

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2017

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
APPELLATE CASE NO. 2014-001051

S.C. SUPREME COURT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2017-002108

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

Vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND,

PETITIONER(S)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND
#290065 WANDO B-239
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472
PETITIONER(S)

TABLE-OF-AUTHORITIES

FOR THE TABLE OF AUTHORITIES SEE EXHIBIT GOURDINE # 2
PAGES I THROUGH XI.

STATEMENT-OF-ISSUES-IN-CERTIORARI

(1) DID THE APPEALS COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, INCLUDING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION BEING MADE VOID FOR THAT DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, DUE TO THE FRAUD RELATED TO THE STATE COMPROMISING MY HIRED COUNSEL AND JUDGE ALISON LEE SITTING ON THIS CASE WHEN SHE IS A DEFENDANT IN CASES PENDING BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURT INVOLVING THE PETITIONER AND HIS CO-PETITIONERS, REQUIRING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO NOW ALLOW FULL REVIEW OF ALL ISSUES OF CONCERN THAT THE PETITIONER WAS DEPRIVED OF HEARING DUE TO THE STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT EXIST IN CASE 2014-001051?

(2) DID THE APPEALS COURT ERR, AND ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION , AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 6th. AND 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, BY DENYING THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, ENTRY INTO THE APPEAL PROCESS TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT DUE TO THE LITIGATION PRESENTED IN BOTH EXHIBIT(S) "TRUSTEE" AND "FOREIGN SOVEREIGN" WHICH VOID THEIR JURISDICTION FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION?

(3) DID THE APPEALS COURT ERR, AND ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION, ACTING AS LEGISLATORS, NOT JUDGES, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 4th., 6th. AND 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, WHEN THE STATE WAS PERMITTED TO ESTABLISH THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY BY TESTIMONY ALONE, STRIPPING DEFENDANTS OF DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS WHERE THERE ARE ALLEGATIONS OF THE PLANTING OF EVIDENCE, WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN DIMINISHED OR PREVENTED HAD THE STATE COURTS ADHERED TO THE STATUTORY PROVISIONS PLACED INTO EFFECT BY THE STATE LEGISLATORS, CAUSING EXTREME PREJUDICE TO THE PETITIONER'S DUE PROCESS MATTERS IN VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE?

(4) DID THE APPEALS COURT ERR IN THEIR DETERMINATION, AND DID THEY ABUSE THEIR DISCRETION, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 4th., 6th., AND 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, BY THE COURT(S) VALIDATING THE SEARCH WARRANT AS IS ARGUED IN EXHIBIT(S) "SEARCH WARRANTS #'S 1 AND 2?

(5) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 14th., 15th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, REGARDING THE INDICTMENT(S) AS CONSTRUCTED, BY THE LANGUAGE AND OR CHARGE CONTAINED THEREIN, WHICH DID CREATE AND OR FORM CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTION(S), THAT TOOK AWAY THE PETITIONER'S PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, AND AUTOMATICALLY SHIFT THE BURDEN OF PERSUASION TO THE DEFENDANT, IN REGARD TO THE CRUCIAL ELEMENTS OF DISPUTE, PREDETERMINING IN ADVANCE THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS?

(6) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, BY THE INDICTMENT FOR TRAFFICKING COCAINE'S FAILURE TO PROPERLY ALLEGE THE DRUG AMOUNTS AND THE SUB SECTION THE PETITIONER IS SAID TO HAVE VIOLATED; THE INDICTMENT FOR POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE MARIJUANA'S FAILURE TO PROPERLY LIST THE DRUG AMOUNT AND SUB SECTION ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN VIOLATED; THE INDICTMENT FOR POSSESSION OF A FIREARM DURING THE COMMISSION OF A VIOLATE CRIME ALLEGING, "DID POSSESS A .45 CALI-

BER HANDGUN OR VISIBLY DISPLAY WHAT APPEARED TO BE A KNIFE DURING THE COMMISSION, OR ATTEMPTED COMMISION, OF TRAFFICKING***", GIVING WAY TO CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT OF THE INDICTMENTS, IN THE BODY OF THE CHARGING INSTRUMENT?

(7) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, AS WELL AS RULES OF COURT, RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, THE S.C. CONSTITUTION, AS WELL AS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION BEING MADE VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, AND OR THEY WERE PROHIBITED FROM ENACTING AND OR INVOKING AND OR CONTINUING THEIR SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTIONARY "[P]OWERS" DUE TO THE "[P]ROCEDURAL [D]EFFECT" IN THAT THERE WAS NO "[W]RITTEN"(EMPHASIS ADDED) ORDER OF CONTINUANCE OBTAINED PURSUANT TO ARTICLE V § 4 OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION?

