

**RECEIVED**

**Feb 17 2026**

**SC Court of Appeals**

YAHDIRA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN  
15306 ROBEY AVENUE SUITE 707  
HARVEY, ILLINOIS 60426

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 2025-001856 AND FILING MOTION TO BE ADDED AS PARTY  
AND OR TO INTERVENE.

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,

THE ATTACHED DOCUMENT IS BEING FILED BEFORE THE COURT  
TO ENSURE THAT THE RIGHTS OF BOTH DIRECT PARTIES THAT WERE BEFORE  
THE LOWER COURT ARE PRESERVED. PLEASE FILE IT WITHIN THE ABOVE  
CAPTIONED CASE AND FORWARD IT FOR ADJUDICATION. WE THANK YOU IN  
ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,

YAHDIRA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN

JONAH THE TISHBITE

FEBRUARY 13, 2026

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

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

---

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

APPELLANT(S)-PETITIONER(S)

YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN,

PARTY OF RECORD-INTERVENOR

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE COUNTY OF KERSHAW,

RESPONDENT-APPELLEES

---


**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

---


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

TISHBITE, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO BE ADDED AS A DIRECT PARTY TO APPEAL AND OR MOTION TO INTERVENE; MOTION TO PRESERVE RIGHT TO FILE APPELLATE BRIEF 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. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219 AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID ON FEBRUARY 13, 2026. WHERE FEDERAL LAW APPLIES DUE TO PENDENT JURISDICTION, IT IS FILED ON THAT DATE, HOUSTON v. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379(U.S.1988).

YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN



JONAH THE TISHBITE



FEBRUARY 13, 2026

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

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

---

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

APPELLANT(S)-PETITIONER(S)

YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN,

PARTY OF RECORD-INTERVENOR

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE COUNTY OF KERSHAW,

RESPONDENT-APPELLEES

---

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO  
BE ADDED AS DIRECT PARTY TO APPEAL AND OR MOTION TO  
INTERVENE; MOTION TO PRESERVE RIGHT TO FILE APPELLATE  
BRIEF AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

---

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

THE DIRECT PARTY TO THIS ACTION, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, MOTION BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS TO BE ADDED AS A DIRECT PARTY TO THIS APPEAL AND OR AT THE MINIMUM, MOTION TO INTERVENE IN THIS APPEAL AND MOTION TO PRESERVE MY RIGHT TO FILE MY OWN INDEPENDENT BRIEF WITHIN THIS APPEAL ONCE THE COURT OF APPEALS RULES ON THIS MOTION DUE TO LACK OF NOTICE ON THE PART OF THE CONSPIRING STATE AND COUNTY ACTORS BY THE VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW. CIVIL RULES OF PROCEDURE MANDATE NOTICE BE GIVEN TO ALL PARTIES NAME IN THE APPLICATION FOR DNA TESTING. I, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, AM A DIRECT PARTY TO THE PROCEEDINGS WITHIN THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT AND WAS NEVER NOTIFIED OF THE ILLEGAL AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL HEARING THAT OCCURRED ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2025 IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW.

WHERE THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT REVIEWED THE PETITION TO INVOKE THEIR ORIGINAL JURISDICTION RELATED TO THESE MATTERS WITH "BOTH PARTIES" ON THE FACE OF THE PLEADING AND RECORD, AND "BOTH" APPEAR ON THE FACE OF THE RECORD WITHIN THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING; "BOTH" PARTIES ARE CONSIDERED "PARTIES OF RECORD". SOUTH CAROLINA LAW REQUIRED THAT THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS SERVE COPIES OF ORDERS AND NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT ON ALL PARTIES AS PROVIDED BY RULE 77(d), S.C.R.C.P.. THE LOWER COURT DIDN'T NOTIFY THE INTERVENOR, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, OF ANY SCHEDULED HEARING AND DIDN'T SERVE A COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER ON ANY OF THE TWO PARTIES THAT APPEAR ON THE FACE OF THE APPLICATION AND RECORD THAT IS THE SOURCE OF THIS APPEAL. THE COMPROMISED LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT WAS REQUIRED TO GIVE NOTICE OF ANY SCHEDULE HEARING WITHIN (20) DAYS BEFORE ANY SUCH HEARING OCCURRED AND FAILED TO DO SO IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW, PRODUCING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION THAT VOIDS THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. CONDUCTING A "SECRET" OR UNNOTIFIED HEARING WITHOUT "BOTH" PARTIES OF RECORD VIOLATES DUE PROCESS AND VOIDS THE COURT'S JUDGMENT AND JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL ELEMENT TO SUBJECT MATTER

