

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

RECEIVED

Dec 15 2025

SC Court of Appeals

IN RE: CASE 2025-001856 AND MOTIONING TO RELIEVE STATE APPOINTED
COUNSEL DUE TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST AS IS ARGUED IN THE ATTACHED
FILING.

TO: THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS,
ATTORNEY MS. WANDA S. CARTER,
THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL ET. AL.,

ATTACHED IS A PLEADING THAT NEEDS TO BE FILED WITHIN THE
ABOVE CAPTIONED CASES WITHIN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, FILED FOR
THE PURPOSE OF MOTIONING TO RELIEVE COUNSEL FROM THE S.C.
APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE DUE TO CLEAR CONFLICT OF INTEREST.
PLEASE FILE WITHIN THE CASE AND NOTIFY THE COURT TO ALLOW
ADJUDICATION. COPY IS SERVED ON THE S.C. APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE
AND S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL. I THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,


RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

DECEMBER 8, 2025

CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR VOIDING THE ORDER UNDER THE
CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION; MOTION TO
RENEW THE PREVIOUS FILED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND OTHER
PLEADING THAT ARE THE SUBJECT TO THE DECEMBER 3, 2025 ORDER AND
MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, AND ITS ATTACHMENTS, ON THE S.C. COURT
OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211, ATTORNEY MS.
WANDA H. CARTER OF THE S.C. APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE 1330 LADY
STREET SUITE 401, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF
APPEALS, THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL,
THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, MR. LAWRENZ DIRECTOR AT WELL PATH
CENTER, THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS, THE UNITED STATES SENATE, THE
U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE AT THE DEPT. OF JUSTICE, THE U.S.
ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ARCH BISHOP
FABRE-JEUNE, POPE LEO AND THE VATICAN, THE UNITED NATIONS, THE
COUNTY OF RICHLAND, THE COUNTY OF KERSHAW, THE COUNTY OF HORRY,
THE COUNTY OF CHARLESTON AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES VIA THEIR
ADDRESSES ON RECORD WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, BY
U.S. MAIL AND OR CERTIFIED, POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT IN
THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON DECEMBER 8, 2025. FEDERAL LAW PREEMPTS
STATE LAW IN THIS CASE. IT IS DEEMED FILED ON THAT DATE PURSUANT
TO THE MAILBOX RULE, HOUSTON v. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108
S.Ct. 2379(U.S.1988).

RESPECTFULLY,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD



DECEMBER 8, 2025

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

Dec 15 2025

SC Court of Appeals

CASE DOCKET NO. 2025-001856

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

APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING
UNDER CASE 2004-GS-28-00385

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD,

PETITIONER-APPELLANT

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO ACT PRO SE (SEEKING TO RELIEVE STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL ALSO DUE TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST); MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER ISSUED ON DECEMBER 3, 2025 HOLDING THE CASE IN ABEYANCE DUE TO

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

Dec 15 2025

SC Court of Appeals

CASE DOCKET NO. 2025-001856

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

APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING
UNDER CASE 2004-GS-28-00385

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD,

PETITIONER-APPELLANT

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO
ACT PRO SE (SEEKING TO RELIEVE STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL
ALSO DUE TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST); MOTION TO VACATE THE
ORDER ISSUED ON DECEMBER 3, 2025 HOLDING THE CASE IN
ABEYANCE DUE TO CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR VOIDING
THE ORDER UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT
MATTER JURISDICTION; MOTION TO RENEW THE PREVIOUS FILE
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND OTHER PLEADING THAT ARE
SUBJECT TO THE DECEMBER 3, 2025 ORDER AND MOTION
TO MOTION THEREFOR

JUDGMENT ON THIS ISSUE RELATED TO THIS MATTER BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS THAT PRODUCE FURTHER EVIDENCE THAT THE STATE PROCESS IS INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT(S) BY PLACING LEGAL COUNSEL WHERE THERE IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST INVOLVED, JONES v. STATE, 2024 WL 2787273 (Tex.2024); McCOY v. LOUISIANA, 584 U.S. 414, 138 S.Ct. 1500, 200 L.Ed.2d. 821(U.S.2018); UNITED STATES v. DiMARTINO, 949 F.3d. 67 (2nd.Cir.2020); MAZE v. OLIVER, Fed. Supp., 2024 WL 2848308(3rd.Cir.2024); WEAVER v. MASSACHUSETTS, 582 U.S. 286, 137 S.Ct. 1899, 198 L.Ed.2d. 420(U.S.2017)(THE RIGHT OF A DEFENDANT TO CONDUCT HIS OWN PROCEEDINGS IS BASED UPON THE FUNDAMENTAL LEGAL PRINCIPLE THAT THE APPELLANT MUST BE ALLOWED TO MAKE HIS OWN CHOICES ABOUT THE PROPER WAY TO PROTECT HIS OWN LIBERTY WHICH ESTABLISH CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS THE ORDER UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND RENEWS THE PREVIOUS FILED MOTIONS THAT ARE THE SOURCE OF THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION DONE BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

