CLASS "A" FELONIES OF CSC WITH A MINOR. THIS TOO, IS A FAILURE AT THE RELEASE OF DISCOVERY BY THE STATE AND IS DISCOVERABLE VIOLATING DUE PROCESS BECAUSE THESE WERE UNDER THE TABLE DEALS WITH MICHAEL, CYLENA AND SYLVIA LEE WHICH WERE NEVER DISCLOSED AND IS RELEVANT AND DISCOVERABLE EVEN FOR IMPEACHMENT PURPOSES, WHICH IS WHY THEY REFUSE TO TEST THAT DNA AND WHY MICHAEL LEE REMAINS UNPROSECUTED UNTIL THIS VERY DAY THOUGH THERE IS NO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON CSC WITH A MINOR IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND AIDING AND ABETTING AFTER THE FACT IN WELL OVER 24 COUNTS OF CLASS "A" FELONIES OF CSC WITH A MINOR. THIS TOO, IS FAILURE IN THE RELEASE OF DISCOVERY THAT CAUSE FOR REVERSAL OF THE CONVICTION UNDER WEARRY v. CAIN 2016.

THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, MADE EVERY STEP AND EFFORT TO LEGALLY OBTAIN THAT DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE, TESTING IT TO MICHAEL LEE, NOT TO PROVE A PATERNITY TEST AS MR. PAULING IN FRAUDULENT MISREPRESENTATION ASSERTED. IT WAS TO PROVE THAT THE PATHOLOGIST GAVE PERJURED TESTIMONY AS TO WHAT THE TRUE CAUSE OF DEATH WAS AT THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD'S, TRIAL, STATING THAT THERE WERE NO SIGNS OF PREGNANCY, CONSPIRING WITH THE COUNTY AND STATE ACTORS UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO FRAME CRAWFORD BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED BASED UPON THE CLAIMS ARGUED IN THIS CASE. MALE SPERM AND FEMALE EGGS ARE "HAPLOID" IN GENETIC TERMS, MEANING HAVING ONLY ONE SET OF CHROMOSOMES AND ALLELES WHERE DNA MATERIAL CAUSED BY CONCEPTION BETWEEN MOTHER AND FATHER WOULD BE WHAT IS CALLED "DIPLOID" IN GENETIC TERMS HAVING THE CHROMOSOMES AND ALLELES OF BOTH MOTHER AND FATHER. IF THE DNA SAMPLES TAKEN FROM KORRESHA AT THE TIME OF HER DEATH ARE TESTED TO MICHAEL LEE, AND ANY OF THE GENETIC MATERIAL WITHIN HER IS DISCOVERED TO BE "DIPLOID" IN GENETIC TERMS AS OPPOSED TO "HAPLOID"? IT WOULD PRODUCE INDISPUTABLE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE THAT WOULD PROVE THAT SHE WAS PREGNANT AT ONE POINT AND POSSIBLY SPONTANEOUSLY ABORTED DUE TO THE POTENTIAL GESTATIONAL DIABETES WHICH CAUSED HER BLOOD SUGAR LEVELS TO DROP, THAT THE PATHOLOGIST LIED ABOUT THE AUTOPSY AND POTENTIAL TRUE CAUSE OF DEATH WHICH WOULD DESTROY THE CORPUS DELECTI FOR THE CRIME OF MURDER CALLING FOR A NEW TRIAL WHERE ANY JURIST WOULD CONCLUDE THAT THE OUTCOME WOULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT AS THE STATUTE FOR DNA TESTING REQUIRES. CRAWFORD MADE EVERY

EFFORT POSSIBLE TO OBTAIN THAT DNA TESTING SINCE 2006 UNDER CASES SUCH AS 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294 IN THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, CASES THAT APPEARED BEFORE BOTH THE S.C. COURT OF APPEAL AND S.C. SUPREME COURT THAT WERE ALSO OBSTRUCTED TALKING ABOUT CRAWFORD HAD TO PAY A FILING FEE WHICH HE DID NOT HAVE AT THAT TIME. THANK GOD THERE IS NO REQUIRED PAYING OF A FILING FEE FOR THE SEEKING OF THIS DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE MANDATED BY THE STATUTE WHERE PREVIOUSLY CRAWFORD WAS CRIMINALLY OBSTRUCTED IN EVERY POSSIBLE WAY IMAGINABLE BY THE STATE AND COUNTY ACTORS IN MACHINATIONS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO PREVENT THEIR CRIMINALITY OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND AIDING AND ABETTING AFTER THE FACT IN OVER 24 COUNTS OF CSC WITH A MINOR FROM BEING REVEALED. CRAWFORD ATTEMPTED TO TIMELY FILE FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF TO OBTAIN THE DNA BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS BY THAT MEANS, ONLY TO BE BLOCKED AND CRIMINALLY OBSTRUCTED FILING BY THE KERSHAW COUNTY CLERK ACTING AS PROXY FOR THE STATE AND COUNTY ACTORS SINCE 2006. CRAWFORD WAS DENIED HIS RIGHT TO FILE PCR BY THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION OF THE DEFENDANTS. THIS IS WHAT FORCED CRAWFORD TO FILE THE CASES AS A TORT ACTION IN RICHLAND COUNTY AFOREMENTIONED WHERE THEY CONSPIRED IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO PREVENT THAT DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE FROM BEING REVEALED. CRAWFORD MADE EVERY EFFORT THEREAFTER SINCE 2012 TO FILE APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING IN BOTH RICHLAND AND KERSHAW COUNTIES ONLY TO BE BLOCKED AND CRIMINALLY OBSTRUCTED AGAIN BY THE CONSPIRING COUNTY AND STATE ACTORS WHERE MAKING USE OF THE KERSHAW COUNTY CLERK OF COURT THEY PREVENTED THE DNA TESTING FROM BEING FILED AS WELL. CRAWFORD WAS THEN FORCED TO OBTAIN ASSISTANCE FROM HIS FAMILY MEMBER, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, TO GET THE DNA APPLICATION FILED THAT WAS BLOCKED AND OBSTRUCTED BY THE CONSPIRING STATE AND COUNTY ACTORS. THIS PRODUCED PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION IN 2020 THAT TEMPORARILY HALTED THEIR OBSTRUCTION PURSUANT TO FILING ALLOWING THE CURRENT DNA APPLICATION TO BE FINALLY FILED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS. THE CONSPIRING STATE AND COUNTY ACTORS THEN HELD THOSE PROCEEDINGS IN LIMBO FOR OVER 4 YEARS IN VIOLATION OF