JURISDICTION. THE FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENT OF DUE PROCESS IS THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD AT A "MEANINGFUL TIME AND IN A MEANINGFUL MANNER". IF THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT EXCLUDED ONE OF THE PARTIES (ie. YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN), WHICH IT DID, IT IS CONSIDERED A "MANIFEST ABUSE OF DISCRETION", CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS ERROR ANALYSIS, LaSALLE BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION v. DAVIDSON, 386 S.C. 276, 688 S.E.2d. 121(S.C.App.2009)(ANY HEARING CONDUCTED WHERE THE ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS OF A FAIR TRIBUNAL [LIKE A JUDGE OR THE OPPORTUNITY FOR A PARTY TO BE HEARD] ARE MISSING IS ILLEGAL, UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID); STATE v. RIVERA, 402 S.C. 225, 741 S.E.2d. 694(S.C.App.2013)(IF A COURT'S PROCEDURAL SETUP IS FUNDAMENTALLY FLAWED AS EXCLUDING A MANDATORY PARTY, IT IS AN ACT THAT CANNOT BE DISMISSED AS HARMLESS REQUIRING REVERSAL AND REMAND); NELSON v. QHG OF SOUTH CAROLINA, INC. 345 S.C. 290, 580 S.E.2d. 171(S.C.2004)(A COURT OF LAW CAN KNOW NO OTHER PERSONS AS PARTIES, THAN THOSE WHOSE RIGHTS ARE MADE TO APPEAR ON THE LOWER COURT RECORD); NATIONAL TRUST AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE UNITED STATES v. CITY OF NORTH CHARLESTON,--S.E.2d.--, 2026 WL 158078(S.C.App.2026);KERALINK INTERNATIONAL, INC. v. STRADIS HEALTHCARE, LLC., 144 F.4TH. 539(4th.Cir.2025)(IT IS A CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR IN LAW TO EXCLUDE JOINT PARTIES).

THE COURT CAN ONLY DISMISS AN APPLICATION SUMMARILY IF IT NOTIFIES "ALL PARTIES" TO THE ACTION OF ITS INTENT TO DO SO AND PROVIDES A REASON. NO SUCH ORDER OF THE REQUIRED NOTICE AND OR REASONS HAS BEEN SERVED ON ANY OF THE TWO PETITIONER(S)-APPELLANT(S) INVOLVED VIOLATING OUR SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, WHICH IS COMPOUNDED BY THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OTHER UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION THAT OCCURRED AND IS ARGUED WITHIN THIS CASE. FAILURE TO CONDUCT THE REQUIRED HEARING WITH ALL THE REQUIRED PARTIES REQUIRES REVERSAL, VACATING AND REMAND. THE LOWER COURTS ACTIONS ALSO VIOLATE AND SUBTLY EXPAND AND OR FORCE CONSTRUCT THE APPLICABLE STATUTE(S) IN VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE PURSUANT TO S.C. CODE ANN. § 17-28-50 AND RULE 71.1 OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

IN SOUTH CAROLINA, A LOWER COURT CANNOT LEGALLY CONDUCT A

RIGHT TO INTRODUCE EVIDENCE AND CONFRONT THE STATE'S CLAIMS, WHICH ARE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA AND DUE PROCESS LAW.) .