(8) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, BY THE TRIAL COURT AND OR PLEA COURT ALLOWING CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT OF THE INDICTMENT(S) AT THE PETITIONER'S TRIAL AND OR PLEA HEARING?

(9) DID THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN STATE-v.-GENTRY-SUPRA ERR, ENGAGING KNOWINGLY, INTENTIONALLY IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ESSENTIALLY ESTABLISH MODERN DAY SLAVERY IN VIOLATION OF THE ANTI-PEONAGE ACT, AND ABUSED THEIR DISCRETIONARY POWERS, WHICH THEY EVEN CONSPIRED TO TAKE AWAY OUR RIGHT TO VOTE, AND OR DONE SO SURREPTITIOUSLY, IN VIOLATION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT. AND IN SUCH, THE COURT'S JURISDICTION WAS MADE VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, AND THE COURT WAS PROHIBITED FROM ENACTING AND OR INVOKING AND OR CONTINUING ITS SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTIONARY POWERS, EVEN THOUGH THEY DO INDEED POSSESS SUCH POWER VIA STATE LEGISLATIVE STATUTES AND OR CONGRESSIONAL INTENT, DUE TO THE INDICTMENT DEFECTS ARGUED WITHIN THIS CASE, IN VIOLATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 4th., 5th., 6th., 13th., 14th., 15th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITU-

TION, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, ALSO 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(2), 1985(3), 1986; 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 1001 AND THE LAWS OF DUE PROCESS?

(10) DID THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ERR, AND ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION, AND WAS THE PETITIONER AS A BENEFICIARY OF "THE TRUST", AND THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AS A BENEFICIARY OF "THE TRUST", 1st., 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, ALSO THEIR DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, AS WELL AS THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, ALSO ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, BY THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA VIA THE SUPREME COURT, PERMITTING SAME SEX MARRIAGE, WHEN SUCH WAS GIVEN TO THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS THAT IS UNDER "CONTRACT" VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION, WHERE SUCH ACTION VIOLATE THE TERMS AND WOULD BURDEN THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS; AND MUST ALL RELIEF SOUGHT VIA THE WRIT OF COMMISSION BE GRANTED?

STATEMENT-OF-THE-CASE

ON JUNE 3, 2011, THE PETITIONER WAS ARRESTED AND CHARGED WITH TRAFFICKING COCAINE 28g.-100g. S.C. CODE ANN §§ 44-53-370, PWID MARIJUANA S.C. CODE ANN. § 44-53-370, UNLAWFUL POSSESSION OF A FIREARM DURING THE COMMISSION OF A VIOLENT CRIME S.C. CODE ANN. § 16-23-490, UNLAWFUL POSSESSION OF A FIREARM BY A CONVICTED FELON S.C. CODE ANN. § 16-23-30, AND POSSESSION OF A STOLEN FIREARM S.C. CODE ANN. 16-23-30. AT THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS , CONVENED ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2011, THE PETITIONER WAS INDICTED ON THE ABOVE CHARGES BY A GRAND JURY. THE HONORABLE JUDGE ROGER M. YOUNG SR. PRESIDED OVER A JURY TRIAL ON MAY 12-13, 2014.

THE PETITIONER MOVED TO SUPPRESS THE SEARCH WARRANT ON THE BASIS THAT IT DID NOT GIVE THE MAGISTRATE INFORMATION SUFFI-

CIENT TO RISE TO A LEVEL OF PROBABLE CAUSE, AND FURTHER, THAT IT CONTAINED AN ERROR SO EGREGIOUS THAT IT FAILED AS A MATTER OF LAW. (TT.PP.70, 71). THE COURT DENIED THE PETITIONER'S MOTION TO SUPPRESS BASED ON THE TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES GIVING RISE TO THE LEVEL OF PROBABLE CAUSE REQUIRED. (TT.PP.74, 75).

THE PETITIONER MOVED FOR A DIRECT VERDICT AT THE CLOSE OF THE STATE'S CASE, ASSERTING THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED DID NOT SUFFICE TO CREATE A JURY ISSUE AS TO CONSTRUCTIVE POSSESSION. (TT.PP.47, 52). THE COURT DIRECTED A VERDICT OF NOT GUILTY ON THE CHARGE OF POSSESSION OF A STOLEN FIREARM S.C. CODE ANN. § 16-23-30, BUT DENIED THE PETITIONER'S DIRECT VERDICT MOTION REGARDING THE REMAINING (3) CHARGES ON THE BASIS THAT THERE WAS SUFFICIENT CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH WOULD SUPPORT A CONVICTION BASED ON CONSTRUCTIVE POSSESSION OF THE DRUGS AND A GUN DURING THE COMMISSION OF A VIOLENT CRIME. (TT.PP. 219).

