

Douglas M Thompson
348634 Wardo A-220
Liebera Ct PO Box 205
Ridgerville SC 29472

RE: CASE

RECEIVED

APR 16 2014

SC Court of Appeals

DEAR Appeals Court,

Please file the attached
documents related to rehearing
and removal. Thank you.

April 14, 2014

Respectfully
Douglas Thompson
Douglas M. Thompson

Certificate of Service

RECEIVED

APR 16 2014

SC Court of Appeals

I, Douglas M. Thompson, do hereby certify, that I have mailed and or served a copy of an affidavit of facts seeking a rehearing; Petition to Remove (6) pages dated April 11, 2014 on the SC Court of Appeals, the SC United States District Court and the New Jersey District Court, by U.S. mail postage prepaid by depositing it in the institution mailbox with attachment on April 11, 2014. This

1066

being an Article III section 2 case
arguing preemption. It is deemed
filed on that date, Harstone v Laek,
287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct 2379 (1988).

Respectfully
Douglas Thompson
Douglas M. Shopp

April 11, 2014

RECEIVED
APR 16 2014
SC Court of Appeals

2086

U.S. District Court

State of South Carolina

et al.

Douglas M. Thompson

et al. #348634

petitioner(s)

vs.

Judge David Norton

et al.

defendants

FOR NEW JERSEY

The Court of Appeals

et al.

RECEIVED

APR 16 2014

SC Court of Appeals

C/A

RE: The 3 1983 actions
being processed in

The New Jersey
District Court and

CASE 3:15-cv-348-
DCN

Affidavit of Facts
Seeking a Rehearing;

Petition to Remove

RUE! CASE NO. 2012-212427 pending in
The South Carolina Court of Appeals.

To: The New Jersey District
Court,

The South Carolina District
Court,

The SC Court of Appeals et al,

The petitioner received notifica-
tion on April 8, 2014 that the corrupt
defendants affirm his appeal circum-
venting and refusing to rule on his
legal issues and denying his constitu-
tional right to counsel of choice
4066

in getting PRO SE. This gives the
petitioner (10) days until April 18,
2014 to motion for rehearing. This
makes this document timely filed.
~~Attached~~ The SC Court of Appeals will
find a copy of the (50) page complaint
dated March 24, 2014. By this docu-
ment I motion for a rehearing,
its not service.

I give the SC Court of Appeals
notice that case 2010-212427 is petitioned
~~removed~~ to the New Jersey District
Court in the § 1903 action that is

PRESENTLY BEING PROCESSED. A CASE
NUMBER WILL SOON BE ASSIGNED. AS
A BACK UP IT IS ALSO SECONDARILY
PROHIBITED TO BE REMOVED TO CASE
3:15-CV-3415-DCL pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1413(d), 1602-1612 et seq. nice try.

Respectfully
Douglas Thompson
Douglas M. Thompson

April 14, 2014

Cooflo

FORM TO BE USED BY A PRISONER IN FILING A
CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Douglas M Thomas et al,
(Enter above the full name of the plaintiff in this action)

348634

COMPLAINT

Civil Action No. _____

(To be supplied by the Clerk of the Court)

v.
Judge David Portas

Judge Kayman D. West

Judge Peter E. Dayne

Judge Young

Governor Chris Christie

(Enter above the full name of the defendant or defendants in this action)

SEE additional sheets

motion for sanctions;
motion to disqualify and
for recusal; motion to
motion therefor
petition to remove

INSTRUCTIONS -- READ CAREFULLY

1443(1) 1602-1612

1. This complaint must be legibly handwritten or typewritten, signed by the plaintiff and subscribed to under penalty of perjury as being true and correct. All questions must be answered concisely in the proper space on the form. Where more space is needed to answer any question, attach a separate sheet.
2. In accordance with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the complaint should contain (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends, (2) a short plain statement of the claim showing that you are entitled to relief, and (3) a demand for judgment for the relief which you seek.
3. You must provide the full name of each defendant or defendants and where they can be found.
4. You must send the original and one copy of the complaint to the Clerk of the District Court. You must also send one additional copy of the complaint for each defendant to the Clerk. Do not send the complaint directly to the defendants.
5. Upon receipt of a fee of \$350.00, your complaint will be filed. You will be responsible for service of a separate summons and copy of the complaint on each defendant. See Rule 4, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure.

