

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 AN APPENDIX AND RELATED
DOCUMENTS.

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,

ATTACHED THE COURT WILL FIND A COPY OF THE REQUIRED
APPENDIX AND RELATED ATTACHMENTS. A COPY IS BEING SENT TO THE
COURT ELECTRONICALLY ON OCTOBER 28, 2026. THE HARD COPY WITH
ATTACHMENTS WILL GO OUT IN THE MAIL TOMORROW. I WAS ABLE TO ALSO
SERVE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AS THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE INDICATE.
THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,

RECEIVED

Oct 28 2026

SC Court of Appeals

RESPECTFULLY,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

OCTOBER 28, 2026

CC: THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

CASE DOCKET NO. 2025-001856

APPEAL FROM KERSHAW COUNTY
THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING
CASE NO. 2004-GS-28-0385

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD,

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 I HAVE MAILED AND SERVED A COPY OF AN APPENDIX AND RELATED DOCUMENTS 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, AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED

PARTIES BY PDF AND OR U.S. MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING
IT WITH THE INSTITUTION AUTHORITIES ON OCTOBER 29, 2026.

RESPECTFULLY,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'L. L. Crawford', with a large, stylized flourish extending from the end of the signature.

OCTOBER 29, 2026

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

RECEIVED

Oct 28 2026

SC Court of Appeals

CASE DOCKET NO. 2025-001856

APPEAL FROM KERSHAW COUNTY
THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING
CASE NO. 2004-GS-28-0385

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD,

APPELLANT

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RESPONDENT

APPENDIX

THE APPELLANT GIVES THE COURT AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE.
THE APPELLANT IS AGAIN BEING SUBJECT TO ACTS OF STATE
INTERFERENCE WHERE THE INSTITUTION IS OUT OF COPY MACHINE TONER
AGAIN CREATING AN INABILITY FOR THE APPELLANT TO SERVICE THE
APPENDIX ON THE OTHER PARTIES ON THE SAME DAY THIS DOCUMENT WAS

COMPLETED AND ELECTRONICALLY FILED WITHIN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. THE APPELLANT GIVES THE COURT NOTICE THAT SERVICE UPON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IS FORTHCOMING, PENDING, ONCE THE INSTITUTION RESOLVES THE COPY MACHINE TONER ISSUE. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO WAIVE OR RELAX THE RULES FOR SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL WHICH SHALL BE REMEDIED IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE INSTITUTION RESOLVES THIS REPEATED CONCERN REGARDING THE INTERFERENCE WITH THE APPELLANT'S ABILITY TO SERVE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SIMULTANEOUSLY. THE APPELLANT GIVES THE COURT JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT THE LEAD APPENDIX DOCUMENT SHALL BE FILED ELECTRONICALLY BUT THE HARD COPY INCLUDING ALL EXHIBITS REFERRED TO THEREIN IS BEING SENT BY REGULAR MAIL DUE TO THEIR VOLUME.

APPENDICE NO. 1---A COPY OF THE DOCUMENTS ENTITLED, [A] "AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; PROTECTIVE MOTION TO WAIVE OR RELAX THE REQUIREMENT TO ATTACH A WRITTEN FINAL ORDER THAT WAS NEVER ENTERED OR COPY OF THE INDICTMENT; ALTERNATIVELY, TO EXTEND THE APPENDIX DEADLINE AND CLARIFY THE RECORD AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (7) PAGES DATED OCTOBER 27, 2026; AND [2] A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT, "AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION AND TRANSMISSION OF THE COMPLETE RECORD, TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD UNDER RULE 212, SCACR, AND MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE APPENDIX PENDING RULING ON THIS MOTION AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFORE", [19] PAGES DATED SEPTEMBER 19, 2029 ALONG WITH A COPY OF THE CASE HISTORY PAGE FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IN THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS THAT PROVE JUDGE NEWMAN'S DIRECT INVOLVEMENT WITH PRIOR CASES SEEKING THE TESTING OF THE DNA EVIDENCE. THESE DOCUMENT WERE RECEIVED BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEAL ON OCTOBER 27, 2026 AND ARE A PART OF THE COURT OF APPEALS RECORD. THEY ARE SUBMITTED ALSO IN LIEN OF THE LACK OF A FINAL (ORDER) JUDGMENT, BEING PLACED WITHIN THE APPENDIX AS IS ARTICULATED BY THE FILING.