THE JURY FOUND THE PETITIONER GUILTY OF TRAFFICKING COCAINE 28g.-100g. S.C. CODE ANN. § 44-53-370, PWID MARIJUANA S.C. CODE ANN. § 44-53-370, AND UNLAWFUL POSSESSION OF A FIREARM DURING THE COMMISSION OF A VIOLENT CRIME S.C. CODE ANN. § 16-23-490 AND SENTENCED THE PETITIONER TO (20) YEARS IN PRISON. (TT.PP.280, 281).

COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER RENEWED HIS PRETRIAL MOTIONS AND DIRECT VERDICT MOTION, AND PETITIONER ALSO MADE ADDITIONAL POST-TRIAL MOTIONS ON HIS OWN ACCORD. (TT.PP. 271-274, 281). THE PETITIONER FILED HIS NOTICE OF INTENT TO APPEAL ON MAY 15, 2014.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

THE S.C. SUPREME COURT HAS BEFORE IT WHAT MAY POTENTIALLY BE THE LARGEST, MOST COMPLEX, MOST EXTRAORDINARY CASE IN EARTH'S JUDICIAL HISTORY. ONE DEALING WITH THE EMERGENCE OF THE RIGHTFUL LOST FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, LAWGIVER AND HIGH PRIEST TO THE (4) THRONES OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, THE FULFILLING OF JEWISH, ISLAMIC AND CHRISTIAN PROPHECY, WHO WAS FRAMED FOR THE MURDER OF HIS OWN CHILD BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED BECAUSE HE MADE THE AFORE SAID CLAIMS PRESENTED WITHIN THIS CASE. IT IS STATED UNDER LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT THAT THIS MAN FORETOLD TO COME BY THOSE RELIGIOUS PROPHECIES WOULD ESTABLISH THE KINGDOM, PURGING ALL GLOBAL BELIEVERS IN PREPARATION FOR CHRIST'S RETURN AS HIS FORERUNNER; THIS KINGDOM ALSO FORETOLD IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL CHAPTER 3. HE IS WHOM THE CHRISTIANS CALL "THE ELIJAH" OF BIBLE PROPHECY; WHOM THE MUSLIMS CALL "THE MAHDI"(MEANING THE GUIDED ONE), WHO WILL BE LED TO THE RESTING PLACE OF THE "ARK OF THE COVENANT" AND RE-BUILD THE TEMPLE IN JERUSALEM AND RULE UPON THE THRONE OF KING DAVID OF ISRAEL AS HIS DIRECT DESCENDANT. BY THE AFORESAID PROPHECIES, IT WAS ALSO FORETOLD THAT HE WOULD CAUSE THE PRISON DOORS TO OPEN AND PROCLAIM A DAY OF LIBERTY FOR THE CAPTIVES AS IS WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF ISAIAH 61:1-3. THIS IS WHAT THE LEGAL ISSUES NOW PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT REPRESENT, TO INCLUDE ALL OTHER MATTERS RELATED THERETO. HE RESTORES ALL THINGS.

DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY AND NOVEL CLAIMS MADE WITHIN THIS CASE, AN UNPRECEDENTED EVENT. YOU HAVE OUR STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, COMPROMISING AND INFLUENCING THE PETITIONER'S HIRED ATTORNEY AND JUDGES WITHIN THE S.C. APPEALS COURT, WITH THE AID OF OTHER STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS DOING EVERY THING IN THEIR POWER, EVEN CRIMINAL ACTS, TO PREVENT WHAT THEY KNOW IS THE REALIZATION OF RELIGIOUS PROPHECY FROM MANIFESTING ITSELF BEFORE THE WORLD COMPROMISING THE PETITIONER'S DIRECT