1 of 50

The plaintiff's motions for judicial notice. There the court and parties will find attached to the face of this complaint the following documents:

(1) A copy of the summons (15) pages dated May 5, 2013, a copy of an amended complaint (60) pages dated May 15, 2013.

For the record Douglas Thompson is the plaintiff in this case. The party Lawrence L Crawford aka Jonah Gabriel Jahjah is making an appearance in this case #300839 Lieber CJ P.O. Box 205 Wando A-127 Ridgewood, SC 29472. A copy

20150

of all responses, notices, court orders etc is to be served on him as well being a party and lead litigator in other related proceedings.

I give the court notice that all plaintiffs listed on pages 8 through 15 are making appearance in this case. This includes Campbell Davis # 179330 Lieber CJ. P.O. Box 205 Ridgerville SC 29472; ~~John Sutcliffe~~ John Sutcliffe # 350197 Lieber CJ P.O. Box 205 Ridgerville SC 29472; Maurice McKenzie # 356402 Lieber CJ P.O. Box 205 Ridgerville SC 29472 and inmate Demetrius Gathers Lieber CJ P.O. Box 205 Ridgerville

SC 2972.

For the record the plaintiffs

might have # 27144; Leo had

Armed input # 349878; (copy

Graphs # 34140; there no longer

plaintiffs in this regard. No notes are

source of documents is required for

these parties.

Defendants

The Defendants in this regard are

Judge Donald Hordas; Judge Raymond D.

West; Judge Peter Eugene Bergin

County Superior Court Law Division 10

maple street room 427 thekissack

11/1/50

NEW JERSEY 07601 ; JUDGE Young JR 595
NEWARK AVENUE JERSEY City NJ 07306 at
THE NJ SUPERIOR COURT Hudson Vicinage
PCR COURT ; BERGEN County NJ ; ESSEX
County NJ. And Hudson County NJ.

(2) Hence the court will find a copy
of the complaint file in the BERGEN
County Superior Court that make up
CASE BER-L-1708-14 et. al. This case
is consolidated related to all plaintiffs.
Thus one plaintiff can argue for the
concerns related to the cases in total
since they are all consolidated by

Judicial order.

Other defendants by this document
ARE Antoinette Outwater; Susan
Stahle; Rocco Scopro; The State of
New Jersey; Governor Chris Christie;
Attorney Raymond Black; The New
Jersey Public Defenders Office; The
New York District Court and all judges
contained therein; all defendants
listed in the (23) page complaint dated
July 22, 2013, on pages 27 through 33.
These individuals are being sued in
both their individual and official
2 of 50

Capacities, Defendants in the (100) document
ARE ADDED.

We give all parties notice that pursuant to Rule 44 of South Carolina State and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Foreign Law will be argued in this case, under Theocratic Law. I am sure the state of New Jersey has a similar provision of Law. Thus as lawyer in the form of Lawrence L Crawford aka Joseph Emmanuel Stephen T. Tishbitz, be as party in this case, giving him authority under Foreign Law to sign off for all plaintiffs signifying that they all are

making APPEARANCES in this CASE

I give all parties notice that there is a default pending against the United States, the 193 member states of the United Nation, the state of South Carolina in the form of the Attorney General and the SC Dept of Corrections related to a Declaration of Sovereignty filed in CASES 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569; 2013-CP-400-2294 and 2013-CP-400-0084.

Thus by this default the parties that ARE plaintiffs within all actions filed to this CASE, possess true SOVEREIGN

Bofso

POWER UNDER THEocratic Law.

We give notice that all U.S. Attorneys in all 50 states and all Attorney Generals from all 50 states are also defendants in this action. Their addresses can be obtained online and the federal employees in total can be served via the U.S. Dept. of Justice in Washington D.C. or the Solicitor General Rm 5614 Dept of Justice 960 Pennsylvania Ave N.W. Washington D.C. 20530-0001.