IN SOUTH CAROLINA, WHEN A PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION IS DECLINED AND THE MATTER PROCEEDS IN THE LOWER COURT, THE NOTICE AND JOINER REQUIREMENTS REMAIN ABSOLUTE. EVEN WITHOUT A FORMAL MANDATE, A LOWER COURT CANNOT LEGALLY CONDUCT A HEARING WITHOUT NOTIFYING BOTH PARTIES NAMED ON THE FORENSIC DNA APPLICATION WHICH THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT FAILED TO DO. YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, THE NOW INTERVENOR, WAS NEVER NOTIFIED AT ALL VOIDING THE JUDGMENT. THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, JOINS IN THIS MOTION AND OR NOTICE AND OR PLEADING TO ESTABLISH THE JURISDICTIONAL FACTS. WHEN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DECLINES THE PETITION UNDER RULE 245, S.C.A.C.R., IT IS OFTEN BECAUSE THE MATTER CAN BE DETERMINED IN A LOWER COURT IN THE FIRST INSTANCE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE PARTIES. IT BECAME PAINFULLY OBVIOUS THAT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT MISCALCULATED THE SITUATION HERE. OVERWHELMING PREJUDICE HAS NOW OCCURRED WHICH IS SUBSTANTIATED BY THE FACT THAT THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT, AMONG OTHER NUMEROUS THINGS, CONDUCTED THE HEARING ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2025 WITHOUT GIVING ANY NOTICE WHATSOEVER TO THE DIRECT PARTY, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, AND LATE NOTICE AFTER THE HEARING ACTUALLY OCCURRED TO THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD VIOLATING CLEARLY ESTABLISHED RULES OF COURT AND DUE PROCESS LAW. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DECLINING JURISDICTION DO NOT RESET THE PARTIES INVOLVED. IF THE LOWER COURT ACCEPTED THE FILING WITH BOTH NAMES, THOSE INDIVIDUALS ARE ESTABLISHED AS "PARTIES OF RECORD". THE LOWER KERSAW COUNTY COURT AND THE CONSPIRING ACTORS INHERITS THE APPLICATION AS IT WAS SUBMITTED. ONCE THE TWO PARTIES ARE NAMED IN THE APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING, THEY MUST BE SERVED WITH EVERY WRITTEN MOTION AND NOTICE OF HEARING WHICH THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT FAILED, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO DENY THE PARTIES CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRACY, VIOLATIONS OF ESTABLISHED CLAIM PROCESSING RULES TIMELY INVOKED AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE ABSENCE OF A MANDATE DO NOT RELAX THE JOINER. IF THE APPICATION IS FILED WITH BOTH PARTIES NAMES AND THE COURT HAS NOT ISSUED AN

ORDER OF SEVERANCE UNDER RULE 21, S.C.R.C.P., BOTH REMAIN LEGALLY TIED TO THE CASE WARRANTING AND ESTABLISHING INTERVENTION BY RIGHT, NOT PERMISSION AND OR THE RIGHT TO BE ADDED AS A PARTY TO THE APPEAL. TO PROCEED WITH ONE PARTY WHILE EXCLUDING THE OTHER IS A VIOLATION OF PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS PRODUCING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VOIDING THE JUDGMENT, TOBIAS v. RICE, 386 S.C. 306, 688 S.E.2d. 552(S.C.App.2010)(THIS CASE CONFIRMS THAT A JUDGMENT RENDERED WITHOUT NOTICE TO A PARTY OF RECORD IS "VOID" FOR VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS); MACK v. SOUTH CAROLINA, 433 S.C. 28, 857 S.E.2d. 361 (S.C.App.2021)(HIGHLIGHTS THAT APPLICANTS UNDER THE DNA ACT ARE ENTITLED TO SPECIFIC PROCEDURAL AVENUES AND BELATED REVIEWS IF THEIR RIGHTS ARE OBSTRUCTED).


