE PART OF THE STATE WHICH VOIDS THE CONVICTION ITSELF, COPER BRIGHT ENTERPRISES v. RAIMONDO, 603 U.S. 369, 144 S.Ct. 2244 (U.S.2024); LOZMAN v. CITY OF RIVERA BEACH, Fla., 133 S.Ct. 735(U.S.2013); CROSS-SOUND FERRY SERV., INC. v. I.C.C., 834 F.3d. 327, 339 (C.A.D.C.1991); THE CITY OF OCALA, FLORIDA v. ROJAS, 598--U.S.--, 2023 WL 2357328 (U.S.2023)(HIGHLIGHTING BOTH ELEMENTS OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND THE VOIDING OF JURISDICTION); WILKINS v. UNITED STATES,--S.Ct.--, 2023 WL 2655449 (U.S.2023)(REGARDING CLAIM PROCESSING RULES AND THE VOIDING OF JURISDICTION); UNITED STATES v. BROWN,--F.4TH.--, 2023 WL 3214545 (4th.Cir.2023)REGARDING THE REQUIREMENT TO PLACE PROPER ELEMENTS WITHIN AN INDICTMENT AND THE VOIDING OF JURISDICTION); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599(U.S.2016)(UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS WITHIN CRIMINAL CASES WHICH INCLUDE BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS VOIDS

JURISDICTION TO DISMISS THIS APPEAL); STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83 (UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION UNDER BOTH THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY ELEMENTS TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION VOIDS JURISDICTION).

AN APPLICATION FOR POST CONVICTION DNA TESTING UNDER THE ACCESS TO JUSTICE POST CONVICTION DNA TESTING ACT MAY FILE A PETITION FOR BELATED APPELLATE REVIEW OF THE DENIAL OF THE APPLICATION, WHERE THE APPLICANT IN THIS CASE WAS PREVENTED BY THIS CURRENT FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE WHERE IN THIS CASE HE WAS NOT JUST OBSTRUCTED IN THE KERSHAW GENERAL SESSIONS COURT, BUT ALSO OBSTRUCTED BEFORE THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT UNDER CASES 2006-CP-3567, 3568, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294, UNITED STATES v. BRANTLEY, 87 F.4TH. 262(4th.Cir.2023); MACK v. STATE, 433 S.C. 267, 858 S.E.2d. 160(S.C.App.2021); MACK v. WARDEN OF LIEBER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, 2024 WL 5694563(DSC.2024); MANGAL v. STATE, 421 S.C. 85, 805 S.E.2d. 568(S.C.App.2017); HOWARD v. CITY OF DURHAM, 68 F.4TH. 943(4th.Cir.2023); GUTIERRIZ v. SAENZ, 145 S.Ct. 2258 (U.S.2025).

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

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

NOVEMBER 3, 2025

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

CASE DOCKET NO. 2025-001856

APPEAL FROM THE COUNTY OF KERSHAW
IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

RECEIVED

NOV 07 2025

SC Court of Appeals

APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING
CASE NO. 2004-GS-28-00385

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

APPELLANT(S)-PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE COUNTY OF KERSHAW,

RESPONDENTS-APPELLES


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 REINSTATE THE APPEAL; MOTION TO STAY AND OR RECALL THE REMITTITUR IF NECESSARY; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS

JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IN THEIR USE OF RULE 207 RELATED TO THE ORDERING OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211, THE S.C. OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION 1220 SENATE STREET, SUITE 200 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201, THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON NOVEMBER 4, 2025. DUE TO FEDERAL PENDENT JURISDICTION, 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', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

NOVEMBER 4, 2025

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE
#300839 F3B. RM. 148
EVANS C.I. 610 HWY. 9 WEST
BENNETTSVILLE, S.C. 29512

IN RE: CASE 2025-001865

RECEIVED

NOV 07 2025

SC Court of Appeals

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,

DUE TO RECENT ATTEMPTS AT FRAUD UPON THE COURT,
CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION
OF JUSTICE INVOLVING THE STATE ACTORS IN THIS CASE. THIS MOTION
TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL IF NECESSARY AND MOTION TO STAY AND OR
RECALL THE REMITTITUR IS NOW FILED WITHIN THIS CASE. THE ATTACHED
DOCUMENTS ARE NOW ATTACHED TO THE FACE OF THIS PLEADING AS
EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF WHAT IS ARGUED WITHIN THE (10) PAGE
DOCUMENT DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2025. PLEASE SEE THAT ALL OF THIS IS
FILED WITHIN THE CASE CAPTIONED ABOVE. THE OTHER PARTIES ARE
SERVED COPY OF THE PLEADING.

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Tishbite', written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and somewhat cursive.

NOVEMBER 3, 2025

CC: THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL

THE S.C. OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION

LAWRENCE L. Crawford
#300839 P3B Rm 148
EVANS C.H. 610 Hwy 9 West
Bennettsville SC 29512



RECEIVED
NOV 07 2025
SC Court of Appeals

SC Court of Appeals
P.O. Box 11,629
Columbia, SC 29211