THIS IS NOT THE FIRST TIME SOMETHING LIKE THIS OCCURRED, AND THIS IS NOT YOUR GARDEN VARIETY FRAUD. IT IS A FRAUD UPON THE COURT DIRECTED AT THE MACHINERY OF THE COURT ITSELF BY OFFICERS OF THE COURT WHICH PREVENT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS BY THIS MACHINATION FROM NORMALLY ADJUDICATING CASES IN ACCORDANCE WITH DUE PROCESS LAW WHERE THE COURT HAS SADDLED THE PETITIONER WITH COUNSEL THAT PRODUCE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS PULLED THIS STUNT IN 2004 ALONG WITH THE S.C. APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE TO PREVENT THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, FROM BEING FULLY HEARD ON THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES WHEN HE WAS ON HIS INITIAL DIRECT APPEAL IN 2004 AND LITIGATING ESSENTIALLY (11) YEARS AHEAD OF U.S. SUPREME COURT RULING THAT DID NOT OCCUR UNTIL 2016. THEIR INTENT IS TO APPOINT THIS COMPROMISED INAPPROPRIATE INFLUENCE STATE APPOINTED ATTORNEY, PRODUCING A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, TO ALLOW THE COMPROMISED APPELLATE ATTORNEY TO THROW OUT AND OR FAIL TO LITIGATE ALL THE CLAIMS AND ISSUES THAT ARE NOW PROPERLY PLACED BEFORE THE COURT BY THE CURRENT PLEADING

TO: THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

HERE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) APPENDIX NO. (1) THIS IS A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; NOTICE OF RELEASE AND ADDRESS CHANGE FOR MAURICE BELLAMY; MOTION TO SUBMIT ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF PROVING MACHINATION AND ESTABLISHING THAT THE STATE PROCESS IS INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT(S) AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", [10] PAGES DATED DECEMBER 8, 2025.

(2) APPENDIX NO. (2). THIS IS A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; NOTICE OF SUBMISSION OF APPELLANTS INFORMAL BRIEF", [29] PAGES DATED OCTOBER 28, 2025. THESE DOCUMENTS ARE FILED BEFORE THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT UNDER THE RELATED CASES AND BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS UNDER THE CASES CAPTIONED ON THE DOCUMENTS. THEY ARE NOW SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF MOTIONING TO RELIEVE STATE APPOINTED APPELLATE COUNSEL TO ALLOW THE PETITIONER TO EXERCISE HIS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO ACT PRO SE AND SELF REPRESENTATION.

INSOMUCH, THERE IS NO NEED TO BE REDUNDANT. THE [10] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED DECEMBER 8, 2025 NOW FILED BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS IS MORE THAN SUFFICIENT TO ADDRESS THESE MATTERS. IT IS BY THE PLEADING IN THAT DOCUMENT THAT THE PETITIONER MOTIONS TO RELIEVE THE STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL AND ACT PRO SE. SINCE WHEN, IN THE ANNALS OF THIS NATION'S HISTORY CAN A STATE COURT FORCE LEGAL COUNSEL ON AN INDIVIDUAL AGAINST HIS WILL WHO CHOOSES TO ACT PRO SE AND EXERCISE HIS RIGHT OF SELF REPRESENTATION, IF THE PERSON IS MENTALLY COMPETENT AND SEEKS TO DO SO VOLUNTARILY, KNOWINGLY AND INTELLIGENTLY, ACKNOWLEDGING ON THE RECORD THAT HE IS FULLY AWARE OF THE DANGERS OF SELF REPRESENTATION AND MAKES THAT CHOICE WITH HIS EYES WIDE OPEN KNOWING THE SAME AND THERE IS A CLEAR CONFLICT OF INTEREST INVOLVING THE S.C. APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE? IT IS THE

UNDER THE GUISE OF ASSERTING THERE IS NO HYBRID DEFENSE IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THE APPELLANT(S) OBJECT AS IS ARGUED WITHIN THE [10] PAGE DOCUMENT ATTACHED. THE PETITIONER HAS NOW BROUGHT THE EYES OF THE WORLD INTO THESE JUDICIAL PROCEEDING WITHIN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. LET THE WORLD NOW SEE IF THE PETITIONER IS RIGHT ABOUT THE STATE PROCESS NOT BEING EFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THE PETITIONER IS MENTALLY COMPETENT TO REPRESENT HIMSELF. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IN MANY REGARDS PERTAINING TO THESE MATTERS HANDLED THE COURT LIKE THE "DEATH STAR" FROM STAR WARS UTILIZING THIS STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL AS A MEANS OF MACHINATION TO STIFLE THE VOICES OF THE PETITIONER WHERE THERE IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THEY REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER TO CLAIM THEIR IS NO HYBRID DEFENSE TO PREVENT JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES FROM BEING HEARD FOR FAR TO LONG. THE MOTION FOR SELF REPRESENTATION IS TIMELY MADE. THE PREJUDICE TO THE PETITIONER IS OVERWHELMING. THOUGH THE RIGHT TO SELF REPRESENTATION ON APPEAL IS DISCRETIONARY, THE MAGNITUDE OF THE DAMAGE THAT CAN OCCUR BY ALLOWING THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE TO HANDLE THIS CASE CANNOT BE OVERSTATED AND WOULD IN FRAUD AND MACHINATION, NOT STRATEGY, PREVENT THE PROPER CHALLENGE TO THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. THERE IS ALSO A CONFLICT OF INTEREST INVOLVING THE S.C. APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE WHERE THE COUNTIES OF RICHLAND AND KERSHAW ARE CURRENTLY BEING SUED UNDER CASE 9:24-cv-04660-BHH-MHC ET. AL., IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT. THE COUNTY AND ITS INVOLVED OFFICERS, INCLUDING THE APPELLANT DEFENSE OFFICE ARE CURRENTLY BEING SUE FOR THEIR INVOLVEMENT WITH THE CONSPIRACY THAT OCCURRED IN 2024 REGARDING THIS CASE. IT WOULD BE A CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE TO REPRESENT THE PETITIONER ON THIS SECOND APPEAL WHILE A § 1983 FEDERAL LAWSUIT IS CURRENTLY PENDING AGAINST THEM FOR ALLEGED INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY TO FRAME THE PETITIONER BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED TO CONFIRM THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTION. A DIRECT CONFLICT ARISES WHEN A LAWYER'S OR LAW FIRM'S (IN THIS CASE, THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE) DUTY TO THEIR CURRENT CLIENT (THE PETITIONER) IS MATERIALLY LIMITED BY THEIR OWN PERSONAL INTERESTS OR BY THEIR RESPONSIBILITY TO A THIRD PARTY. THIS CURRENT APPEAL