THE STATUTE AND U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609 (U.S.2016) AND WHERE MOTION FOR DEFAULT, JUDGMENT, FORFEITURE AND WAIVER WAS FILED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS AT THE ONE YEAR MARK BASED UPON RIGHTS ESTABLISHED BY THE CLAIM PROCESSING RULE THAT IS JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE WHICH REQUIRED THAT THE COURT CONCLUDE THE MATTER WITHIN (365) DAYS OF THE APPLICATION'S FILING OR OBTAIN AN ORDER OF CONTINUANCE TO PROCEED FURTHER WHICH THEY FAILED TO DO, A CLAIM PROCESSING RULE ATTACHED TO THE S.C. CONSTITUTION WHERE ARTICLE 1 § 23 OF THE S.C. CONST. WOULD HAVE ALSO MADE THE PROVISION MANDATORY AS PREVIOUSLY STATED. THE COURT STILL, IN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, IGNORED THE CLEAR DEFAULT AND CHALLENGE TO THE COURT'S JURISDICTION WHERE THE APPELLANTS ARE ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT UNDER APPELLATE COURT RULE 217 THAT WAS ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE v. GENTRY 2005, U.S. v. COTTON 2002, STATE v. PARKHURST AND STATE v. LANGFORD 2012 CASES WHERE THOSE CASES WERE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE "STATUTORY" ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND ARE UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE ON THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THOUGH A COURT MAY HAVE JURISDICTION GIVEN TO THEM BY STATUTE, DO THEIR FAILURE TO ADHERE TO CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS PRODUCING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, WOULD VOID THE ACT OR JURISDICTION TO ACT UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION? IT IS OBVIOUS FROM MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599(U.S.2016) THAT A CRIMINAL COURT'S JURISDICTION IS NOT ABSOLUTE BASED UPON STATUTORY INTENT WHEN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION EXISTS WITHIN THAT CRIMINAL CASE, SUCH AS THE ONES ARGUED BASED UPON THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY THAT EXIST IN THE CRAWFORD, CHISOLM AND BELLAMY CASES. CRAWFORD SOUGHT TO BRING THESE MATTERS UP IN HIS DIRECT APPEAL BACK IN 2006, BUT CRAWFORD WAS ESSENTIALLY LITIGATING 11 YEARS AHEAD OF U.S. SUPREME COURT RULINGS, WHO DID NOT GIVE CLARIFICATION ON THE ISSUE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION UNTIL THE MONTGOMERY RULING IN 2016. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IS NOW REVISITED BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AT ANY STAGE, EVEN AFTER A FINAL JUDGMENT WAS ISSUED IN THE CASES INVOLVED, EVEN FOR THE FIRST TIME ON APPEAL BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHICH REQUIRE THE

4TH. CIRCUIT TO TAKE NOTICE AS DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRES. SEE CITINGS OF LAW IN THE HABEAS CORPUS PETITION FILED AND OTHER DOCUMENTS WITHIN THE LOWER COURT RECORD. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WAS A PART OF THE ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. AT THE TIME OF CRAWFORD'S CONVICTION THE STATE DISCOVERED THAT THE INDICTMENT FOR MURDER IN THE STATE POSSESSED A FATAL FLAW IN THAT THEY DID NOT PROPERLY ALLEGE THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF "TIME AND PLACE" AS THE MURDER STATUTE REQUIRED SO THEY HELD MANY OF THE CASES IN LIMBO SOME FOR OVER 7 YEARS IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS TO ALLOW THEM TO DO A NATION WIDE SEARCH AND "FISHING EXPEDITION" FOR UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE CASE LAW THAT ONLY ADDRESSED THE ISSUE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION UNDER THE STATUTORY ELEMENT OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION TO DEFRAUD THE INMATES OF THIS STATE FURTHER DEMONSTRATING THAT THE STATE PROCESS IS INEFFECTIVE TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANTS. THEY PURPOSELY IGNORED CASES LIKE STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83 THAT EXISTED AT THE TIME AND CLEARLY SHOWED THERE WERE TWO ELEMENTS TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION TO ALLOW THEM IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO ADJUDICATE THE ISSUE UNDER THE INCORRECT ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION TO DEPRIVE THE INMATES OF THIS STATE OF CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS.

INSOMUCH, ONCE THE ESTABLISHED APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING WAS FINALLY PERMITTED FILED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS, DESPITE THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, THE CONSPIRING STATE AND COUNTY ACTORS INTENDED TO ALLOW THE CASE TO UNCONSTITUTIONALLY SIT THERE UNRESOLVED ESSENTIALLY FOREVER WHICH PROMPTED YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN AND THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, TO GO BACK BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND INFORMED THEM OF THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL INORDINATE DELAY THAT VIOLATED U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA 2016 AND DUE PROCESS LAW. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDERED THE STATE TO FINALLY RESPOND AND GO ON THE RECORD, SCHEDULE A HEARING AND GIVE A LEGITIMATE EXCUSE AS TO WHY THE CASE REMAINED UNRESOLVED FOR OVER 4 YEARS. THE SOLICITOR FAILED TO GIVE ANY JUSTIFIABLE REASON FOR THE INORDINATE DELAY. NOR DID HE SEEK LEAVE TO FILE HIS RESPONSE LATE IN VIOLATION OF THE