INSOMUCH, THE DIRECT PARTY TO THESE PROCEEDINGS WITHIN THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, MOTION TO BE ADDED AS A DIRECT PARTY TO THIS APPEAL AND OR IN THE ALTERNATE, MOTION TO INTERVENE BY RIGHT, NOT PERMISSION, AND MOTION TO EXERCISE AND PRESERVE HER RIGHT TO FILE HER OWN APPELLATE BRIEF AS WELL AND THE APPELLANT, CRAWFORD, SUPPORTS AND JOINS IN HER ACTION. THE UNNOTIFIED HEARING REGARDING THE PARTY, YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, PRODUCES A CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL DEFECT AND VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS RENDERING THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT'S JUDGMENT, WHICH IS COMPOUNDED BY EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, VIOLATIONS OF TIMELY INVOKED CLAIM PROCESSING RULES AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VOID, SUBJECTING THE STATE AND COUNTY TO DEFAULT, FORFEITURE AND WAIVER AS WAS ARGUED AND TIMELY, PROPERLY SOUGHT BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS. THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS WHO HAVE PENDENT JURISDICTION OVER THESE MATTERS SHALL BE NOTIFIED OF THIS CONTINUED FIASCO OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT THE STATE COURT IS INEFFECTIVE IN PROTECTING THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS OF THE PARTIES INVOLVED SUPPORTING THE DEMAND FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND OTHER CLAIMS MADE WITHIN THOSE COURTS OF THE STATE AND COUNTY ACTORS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED, SINES v. KESSLER, 2021 WL 1431296 (W.D.Va.2021);

HUNT v. CENTRAL CONSOL. SCHOOL DIST., 951 F.Supp.2d. 1136 (D.MEXICO.2013); WORLDWIDE NETWORK SERVICES, LLC. v. DYNCORP INTERN, LLC, 365 Fed. Appx' 432 (4th.Cir.2010); ALLEN v. MILLIGAN, 599 U.S. 1, 143 S.Ct. 1487, 216 L.Ed.2d. 60(U.S.2023); AMERICAN LEAGION v. AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION, 588 U.S. 29, 139 S.Ct. 2067, 204 L.Ed.2d. 452(U.S.2019); FULTON v. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA, 593 U.S. 522, 141 S.Ct. 1868, 210 L.Ed.2d. 137(U.S.2021).

YAHDNA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN



JONAH THE TISHBITE



FEBRUARY 13, 2026

**IMPORTANT NOTICE:** THE INTERVENOR, YAHDNA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN MOTIONS TO FILE HER APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS DUE TO INDIGENCE AND BEING OVER 65 YEARS OLD AND BEING ON A FIXED INCOME WHICH WAS PERMITTED WITHIN THE PENDENT JURISDICTION CASES RELATED TO THE MATTER. AN AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCE IS ATTACHED.

)  
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
THE COUNTY OF RICHLAND ) AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCY  
)  
)

CASE NAME: LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD ET. AL., v. THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

CRIMINAL CASE NO.: 2025-001856

CURRENT ADDRESS: 15306 ROBEY AVENUE SUITE 707, HARVEY, ILLINOIS 60426.

ARE YOU INCARCERATED?: THE ANSWER IS NO.

WHAT WERE YOU CONVICTED OF?: THIS IS NON-APPICABLE.

WHAT WAS YOUR SENTENCE?: THIS IS NON-APPLICABLE.

WHAT ARE YOU APPEALING?: THE DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING.

IN WHAT COUNTY WAS THE TRIAL/HEARING/GUILTY PLEA HEARD? THE CASE WAS HEARD BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS.

WHO REPRESENTED YOU?: THE APPELLANT WAS SELF-REPRESENTED.

NAME OF ATTORNEY/PUBLIC DEFENDER?: THIS IS NON-APPLICABLE.

IF RETAINED, HOW MUCH DID YOU PAY FOR ATTORNEY FEES?: THIS IS NON-APPLICABLE.

IF YOU STILL OWE MONEY TO YOUR ATTORNEY, HOW MUCH?: THIS IS NON-APPLICABLE.

ARE YOU PRESENTLY EMPLOYED?: THE ANSWER IS NO.

IF YES, STATE THE AMOUNT OF YOUR SALARY OR WAGES PER MONTH, AND GIVE THE NAME AND ADDRESS OF YOUR EMPLOYER: I AM NOT EMPLOYED. I AM ON A FIXED INCOME FROM THE GOVERNMENT.