DECLINE REPRESENTATION IF THE "REPRESENTATION WILL RESULT IN A VIOLATION OF THE RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OR OTHER LAW". THIS PRODUCES A SCENARIO THAT IS NON-CONSENTABLE, THE LAWYER CANNOT REASONABLY BELIEVE THEY CAN PROVIDE COMPETENT AND DILIGENT REPRESENTATION, IN THE MATTER OF ANONYMOUS MEMBER OF SOUTH CAROLINA BAR, 392 S.C. 328, 709 S.E.2d. 633(S.C.App.2011); IN THE MATTER OF ANONYMOUS MEMBER OF THE BAR, 346 S.C. 177, 552 S.E.2d. 10 (S.C.App.2001); STANKO v. STIRLING, 109 F.4TH. 681(4th.Cir.2024); CUYLER v. SULLIVAN, 446 U.S. 335, 100 S.Ct. 1708, 64 L.Ed.2d. 333(U.S.1980); HOLLOWAY v. ARKANSAS, 435 U.S. 475, 98 S.Ct. 1173, 55 L.Ed.2d. 426(U.S.1978); STATE v. HENDERSON, 205 Kan. 231, 468 P.2d. 136(1970); PEOPLE v. BLALOCK, 197 Colo. 320, 592 P.2d. 406 (1979); STRICKLAND v. WASHINGTON, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d. 674(U.S.1984); WILLIAMS v. TAYLOR, 529 U.S. 362, 391, 120 S.Ct. 1495, 146 L.Ed.2d. 389(U.S.2000).

INASMUCH, RULE 602, SCACR (REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS): OUTLINES THE PROCEDURE FOR APPOINTING AND RELIEVING COUNSEL FOR INDIGENT DEFENDANTS. THE RULE DOES NOT PROVIDE MECHANISM TO FORCE AN ATTORNEY ONTO AN UNWILLING, COMPETENT CLIENT, ESPECIALLY WHERE THERE EXIST A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. RULE 71.1(g), SCRPC (POST CONVICTION RELIEF ACTIONS SIMILAR TO FORENSIC DNA TESTING GOVERNS THE CONTINUANCE OF REPRESENTATION DURING APPEAL. COUNSEL AT THE LOWER COURT STAGE, IN THIS CASE SELF REPRESENTATION, SHALL CONTINUE REPRESENTATION ON APPEAL. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS CANNOT FORCE A MENTALLY COMPETENT INDIVIDUAL TO ACCEPT LEGAL COUNSEL AGAINST THEIR WILL IF THEY MAKE A TIMELY MOTION TO REPRESENT THEMSELVES AND THERE IS A CLEAR CONFLICT OF INTEREST INVOLVING THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE AS STATED. MOTION IS OFFICIALLY AND TIMELY MADE. THE RIGHT TO SELF REPRESENTATION IS A CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHT ROOTED IN DUE PROCESS LAW, EVEN THOUGH THE PETITIONER IS AWARE THAT ON APPEAL IT GOES TOWARDS THE COURT'S DISCRETION. A CONFLICT OF INTEREST CLEARLY EXISTS. THE ONLY THING THAT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IS REQUIRED TO DO UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES IS CONFIRM THAT THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO MOVE FORWARD WITHOUT COUNSEL IS MADE KNOWINGLY, INTELLIGENTLY, AND VOLUNTARILY AND THAT THE PARTY