STATUTE AND CLAIM PROCESSING RULE BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT AS THE STATUTE AND DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRED. NOR DID THE STATE CHALLENGE THE CLAIM OF DEFAULT BASED UPON THE CLAIM PROCESSING RULE FILED AT THE ONE YEAR MARK WHEN DIRECTLY ASKED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY GENERAL SESSIONS COURT FURTHER ESTABLISHING DEFAULT, FORFEITURE AND WAIVER AS WAS ARGUED BEFORE THE LOWER STATE COURT BUT WAS IGNORED IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MACHINATION AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL BIAS BY JUDGE NEWMAN WHO SHOULD HAVE NEVER PRESIDED OVER THE CASE IN THE FIRST PLACE IN THEIR JUDICIAL AMBUSH. IN FURTHER ACTS OF CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND IN ACTS OF MACHINATION TO KEEP CRAWFORD UNJUSTLY TIED UP IN THE SYSTEM FOR 10 YEARS HOPING HE WOULD DIE BEFORE PROPER REVIEW OCCURRED BEING 64 YEARS OLD, TO THWART "JUST AND FAIR" REVIEW. THE CONSPIRING STATE AND COUNTY ACTORS WENT JUDGE SHOPPING AND PURPOSELY GOT JUDGE NEWMAN WHO SAT ON AND DISMISSED THE CASE UNDER 2013-CP-400-0084 IN RICHLAND COUNTY, S.C. WHERE THE SEEKING OF THE DNA TESTING WAS PREVIOUSLY SOUGHT TO PREVENT AGAIN THE REVEALING OF THIS EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND THE CRIMINALITY THAT OCCURRED INVOLVING THE COUNTY OFFICIALS AND 5th. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE AND McMASTERS WHO WAS ALSO INVOLVED FROM BEING DISCOVERED IN A CASE THAT WAS A HIGH PROFILE CASE AT THE TIME. THE COURT NEVER GAVE CRAWFORD ANY ADVANCE WRITTEN NOTICE OF THE SCHEDULED HEARING DATE, OR NOTIFICATION THAT JUDGE NEWMAN INTENDED TO SIT UPON THE CASE TO DEPRIVE CRAWFORD OF THE DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO FILE MOTION FOR HER RECUSAL BEFORE THE HEARING OCCURRED ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2025 UNTIL AFTER THE HEARING OCCURRED IN VIOLATION OF RULES OF COURT AND DUE PROCESS LAW AND RULE 6(d) AND OR RULE 40, TO AMBUSH CRAWFORD BY HAVING JUDGE NEWMAN SIT IN MACHINATION, WHEN IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO CRAWFORD WHO OBJECTED AND SOUGHT HER RECUSAL AT THE HEARING, SHE WAS REQUIRED TO RECUSE HERSELF DUE TO THE IMPARTIALITY AND POTENTIAL FOR BIAS RISING TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL CREATING A CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR WHICH VOIDED THE COURT'S JURISDICTION AB INITIO UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, IN VIOLATION OF U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER WILLIAM v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899(U.S.2016). THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SPOKE WITH ALL CLARITY UNDER THE CASE OF DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC. v.

NTE CAROLINAS II, LLC., 111 F.4TH. 337 (4th.Cir.2024), WHEN A JUDGE PRESIDED OVER A PREVIOUS CASE INVOLVING FRAUD BY THE JUDGE WHERE SHE ACTED TO DISMISS THE CASE WHEN THE CASE WAS PETITIONED REMOVED TO THE OHIO FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 2:23-cv-02962-JLG-CHG A CASE STILL PENDING UNTIL THIS VERY DAY, SHE SHOULD NOT ACCEPT REASSIGNMENT TO A CASE INVOLVING THE SAME PLAINTIFF AND THE SAME CAUSE AS IT RELATES TO THE SEEKING OF THE DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE. THE IMPROPER DENIAL OF A RECUSAL MOTION WHEN THE TRIAL JUDGE'S IMPARTIALITY REASONABLY MIGHT BE IN QUESTIONED HARMS NOT ONLY THE DEFENDANT, IN SUCH CASES, BUT ALSO THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM AND THE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IT ENJOYS, BELUE v. LEVENTHAL, 640 F.3d. 567 (4th.Cir.2011); PATEL v. PATEL, 359 S.C. 515, 599 S.E.2d. 114(S.C.App.2004); U.S. v. NEAL, 101 F.3d. 993 (4th.Cir.1996)(APPEARANCE OF IMPROPRIETY BY LACK OF NOTICE IN JUDICIAL AMBUSH AND JUDGE ACTING IN SIMILAR CASE WHEN IT WAS PETITIONED REMOVED INDICATE RECUSAL IS APPROPRIATE); ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCH DIOCESE OF PUERTO RICO v. ACEVEDO FELICIANO, 140 S.Ct. 696 (ONCE A NOTICE OF REMOVAL IS FILED THE STATE COURT LOSES ALL JURISDICTION, ITS SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDINGS ARE NOT SIMPLY ERRONEOUS, BUT ABSOLUTELY VOID AS IT RELATES TO CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH JUDGE NEWMAN SAT ENGAGING IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, BECAUSE EVERY ORDER THEREAFTER MADE IN THAT COURT IS CORAM NON JUDICE. ie. NOT BEFORE A JUDGE). THE SEEKING OF THE DNA WAS NOT MERELY ARGUED BEFORE THE STATE COURT. IT IS ALSO SOUGHT WITHIN THIS FILED § 1983 ACTION THAT IS THE SOURCE OF THIS APPEAL. ALSO SEE OKEOWO v. CHILDREN'S GUILD, 2024 WL 1604492 (D.Md.2024). THEY WENT JUDGE SHOPPING TO FIND JUDGE NEWMAN WHOSE ACTIONS ARE STILL CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHERE MOTION TO VACATE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT IS STILL PENDING AND WHERE HER ACTS ARE CURRENTLY UNDER SCRUTINY BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURT WHERE SHE ACTED WHEN THE CASE WAS PETITIONED REMOVED, TO COME IN THE KERSHAW COUNTY DNA APPLICATION CASE TO AGAIN PREVENT THE RELEASE OF THE EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND PREVENT THEIR CRIMINALITY FROM BEING REVEALED. JUDGE NEWMAN HAS AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME WHERE HER FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS ARE STILL CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW WITHIN BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL DISTRICT

COURTS INVOLVED TO INAPPROPRIATELY TIE THE CASE UP FOR YEARS IN MACHINATION HOPING CRAWFORD WOULD DIE BEFORE HE OBTAINS JUST AND FAIR JUDICIAL REVIEW BEING 64 YEARS OLD, PRODUCING CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899(U.S.2016); RIPPO v. BAKER, 137 S.Ct. 905 (U.S.2017); BASKIN v. WALKUP, 913 S.E.2d. 282(S.C.App.2025).