APPEAL. ADDITIONALLY, THEY ATTACKED THE OTHER INMATES CASES AND DUE PROCESS MATTERS INVOLVED, IN ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, BECAUSE THE PETITIONER AND THEY SOUGHT TO AID THE KING-KHALIFAH HAVE THE LEGAL ISSUES HEARD EVEN WITHIN OUR OWN PENDING CRIMINAL CASES AS BENEFICIARIES OF "THE TRUST". AS THE RIGHTFUL FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH, PROPHET, LAWGIVER, ESTABLISHED BY CONTRACT VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION, PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, HE, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, HAS THE LEGAL RIGHT AND AUTHORITY TO END SAME SEX MARRIAGE GLOBALLY, BEING HIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY BY INHERITANCE, WHICH IS ALSO WHY THE STATE ACTORS AND JUDGES ENGAGED IN THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION WITHIN MY DIRECT APPEAL TO PREVENT THIS ISSUE AND OTHER LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHECY FROM BEING HEARD. THE COURTS CANNOT MAKE OR UNMAKE THE CONTRACT ESTABLISHED THOUSANDS OF YEARS BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION WITH EX POST FACTO LAW. WRIT OF COMMISSION IS GIVEN TO ME. AS ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL. I NOT ONLY ADDRESS ALL ISSUES RELATED TO MY CASE, BUT ALSO ALL OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ALL PETITIONERS THAT ARE PARTIES WITHIN THESE RELATED STATE AND OR FEDERAL CASES. CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION IS DEMANDED AS WELL.

JUDGE ALISON LEE CAME FROM PRESIDING OVER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 TO GET A SECOND OPPORTUNITY TO ATTACK THESE CASES WHEN SHE FAILED IN THE RICHLAND COURT OF COMMON PLEAS WHERE SHE IS A DEFENDANT WITHIN THE PENDING FEDERAL CASES CREATING A CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR WHICH VOIDS THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, DUE TO THERE BEING NO WAY IN TELLING WHAT SORT OR THE MAGNITUDE OF THE INFLUENCE SHE HAD UPON THE DECISIONS OF THAT COURT AND JUDGES, CORRUPTING THE FOUNDATION AND WHOLE OF THE PROCEEDINGS, PLACING THE STATE IN FORFEITURE OF THE CAUSES PRESENTED BY SANCTIONS SOUGHT, REQUIRING THAT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT NOW ADDRESS ALL MATTERS AS IF NO REVIEW AT ALL OCCURRED IN THE S.C. APPEALS COURT DUE TO THE FRAUD AND STRUCTURAL ERROR. INASMUCH, (1) THERE ARE NOVEL

QUESTIONS OF LAW IN THIS CASE; (2) THERE IS A DISSENT BEING ARGUED INVOLVING JUDGE PLECONES OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO THE STATE-v.-GENTRY CASE, WHERE FACTS NOW CLEARLY ESTABLISHED WOULD SERVE TO SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE PLECONES WAS CORRECT IN HIS DISSENT. WE ARE ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE; (3) THERE ARE SUBSTANTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS INVOLVED WHERE WE ARE ARGUING AGAINST SEVERAL OTHER PRECEDENT SETTING CASES; (4) THERE ARE FEDERAL QUESTIONS INVOLVED, SUCH AS THOSE PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND WHERE THE ACTS OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS STAND IN BLATANT DEFIANCE OF THE HOLDINGS MADE BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT UNDER WILLIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016). THUS, THE GRANTING OF THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI BECOMES MANDATORY ESTABLISHING THIS CASE BEFORE THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT.

BY MY COMMISSION AS NEWLY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, WITH ALL SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN. I, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, AM COMMANDED BY WRIT OF THE KING-KHALIFAH TO BRING THESE MATTERS BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN ORDER THAT ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND DECREES OF THE KING-KHALIFAH OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES WHOSE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY IS BINDING UPON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHERE YOUR ATTORNEYS APPEARED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 AND FAILED TO TIMELY RESPOND TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION AS ALSO DID THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S ATTORNEY WHO ARE ONE IN THE SAME. ALL RIGHTS, TITLES AND PRIVILEGES ARE NOW PROTECTED BY THE DEFAULT AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE MANDATES OF DUE PROCESS LAW.

INSOMUCH, THERE IS NEED TO BE REPETITIVE OR REDUNDANT PRODUCING EXTENSIVE LITIGATION, UNNECESSARILY BURDENING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WITH SUCH REDUNDANT PLEADING WHEN THE PETITIONER FEELS THAT THE BEST AND MOST EXPEDIENT METHOD FOR ADDRESSING IS SIMPLY TO MAKE A SHORT AND CONCISE REFERENCE TO THE ISSUES, SUMMARIZING OF EACH OF THE ISSUES SOUGHT TO BE ADDRESSED AND THEN REFER THE COURT TO THE FULL LITIGATION THAT

IS EMBODIED WITHIN THE EXHIBITS CONTAINED WITHIN THE APPENDIX. THE PETITIONER FEELS ADOPTING THIS METHOD WOULD BE BEST FOR EXPEDIENCY SAKE.