INVOLVE CHALLENGE TO THE LEGITIMACY OF THE PRIOR CONVICTION, WHICH COULD POTENTIALLY EXPOSE OR SUPPORT CLAIMS MADE IN THE PENDING § 1983 TO WHICH PETITION FOR HABEAS CORPUS IS ALSO FILED THAT WOULD PERMIT SELF REPRESENTATION BEFORE THAT COURT AGAINST THE OFFICE AND ITS ACTORS. THE OFFICE INTEREST IS DEFENDING ITSELF AGAINST SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS OF CONSPIRACY IN THE FEDERAL LAWSUITS CREATES A SIGNIFICANT RISK THAT ITS REPRESENTATION OF THE PETITIONER WOULD BE COMPROMISED. ATTORNEYS OWE THEIR CLIENTS A DUTY OF UNDIVIDED LOYALTY. THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE ALONG WITH THE OTHER COUNTY OFFICIALS ARE BEING SUED BY THE PETITIONER WHO YOU SET UP AS THEIR CLIENT FOR THE ALLEGED CONSPIRACY IN CONFIRMING AN UNLAWFUL CONVICTION. IT WOULD BE FUNDAMENTALLY OPPOSED TO THE PETITIONER'S INTEREST FOR THE OFFICE TO CONTINUE TO REPRESENT HIM IN THE UNDERLYING CRIMINAL CASE. LEGAL ETHICS RULES UNIVERSALLY PROHIBIT SUCH CONFLICTS TO ENSURE A CLIENT RECEIVES ZEALOUS AND UNCOMPROMISED REPRESENTATION. CONTINUED REPRESENTATION UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES WOULD VIOLATE RULES OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS. THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE ALONG WITH THE OTHER COUNTY OFFICIAL'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE CIVIL LAWSUIT FOR THE ALLEGED CONSPIRACY RELATED TO THE ORIGINAL CONVICTION DIRECTLY UNDERMINES ITS ABILITY TO PROVIDE CONFLICT-FREE AND ZEALOUS ADVOCACY IN THE CONTINUING APPEAL PROCESS. THE PETITIONER MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO RELIEVE APPOINTED COUNSEL AND TO EXERCISE HIS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY AND TO ACT PRO SE DUE TO THIS SIGNIFICANT CONFLICT OF INTEREST THAT EXIST IN THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE REPRESENTING THE PETITIONER IN THIS APPEAL. SEE S.C. RULES OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT RULE 1.7.(a)(2)(A LAWYER SHALL NOT REPRESENT A CLIENT IF THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT RISK THAT THE REPRESENTATION WILL BE MATERIALLY LIMITED BY THE LAWYER'S PERSONAL INTERESTS OR RESPONSIBILITIES TO A THIRD PARTY). THE OFFICE POTENTIALLY DEFENDING ITSELF IN A FEDERAL LAWSUIT FROM THE CLIENT FOR CONSPIRACY TO WRONGFULLY CONVICT THE PETITIONER PRESENTS A PROFOUND "PERSONAL INTEREST" CONFLICT. WHEN A LAWYER'S OWN CONDUCT IN A RELATED TRANSACTION IS IN "SERIOUS QUESTION", IT WOULD BE "DIFFICULT OR IMPOSSIBLE" TO GIVE THE PETITIONER DETACHED ADVICE. THIS PRINCIPLE DIRECTLY APPLIES HERE AS THE OFFICE AND COUNTY'S PRIOR CONDUCT IS SUBJECT TO THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL LAWSUIT. RULE 1.16(a)(1) THAT A LAWYER MUST TERMINATE OR

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

RECEIVED

Dec 15 2025

SC Court of Appeals

APPELLATE CASE NO.(S) 2025-6589, 2025-6599, 2025-1840, 2025-6602

APPEAL FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT

APPEAL FROM CASE NO. 9:24-cv-04660-BHH-MHC ET. AL.,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, ALTON
CHISOLM, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, MAURICE BELLAMY,

PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,

DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES


AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T.
TISHBITE, ALTON CHISOLM, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, MAURICE
BELLAMY, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A
COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; NOTICE OF
RELEASE AND ADDRESS CHANGE FOR MAURICE BELLAMY; MOTION TO SUBMIT
ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF PROVING MACHINATION AND

THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT(S) WARRANTING HABEAS
CORPUS AS IS SOUGHT WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. THE
PETITIONER MOTIONS TO RELIEVE COUNSEL AND MOTION TO ACT PRO SE,
MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER OF ABEYANCE AND RENEWS THE PREVIOUS
FILED PLEADINGS BEFORE THE COURT OF APPEALS.

RESPECTFULLY,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lawrence L. Crawford", with a stylized flourish at the end.

DECEMBER 8, 2025

IS FULLY AWARE OF THE CONSEQUENCES AND SIGNIFICANT RISKS OF SELF REPRESENTATION. THE REQUEST MUST BE TIMELY MADE, WHICH OF COURSE THE REQUEST IS TIMELY, SINCE THE APPEAL JUST BEGAN. ANY OTHER REQUIREMENT WOULD BE AN ACT OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND MACHINATION WHERE THERE IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST INVOLVING THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE ESTABLISHING CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT WOULD VOID THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. SEE CASES CITED WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT INFORMAL BRIEF. ALSO SEE STATE v. BARNES, 407 S.C. 27, 753 S.E.2d. 545 (S.C.App.2014); BROOKS v. SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION OF INDIGENT DEFENSE, 419 S.C. 319, 797 S.E.2d. 402(S.C.App.2017); STATE v. POLITE, S.E.2d., 2017 WL 105020 (S.C.App.2017); STATE v. MAZIQUE, 419 S.C. 282, 797 S.E.2d. 730 (S.C.App.2016); STATE v. GREEN, S.E.2d., 2016 WL 3200132 (S.C.App.2016); INDIANA v. EDWARDS, 554 U.S. 164, 128 S.Ct. 2379, 171 L.Ed.2d. 345(U.S.2008); FARETTA v. CALIFORNIA, 422 U.S. 806, 95 S.Ct. 2525, 45 L.Ed.2d. 562(U.S.1975); HERRINGTON v. DOTSON, 99 F.4TH. 705(4th.Cir.2024); UNITED STATES v. ZIEGLER, 1 F.4TH. 219 (4th.Cir.2021); UNITED STATES v. GLOVER, 2021 WL 3500350 (4th.Cir.2021). THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS NEVER EXPECTED THE APPELLANT TO MOVE THIS FAST TO FORCE THE MATTER BEFORE THE COURT AND TO SEEK TO MOTION TO OBTAIN TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS AND ADVANCE THE CAUSE TO MOVE THE CASE UP ON THE DOCKET DUE TO THERE BEING A CONFLICT OF INTEREST INVOLVING THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE AS STATED. SUCH INTENT IS NOT JUST MEANT TO STIFLE THE APPELLANT'S VOICE. IT IS ALSO TO UNDER THE GUISE OF A MISREPRESENTED CLAIM OF HYBRID DEFENSE PREVENT THE APPELLANT FROM ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE AND TO EXERCISE RIGHTS ESTABLISHED BY THE CLAIM PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON TIMELY INVOKED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY GENERAL SESSIONS COURT AND OTHER DUE PROCESS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ARGUED FROM BEING GIVEN "JUST AND FAIR" JUDICIAL REVIEW, BY PLACING SUCH COMPROMISED COUNSEL ON THE PETITION WHEN THERE IS A CLEAR CONFLICT OF INTEREST. IN LIGHT OF THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, INCLUDING THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST INVOLVING THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE. THIS WOULD FURTHER DEMONSTRATE THAT THE STATE PROCESS BY THIS MACHINATION AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE IS INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING

THE APPELLANTS GIVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDICIAL NOTICE OF ADDRESS CHANGE AND RELEASE OF THE APPELLANT MAURICE BELLAMY FROM THE S.C. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS. HIS CURRENT ADDRESS NOW IS:

MAURICE BELLAMY
137 BENDICK COURT
LITTLE RIVER, S.C. 29566

HERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS UNDER CASE 2025-001856 DATED DECEMBER 3, 2025.

(2) A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO ACT PRO SE; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER ISSUED ON DECEMBER 3, 2025 HOLDING THE CASE IN ABEYANCE DUE TO CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR VOIDING THE ORDER UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION; MOTION TO RENEW THE PREVIOUS FILED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS AND OTHER PLEADING THAT IS SUBJECT TO THE DECEMBER 3, 2025 ORDER AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR".

INSOMUCH, SINCE WHEN, IN THE ANNALS OF THIS NATION'S HISTORY CAN A STATE COURT FORCE LEGAL COUNSEL ON AN INDIVIDUAL AGAINST HIS WILL WHO CHOOSES TO ACT PRO SE AND EXERCISE HIS RIGHT OF SELF REPRESENTATION, IF THE PERSON IS MENTALLY COMPETENT AND SEEKS TO DO SO VOLUNTARILY, KNOWINGLY AND INTELLIGENTLY, ACKNOWLEDGING ON THE RECORD THAT HE IS FULLY AWARE OF THE DANGERS OF SELF REPRESENTATION AND MAKES THAT CHOICE WITH HIS EYES WIDE OPEN KNOWING THE SAME?

IT IS THE APPELLANT(S) POSITION THAT THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION IS DONE AS AN ADDITIONAL ACT OF FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION AND MACHINATION INVOLVING THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA COURTS TO PLACE COMPROMISED STATE APPOINTED LEGAL COUNSEL ON THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, TO STIFLE HIS VOICE AND

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

RECEIVED

Dec 15 2025

SC Court of Appeals

APPELLATE CASE NO.(S) 2025-6589, 2025-6599, 2025-1840, 2025-6602

APPEAL FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT

APPEAL FROM CASE NO. 9:24-cv-04660-BHH-MHC ET. AL.,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, ALTON
CHISOLM, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, MAURICE BELLAMY,

PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,

DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES


AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; NOTICE OF
RELEASE AND ADDRESS CHANGE FOR MAURICE BELLAMY; MOTION
TO SUBMIT ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF PROVING
MACHINATION AND ESTABLISHING THAT THE STATE PROCESS IS
INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF
THE APPELLANT(S) AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR


TO: THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

ESTABLISHING THAT THE STATE PROCESS IS INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT(S) AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211, ATTORNEY MS. WANDA H. CARTER OF THE S.C. APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE 1330 LADY STREET SUITE 401, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, MR. LAWRENZ DIRECTOR AT WELL PATH CENTER, THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS, THE UNITED STATES SENATE, THE U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE AT THE DEPT. OF JUSTICE, THE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ARCH BISHOP FABRE-JEUNE, POPE LEO AND THE VATICAN, THE UNITED NATIONS, THE COUNTY OF RICHLAND, THE COUNTY OF KERSHAW, THE COUNTY OF HORRY, THE COUNTY OF CHARLESTON AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES VIA THEIR ADDRESSES ON RECORD WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, BY U.S. MAIL AND OR CERTIFIED, POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON DECEMBER 8, 2025. FEDERAL LAW PREEMPTS STATE LAW IN THIS CASE. IT IS DEEMED FILED ON THAT DATE PURSUANT TO THE MAILBOX RULE, HOUSTON v. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379(U.S.1988).