THIS IS COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT RIGHTS OF RES JUDICATA AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL WERE INVOKED EMERGING FROM HOWARD v. CITY OF DURHAM, 68 F.4TH. 943 (4th.Cir.2023) WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DETERMINED THAT GENUINE ISSUE OF DISPUTE EXIST TO OBTAIN DNA TESTING TO INCULPATE ANOTHER (MICHAEL LEE'S SEXUAL ASSAULT OF HER) AS A POTENTIAL RESULT AND REASON FOR THE DEATH. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DETERMINED IN THE CONTEXT OF STATE CREATED POST CONVICTION PROCEDURES, INDIVIDUALS CONVICTED OF CRIMES IN STATE COURT HAVE A LIBERTY INTEREST IN DEMONSTRATING THEIR INNOCENCE WITH NEW EVIDENCE UNDER STATE LAW. THOUGH THE CASE WAS ARGUED UNDER 1983, WHETHER 1983 OR HABEAS CORPUS, THE SUBSIDIARY FACTS RELATED TO LIBERTY INTEREST WOULD APPLY IN BOTH INSTANCES REGARDING DNA TESTING TO PROVE ACTUAL INNOCENCE HERE. THE COURT ALSO DETERMINED THAT INMATE HAS STANDING TO BRING THIS ACTION, NOT JUST UNDER THE DNA STATUTE, BUT ALSO UNDER 1983 FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF WHICH IS ALSO SOUGHT BY THIS APPEAL. THIS CONSTITUTE A THIRD REQUEST FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF TO REQUIRE THE RELEASE OF ALL DNA TESTING AND EVIDENCE WHICH WAS SOUGHT BEFORE THAT LOWER STATE DNA COURT. THIS IS REQUIRED TO SEEK DNA TESTING EVEN IF THE LOCAL PROSECUTOR WHO HAS CUSTODY OF THE UNTESTED EVIDENCE HAD OTHER REASONS (LIKE ASSERTING IT WAS FOR SOME STUPID PATERNITY TEST) TO DENY DNA TESTING; INMATE ALLEGING THAT THE LOCAL PROSECUTOR'S DENIAL OF HIS REQUEST FOR DNA TESTING DEPRIVED THE APPELLANT OF HIS LIBERTY INTEREST IN UTILIZING STATE PROCEDURES TO OBTAIN AN ACQUITTAL AND OR REDUCTION OF HIS SENTENCE, IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW, AND A DECLARATORY JUDGMENT WOULD REDRESS THAT INJURY BY ORDERING OF THE CHANGE IN THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE PARTIES AND ELIMINATION OF THE

STATE PROSECUTOR'S ALLEGEDLY UNLAWFUL JUSTIFICATION FOR DENYING DNA TESTING. THE APPELLANT(S) MOTION FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF TO REMEDY THE INJUSTICE AND REQUIRE THE STATE TO RELEASE THAT DNA MATERIAL FOR TESTING AND OTHER EVIDENCE THAT WAS SOUGHT BEFORE THE LOWER STATE COURT AND GET CHISOLM AND BELLAMY BEFORE THOSE STATE COURTS TO OBTAIN THEIR IMMEDIATE RELEASE OR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ORDER THE RELEASE DUE TO THE INJUSTICE ARGUED, GUTIERREZ v. SAENZ, 145 S.Ct. 2258(U.S.2025); WOOD v. PATTON, 150 F.4TH. 377, 5TH.Cir.; LONG v. BONDI, 2025 WL 2348708, * 9, 4th.Cir.(Va.)(INJUNCTIVE RELIEF REQUIRED TO REMOVE THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BARRIER). THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE IS FURTHER COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT THE CRAWFORD, CHISOLM AND BELLAMY CONVICTIONS ARE ALREADY INVALIDATED BY WHAT IS ARGUED DEMONSTRATING THAT HECK v. HUMPHREYS WOULD NOT APPLY BASED UPON THE TIMELY INVOKING OF THE CLAIM PROCESS RULE. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR ON THIS ISSUE. IF AN AFFECTED PARTY ALERTS THE COURT OF THE DEADLINE IN A CLAIM PROCESSING RULE AND INVOKES ITS PROTECTION AS CRAWFORD, CHISOLM AND BELLAMY DID IN THEIR RESPECTIVE CASES, THE RELEVANT ACTION CANNOT BE TAKEN AFTER THE DEADLINE HAS PASSED WHERE THESE PROVISIONS ARE ALSO ATTACHED TO THE S.C. CONSTITUTION MAKING THEM MANDATORY, JURISDICTIONAL, UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 23 OF THE S.C. CONSTITUTION, SUBJECTING THE STATE TO DEFAULT, FORFEITURE AND WAIVER AS IS ARGUED IN THE CASES INVOLVED. THEY NO LONGER HAVE "CONSTITUTIONAL" JURISDICTION TO ADDRESS THE MERITS OR GO ANY FURTHER EXCEPT TO ANNOUNCE THIS FACT AND DISMISS THE CAUSE OF CONVICTION OR CIVIL DETAINMENT AGAINST THE APPELLANT(S), STATE v. THOMPSON, 322 A.3d. 32, 62+ Md.; UNITED STATES v. WILLIAMS, 56 F.4TH. 366(4th.Cir.2023); UNITED STATES v. BRANTLEY, 87 F.4TH. 262(4th.Cir.2023); UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F.3d. 415(4t.Cir.2018); WILLIAMS v. SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, 176 Fed.Cl. 215 Fed.Cl.; FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019); McINTOSH v. UNITED STATES, 601 U.S. 330, 144 S.Ct. 980; HAMER v. NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE OF CHICAGO, 138 S.Ct. 13; UNITED STATES v. MARSH, 944 F.3d. 524(4th.Cir.2019): SANTOS-ZACARIA v. GARLAND, 143 S.Ct. 1103(U.S.2023). THEIR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS PREVENTED AND OR