APPENDICE NO. 2---EXHIBIT, "FORCED VENUE CHANGE". THIS IS A COPY OF THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING

JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER OF CONTINUANCE RECENTLY FILED; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COMMON PLEAS COURT'S JURISDICTION TO ISSUE IT DUE TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION; MOTION RENEWING THE PREVIOUS FILED MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", [12] PAGES DATED AUGUST 20, 2021 FILED UNDER CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569 FURTHER DEMONSTRATING JUDGE NEWMAN'S INVOLVEMENT IN THESE MATTERS AND THE OVERWHELMING PREJUDICE OF HER SITTING ON THE APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA WHERE SHE CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW WITH THE RESPONDENT TO KEEP THOSE CASES IN LIMBO FOR 15 YEARS AND COUNTING WHEN THOSE CASES WERE REMANDED FROM THE KENTUCKY DISTRICT COURT, DEMONSTRATING THEY WERE NOT TO BE DISMISSED BY FEDERAL TRANSFER ORDER AND WHERE THE PRIOR CIRCUIT JUDGE (MANNING) SET THE CASES ON THE TRIAL ROOSTER) BUT WERE TO BE SCHEDULED FOR TRIAL. THIS DOCUMENT ALSO ILLUSTRATE THE APPELLANT'S ATTEMPTS TO HAVE THESE MATTERS BROUGHT BEFORE THIS COURT IN PRIOR PLEADING BUT WAS PREVENTED BECAUSE THIS COURT INAPPROPRIATELY REQUIRED THE PAYING OF A FILING FEE WHEN DNA EVIDENCE BY STATUTE WAS ALSO SOUGHT WITHIN THE CASE. THE CASE AROSE FROM THE FACT THAT OFFICIALS OBSTRUCTED TIMELY ACCESS TO THE FILING OF POST CONVICTION PROCEEDINGS IN KERSHAW COUNTY WHICH THE APPELLANT SOUGHT DNA EVIDENCE BEARING ON ACTUAL INNOCENCE WHICH FORCED THE APPELLANT IN THE RICHLAND COURT IN THE FIRST PLACE. THE RELATED RICHLAND TORT ACTION ALLEGED THAT SERVICE WAS NOT MADE WHEN IT WAS AND ONE OF THE MAIN DEFENDANTS MADE A VOLUNTARY APPEARANCE AND NEVER CHALLENGED ANT DEFICIENCY IN SERVICE. THAT PRIOR APPEAL IMPLICATED MORE THAN AN ORDINARY DISPUTE OVER DAMAGES: IT CONCERNED ALLEGE INTERFERENCE WITH ACCESS TO JUDICIAL PROCEDURES FOR PURSUING POTENTIALLY EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE. EX PARTE MARTIN v. STATE, 321 S.C. 533, 471 S.E.2d. 134 (1995), RECOGNIZES THAT FILING FEE RELIEF MAY BE REQUIRED WHERE AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR WHERE CONSTITUTIONAL ACCESS TO THE COURT PRINCIPLES APPLY. BODDIE v. CONNECTICUT, 401 U.S. 371 (1971), AND SMITH v. BENNETT, 365 U.S. 708 (1961), RECOGNIZED THAT, IN PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES, INABILITY TO PAY CANNOT BE USED TO FORECLOSE ACCESS TO JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS IMPLICATING IMPORTANT RIGHTS. SOUTH CAROLINA DNA-TESTING FRAMEWORK, S.C. CODE

ANN. §§ 17-28-90 AND 17-28-100, FURTHER REFLECTS THE STATE'S RECOGNITION OF A JUDICIAL PROCESS FOR TESTING POTENTIALLY EXCULPATORY EVIDENCE. THESE AUTHORITIES DO NOT ESTABLISH AN AUTOMATIC FEE EXEMPTION FOR EVERY CIVIL TORT APPEAL; THEY SUPPORT A FACT-SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT OF INDIGENCY, THE RELIEF THAT WAS REQUESTED, AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL INTEREST THAT WAS ACTUALLY PRESENTED WHERE THIS INJUSTICE FURTHER ESTABLISH CLAIMS OF A BACKWARDS-LOOKING-ACCESS-TO-THE-COURTS CLAIM.