The addresses for the other
9 of 50

defendants aforementioned are listed in not just the (9) page complaint filed in case BER-L-1708-14 et al., but also in the copy of the complaint that is filed in the BERGEN County case from case 1:12-cv-2238-PAG that was filed in the state of Ohio.

WE object to any claim of immunity on the part of all defendants involved. The (60) page amended complaint addresses and rebuts any claim of immunity. Immunity notwithstanding ENUNSO, at this juncture I am only

su~~ing~~ for injunctive relief and
due to the default in the other
related cases. Any claim of frivolous
or malicious must be deemed moot,
by the doctrine of estoppel in pais.
I am also su~~ing~~ for court cost and
attorney fees. No party is immune
from such. See cases cited in the
(60) page amended complaint, In RE
VARANT ENTERPRISES Inc., 81 F2d 1310 (1996);
BRITAMCO UNDERWRITERS Inc v. Nishi
PAMAJIKA & ASSOCIATES Inc., 20 F.Supp 2d
73; ANDERSON v Cox, 977 F.Supp. 413.

FORM TO BE USED BY A PRISONER IN FILING A
CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

6. If you cannot prepay the \$350.00 filing fee, you may request permission to proceed in forma pauperis in accordance with the procedures set forth in the application to proceed in forma pauperis. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915. (If there is more than one plaintiff, each plaintiff must separately request permission to proceed in forma pauperis.)
7. If you are given permission to proceed in forma pauperis, the Clerk will prepare and issue a copy of the summons for each defendant. The copies of summonses and the copies of the complaint which you have submitted will be forwarded by the Clerk to the United States Marshal, who is responsible for service. The Marshal has USM-285 forms you must complete so that the Marshal can locate and serve each defendant. If the forms are sent to you, you must complete them in full and return the forms to the Marshal.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

1 a. Jurisdiction is asserted pursuant to (CHECK ONE)

42 U.S.C. § 1983 (applies to state prisoners)

Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics,
403 U.S. 388 (1971) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (applies to federal prisoners)

If you want to assert jurisdiction under different or additional statutes, list these below:

SEE additional attached sheets and documents

1 b. Indicate whether you are a prisoner or other confined person as follows:

- Pretrial detainee
 Civilly-committed detainee
 Immigration detainee
 Convicted and sentenced state prisoner
 Convicted and sentenced federal prisoner
 Other: (please explain) _____

2. Previously Dismissed Federal Civil Actions or Appeals

If you are proceeding in forma pauperis, list each civil action or appeal you have brought in a federal court while you were incarcerated or detained in any facility, that was dismissed as frivolous or malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Please note that a prisoner who has on three or more prior occasions, while detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a federal court that was dismissed as frivolous or malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, will be denied in forma pauperis status unless that prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

120850

Statement of Jurisdiction

The NEW JERSEY District Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Article III Section 2, wherein many causes of action occurred within that state. Also due to the acts that occurred in South Carolina having a detrimental effect in NEW JERSEY. The Court has jurisdiction pursuant to the C.A.T. Treaty, The Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act of 28 USC § 1602-1612 et seq.) also pursuant to 28 USC §§ 1331, 1332, 1301-50

1343, 2201, 2202, 1443(1); 42 USC §§
1983, 1985(2), 1985(3), 1986 and other
provisions of law argued within all
documents attached. I am seeking
to disqualify the state of South
Carolina in all civil and criminal
matters argued within all cases in
total since they are consolidated.
I motion to disqualify Judge Lipares,
Judge Czechi and the New Jersey
District Court Newark Division all
together and this case be established
in Trenton N.J. venue falls to us.

140850

Other defendants are the SC Court of Appeals judges who preside over the Thompson direct Appeal; the SC Court of Appeals; the South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense; Lanielle C Durant.

I motion to have the magistrate judge waived in this case. Its presence has been simply to collaborate fraud on the court. This will be sought by writ of mandamus. Just like in South Carolina I would be prejudiced. I motion for the appointment of legal counsel.