DELAYED DISCOVERY OF EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN MACHINATION, FRAUD AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THE DNA TESTING WAS MORE THAN LIKELY TO PRODUCE EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE, EASILY TO BE DETERMINED, IF THOSE SAMPLES FROM KORRESHA ARE FOUND TO BE "DIPLOID" IN GENETIC TERMS, AS OPPOSED TO BEING "HAPLOID" IN GENETIC TERMS WHERE ANY JURIST WOULD CONCLUDE THAT THE OUTCOME WOULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT. THIS WAS ARBITRARY DENIAL AND OR OBSTRUCTION OF DUE PROCESS LAW ALSO IN VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. THE NEW RULINGS RELATED TO CLAIM PROCESSING RULES IN THE SUPREME COURT CASES CITED AND THOSE RELATED TO DNA TESTING WOULD WARRANT THE FILING OF SUCCESSIVE HABEAS CORPUS OR HABEAS CORPUS UNDER 2241 FOR THE CIVIL COMMITMENT OR HABEAS CORPUS WHERE BY THE FRAUD EVEN INVOLVING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO THE GENTRY CASE, EQUITABLE TOLLING WOULD BE ESTABLISHED AND THE STATE JUDICIAL PROCESS IS INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT(S) AND THEIR JURISDICTION IS VOID UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION LEAVING NOTHING ELSE LEFT FOR THE STATE COURTS TO DO EXCEPT ANNOUNCE THIS FACT AND DISMISS THE CAUSE OF CONVICTION OR CIVIL COMMITMENT INVOLVING THE APPELLANT(S). THE FILING OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS FOR THE RELEVANT APPELLANTS MUST IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS BE PERMITTED DUE TO THESE EXTERNAL IMPEDIMENTS AND EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THE FRAUD PREVENT THE STATE COURT OF PERFORMING ITS NORMAL FUNCTION OF ADJUDICATING CASES AS THE CONSTITUTION WOULD REQUIRE AND IS DIRECTED AT THE MACHINERY OF THE COURT ITSELF INVOLVING OFFICERS OF THE COURT. THE STATE'S JURISDICTIONAL RULE ACTS AS AN IMPEDIMENT TO ANY FURTHER ADJUDICATION BEFORE THEIR COURTS OTHER THAN TO ANNOUNCE THIS WHERE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IS EVEN INVOLVED PURSUANT TO THE GENTRY CASE PRODUCING EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES AND EXTREME PREJUDICE IF THE APPELLANTS WERE REQUIRED TO CONTINUE ANY FURTHER BEFORE THE STATE COURTS INVOLVED, SEBELIUS v. AUBURN REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, 133 S.Ct. 817(U.S.2013); 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. CITIZEN FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT SUPRA.; al-SUYID v. HIFTER, 139 F.4TH.

368(4th.Cir.2025); STOP RECKLESS ECONOMICS INSTABILITY CAUSED BY DEMOCRATS v. FEDERAL ELECTION COMM'N., 814 F.3d. 221(4th.Cir.2016); FIRST PROTECTION INS. CO. v. LEWIS EDWARD O'LEARY, 2025 WL 1936566 (4th.Cir.2025); KOKKONEN v. GUARDIAN LIFE INS. CO. OF AMERICA, 114 S.Ct. 1673(U.S.1994)(COURTS 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 ON THE RESPONDENT TO PROVE OTHERWISE, COPER BRIGHT ENTERPRISES v. RAIMONDO, 144 S.Ct. 2244(U.S.2024); THE CITY OF OCALA v. ROJAS, 598--U.S.--, 2023 WL 2357328(U.S.2023); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718 (U.S.2016); STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT SUPRA.

AS IT RELATES TO THE PCR CASES STATUTES, STATEMENTS ILLEGALLY USED AT CRAWFORD'S TRIAL STATUTES AND DNA STATUTES RELIED UPON PERTAINING TO THE USE OF STATEMENTS AT TRIALS AND TIMELINES FOR RESPONSE WHERE THE COURTS EITHER SUBTLY EXPANDED AND OR FORCE CONSTRUCTED THE STATUTES TO DENY US CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS AND PROTECTIONS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, ALSO WHERE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 578 U.S. 437 (U.S.2016) DETERMINED THAT IF A POST CONVICTION PROCEEDING IS HELD FOR 4 YEARS THOSE PROCEEDINGS BECOME UNCONSTITUTIONAL, IF THEY ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL, THEY ARE VOID UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, AND THAT A DEFENDANT WOULD HAVE TAILORED RELIEF UNDER THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS DUE PROCESS CLAUSE. THE PLAIN LANGUAGE OF THE STATUTES MUST BE ADHERED TO WITHOUT GIVING WAY TO FORCED CONSTRUCTION OR SUBTLY EXPANDING THE STATUTES RELIED UPON HERE WHICH THE STATE COURTS CONSPICUOUSLY FAILED AT, ALVAREZ RONQUILLO v. BONDI, 2025 WL 2371033(4th.Cir.2025); UNITED STATES v. CHAUDHRI, 134 F.4TH. 166(4th.Cir.2025).

(3) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025 FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY

31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, DO THE APPELLANTS HAVE A RIGHT OF AUTONOMY TO FILE THE CASE JOINTLY DUE TO IT POSSESSING COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT?

(4) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025 FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, DO THE APPELLANTS HAVE A RIGHT OF AUTONOMY TO CONSOLIDATE THE APPEALS FOR REMAND PURPOSES DUE TO THE APPEALS POSSESSING COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT, TO SEEK ADDITIONAL CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND FINDINGS OF FACT, AND HAVE THE CASES CONSOLIDATED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT PURSUANT TO RULE 52 AND DUE PROCESS LAW?