IF NO STATE THE NAME AND ADDRESS OF YOUR LAST EMPLOYMENT, DATE OF EMPLOYMENT, AND AMOUNT OF YOUR SALARY OR WAGE PER MONTH: I AM A WIDOWER LIVING OFF MY DECEASE HUSBAND'S BENEFITS.

LIST BY NAME, AGE AND RELATIONSHIP TO YOU, ANY PERSONS WHO ARE DEPENDENT UPON YOU FOR SUPPORT. INDICATE BESIDES EACH HOW MUCH YOU CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS THEIR SUPPORT: THIS IN NON-APPLICABLE.

HAVE YOU RECEIVED WITHIN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS ANY MONEY FROM ANY OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCES?:

A. BUSINESS PROFESSION OR FORM OF SELF EMPLOYMENT? THE ANSWER IS NO.

B. RENT PAYMENTS, INTEREST OR DIVIDENDS? THE ANSWER IS NO.

C. PENSIONS, ANNUITIES OR LIFE INSURANCE PAYMENTS? MY DECEASE HUSBAND'S PENSION, YES.

D. GIFTS OR INHERITANCE? THE ANSWER IS NO.

E. ANY OTHER SOURCE? THE ANSWER IS NO.

IF THE ANSWER IS YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE, DESCRIBE EACH SOURCE OF MONEY AND STATE THE AMOUNT RECEIVED FROM EACH DURING THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS. THE ANSWER IS THAT I RECEIVE APPROXIMATELY \$800 A MONTH FROM MY DECEASE HUSBAND'S PENSION.

DO YOU OWN CASH OR DO YOU HAVE ANY MONEY IN A SAVINGS ACCOUNT? THE ANSWER TO THIS IS THAT I HAVE ABOUT \$100 IN MY CHECKING ACCOUNT.

DO YOU OWN REAL ESTATE, STOCKS, BONDS, NOTES OR OTHER VALUABLE

PROPERTY (EXCLUDING ORDINARY HOUSEHOLD FURNISHINGS AND CLOTHING)?  
THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION IS NO.

WHAT KIND OF MOTOR VEHICLE DO YOU OWN? THE ANSWER TO THIS  
QUESTION IS THAT I OWN A 2005 NISSAN.

IS IT PAID FOR? THE ANSWER IS YES.

I DO SOLEMNLY AFFIRM THAT THE ACCOUNT BY ME DELIVERED INTO  
THIS COURT DOES CONTAIN A TRUE AND FULL ACCOUNT OF ALL MY REAL  
AND PERSONAL ESTATE, DEBTS, CREDITS, AND EFFECTS WHATSOEVER  
WITHOUT EXCEPTION, WHICH I, OR ANY PERSON IN TRUST FOR ME, HAVE  
OR AT THE TIME OF MY POSSESSION HAD, OR AM, OR WAS, IN RESPECT,  
ENTITLED TO, IN POSSESSION, REMAINDER OR REVERSION AND THAT I  
HAVE NOT AT ANY TIME SINCE CHARGES WERE MADE AGAINST ME OR BEFORE  
, DIRECTLY OR TIME SINCE CHARGES WERE MADE AGAINST ME OR BEFORE,  
DIRECTLY, OR INDIRECTLY SOLD, LEASED, ASSIGNED OR OTHERWISE  
DISPOSED OF OR MADE OVER, IN TRUST FOR MYSELF OR OTHERWISE, OTHER  
THAN IS MENTIONED HEREIN.

I UNDERSTAND THAT THE STATE SHALL FILE A CLAIM AGAINST ME  
IN AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO THE COST OF REPRESENTATION, BUT THAT SUCH  
CLAIM SHALL NOT CONSTITUTE A LIEN AGAINST MY PROPERTY, UNLESS,  
THE CLAIM IS REDUCED TO JUDGMENT BY THE ORDER OF THE COURT AFTER  
GIVING ME AT LEAST 30 DAYS NOTICE.

UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY, I CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION  
GIVEN BY ME ON THIS AFFIDAVIT IS TRUE AND CORRECT, AND I UNDER-  
STAND THAT I WILL BE SUBJECT TO CIVIL AND OR CRIMINAL PENALTIES  
IF I KNOWINGLY FURNISH FALSE INFORMATION.


I AM FINANCIALLY UNABLE TO EMPLOY COUNSEL.

THIS 13TH. DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026

  
YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN

I UNDERSTAND THAT I AM ENTITLED TO AT LEAST 30 DAYS NOTICE BEFORE A CLAIM AGAINST ME MAY BE REDUCED TO JUDGMENT, AND I DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I DO NOT WAIVE MY RIGHT TO NOTICE.

THIS 13TH. DAY OF FEBRUARY 2026.



YAHDINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN

SWORN AND OR AFFIRMED BEFORE ME THIS

13th DAY OF February 2026

Beth McCormick  
NOTARY

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 1/20/30

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF RICHLAND )

AFFIDAVIT OF INDIGENCY

Case Name LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD v. THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Criminal Case No. 2025-001856

Current Address: F3B. RM. 148 EVANS C.I. 610 HWY. 9 WEST BENNETSVILLE

Are you incarcerated? XXX Yes (If "Yes") Where? EVANS C.I.  
       No

What were you convicted of? MURDER

What was your sentence? LIFE

Are you appealing from APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING  
       trial,        guilty plea        a post-conviction relief hearing?

In what county was this trial/hearing/guilty plea held? KERSHAW COUNTY

Presiding Judge's name? JUDGE JOCELYN NEWMAN

Date of trial/guilty plea or post-conviction hearing SEPTEMBER 13, 2025

Were you represented by  
       a court-appointed attorney        public defender or        retained counsel?

Name of attorney/public defender? N/A

If retained, how much did you pay for attorney fees? \$ N/A

If you still owe money to your attorney, how much? \$ N/A

1. Are you presently employed? Yes        No XXX

a. If "yes," state the amount of your salary or wages per month, and give the name and address of your employer: N/A

b. If "no," state the name and address of last employment, date of termination of employment, and amount of your salary or wages per month. SELF EMPLOYED 80K YEARLY

2. List by name, age and relationship to you, any persons who are dependent upon you for support. Indicate beside each how much you contribute toward their support. N/A

3. Have you received within the past twelve months any money from any of the following sources?

- a. Business, profession or form of self-employment?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No XXX
- b. Rent payments, interest or dividends?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No XXX
- c. Pensions, annuities or life insurance payments?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No XXX
- d. Gifts of inheritance?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No XXX
- e. Any other sources?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No XXX

If the answer to any of the above is "yes," describe each source of money and state the amount received from each during the past twelve months. \_\_\_\_\_  
N/A  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. Do you own cash, or do you have any money in a checking or savings account?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No XXX

If the answer is "yes," state the total amount of the cash owned. \$ N/A

5. Do you own any real estate, stocks, bonds, notes or other valuable property (excluding ordinary household furnishing and clothing)? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No XXX

If the answer is "yes," describe the property and state the appropriate value of the items owned. \_\_\_\_\_  
N/A  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. What kind of motor vehicle do you own? \_\_\_\_\_ N/A

Is it paid for? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If not, what are the monthly payments? \$ \_\_\_\_\_


I do solemnly swear that the account by me delivered into this Court does contain a true and full account of all my real and personal estate, debts, credits and effects whatsoever without exception, which I, or any person in trust for me, have or at the time of my possession had, or am, or was, in respect, entitled to, in possession, remainder or reversion and that I have not at any time since charges were made against me or before, directly or time since charges were made against me or before, directly or indirectly sold, leased, assigned or otherwise disposed of or made over, in trust for myself or otherwise, other than is mentioned herein.

I understand that the State shall file a claim against me in an amount equal to the representation, but that such claim shall not constitute a lien against my property, unless, the claim is reduced to judgment by the Order of the Court after giving me at least thirty days' notice.