FORM TO BE USED BY A PRISONER IN FILING A CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

a. Parties to previous lawsuit:

Plaintiff(s): MLA

Defendant(s): U

b. Court and docket number: U

a. Grounds for dismissal: () frivolous () malicious () failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted

d. Approximate date of filing lawsuit: U

e. Approximate date of disposition: U

If there is more than one civil action or appeal, describe the additional civil actions or appeals using this same format on separate sheets.

3. Place of Present Confinement? LIEBIA CT P.O. Box 205
Ridgenville SC 29472

4. Parties

(In item (a) below, place your name in the first blank and place your present address in the second blank. Do the same for additional plaintiffs, if any.)

a. Name of plaintiff: Douglas M. Thompson
Address: LIEBIA CT P.O. Box 205 Wando A-220
Ridgenville SC 29472
Inmate #: 348634

b. First defendant -- name: David Norton
Official position: Judge SC U.S District Court
Place of employment: P.O. Box 2317 Florence SC 29503

11 of 50

FORM TO BE USED BY A PRISONER IN FILING A CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

How is this person involved in the case?
(i.e., what are you alleging that this person did or did not do that violated your constitutional rights?)

SEE Attached sheets. space is not adequate to describe

c. Second defendant -- name: Judge Roymani D. West
Official position: Judge S.E. U.S. District Court
Place of employment: P.O. Box 2317 Florence SC 29503

How is this person involved in the case?
(i.e., what are you alleging that this person did or did not do that violated your constitutional rights?)

SEE attached sheets space is not adequate to describe

d. If there are more than two defendants, attach a separate sheet. For each defendant specify: (1) name, (2) official position, (3) place of employment, and (4) involvement of the defendant.

5. I previously have sought informal or formal relief from the appropriate administrative officials regarding the acts complained of in the Statement of Claims on page 6.

Yes No

If your answer is "Yes," briefly describe the steps taken, including how relief was sought, from whom you sought relief, and the results.

MLA

u

u

17 of 50

FORM TO BE USED BY A PRISONER IN FILING A
CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

If your answer is "No," briefly explain why administrative remedies were not exhausted.

This is not claims subject to
institutional administrative
REMEDIES REQUIREMENT. This is also
petition to REMOVE and disqualify South
Carolina

6. Statement of Claims

(State here as briefly as possible the facts of your case. Describe how each defendant violated your rights, giving dates and places. If you do not specify how each defendant violated your rights and the date(s) and place of the violations, your complaint may be dismissed. Include also the names of other persons who are involved, including dates and places. Do not give any legal arguments or cite any cases or statutes. If you intend to allege a number of related claims, number and set forth each claim in a separate paragraph. Use as much space as you need. Attach a separate sheet if necessary.)

THE SOVEREIGN plaintiff(s) motion to
expand the scope and for inclusion and
that all documents filed in cases 2:08-cv-
04187-JL ; 11-cv-06266 ; 2:14-cv-000725
and 2:14-cv-01410-ccc be obtained
and be made a part of the court record
in this case. The plaintiff can discover
and seek inclusion on all documents
related to the subject matter that bear
on the claims, issues and defenses in
this case, Valentin v Hospital Bella Vista,
254 F.3d 358, 364 (1st Cir 2001); JONES v Bush,
122 F. Supp 2d 713, 715 (MD Tex. 2000); In Re;
Maxim Group Inc Securities Litigation, 2002

Will 987660 (N.D. GA 2002); Fed. Rules of Civ. Pro, Rule 26 (b)(1); Oppenheimer Fund Inc v. Sanders, 437 U.S. 340, 351, 98 S.Ct 2380, 2389-90, 57 L.Ed.2d 253 (1978); Kidwiler v. Progressive Palomares Inc Co, 192 F.2d R. 193, 199 (N.D. W. Va 2000).