(5) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025 FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, DO THE APPELLANTS HAVE A RIGHT TO INTERVENE PURSUANT TO RULE 24 WITHIN EACH OTHERS CASES TO PROTECT THEIR ACQUIRED INTERESTS AS THE RULES FOR INTERVENTION PERMITS, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE CASE WAS ORIGINALLY FILED JOINTLY AND IT IS OBVIOUS FROM THE PLEADING THAT THE CASES ARE NOT DISTINCTLY UNIQUE TO EACH OTHER POSSESSING COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT WHERE WE ARE CONNECTED BY THE LITIGATION PRESENTED POSSESSING COMMON INTERESTS AND POTENTIAL "COVENANT", "CONTRACTUAL" OBLIGATIONS?

(6) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025 FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, THE PLAINTIFFS FILE [11] DIFFERENT AND DISTINCT MOTIONS FOR RELIEF BEFORE THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT ONLY TO IN FRAUD AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL BIAS BE CIRCUMVENTED RULING. DO THE APPELLANTS HAVE A RIGHT OF DUE PROCESS TO HAVE EACH OF THE NUMEROUS MOTIONS SUBMITTED ADJUDICATED INDEPENDENTLY, SEPARATELY, PRODUCING INDEPENDENT FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW FOR EACH MOTION TO ALLOW THEM TO PROPERLY PRESERVE ANY POTENTIAL DENIAL OF THOSE MOTIONS FOR ANY SOUGHT SUBSEQUENT APPELLATE REVIEW INSTEAD OF HAVING THIS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE DETERMINATION IN

FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, THE APPELLANTS SOUGHT TO EXERCISE RIGHTS UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AND INTERNATIONAL LAW. THEREFORE, THESE ESSENTIAL LEGAL QUESTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL. CAN YOU NATURALIZE BY THE 14TH. AMENDMENT STOLEN SOVEREIGN ETHIOPIAN KINGS OR THEIR STOLEN SOVEREIGN OFFSPRING VIA THE TRANS-ATLANTIC SLAVE TRADE WHO DO NOT JUST HAVE DIRECT TIES TO THE THRONE OF ETHIOPIAN, BUT ALSO TO THE THRONE OF ISRAEL AND THE ISLAMIC KHALIFATE? IS THERE A CONGRESSIONAL STATUTE OR ENACTMENT THAT STATE YOU CAN DO THIS LIKE THE INDIAN ACT OF 1924? CRAWFORD AND HIS ANCESTORS WERE NOT NORMAL SLAVES AS OTHER AFRICAN AMERICANS ARE. THEY ARE AN ANOMALY, AN EXCEPTION TO THE BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP RULE. THEY ARE THE DIRECT DESCENDANTS OF PROPHETS, KINGS, HIGH PRIESTS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, OF KING SOLOMON, THE ETHIOPIAN QUEEN OF SHEBA AND KING MENEYLEK I OF THE ETHIOPIAN EMPIRE, HEIRS TO THE THRONE OF ETHIOPIA, OF ISRAEL AND LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD, WHICH CANNOT BE DEEMED A CONCLUSORY CLAIM WHEN CRAWFORD POSSESS ALL THE PHYSICAL FEATURES THAT ARE FORETOLD BY RELIGIOUS PROPHESY INCLUDING THE FACT THAT HE WOULD COME OUT OF PRISON BETRAYED BY MEMBERS OF HIS OWN HOUSEHOLD WHICH IS THE SOURCE OF SEEKING THE DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE. SEE THE BOOK OF DANIEL 11:26, ISAIAH 14:29-32, ZECHARIAH 6:12-13, JEREMIAH 33:15-22 KING JAMES VERSION OF THE BIBLE AND ISLAMIC HADITH IN SUNA ABU DAWUD. THIS IS FURTHER SUPPORTED BY THE MANIFESTATION OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH 14:29-32 THAT FORETOLD THIS MAN FROM THE NORTH (JERSEY CITY, N.J.) WOULD BE A "COCATRICE" (FIERY SPIRIT STOCKY MAN) AND WOULD APPEAR WHEN ISRAEL WOULD HAVE DESTROYED GAZA, PALESTINE, EXISTING NOW; AND FURTHER SUPPORTED BY ISLAMIC PROPHESY THAT SAID HE WOULD APPEAR AT A TIME WHEN THERE IS BOTH A LUNAR AND SOLAR ECLIPSE OCCURRING DURING THE MONTH OF RAMADAN WHICH OCCURRED IN 2024, AN EVENT THAT HAS NOT BEEN SEEN IN ABOUT 150 YEARS AND IS ALSO SUPPORTED BY THE FACT THAT CRAWFORD HAS A "SICLE CELL TRAIT" PRODUCING SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE THAT HIS ANCESTRY ONCE ORIGINATED FROM THE ARABIAN PENINSULA AS WELL. THUS, SUCH A CLAIM IS NOT