APPENDICE NO. 3---EXHIBIT, ADDITIONAL OBSTRUCTION". THIS IS A COPY OF A LETTER DATED MAY 27, 2020 FROM THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE HIGHLIGHTING IN SPECIFIC DETAIL THE APPELLANT'S CONTINUED ATTEMPTS IN OBTAINING THE DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE, FILE 5501014, THAT WAS CRIMINALLY SUPPRESSED IN VIOLATION OF UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016), EVIDENCE INDISPUTABLY SOUGHT UNDER CASES 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569; 2013-CP-400-0084 IN THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS WHERE THE APPELLANT WAS SUBJECT TO ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, ,CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND COLLUSION. THIS DOCUMENT DEMONSTRATES THAT THE 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE WAS DIRECTLY NOTIFIED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL WHERE THE SAME PLEADING WAS ALSO DIRECTLY SERVED UPON THE 5TH. CIRCUIT'S SOLICITOR'S OFFICE AND KERSHAW COUNTY CLERK OF COURT TO ONLY BE CONTINUED BLOCKED AND OBSTRUCTED FILING AT THE DATE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL LETTER DATED MAY 27, 2020. THIS IS WHY THE APPELLANT WAS FORCED TO SOLICIT THE AID OF HIS SISTER "YAHDNA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN, TO ASSIST HIM IN GETTING THE MATTERS FILED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT.

APPENDICE NO. 4---EXHIBIT, "YAHDNA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN". THIS IS A COPY OF THE LETTER TO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DATED APRIL 20, 2025 RELATED TO THE DNA PROCEEDINGS, THE ORIGINAL DNA APPLICATION DATED FILED ON APRIL 15, 2021 WHICH IS THE SOURCE OF THIS APPEAL CLEARLY ILLUSTRATING THE NAME OF "YAHDNA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN APPEARING ON THE FACE OF THE APPLICATION FOR

6-of-15

WHICH THERE IS NO SEVERANCE ORDER ISSUED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT OF KERSHAW GENERAL SESSIONS COURT. THIS SUPPORTS A BACKWARDS-LOOKING-ACCESS-TO-THE-COURT CLAIM FOR HER. THIS DOCUMENT ALSO DEMONSTRATE THAT DESPITE THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL MAY 27, 2020 INSTRUCTION GIVEN TO THE 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE. BY THE OBSTRUCTION IT'S FILING WAS NOT REMEDIED UNTIL APRIL 15, 2021 AFTER BRINGING THE MATTER BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

APPENDICE NO. 5---EXHIBIT, "CLAIM PROCESSING RULE". THIS IS A COPY OF THE TWO PAGE COVER LETTER, AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE, RULE 56 AFFIDAVIT SUBMITTED IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY DISMISSAL OF APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING; MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO ANY EFFORT TO THE ATTEMPTS AT SUMMARY DISMISSAL RENEWING THE PREVIOUS FILED MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THE RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE DUE TO IT BEING UNTIMELY SUBMITTED IN VIOLATION OF THE STATUTE WHERE THE RESPONDENT FAILED TO ESTABLISH CAUSE FOR THE DELAY AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, [24] PAGES DATED JULY 8, 2025", DATED NOTARIZED JULY 24, 2025. THIS DOCUMENT IS A PART OF THE KERSHAW COURT RECORD. SINCE THE SUPREME COURT DID NOT ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION, RES JUDICATA OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DO NOT EMERGE FROM THAT COURT WHERE THE PLEADING WAS ALSO DIRECTLY SOUGHT ADJUDICATION WITHIN THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO SUBMITTED AS EVIDENCE THAT THE APPELLANT TIMELY AND PROPERLY INVOKED RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS PURSUANT TO SPECIFIED "CLAIM PROCESSING RULES" WHICH WERE BLATANTLY IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW IGNORED BY THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO DENY THE APPELLANT CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS. THE TIMELY EXERCISING OF THE RIGHTS ESTABLISHED BY THE CLAIM PROCESSING RULES PROCEDURALLY BARRED THE 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE FROM FILING ANY MOTION OF DISMISSAL WHERE THEY NEVER EVEN PRODUCE ANY EXCUSE FOR THE OBSTRUCTION OF THE APPELLANT'S FILING OR THEIR INORDINATE DELAY HOLDING THE APPLICATION FOR DNA TESTING PAST 4 YEARS ONCE THE APPELLANT AND HIS SISTER FOUGHT TO GET THE MATTERS FILED BEFORE