By the documents submitted in this case which are clearly connected directly, we are arguing preemption. We seek to enjoin the state and or federal officials and or parties in this action from interfering with federal, foreign and international law which applies in this case, Shaw v Delta Airlines Inc 463 U.S. 85, 16 n. 14, 103 S.Ct 2090, 2099 n. 14, 1983-80

77 LEd 2d 490 (1983); 28 USC §§ 1334, 1332, 1343; 42 USC A § 2014(h); Caterpillar, Inc v Williams, 482 U.S. 386, 389, 101 S Ct 2425, 2427, 96 LEd 2d 318 (1987); The Fair v Kohler Die & Specialty Co., 228 U.S. 22, 25 33 S Ct 410, 411, 57 LEd 716 (1913) ("[T]he party who brings suit is master to decide what law he will rely upon").

The sovereign plaintiff(s) invoke the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, § 201, 42 USC A § 2000 (a) and the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act of 28 USC § 1602-1612 et seq. Therefore the claims of the plaintiff(s) must be considered as true, Elie Guynn v Long

TIER 1 Credit Bank, Japan, 322 F3d 635
(9th Cir 2003); Liu v Republic of China, 892
F2d 1419, 1424 (9th Cir 1989) cert. dismissed.
U.S. - 11 Sct 27, 11 LEd2d 840 (1990); Bodine
Connecticut, 401 U.S. 371, 379, 91 Sct 780,
28 LEd2d 113 (1973); Juras v Martinez,
106 Sct 1787, 475 U.S. 1138, 90 LEd2d 333;
Morroe v Pape, 365 U.S. 167, 81 Sct 473,
5 LEd2d 492 (1961).

I give the parties notice that
all documents submitted and written
instruments are attached to the face
of this complaint and are made a
part of the complaint or pleading for
all purposes including service upon all
21 of 50

defendants involved, Perkins v Silverstein
939 F2d 463, 467 n. 2 (7th Cir. 1997); Verizon
Int'l Inc v Global Maps Inc, 377 F3d 355,
363 (4th Cir. 2004); Sira v Marton, 380 F3d
57 (2nd Cir. 2004); Witzke v Fiemal, 376 F3d
744, 749 (7th Cir. 2004); Newman v NLO, Inc,
108 F3d 1546, 1555 (6th Cir. 1997); Wells v
Braun, 891 F2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989).

Attached the parties will find:

(3) A copy of the Attorney Kays letter
(32) pages dated October 27, 2013.

(4) A copy of the Crawford PCR and
(69) page legal issue that establishes the
class action. This legal issue is at

The heart of Both my cases that were filed in the S.C. U.S. District Court and my direct appeal as it is for every inmate in the nation both state and federal level, 3.2 million inmates producing the largest class action in earth's judicial history. Mr Crawford discovered it.

(5) A copy of the petition to Revoke Case 26-13, (20) pages dated January 14, 2014.

(6) A copy of the affidavit of facts seeking to supplement the mandamus Case 14-1364, (20) pages dated February 20, 2014. and attachments.

(c) A copy of the (6) page Affidavit of Facts seeking to supplement the writ of mandamus dated March 4, 2014.

THESE documents, even though they pertain to the Crawford PCR it directly affects all plaintiffs in the civil state case BER-L-1708-14 et al... Our intent was to move his PCR into the federal district court and argue it as a class action for all plaintiffs including myself to establish the New Jersey District Court's jurisdiction related to our present criminal charges though we reside out of state. The state civil case could not be used to overturn a criminal

240850

convictions thus, this PCR directly effect
and is tied to me and every inmate in
the nation. Judges Linares, Creechi, Young,
Hudson County, the defendants in total
engaged in fraud plot just to directly
attack Crawford, but to attack us all.
They all conspired in this to prevent
the cases from moving forward. The
damage caused by their criminal acts
is clear. The hand of one is the
hand of all by conspiracy and the
accomplice liability doctrine.

(8) A copy of the order of
consolidation from the Essex County
Superior Court in case ESX-L-9387-13
etal that produced cases BER-L-1708-
25050

- 14 ET AL

(9) A copy of medical proof for Crawford showing he comes under ADA requiring that legal counsel be appointed in every case to which he is a party dated JANUARY 17, 2014.