CONCLUSORY, BASELESS OR MERITLESS IN LAW AND FACT, AND IS EVEN PROTECTED BY THE 1st. AMENDMENT FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE PURSUANT TO RELIGION. BUT THIS IS NOT THE QUESTION OR LEGAL ISSUE PRESENTED. CAN YOU WITHOUT AN ACT OF CONGRESS NATURALIZE BY THE 14TH. AMENDMENT STOLEN SOVEREIGN ETHIOPIAN KINGS OR THEIR STOLEN SOVEREIGN OFFSPRING VIA THE TRANS-ATLANTIC SLAVE TRADE BY THE 14TH. AMENDMENT WHO HAVE DIRECT TIES TO THE ETHIOPIAN THRONE, THE THRONE OF ISRAEL AND THE ISLAMIC KHALIFATE? BOTH ETHIOPIA AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL ARE FORMALLY RECOGNIZED FOREIGN STATES FROM WHICH CRAWFORD'S SOVEREIGN ANCESTRY ORIGINATES WHERE ISRAEL WAS DISPERSED EVEN TO ETHIOPIA AND THE MIDDLE EAST AND DID NOT BECOME A STATE AGAIN UNTIL 1948. IN THE 6TH. CENTURY, MODERN DAY ERITREA, ETHIOPIA, PORTIONS OF SUDAN, INCLUDING THE TERRITORY OF THE FORMER KINGDOM OF KUSH. COASTAL AREAS OF DJIBOUTI AND SOMALIA. ACROSS THE RED SEA IN YEMEN IN THE SOUTHERN ARABIAN PENINSULA, ALL OF THIS WAS PART OF THE ETHIOPIAN EMPIRE TO WHICH ALSO CHISOLM, BELLAMY AND YAHDINA TRACE THEIR ANCESTRAL HISTORY TO, PRODUCING ADDITIONAL COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT SUPPORTING JOINT FILING THOUGH THEY ARE NOT OF SOVEREIGN ANCESTRY. AMERICAN INDIANS WERE NOT EVEN CONSIDERED CITIZENS OF THIS NATION THOUGH THE 14TH. AMENDMENT WAS ESTABLISHED UNTIL THE INDIAN ACT OF 1924. BEFORE THEN THEY WERE CONSIDERED "FOREIGNERS" THOUGH THEY WERE BORN ON AMERICAN SOIL. THE SAME PRINCIPLE WOULD APPLY TO THE CHILDREN OF FOREIGN SOVEREIGNS, CRAWFORD, IN THIS INSTANCE. IT TOOK AN ACT OF CONGRESS TO MAKE THE AMERICAN INDIANS CITIZENS BECAUSE THE AMERICAN INDIANS, LIKE CRAWFORD AND HIS ANCESTRY FELL WITHIN THE EXCEPTION TO BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP DEMONSTRATING THIS IS NOT A FRIVOLOUS, BASELESS OR MERITLESS CLAIM OR SOME STUPID, FRIVOLOUS "SOVEREIGN CITIZEN CLAIM" WHICH WOULD ESTABLISH RIGHTS UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AND INTERNATIONAL LAW. WHAT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION OR ACT OF CONGRESS STATE YOU CAN NATURALIZE BY THE 14TH. AMENDMENT STOLEN SOVEREIGNS OR THEIR STOLEN SOVEREIGN CHILDREN?

(11) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025 FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, IF THERE IS NO CONGRESSIONAL ENACTMENT THAT STATE YOU CAN NATURALIZE

GOVERNMENT AIDED IN THE ALLEGED KIDNAPPING AFTER THE FACT BY PLACING A U.S. MARSHAL NOTIFY IN CRAWFORD'S S.C.D.C. RECORDS TO CONTINUE TO ILLEGALLY KIDNAP HIM IF THE STATE FAILED IN THEIR EFFORTS, (A U.S. NOTIFY THAT HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH CRAWFORD AT ALL PURSUANT TO A SAID BANK ROBBERY IN GEORGIA THAT STILL EXIST IN CRAWFORD'S S.C.D.C. FILE UNTIL THIS VERY DAY), THE FEDERAL COURTS WOULD HAVE JURISDICTION TO HEAR THE MATTER AS IS ALSO ARGUED BEFORE THE OHIO DISTRICT COURT AND 6TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. THE SEEKING OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION IS ALSO SOUGHT TO GET THAT U.S. NOTIFY OUT OF CRAWFORD'S S.C.D.C. FILES IMMEDIATELY FOR WHICH THE U.S. MARSHALS AND UNITED STATES ARE BEING SUED FOR $30 MILLION FOR PLACING IT THERE INTENTIONALLY WITH NEFARIOUS INTENT, WHICH SHOULD NOT BE THERE AT ALL AND REMAINS SO UNTIL THIS VERY DAY, AND TO HALT ANY POTENTIALLY SOUGHT DEPORTATION UNTIL ALL § 1983 ACTIONS AROUND THE NATION INVOLVING THESE MATTERS ARE CONCLUDED OR IT WOULD PREJUDICE THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, IN BRINGING THESE MATTERS BEFORE THE COURTS INVOLVED WHICH AID IN THE COURTS JURISDICTION UNDER THE ALL WRITS ACT. THE APPELLANT(S) ALSO GIVE THE COURT JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT THESE MATTERS ARE ALSO BEFORE ARCH BISHOP FABRE-LaJUENE OF THE GEORGIA AND CHARLESTON, S.C. CATHOLIC ARCH DIOCESES, POPE LEO AND THE VATICAN WHO INTEND TO MAKE AN OFFICIAL ASSESSMENT ON THE VATICAN RECORD AT THE TIME OF CRAWFORD'S SOUGHT RELEASE.

(12) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025 FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, IS THERE ANY INDICATION OF A "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" EMERGING FROM THE 3 TRUE MONOTHEISTIC MAINSTREAM RELIGIOUS OF THE SEED OF THE PROPHET ABRAHAM THAT THE APPELLANTS ARE RELYING UPON AS BENEFICIARIES OF SUCH A "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" AS BEING CHRISTIAN, MUSLIM OR JEWS?

(13) IS A RELIGIOUS "COVENANT" A FORM OF "CONTRACT"?

(14) ARE ALL FORMS OR TYPES OF CONTRACTS PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, INCLUDING

"COVENANTS"? WE DO NOT WANT THE HONORABLE 4TH. CIRCUIT GOING ALL OVER THE PLACE ATTEMPTING TO ADDRESS THE MERITS OTHER THAN TO ANSWER YES OR NO TO THESE SPECIFIC LEGAL QUESTIONS. WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE THE FULL ADDRESSING OF THE MERITS DONE AT THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT LEVEL AS DUE PROCESS LAW WOULD PERMIT IN ORDER THAT THEY WOULD BE PROPERLY PRESERVED FOR ANY POTENTIAL SUBSEQUENT APPELLATE REVIEW WHICH ALSO SUPPORTS OUR SEEKING OF REMAND.

REFERRING BACK TO THE ISSUE OF THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION FOR THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL DELAY OF MEDICAL TREATMENT ALSO IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF ADA. CRAWFORD WAS FOUND IN 2018 TO HAVE A GROWTH ON HIS COLON WHICH HAD TO BE SURGICALLY REMOVED. THE PHYSICIAN REQUIRED CRAWFORD BE BROUGHT BEFORE HIM YEARLY TO ENSURE THAT NO FURTHER GROWTHS OCCUR. UNTIL THIS CURRENT DAY APPROXIMATELY 7 YEARS LATE S.C.D.C. HAS FAILED AND DENIED AND OR DELAYED THIS PRESCRIBED MEDICAL TREATMENT AS WELL. THIS, TOO, IS SOUGHT REMEDIED BY THE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF. WE DO DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT AND WE ARE COMPETENT TO TESTIFY AS TO THE VERITY OF THE CLAIMS PRESENTED HAVING PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS.