THE LOWER KERSHAW COUNTY COURT. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SPOKE IN NO UNCERTAIN TERMS WHEN IT COMES TO PARTIES TIMELY AND PROPERLY INVOKING RIGHTS PURSUANT TO CLEARLY ESTABLISHED "CLAIM PROCESSING RULES". THAT COURT DETERMINED: "IF AN AFFECTED PARTY ALERTS THE COURT OF A DEADLINE IN A CLAIM-PROCESSING RULE (WHICH WOULD APPLY TO STATE COURTS UNDER THE DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSES) AND INVOKES ITS PROTECTION (AS THE APPELLANT DID BEFORE THE LOWER COURT), THE RELEVANT ACTION CANNOT BE TAKEN AFTER THE DEADLINE HAS PASSED". CASES LIKE STATE v. THOMPSON, 322 A.3d. 32, 62+ Md.; COX v. UNITED STATES, 325 A.3d. 360, 372+ D.C. (Ct.Of.Appeals); PEOPLE v. MARES, 2025 WL 2416814 (Colo.Ct. App.); PEOPLE v. THIEMAN, 2025 WL 76783, * 5 Colo.App.; PEOPLE v. BURGESS, 245 N.Y.S.3d. 542, 542 (N.Y.City.Crim.Ct.); MIAMI v. SYLINE CONSTRUCTION, 2019 WL 5103246 * 1+ Fla.App.3 Dist., DEMONSTRATE WITHOUT A DOUBT THAT THE FEDERAL AND U.S. SUPREME COURT CASES REGARDING CLAIM-PROCESSING RULES (STATE PROCEDURAL RULES) APPLY TO AND IS TO BE ADOPTED BY THE STATES. ALSO SEE 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(4th.Cir.2018); WILLIAMS v. SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, 176 Fed.Cl. 215 Fed.Cl.; FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 587 U.S. 541, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019); SANTOS-ZACARIA v. GARLAND, 598 U.S. 411 (U.S.2023); McINTOSH v. UNITED STATES, 601 U.S. 330, 144 S.Ct. 980; UNITED STATES v. MARSH, 944 F.3d. 524(4th.Cir.2019); HAMER v. NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICE OF CHICAGO, 583 U.S. 17, 20-21 (U.S.2017). BY THE TIMELY AND PROPERLY INVOKED CLAIM PROCESSING RULE THAT REQUIRED THE GENERAL SESSIONS COURT TO CONCLUDE ALL CASES WITHIN (365) DAYS, THE RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE WAS PROCEDURALLY BARRED AND THE APPLICANT SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN DISMISSED.

APPENDICE NO. 6---EXHIBIT, "KERSHAW COURT ADJUDICATION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE PLEADING ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS JURISDICTION TO HOLD A MERITS HEARING

ON SEPTEMBER 2, 2025 (THE HEARING WAS LATER CONDUCTED ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2025) DUE TO VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR" [4] PAGES DATED JULY 28, 2025 AND ITS SISTER DOCUMENT [8] PAGES DATED NOTARIZED AUGUST 25, 2025. THESE, AND OTHER DOCUMENTS FILED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT RECORD INDISPUTABLE PROVE THAT THE RELIEF ARGUED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS THAT WERE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WERE DIRECTLY SOUGHT ADJUDICATION BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT WHERE A "KEY V. CURRIE" DETERMINATION IS NOT A RULING ON THE MERITS, ESTABLISHING THAT THE JURISDICTION OF THE LOWER COURT WAS INVOKED TO ADDRESS ALL MATTERS PRESENTED.