(10) A copy of the dismissal notices for Crawford, Cook that was sealed on all the plaintiffs in case BIER-L-1708-14 ET AL..

(11) A copy of the affidavit of facts seeking to change the track number

(12) pages dated November 22, 2013.

(13) A copy of the affidavit of facts seeking to suspend the procedural Rules

for any defect in form or service related to this document; motion for sanctions; motion to stay service on the defendants ~~xxx~~, (24) pages dated DECEMBER 31, 2013.

(13) A copy of the certificate of service and writ of mandamus that make up case 14-1539 in the 3rd Circuit.

(14) A copy of the certificate of service and (13) page complaint dated JULY 22, 2013.

(15) A copy of the writ of mandamus (50) pages dated August 26, 2013 that was sent to the NEW JERSEY SUPREME COURT but was returned unfilled, that

Court informing us it must be filed in the federal court.

(16) A copy of the two E.A. Cooper debit slips showing when my complaint to be made party in the civil action BER-L-1708-14 et al. was mailed out twice. Once on December 19, 2013 and March 16, 2014. Yet until this present date the defendants either destroyed the plaintiffs complaints or either prevented them from being filed.

THESE SET of documents highlight the causes of action against Hudson, BERGEN, ESSEX COUNTIES, THE JUDGES
2800.50

Shirley from and all defendants in total
by conspiracy including the governor,
state attorney general and others listed
within the documents.

They blocked me and additional
plaintiffs from being added to the action.
They then purposely failed to mail us the
summones to create a defect in service.
When we realized their intent and
caught it....

(7) A copy of the COOPER E.L. fund
debit slip showing the summones being
mailed to the court to be clocked stamp,
filed and then returned to us to allow

US to perfect SERVICE, dated DECEMBER 12, 2013. This was summons for all plaintiffs cases. They destroyed or lost.

This is why the defendants transferred the cases from Hudson County to Essex County to Bergen County. They destroyed the summons, NEVER returning it to us, to permit us to complete SERVICE, which we discovered their intent and documented it. NEVER returning to us the summons which they destroyed. The Bergen County Court now tells us they will dismiss the cases in (60) days for failure to

PROSECUTE when it is they, the defend-
ants in total, who conspired to create
this defect in SERVICE. This delayed
SERVICE on the defendants to allow
Judge Morton and West to inflict
indiscriminate damage in acts of
fraud on the court to prevent my /
our disqualifying them to have my
mandamus action and civil action
transferred to NEW JERSEY to be
heard with the other plaintiffs in
CASE BER-L-1700-14 ET AL, destroying
my filed complaint or preventing it

from being filed behind religious and racial hatred due to my cases connection to the Crawford cases and the plaintiffs in case BER-L-1708-14 et al. The defendants did this collectively conspiring across multiple state and federal jurisdictions, in acts of fraud

PLEASE TAKE NOTE OF DOCUMENTS:

(18) ENTRIES NO. (S) 19, 20, 21 FILED IN CASE 5:13-CV-3415-DCM DATED FILED FEBRUARY 24, 2014.

(19) DOCUMENT NO. 40 FILED IN CASE 5:13-CV-2873-DCM.

(20) Document No. 26 filed in case 5:13-cv-2873-DCM.

(21) The copy of the § 1983 action that created case 5:13-cv-3415-DCM.

(22) A copy of the response to the report and recommendation in case "3415", (27) pages dated March 24, 2014

(23) A copy of the two orders from the SC Court of Appeals and SC Supreme Court.

(24) A copy of certificates of service and affidavit of facts seeking to reinstate dated JANUARY 31, 2014.

(25) A copy of the affidavit of Facts
filing objections to defendant's Return
to motion for default etc; motion
for sanctions and motion to motion
therefor dated DECEMBER 27, 2013.

(26) A copy of the proof of service
and affidavit of Facts seeking judicial
notice; motion for default and judgment
pursuant to Rules 54(c); 54(d); 55(a) and
55(b)(2) dated DECEMBER 25, 2013.