Under penalty of perjury, I certify that the information given by me on this affidavit is true and correct, and I understand that I will be subject to civil and/or criminal penalties if I knowingly furnish false information.


I am financially unable to employ counsel.

This 5TH. day of FEBRUARY 2026, \_\_\_\_\_.

  
Defendant

I understand that I am entitled to at least thirty days' notice before a claim against me may be reduced to judgment, and I do hereby waive the right to such notice. I DO NOT WAIVE MY RIGHT TO NOTICE OF ANY KIND.

This 5TH day of FEBRUARY, 2026.

  
Defendant


SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this

6th day of February, 2026

Sandra Outlaw

Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission Expires: 2/28/34



HEARING WITHOUT BOTH CRAWFORD AND OVERSTREET BEING GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAR WHERE THESE JOINT PARTIES APPEAR ON THE FACE OF THE APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING UNLESS AN ORDER OF SEVERANCE (OR A SIMILAR FORMAL ORDER DROPPING THE PARTY) HAS BEEN ISSUED WHICH NO SUCH ORDER OF SEVERANCE WAS EVER ISSUE IN THIS CASE BY THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT IN CRIMINAL ACTION OF CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO DEPRIVE THE PARTIES OF SUBSTANTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED. BECAUSE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEWED THE MATTER IN THE SEEKING TO INVOKE THEIR ORIGINAL JURISDICTION ALSO, WITH BOTH PARTIES, THEY ARE BOTH "PARTIES OF RECORD" AND MUST BE TREATED AS SUCH THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS, STATE v. 192 COIN-OPERATED VIDEO GAME MACHINES, 338 S.C. 176, 525 S.E.2d. 872(S.C.App.2000)(THE LOWER COURT HAD NO POWER OR AUTHORITY TO DEVIATE HOW THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ESTABLISHED THE PARTIES. ANY PROCEEDING THAT IGNORED THESE ESTABLISHED PARTIES IS VOID); BECKMAN CONCRETE CONTRACTORS, INC. v. UNITED FIRE AND CAS. CO., 360 S.C. 127, 600 S.E.2d. 76(S.C.App.2004)(UNDER RULE 5, S.C.R.C.P., EVERY WRITTEN MOTION AND NOTICE OF HEARING MUST BE SERVED ON EACH OF THE PARTIES. THIS CASE HIGHLIGHTS THAT FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE TO A PARTY WHO HAS APPEARED IN THE ACTION (OR IS NAMED IN THE APPLICATION) IS A REVERSIBLE ERROR); EX PARTE ROPER, 254 S.C. 558, 176 S.E.2d. 175(S.C.App.1970)(THE COURT RULED THAT A JUDGMENT IS VOID IF IT IS RENDERED WITHOUT NOTICE TO THE PARTIES CONCERNED. EVEN IN COMPLEX SCENARIOS INVOLVING MULTIPLE INTERESTS, THE COURT CANNOT ADJUDICATE THE RIGHTS OF PARTIES WITHOUT GIVING THEM THEIR "DAY IN COURT".); AL-SHABAZZ v. STATE, 338 S.C. 354, 527 S.E.2d. 742(S.C.App.2000)(IN POST CONVICTION MATTERS [WHICH DNA APPLICATIONS FALL UNDER], THE COURT HELD THAT A JUDGE CANNOT SUMMARILY DISMISS OR RULE ON AN APPLICATION WITHOUT PROVIDING 20 DAY NOTICE OF THE INTENT TO DISMISS. THIS ENSURES THAT ALL PARTIES CAN RESPOND BEFORE A FINAL DECISION IS MADE.); STATE v. GERMAN, 440 S.C. 28, 890 S.E.2d. 411 (S.C.App.2023)(THE COURT EMPHASIZED THAT PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITIES IN HANDLING FORENSIC EVIDENCE (LIKE DNA) MUST BE SCRUTINIZED. IF THE LOWER COURT HOLDS A HEARING THAT EXCLUDED A NAMED APPLICANT (PARTY), IT DENIES THE APPLICANT (PARTY) THE