APPENDICE NO. 7---EXHIBIT, "INDEPENDENT DNA TESTING". THIS IS A COPY OF A PLEADING ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO DISQUALIFY SLED AND THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ENTITIES FROM CONDUCTING THE DNA ANALYSIS SEEKING TO HAVE IT DONE BY AN INDEPENDENT SOURCE AND OR ENTITIY DUE TO CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", [5] PAGES DATED AUGUST 5, 2025. THIS DOCUMENT WAS NOT JUST SOUGHT ADJUDICATED WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. IT WAS ALSO SOUGHT ADJUDICATED DIRECTLY BEFORE THE KERSHAW GENERAL SESSIONS COURT. THE APPELLANT IS SEEKING THAT ANY DNA TESTING BE CONDUCTED BY AN ENTITY OUTSIDE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA (THERE IS AN ENTITY IN NORTH CAROLINA) DUE TO THE CONTINUOUS FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO CONCEAL POTENTIAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITY IN FRAMING THE APPELLANT BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED AND WIDESPREAD COLLUSION THAT THE DNA TESTING BE CONDUCTED OUTSIDE THE STATE BY AN INDEPENDENT SOURCE TO ENSURE THAT NO OTHER INAPPROPRIATE CONDUCT COULD POSSIBLY BE DONE BY THE CONSPIRING SOUTH CAROLINA STATE ACTORS.

APPENDICE NO. 8---EXHIBIT, "TRIAL TRANSCRIPT". THIS IS A COPY OF THE [55] PAGE PLEADING THE APPELLANT FILED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS IN HIS EFFORTS TO FILE THE APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND SEEK THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT. SINCE THE RULES OF THE APPENDIX REQUIRE THE COMPLETE RECORD BEFORE THE LOWER COURT, IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION THIS EXHIBIT IS SUBMITTED

INTO THE COURT RECORD.

APPENDICE NO. 9---EXHIBIT, "S.C. COURT OF APPEALS PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE LETTER FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DATED AUGUST 24, 2023 ACKNOWLEDGING LEGAL PLEADING RECEIVED BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ON JULY 12, 2023, INCLUDING A COVER LETTER DATED JULY 7, 2023, A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; APPLICATION AND OR PETITION FOR AN INJUNCTION, [13] PAGES DATED RECEIVED BY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ON JULY 12, 2023. THE APPELLANT WANTS THE COURT TO TAKE NOTICE OF THE APPENDICE BECAUSE IT ALSO BEARS ON THE NEXT APPENDICE TO COME. THIS IS INDISPUTABLE PROOF FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ITSELF THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT THE APPELLANT TIMELY AND PROPERLY SOUGHT PROTECTIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE VARIOUS CLAIM PROCESSING RULES RELIED UPON FURTHER DEMONSTRATING THAT THE RESPONDENT WAS PROCEDURALLY BARRED IN SUBMITTED ANY RESPONSE AND MOTION TO DISMISSED THE APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING WHEN HE REPEATEDLY FAILED TO CHALLENGE AT NUMEROUS APPROPRIATE OPPORTUNITIES GIVEN TO HIM VIOLATING THE APPELLANT'S SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS.

APPENDICE NO. 10---EXHIBIT, "5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR RESPONSE". THIS IS A COPY OF THE MOTION TO DISMISS APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING FILED BY THE 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE, CURTIS PAULING, DATED FILED JULY 27, 2025 OVER 4 YEARS PAST THE TIME THE DNA APPLICATION WAS FORCED FILED BY THE APPELLANT AND FAMILY HAVING TO GO TO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FOR INTERVENTION. IT IS INDISPUTABLE CLEAR THAT THIS RESPONSE IS FAR PAST THE TIME ESTABLISHED BY THE CLAIM PROCESSING RULE(S) RELIED UPON, EVEN TWO YEARS AFTER THE TIME THE APPELLANT SOUGHT A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION TO ADDRESS THE INJUSTICES BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS BY THAT JULY 12, 2023 FILING. THE APPELANT BRINGS THE COURT'S ATTENTION TO THE SUPPLEMENT RESPONSE ALSO ATTACHED. ACCORDING TO THIS RESPONSE, IT VIOLATES THE STATUTE AND PROTECTIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE CLEAR LANGUAGE OF THE CLAIM PROCESSING RULE(S) RELIED UPON. IF THE RESPONDENT FELT THAT THIS