These documents highlight the
damage done to both the plaintiff's
South Carolina federal cases and his

direct appeal with the New Jersey
defendants working with all defendants
involved to destroy the summons and
our present service by way of the
prejudice heaped upon us in acts of
fraud on the court under the fraudu-
lent deceptive guise of transferring
our cases from county to county unjustly
delaying or circumventing appointing
counsel in the pending New Jersey
cases. The damage done by the
conspiring defendants is clear.
The defendants entered into as well
as executed a deliberate plot and

scheme to defraud the plaintiff and other plaintiffs in the pending actions and any future court on appeal perverting the integrity of the court itself so that its machinery cannot perform its normal function of adjudicating cases in the pristine manner the constitutional fathers have established. They have inappropriately obtained jurisdiction over the cases in total for the specific intent of legalizing modern day slavery which congress have outlawed judge

360850

State or federal to essentially legalize
modern day slavery producing fraud
on the court rendering their power
void from the conception stripping them
of all immunity, Calton Petroleum Co. v
Frontier Ins Co., 351 F3d 204, 208 (5th
Cir 2003); Digital Equip Corp v. Desktop
Direct Ins., 511 U.S. 869, 868, 114 S.Ct 1992,
1996, 128 L.Ed 2d 842 (1994); Chewing v.
Ford Motor Company, 354 SC 72, 579
SE 2d 605 (2003); Applying v State Farm
Mut Auto Ins Co., 340 F3d 769, 780 (4th Cir
2003); Kingu First American Investigators

Ex parte, 201 Fed 94, 95 (2nd Cir 2002) cert.
denied 537 U.S. 960, 123 S Ct 393, 154
L Ed 2d 314 (2002); Brailsford, 669 S Ed 2d
342, 380 SC 443; 18 USC § 116 (a)(b)(c);
18 USC § 116 (a)(b)(2)(3)(4); United States v
Dizdar CA. 2 (N.Y) 1978, 581 Fed 1031;
Weeper v United States - U.S. 106 S Ct 179,
88 L Ed 2d 140 (1985); The Amistad, 40
U.S. 518, 15 Pet 518, 1841 WL 5024, 2006
A.M.C. 2955, 10 L Ed 826, U.S. Comp
January 1841; Ex parte Virginia, 100
U.S. 339, 348-349, 25 L Ed 676 (1880);
Pulliam v Allen, 466 U.S. 522, 536-543,
104 S Ct 1970, 1977-1982, 80 L Ed 2d 565

(1984); MIRELES v WACO, 502 U.S. 9, 112 S.Ct
286 (U.S. Cal. 1991); Schmidt v DIEGEN ED Pa
1974, 376 F.Supp. 664; 18 USC § 3, 241, 242;
Stump v SPARKMAN, 98 S.Ct 1099; PIERSON
v RAY, 386 U.S. at 554, 87 S.Ct at 1210.

I quote the words of the great
THOMAS JEFFERSON, one of our founding
fathers:

"Single acts of Tyranny may be
ascribed to the accidental opinion
of the day; but a series of oppressions,
begun at a distinguished period and
pursued unalterably through

EVERY change of ministers too plainly prove a deliberate, systematic plan of reducing us to slavery".

The overt acts are clear and numerous. No formal verbal agreement is necessary to establish conspiracy. It can be proven from circumstantial evidence. One single overt act will suffice to support a conspiracy conviction, United States v Brinkley, 903 F2d 1130; United States v Sheikh, 654 F2d 1057, 1063 (5th Cir. 1981) cert. denied 455 U.S. 991, 102 S.Ct 1607, 71 LEd 2d 852 (1982).

Relief Sought

The plaintiff seeks injunctive Relief in the following:

(1) I want the state of South Carolina in all civil and criminal cases involved disqualified and the civil as well as criminal cases, as well as all plaintiffs involved and listed in the (60) page complaint and this document, moved to the jurisdiction of the state of New Jersey, housed together even if

its segregated wing in the nicest,
cheapest federal institution in the
state of New Jersey that they have,
with all of our personal property
until the cases in total are heard.