RESPECTFULLY,


JONAH THE TISHBITE


ALTON CHISOLM



YAHDIRA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN


MAURICE BELLAMY



DECEMBER 8, 2025

APPELLANTS, KAUR v. WARDEN, NO. 24-6440 (4th.Cir.2025); WOLFE v. CLARK, 691 F.3d. 410(4th.Cir.2012)(COURTS FOUND OFFICIAL SUPPRESSED EVIDENCE (IN THIS CASE CONSPIRING TO SUPPRESS LEGAL ISSUES FROM BEING HEARD CLAIMING HYBRID DEFENSE VIOLATING AUTONOMY) AND ENGAGED IN A PATTERN OF MACHINATION); SIMS v. HYATTE, 914 F.3d. 1078 (7th.Cir.2019)(THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHECY THAT ARE FILED IN CHISOLM, BELLAMY AND CRAWFORD CASES ARE SEEN WITHIN THIS APPEAL AS EVIDENCE OF THE CLAIMS WHICH THEY ARE CONSPIRING TO BLOCK REVIEW BY THE APPOINTMENT OF THIS COUNSEL CONSTITUTE MACHINATION); HILL v. REYNOLDS, 942 F.2d. 1494 (10th.Cir.1991)(PLACING THIS COMPROMISED COUNSEL TO INORDINATELY DELAY AND OR PREVENT LEGITIMATE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS FROM BEING RAISED IS MACHINATION IN STATE PROCESS RENDING THAT PROCESS INEFFECTIVE); MOONEY v. HOLOHAN, 294 U.S. 103 (U.S.1935)(THE SUPREME COURT HELD THAT A CONVICTION OBTAINED THROUGH THE KNOWING USE OF PERJURED TESTIMONY AS WAS DONE IN THE CRAWFORD CASE VIOLATES DUE PROCESS. THE STATE'S FAILURE TO PROVIDE CORRECTIVE PROCESS BY CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO PREVENT JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS FROM BEING ARGUED REGARDING THIS TYPE OF MISCONDUCT MAKES FEDERAL REVIEW BY HABEAS CORPUS NECESSARY). THE ACTIONS OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ESTABLISH OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MACHINATION AND DENIES THE APPELLANT RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, PAUL ADAMS v. CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; U.S. v. HARE, 820 F.3d. 93 (4th.Cir.2016); PEGG v. HEARNBERGER, 845 F.3d. 112 (4th.Cir.2017); GRAHAM v. GAGNON, 831 F.3d. 176 (4th.Cir.2016).

SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH WITH INTENT TO DECEIVE BY PLACING THIS COMPROMISED STATE APPELLANT COUNSEL ON THE APPELLATE, CRAWFORD, TO CONSPIRE UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO SUPPRESS LEGITIMATE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS FROM BEING ARGUED UNDER THE GUISE OF ASSERTING THERE IS NO HYBRID DEFENSE IS FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO DENY THE RIGHT OF SELF REPRESENTATION. FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT WITHOUT ANY MISREPRESENTATION (LIKE THEY ARE GIVING CRAWFORD COUNSEL BUT THE INTENT IS TO PREVENT JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS FROM BEING RAISES, OR DUTY TO DISCLOSE, CONSTITUTE FRAUD,

582 U.S. 286, 137 S.Ct. 1899, 198 L.Ed.2d. 420(U.S.2017)(THE RIGHT OF A DEFENDANT TO CONDUCT HIS OWN PROCEEDINGS IS BASED UPON THE FUNDAMENTAL LEGAL PRINCIPLE THAT THE APPELLANT MUST BE ALLOWED TO MAKE HIS OWN CHOICES ABOUT THE PROPER WAY TO PROTECT HIS OWN LIBERTY WHICH ESTABLISH CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS THE ORDER UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND RENEWS THE PREVIOUS FILED MOTIONS THAT ARE THE SOURCE OF THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION DONE BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

THIS IS NOT THE FIRST TIME SOMETHING LIKE THIS OCCURRED, AND THIS IS NOT YOUR GARDEN VARIETY FRAUD. IT IS A FRAUD UPON THE COURT DIRECTED AT THE MACHINERY OF THE COURT ITSELF BY OFFICERS OF THE COURT WHICH PREVENT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS BY THIS MACHINATION FROM NORMALLY ADJUDICATING CASES IN ACCORDANCE WITH DUE PROCESS LAW. THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS PULLED THIS STUNT IN 2004 TO PREVENT THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, FROM BEING FULLY HEARD ON THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES WHEN HE WAS ON HIS INITIAL DIRECT APPEAL IN 2004 AND LITIGATING ESSENTIALLY (11) YEARS AHEAD OF U.S. SUPREME COURT RULING THAT DID NOT OCCUR UNTIL 2016. THEIR INTENT IS TO APPOINT THIS COMPROMISED INAPPROPRIATE INFLUENCE STATE APPOINTED ATTORNEY, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, TO ALLOW THE COMPROMISED APPELLATE ATTORNEY TO THROW OUT AND OR FAIL TO LITIGATE ALL THE CLAIMS AND ISSUES THAT ARE NOW PROPERLY PLACED BEFORE THE COURT BY THE CURRENT PLEADING UNDER THE GUISE OF ASSERTING THERE IS NO HYBRID DEFENSE IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THE APPELLANT(S) OBJECT. THIS ACT OF FRAUD, OBSTRUCT AND MACHINATION GOES TOWARDS FURTHER ESTABLISHING THE CLAIM BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS THAT THE STATE COURTS PROCESS IS INEFFECTIVE BY THIS CONTINUED MACHINATION TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT(S) REQUIRING THE GRANTING OF HABEAS CORPUS AND OTHER RELIEF THAT IS SOUGHT WITHIN THE INFORMAL BRIEF, de CSEPEL v. REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY, 752 F.Supp.3d. 147 (D.D.C.2024); de CSEPEL v. REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY, 613 F.Supp.3d. 255 (D.D.C.2020); ROSS v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850(U.S.2016). THE STATE PROCESS IS NO LONGER EFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE

PREVENT HIM FROM ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE OF 2005 UNDER APPELLATE COURT RULE, RULE 217 AND TO PREVENT THE LEGAL ISSUES THAT HE INTENDS TO BE ARGUED BEFORE THAT COURT FROM BEING PROPERLY HEARD, VIOLATING HIS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SPOKE IN NO UNCERTAIN TERMS. WITH INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AT STAKE, IT IS THE APPELLANT'S PREROGATIVE, NOT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN ACTS OF FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION AND MACHINATION TO PREVENT LEGAL ISSUES AND CLAIMS FROM BEING HEARD AND TO STIFLE THE APPELLANT'S RIGHT TO BE FULLY HEARD, TO DECIDE ON THE OBJECTIVES OF HIS DEFENSE AND OR APPEAL AND THE LEGAL ISSUES TO BE PRESENTED, AND THE APPELLANT MAY INSIST UPON REPRESENTING HIMSELF NO MATTER HOW COUNTER PRODUCTIVE THAT COURSE MAY BE. THE RIGHT TO BRING THIS APPEAL UNDER CASE 2025-001856 IS PERSONAL, AND THE APPELLANT'S CHOICE IN EXERCISING THAT RIGHT OF SELF REPRESENTATION MUST BE HONORED OUT OF THAT RESPECT FOR THE INDIVIDUAL WHICH IS THE LIFEBLOOD OF LAW AS IT RELATES TO HOW HE WISHES TO PROCEED WITHIN HIS APPEAL WHERE THE MOTION IS MADE EARLY, AND IS NOT DONE TO DISRUPT THE COURT OR CAUSE ANY UNDULY DELAY. AS A MATTER OF FACT, ITS THE CONTRARY. THIS IS SOUGHT IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE THESE MATTERS WHERE THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, WAS ALREADY SUBJECT TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL, INORDINATE DELAY WITHIN THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND THIS INJUSTICE IS DONE TO PREVENT THE APPELLANT FROM ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT RELATED TO THE ISSUE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AS DUE PROCESS LAW WOULD PERMIT. IT IS DONE TO PREVENT FAIR AND PROPER RULING ON THE OTHER JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS THAT ARE PRESENTED BEFORE THAT COURT BY THE PLEADING FILED. THE APPELLANT(S) ARE MOTIONING FOR AND SEEKING DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ON THIS ISSUE RELATED TO THIS MATTER BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS THAT PRODUCE FURTHER EVIDENCE THAT THE STATE PROCESS IS INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT(S), JONES v. STATE, 2024 WL 2787273 (Tex.2024); McCOY v. LOUISIANA, 584 U.S. 414, 138 S.Ct. 1500, 200 L.Ed.2d. 821(U.S.2018); UNITED STATES v. DiMARTINO, 949 F.3d. 67 (2nd.Cir.2020); MAZE v. OLIVER, Fed. Supp., 2024 WL 2848308(3rd.Cir.2024); WEAVER v. MASSACHUSETTS,

ALTON CHISOLM

Alton Chisolm

YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN

Yahdina Overstreet-U-Deen

MAURICE BELLAMY

Maurice Bellamy


DECEMBER 8, 2025

BEGAN. ANY OTHER REQUIREMENT WOULD BE AN ACT OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND MACHINATION ESTABLISHING CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT WOULD VOID THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. SEE CASES CITED WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT INFORMAL BRIEF. ALSO SEE STATE v. BARNES, 407 S.C. 27, 753 S.E.2d. 545 (S.C.App.2014); BROOKS v. SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION OF INDIGENT DEFENSE, 419 S.C. 319, 797 S.E.2d. 402(S.C.App.2017); STATE v. POLITE, S.E.2d., 2017 WL 105020 (S.C.App.2017); STATE v. MAZIQUE, 419 S.C. 282, 797 S.E.2d. 730 (S.C.App.2016); STATE v. GREEN, S.E.2d., 2016 WL 3200132 (S.C.App.2016); INDIANA v. EDWARDS, 554 U.S. 164, 128 S.Ct. 2379, 171 L.Ed.2d. 345(U.S.2008); FARETTA v. CALIFORNIA, 422 U.S. 806, 95 S.Ct. 2525, 45 L.Ed.2d. 562(U.S.1975); HERRINGTON v. DOTSON, 99 F.4TH. 705(4th.Cir.2024); UNITED STATES v. ZIEGLER, 1 F.4TH. 219 (4th.Cir.2021); UNITED STATES v. GLOVER, 2021 WL 3500350 (4th.Cir.2021). THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS NEVER EXPECTED THE APPELLANT TO MOVE THIS FAST TO FORCE THE MATTER BEFORE THE COURT AND TO SEEK TO MOTION TO OBTAIN TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS AND ADVANCE THE CAUSE TO MOVE THE CASE UP ON THE DOCKET. THEIR INTENT IS NOT JUST TO STIFLE THE APPELLANT'S VOICE. IT IS ALSO TO UNDER THE GUISE OF A MISREPRESENTED CLAIM OF HYBRID DEFENSE PREVENT THE APPELLANT FROM ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE AND TO EXERCISE RIGHTS ESTABLISHED BY THE CLAIM PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON TIMELY INVOKED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY GENERAL SESSIONS COURT AND OTHER DUE PROCESS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ARGUED FROM BEING GIVEN "JUST AND FAIR" JUDICIAL REVIEW FURTHER DEMONSTRATING THAT THE STATE PROCESS BY THIS MACHINATION IS INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT(S) WARRANTING HABEAS CORPUS AS IS SOUGHT WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