WAS A LEGITIMATE REASON FOR THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL INORDINATE DELAY. HE WAS REQUIRED BY STATUTE AND BY THE (365) DAY CLAIM PROCESSING RULE TO BRING THE MATTER BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND THE APPROPRIATE JUDGE, PRESENT HIS REASONING AND SEEK THE REQUIRED ORDER OF CONTINUANCE BY THE MANDATORY CLAIM PROCESSING RULE WHICH WOULD HAVE EASILY ALLOWED HIM TO GO BEYOND ANY PRESCRIBED DEADLINES. HAD THE POSITIONS BEEN SWITCHED AND THE APPELLANT FAILED AT PROCEDURAL BENCHMARKS, THE LOWER COURT WOULD HAVE IMMEDIATELY DISMISSED THE APPLICANTS PETITION FOR THE DNA TESTING. THE ACTIONS OF THE LOWER COURT VIOLATE NOT JUST THE PROTECTION ESTABLISHED BY THE TIMELY AND PROPERLY INVOKED CLAIM PROCESSING RULES. THEY ALSO VIOLATE THE APPELLANT'S RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS AND DUE PROCESS CLAUSES. THIS IS NOT THE END OF IT. THE APPELLANT BRINGS THE COURT'S ATTENTION TO THE SUPPLEMENT. IT STATES IN RELEVANT PART:

"SINCE (EMPHASIS ADDED DEMONSTRATING HE DONE ABSOLUTELY NOTHING FOR OVER 4 YEARS UNTIL THE SUPREME COURT ORDER HIM TO RESPOND IN VIOLATION OF THE CLAIM PROCESSING RULES WHEN EVEN THE STATUTE ITSELF PLACED A MANDATE ON HIM TO RESPOND ON THE LOWER COURT RECORD TO EXPLAIN THE DELAY) MR. CRAWFORD'S MOST RECENT FILINGS WITH THE SUPREME COURT, I HAVE BEEN IN COMMUNICATION WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE AND JOHN MEADORS WHO WAS "ONE" OF THE PROSECUTORS ON THE ORIGINAL CASE (McMASTERS WAS PART OF IT ALSO). MR. MEADORS DID NOT RECALL ANY EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT TRIAL (WATCH THE DECEPTIVE VERBAL MANEUVERING, BECAUSE HE SUPPRESSED SLED FILE 5501014 TO PREVENT IT FROM BEING ENTERED AT TRIAL WHICH CONTAINED THE CORONER'S NOTES POTENTIALLY IMPLICATING THE HYPOGLYCEMIC SHOCK) THAT THE VICTIM KORRESHA CRAWFORD WAS PREGNANT (WATCH THE VERBAL DECEPTIVE MANEUVERING) "AT THE TIME OF HER DEATH" (EMPHASIS ADDED). I CONTACTED DON ZELENSKA WITH THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE...I CONTACTED NEWBERRY PATHOLOGY REGARDING THE AUTOPSY REPORT OF THE VICTIM. DR. JANICE ROSS CALLED ME AND CONFIRMED THAT THE VICTIM KORRESHA CRAWFORD (WATCH THE MANEUVERING LANGUAGE) "WAS NOT PREGNANT AT

HER TIME OF DEATH" (EMPHASIS ADDED)...THE DELAY IN HANDLING THE CASE WAS NOT INTENTIONAL OR ANY ATTEMPT TO DENY MR. CRAWFORD ANY DUE PROCESS RIGHTS".

IN HAMER v. NEIGHBORHOOD HOISING SERVICES OF CHICAGO, 583 U.S. 17 (U.S.2017) THE SUPREME COURT EXPLAINED THAT A MANDATORY, NONJURISDICTIONAL CLAIM PROCESSING RULE MUST BE ENFORCED WHEN PROPERLY INVOKED, ALTHOUGH IT MAY BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED FOR FAILURE TO RAISE IT. IT SUPPORTS THE CLAIM THAT THE STATE COURT CANNOT DISREGARD A MANDATORY PROCEDURAL RULE. IN REED v. GOERTZ, 598 U.S. 230 (2023) THE COURT RECOGNIZED THAT A PRISONER PURSUING DNA TESTING MAY BRING A PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS CHALLENGE TO THE FAIRNESS OF THE STATE'S DNA-TESTING PROCESS. THE COURT ALSO EXPLAINED THAT AN ALLEGED DUE PROCESS VIOLATION IS COMPLETE WHEN STATE FAILS CONSTITUTIONALLY ADEQUATE PROCESS. THE STATE ACTION IMPAIRED THE PROCESS ESTABLISHING CLEAR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. WHAT IS THIS MAN TALKING ABOUT? IT DOESN'T MATTER IF IT WAS INTENTIONAL. THE QUESTION CONCERNS THE ADEQUACY OF THE PROCESS PROVIDED WHICH WAS NON-EXISTENT UNTIL THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDERED THEM TO RESPOND AND FILE THE APPLICATION THEY INITIALLY BLOCKED FILING, THEN THEY DELAYED IT FOR OVER 4 MORE YEARS. THE ISSUE IS NOT MERELY A MISSED DEADLINE BUT WHETHER THE STATE PROVIDED THE PROCESS REQUIRED BY DUE PROCESS LAW. THE CIRCUMSTANCES SUPPORT THE CONTENTION THAT THE STATUTORY PROCEDURE WAS NOT ADMINISTERED WITHIN THE TIME AND MANNER PRESCRIBED BY LAW. THIS IS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS WHICH IS COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT THE STATE IGNORED ESTABLISHED PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS THAT WOULD HAVE ALLOWED FOR EXTENSIONS ON THE COURT RECORD WHICH IN NEGLIGENCE THEY FAILED TO PROPERLY EXERCISE OR EXECUTE.