(2) I want my direct appeal
removed to the federal district court
of New Jersey, case 5:13-cv-2873-DCN
reinstated and default be entered in
the record. I want both cases 5:13-cv-
2873-DCN and 5:13-cv-3415-DCN trans-
ferred to New Jersey all parties served
by US Marshal and the cases be

420850

placed before a jury consolidated with
this case.

(3) I want the (50) State Attorneys
Generals and the (50) U.S Attorneys
for every state in this nation to
produce a copy of an indictment or
criminal complaint, what ever one is
applicable for that state, of any random
conducted field, both state and federal
If the structural error affect all 50
states as we suspect, we want class
action certification and all inmates
nationally be given notice of the

430850

pending proceedings. This includes
having every determination made by
Morton and West rendered void and
the Habeas Corpus filed be filed as
a class action, diversity jurisdiction.

(4) I want the discovery sought
by Crawford in the Attorney Kays letter
given to him without delay. It bears
on the facts, jurisdictional claims and
defenses related to and directly
affecting all plaintiffs in case BER-
L-1708-14 et al. including myself. That
evidence must be obtained to establish

440850

The jurisdictional facts related to our
sovereignty and invoking the F.S.I.A.

(5) I want legal counsel appointed
immediately in my now filed civil
case in NEW JERSEY to represent
me due to the complexity of this
case and class action sought under
the All Writs Act.

(6) I want SC Dept. of Corrections
(^{Cranford}) to immediately repair his typewriter/
word processor, paying for its repair
in full, replace him with (2) bottles
of black ink pad ink, (3) re-inkable

Reinstated as a PCR petitioned removal
under Article III section 2, 28 USC §
1443(d), and 1602-1612 et seq. and federal
legal counsel be appointed to him in
that case, the case be given class
action certification and then be
consolidated with my cases in the
New Jersey Court pursuant to the
F.S.I.A., whether it be Mr. Crawford
or any plaintiff independently. We
all have a right to consolidate these
cases being sovereign members of
the reestablished global theocratic
state.

470850

(8) I want my name and all the names of the plaintiffs listed in the (60) complaint, including those added referred to in this document, deleting those referred to in this document established as plaintiffs with independent case numbers, being consolidated in case BER-L-1708-14 et al in Bergen County, with Mr Crawford name added as a party in each separate complaint. I want all notices of dismissal rendered void and the time of service in

480850

that case be stayed, legal counsel be immediately appointed to represent the plaintiffs in total and that appointed counsel be given ~~some~~ time to perfect service in the case. We want the case established under Track I not Track II and discovery issue in (150) days. We then want the case transferred to Union County, New Jersey.

(9) I want attorney fees paid for all cases involved with court cost at conclusion. We want the

490850

FORM TO BE USED BY A PRISONER IN FILING A CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT

7. Relief

(State briefly exactly what you want the Court to do for you. Make no legal arguments. Cite no cases or statutes.)

Attorneys appointed in EVERY CASE to be from a SEPERATE independent law firm not affiliated with the state or defendants in ANY MANNER.

8. Do you request a jury or non-jury trial? (Check only one)

() Jury Trial

() Non-Jury Trial

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signed this 24th day of March, 2014

David M. Jones
Signature of plaintiff

APPEARING:

Lucy [Signature]
ET AL.

EACH PLAINTIFF NAMED IN THE COMPLAINT MUST SIGN THE COMPLAINT HERE. ADD ADDITIONAL LINES IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE PLAINTIFF. REMEMBER, EACH PLAINTIFF MUST SIGN THE COMPLAINT.

500 of 50

Douglas M Thompson
348634 Wando A-220
Lieber CJ P.O. Box 205
Ridgville SC 29472

RECEIVED

APR 11 2014
MAIL ROOM
LIEBER C.L.

SC Court of Appeals
1015 Sumter Street
Columbia SC 29201



FOR LEGAL USE ONLY

THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HAS NOT
INSPECTED OR CENSORED THIS ITEM; THEREFORE,
THE DEPARTMENT DOES NOT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY
FOR ITS CONTENTS.

LIEBER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION
S.C. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS



FOR LEGAL USE