RESPECTFULLY,
MAURICE BELLAMY

ALTON CHISOLM

JONAH THE TISHBITE

YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN

OCTOBER 28, 2025

VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW AND PROTECTIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE AND RULE 52?

(7) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025 FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, THE PLAINTIFFS FILE [3] DIFFERENT AND DISTINCT MOTIONS BEFORE THE LOWER COURT. DID THE APPELLANTS HAVE A RIGHT OF DUE PROCESS TO HAVE EACH OF THE MOTIONS SUBMITTED FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION ADJUDICATED INDEPENDENTLY, SEPARATELY, PRODUCING INDEPENDENT FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW FOR EACH MOTION TO ALLOW THEM TO PRESERVE ANY POTENTIAL DENIAL OF THOSE MOTIONS PROPERLY FOR ANY SOUGHT SUBSEQUENT APPELLATE REVIEW INSTEAD OF HAVING THIS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE DETERMINATION IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW AND PROTECTIONS ESTABLISHED BY RULE 52?

(8) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025 FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT, THE [29] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 31, 2025 DOCUMENT NO. 6 AND THE DOCUMENTS FILED SUBJUDICE, DO THE APPELLANTS HAVE A RIGHT OF AUTONOMY TO SEEK AND IT BE GRANTED THAT THE CASE BE GIVEN COMPLEX LITIGATION STATUS DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY NATURE OF THE LITIGATION DUE TO THE CASE POSSESSING NOVEL QUESTIONS OF LAW, MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL DEFENDANTS, INTERNATIONAL DEFENDANTS, NUMBERING OVER 200, WITH LARGE DISCOVERY REQUESTS, QUESTIONS INVOLVING 50 STATES AND FOREIGN NATIONS REGARDING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE CASE THAT WOULD JUSTIFY COMPLEX CASE DESIGNATION?

(9) CAN INMATES FILE A § 1983 ACTION TO CHALLENGE THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL WITH ITS PLRA, AEDPA, 3 STRIKE AND SENTENCING GUIDELINES SUING THE U.S. CONGRESS AND SENATE FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF RELATED THERETO DUE TO THEY DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS TO THEIR DETRIMENT IN VIOLATION OF THE 14TH. AMENDMENT BY THE EVIDENCE ARGUED IN THE COMPLAINT?

(10) BY THE [26] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 5, 2025

BY THE 14TH. AMENDMENT STOLEN ETHIOPIAN SOVEREIGN KINGS OR THEIR STOLEN SOVEREIGN OFFSPRING, WHICH THERE IS NOT, WOULD THOSE STOLEN SOVEREIGNS OR THEIR STOLEN SOVEREIGN OFFSPRING RETAIN ALL RIGHTS, TILTLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES THAT ARE AFFORDED TO THEM BY THEIR SOVEREIGNTY UNDER THEIR ORIGINATING NATION(S) UNLESS THERE WAS SOME ACT OF CONGRESS THAT WOULD DETERMINE OTHERWISE? THE LAW OF THE "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" WHEN AND WHERE IT WAS MADE STANDS AS IS ARGUED AND WAS DEFAULTED ON WITHIN THE STATE CASES REFERRED TO. RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES DERIVED FROM A FOREIGN NATION (AFRICA, ISRAEL, MIDDLE EAST) ARE GOVERNED BY THAT FOREIGN NATION'S LAWS AT THE TIME THE COVENANT, CONTRACT WAS ESTABLISHED, NOT U.S. LAW. FOREIGN LAW PREVAILS ON FOREIGN MATTERS. A "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" FROM THE ORIGINAL NATION WOULD DICTATE THE INDIVIDUAL'S STANDING, TITLE AND PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES, (ie. JEREMIAH 33:15-22; ISAIAH 11:1-5, ZECHARIAH 6:12-13, DANIEL CHAPT.11), ESPECIALLY WHEN WE ARE DEALING WITH A "SOLE CORPORATION", CONTINUOUS PRESENCE, UNDER CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION. THE U.S. GOVERNMENT CANNOT INTERFERE OR INVALIDATE A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT'S "COVENANTS", "CONTRACTS", RELIGIOUS OR OTHERWISE. THE SUCCESSION OF A FOREIGN THRONE IS NOT A MATTER FOR THE U.S. COURTS TO DECIDE. THEREFORE, THE QUESTION MUST BE ANSWERED, BUT NOT THE MERITS. FOREIGN LAW BASED UPON THOSE FOREIGN COVENANTS OR CONTRACTS WOULD PREVAIL (JEREMIAH 33:15-22, ISAIAH 11:1-5, ZECHARIAH 6:12-13, DANIEL CHAPT.11, SUNA ADU DAWUD REGARDING AL MAHDI) AND BE REQUIRED TO BE GIVEN FULL FAITH AND CREDIT WITHIN ALL COURT RECORDS, UNITED STATES v. WONG KIM ARK, (1898); REPUBLIC OF ARGENTINA v. WELTOVER INC. (1992); THE NOTTEBOLM CASE (1955). UNDER SUCH SCENARIO, A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN WHO WAS FORCIBLY BROUGHT TO THE U.S. WOULD BE ABLE TO SUE IN AMERICAN COURTS AND PERSONAL JURISDICTION WOULD EXIST AND BASED UPON THE LACK OF VOLUNTARY APPEARANCE IN THE COUNTRY AS ALSO SUPPORTED UNDER FRISBIE v. COLLINS (1952) VIA THE KER-FRISBIE DOCTRINE ILLUSTRATING THAT AN ILLEGAL KIDNAPPING (EVEN PURSUANT TO THE ILLEGAL FRAMING) WOULD NOT INVALIDATE JURISDICTION OVER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN. CLEAR CAUSE WOULD BE ESTABLISHED FOR KIDNAPPING AND FALSE IMPRISONMENT. SINCE THE U.S.