THE APPELLANT BRINGS THE COURT'S ATTENTION TO THE DNA APPLICATION. IT READS IN RELEVANT PART:

"IT WOULD GO TO PROVING AND SUPPORTING THE CLAIM THAT SHE MAY HAVE BEEN MADE PREGNANT BY HER HALF BROTHER "BEFORE" THEIR SEPARATION, THAT SHE MAY HAVE DEVELOPED GESTATIONAL DIABETES SINCE HER BLOOD SUGAR LEVEL WAS DOWN TO 17dm/ml., THAT

SHE SPONTANEOUSLY "ABORTED" THE FETUS (NEVER WAS IT CLAIMED SHE WAS PREGNANT "AT THE TIME OF DEATH") AND IT KILLED HER, ALSO DUE TO SHE NOT RECEIVING A DECONTAMINATE CLEANING, AND THEY CRIMINALLY SUPPRESSED THESE FACTS IN THE AUTOPSY". THIS IS THE FRAUDULENT DECEPTION, MACHINATIONS AND WORD MANEUVERING THE STATE IS PLAYING. NEVER WAS IT SAID SHE "WAS PREGNANT AT THE TIME OF DEATH". HOW THE HECK CAN YOU BE "PREGNANT" AND "ABORTED A FETUS" POTENTIALLY 2 WEEKS "BEFORE" HER DEATH? THIS IS THE WORD-PLAY THE STATE IN FRAUD, COLLUSION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IS UTILIZING TO PREVENT THE RELEASE OF THE DNA EVIDENCE AND SLED FILE WITH THE CORONER'S NOTES. YOU CAN'T BE PREGNANT "AT THE TIME OF DEATH" AND BE ALLEGED TO HAVE "SPONTANEOUSLY ABORTED WEEKS EARLIER AT THE SAME TIME. THIS IS THE DECEPTIVE MEANS IN WHICH THEY CONSPIRED TO DECEIVE COURT AND JURY AT TRIAL.

APPENDICE NO. 11.---EXHIBIT(S) "RECORD ON APPEAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR". THE EXHIBIT, "RECORD ON APPEAL" WAS PREVIOUSLY FILED WITHIN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS RECORD WHERE THIS WAS THE INITIAL APPENDIX THAT WAS FILED WHICH WAS MIS-LABELED BY THE APPELLANT AS "RECORD ON APPEAL". ALL THOSE DOCUMENTS ARE NOW FORWARDED AND FILED ATTACHED TO THIS APPENDIX DUE TO MISTAKE IN LABELLING AND INADVERTENCE. AN ADDITIONAL COPY OF EXHIBIT, "CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR" IS HEREWITH ATTACHED IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION. THESE DOCUMENT WERE ALSO THE SOURCE OF RELIEF SOUGHT AND RAISED BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSION REGARDING THE DNA TESTING. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CANNOT BE WAIVED AND OR FORFEITED, CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AT ANY STAGE, EVEN IN A DNA APPLICATION, OR AFTER A FINAL JUDGEMENT IN THE TRIAL COURT WAS ISSUED BACK IN 2004. EXHIBIT, "CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR" IS THE CHARGING FUNCTION ISSUE REGARDING THE INDICTMENT(S) AND CHALLENGE ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT REGARDING THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE OF 2005 AS IT PERTAINS TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION.