9-of-10



EVEN IN ABSENCE OF FIDUCIARY DUTY, STATUTORY, OR OTHER INDEPENDENT LEGAL DUTY TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION (LIKE RULING ON ALL THE ISSUES SEEN IN THE FILING THEY BLOCKED REVIEW BY THE DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO FORCE LEGAL COUNSEL ON THE APPELLANT(S)), COMMON LAW FRAUD INCLUDES ANY ACTS TAKEN TO CONCEAL, CREATE A FALSE IMPRESSION (LIKE IS OCCURRING HERE BY THE APPOINTMENT), MISLEAD, OR OTHERWISE DECEIVE TO PREVENT OTHER PARTY FROM ACQUIRING MATERIAL INFORMATION, SUCH AS A RULING ON ALL THE LEGAL ISSUES THAT ARE CURRENTLY BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS BY THE CURRENT FILING UNDER CASE 2025-001856, U.S. v. COTTON, 231 F.3d. 890 (4th.Cir.2000); MDC 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); 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).

INASMUCH, RULE 602, SCACR (REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT DEFENDANTS): OUTLINES THE PROCEDURE FOR APPOINTING AND RELIEVING COUNSEL FOR INDIGENT DEFENDANTS. THE RULE DOES NOT PROVIDE MECHANISM TO FORCE AN ATTORNEY ONTO AN UNWILLING, COMPETENT CLIENT. RULE 71.1(g), SCRCR (POST CONVICTION RELIEF ACTIONS SIMILAR TO FORENSIC DNA TESTING GOVERNS THE CONTINUANCE OF REPRESENTATION DURING APPEAL. COUNSEL AT THE LOWER COURT STAGE, IN THIS CASE SELF REPRESENTATION, SHALL CONTINUE REPRESENTATION ON APPEAL. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS CANNOT FORCE A MENTALLY COMPETENT INDIVIDUAL TO ACCEPT LEGAL COUNSEL AGAINST THEIR WILL IF THEY MAKE A TIMELY MOTION TO REPRESENT THEMSELVES. MOTION IS OFFICIALLY AND TIMELY MADE. THE RIGHT TO SELF REPRESENTATION IS A CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHT ROOTED IN DUE PROCESS LAW. THE ONLY THING THAT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IS REQUIRED TO DO IS CONFIRM THAT THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO MOVE FORWARD WITHOUT COUNSEL IS MADE KNOWINGLY, INTELLIGENTLY, AND VOLUNTARILY AND THAT THE PARTY IS FULLY AWARE OF THE CONSEQUENCES AND SIGNIFICANT RISKS OF SELF REPRESENTATION. THE REQUEST MUST BE TIMELY MADE, WHICH OF COURSE THE REQUEST IS TIMELY, SINCE THE APPEAL JUST

APPELLANT(S) POSITION THAT THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION IS DONE AS AN ADDITIONAL ACT OF FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION AND MACHINATION INVOLVING THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA COURTS TO PLACE COMPROMISED STATE APPOINTED LEGAL COUNSEL ON THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, TO STIFLE HIS VOICE AND PREVENT HIM FROM ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE OF 2005 UNDER APPELLATE COURT RULE, RULE 217 AND TO PREVENT THE LEGAL ISSUES THAT HE INTENDS TO BE ARGUED BEFORE THAT COURT FROM BEING PROPERLY HEARD, VIOLATING HIS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SPOKE IN NO UNCERTAIN TERMS. WITH INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AT STAKE, IT IS THE APPELLANT'S PREROGATIVE, NOT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN ACTS OF FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION AND MACHINATION TO PREVENT LEGAL ISSUES AND CLAIMS FROM BEING HEARD AND TO STIFLE THE APPELLANT'S RIGHT TO BE FULLY HEARD BY THIS CONFLICT OF INTEREST THAT EXISTS, TO DECIDE ON THE OBJECTIVES OF HIS DEFENSE AND OR APPEAL AND THE LEGAL ISSUES TO BE PRESENTED, AND THE APPELLANT MAY INSIST UPON REPRESENTING HIMSELF NO MATTER HOW COUNTER PRODUCTIVE THAT COURSE MAY BE. THE RIGHT TO BRING THIS APPEAL UNDER CASE 2025-001856 IS PERSONAL, ESPECIALLY SINCE THERE IS A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, AND THE APPELLANT'S CHOICE IN EXERCISING THAT RIGHT OF SELF REPRESENTATION DUE TO THE CONFLICT MUST BE HONORED OUT OF THAT RESPECT FOR THE INDIVIDUAL WHICH IS THE LIFEBLOOD OF LAW AS IT RELATES TO HOW HE WISHES TO PROCEED WITHIN HIS APPEAL WHERE THE MOTION IS MADE EARLY, AND IS NOT DONE TO DISRUPT THE COURT OR CAUSE ANY UNDULY DELAY. AS A MATTER OF FACT, ITS THE CONTRARY. THIS IS SOUGHT IN ORDER TO EXPEDITE THESE MATTERS WHERE THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, WAS ALREADY SUBJECT TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL, INORDINATE DELAY WITHIN THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND THIS INJUSTICE IS DONE TO PREVENT THE APPELLANT FROM ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT RELATED TO THE ISSUE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AS DUE PROCESS LAW WOULD PERMIT. IT IS DONE TO PREVENT FAIR AND PROPER RULING ON THE OTHER JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS THAT ARE PRESENTED BEFORE THAT COURT BY THE PLEADING FILED. THE APPELLANT(S) ARE MOTIONING FOR AND SEEKING DECLARATORY