APPENDICE NO. 12.---EXHIBIT, "COUNSEL RETENTION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE COVER LETTER, AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE, AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; PETITIONER/APPELLANT EMERGENCY

MOTION TO STAY THE APPENDIX DEADLINE AND FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE RULE 247 APPENDIX PENDING RETENTION AND OR APPOINTMENT OF LEGAL COUNSEL AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, [22] PAGES DATED OCTOBER 4, 2026. THIS APPENDICE IF FILED TO GIVE THE COURT JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT ON OCTOBER 26, 2026 THE APPELLANT DID INDEED CONSULT WITH ATTORNEY TANYA D. JEFFORDS OF JEFFORDS AND ASSOCIATES ABOUT BECOMING ATTORNEY FOR THE APPELLANT'S PROCEEDINGS. THE SEEKING OF STAY AND OR EXTENSION IS RENEWED. MS. JEFFORDS INFORMED THE APPELLANT THAT SHE HAS A SEPARATE CLIENT THAT IS POTENTIALLY BEFORE THE PRESUMING SUPREME COURT ARGUING AN IDENTICAL ISSUE ABOUT THE STATE RUBBER STAMPING THE INDICTMENTS GIVING A FALSE IMPRESSION THAT THE INDICTMENTS WERE RETURNED BY THE GRAND JURY WHEN IN TRUTH THEY WERE NOT. SHE EVEN INFORMED THE APPELLANT THAT THIS OTHER CLIENT OF HERS HAVE ACTUAL EVIDENCE THAT PROVES THE CLAIM. ATTORNEY JEFFORDS ADVISED THE APPELLANT THAT SHE IS NOT DECLINING THE TAKING OF THE APPELLANT'S CASE, THAT SHE WANTS TO WAIT UNTIL SHE SEES HOW THE SUPREME COURT OR WHATEVER COURT THIS OTHER CLIENT IS IN HANDLES THIS ISSUE, AND IF RELIEF IS GIVEN, SHE WILL TAKE ON THIS APPEAL. SHE ASKED IF I WOULD SEEK TO STAY TO ALLOW HER TO FULLY DECIDE. SHE INSTRUCTED HER OFFICE STAFF TO RESCHEDULE THE APPELLANT FOR A FOLLOW-UP CONSULTATION IN ABOUT (30) DAYS TO ALLOW RULING IN THAT OTHER COURT TO OCCUR. SHE ALSO ASKED THE APPELLANT TO FORWARD HER ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THIS SUBJECT IN WHICH THE APPELLANT DID FORWARD HER THE INFORMATION DOCUMENTED BY THE ROCK HILL HERALD FROM 2018 WHERE THEY DOCUMENTED THAT THE STATE IN FRAUD TRIED TO ALLEGE THAT OVER 904 INDICTMENTS WERE ACTUALLY TRUE BILLED BY THE GRAND JURY IN ONE DAY IN ABOUT TWO HOURS AVERAGING .39 SECONDS PER GRAND JURY REVIEW. THE COURT CAN GOOGLE THIS INFORMATION. IT IS RECORDED AND DOCUMENTED FACTS. IN SUCH, THE APPELLANT RENEWS THE PREVIOUS MOTION REGARDING SEEKING COUNSEL TO EXTEND THE TIME UNTIL DECEMBER 12, 2026 TO ALLOW MS. JEFFORDS TO MAKE A FINAL DECISION ON WHETHER SHE WOULD INDEED TAKE THIS APPEAL.

ADDITIONAL NOTICE: THE ACTUAL APPENDIX IS SERVED ON ALL PARTIES DIRECTLY AS THE RULES REQUIRE. DUE TO STATE INTERFERENCE, THE

INSTITUTION REFUSING AND OR OBSTRUCTING COPIES, THE ATTACHMENTS (HARD COPIES) REFERRED TO WITHIN THE APPENDIX ARE SENT DIRECTLY TO THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. MANY WERE PREVIOUSLY SERVED UPON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL. BUT THEY CAN BE REVIEWED ELECTRONICALLY ONCE THE CLERK ENTERS THEM INTO THE COURT RECORD.

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD
#300839 F3B. RM. 148
EVANS C.I. 610 HWY. 9 WEST
BENNETTSVILLE, S.C. 29512

OCTOBER 28, 2026