THE PETITIONER(S) GIVE THE COURT AND PARTIES FURTHER JUDICIAL NOTICE. BY WHAT IS ARGUED WITHIN ITEM # (6) EXHIBIT "INJUNCTION". THERE IS STATE INTERFERENCE AND WE ARE RESTRICTED IN OBTAINING COPIES IN ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE WHICH RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. THEREFORE, A COPY OF THE EXHIBITS LISTED WITHIN THE APPENDIX IS FILED WITH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, BUT WERE NOT DIRECTLY SERVED ON THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL. THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND APPENDIX MINUS THE EXHIBITS ARE INDEED SERVED UPON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL. DUE TO THE STATE INTERFERENCE THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL PRODUCING EXTREME PREJUDICE. THE DOCUMENTS SERVED ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ARE SERVED IN LIEN OF THE EXHIBITS GIVING YOU NOTICE OF THEIR EXISTENCE AND FILING WITH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHERE YOU MUST NOW OBTAIN COPY ELECTRONICALLY AND WE MOTION THAT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CLERK SEND COPY OF THE EXHIBITS TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ELECTRONICALLY. MANY OF THESE EXHIBITS HAVE ALREADY BEEN SERVED UPON THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL VIA THE OTHER PENDING STATE AND OR FEDERAL CASES, AS WELL AS THE david duren CASE UNDER 2017-000605 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THUS, THE APPENDIX SERVED UPON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL MUST BE DEEMED SUFFICIENT NOTICE ALLOWING HIM TO OBTAIN ANY NEEDED COPY ELECTRONICALLY DUE TO THE STATE INTERFERENCE THAT THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL HIMSELF IS CONSPIRING IN. SEE EXHIBIT "INJUNCTION" . ALSO SEE, HODGKINS-v.-PETERSON, F.Supp.2d., 2000 WL 33128726 (S.D.Ind.2000); UNITED-STATES-v.-SCOTT, 958 F.Supp. 761(1997); HANKINS-v.-WETZEL, 2014 WL 4918813 (D.C.Pa.2014).

ARGUMENT

(1) DID THE APPEALS COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, INCLUDING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION BEING MADE VOID FOR THAT DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, DUE TO THE FRAUD RELATED TO THE STATE COMPROMISING MY HIRED COUNSEL AND JUDGE ALISON LEE SITTING ON THIS CASE WHEN SHE IS A DEFENDANT IN CASES PENDING BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURT INVOLVING THE PETITIONER AND HIS CO-PETITIONERS, REQUIRING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO NOW ALLOW FULL REVIEW OF ALL ISSUES OF CONCERN THAT THE PETITIONER WAS DEPRIVED OF HEARING DUE TO THE STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT EXIST IN CASE 2014-001051?

BY THIS FIASCO OF A DIRECT APPEAL IN THE APPEALS COURT, YOU HAVE ONE OF THE MOST OUTRAGEOUS, FRAUDULENT PROCEEDINGS OCCURRING IN THIS STATE'S HISTORY. DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THIS CASE. YOU HAVE THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, WITH THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES BEING PARTY TO IT, THIS INCLUDES WITH THE SUPPORT OF OTHER STATE, FEDERAL EVEN POTENTIALLY INTERNATIONAL PARTIES, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW AND OR AUTHORITY, TO PREVENT WHAT THEY KNOW IS THE REALIZATION OF RELIGIOUS PROPHECY FROM OCCURRING, IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, ALSO IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS. THE PARTIES CONSPIRED TO PREVENT THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHECY FROM OBTAINING FAIR AND PROPER REVIEW WITHIN MY DIRECT APPEAL, DENYING THE PETITIONER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS, DICKENS-v.-AETNA-LIFE-INS. CO. 677 F3d. 288 CA4 (W.Va.2012); U.S.-v.-BANK-OF-AMERICA-CORP. F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 2777397(N.C.2014); MINA-v.-CHESTER-COUTY, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 6550543(2015); BODMAN-v.-STATE, 403 S.C. 60, 742 S.E.2d. 363(S.C.2013); MARSHALL-v.-CITY-OF-ROCK-HILL, S.E.2d., 2015 WL 3884258(S.C.App.2015); PAUL-ADAMS-v.-CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; U.S.-v.-HARE, 820 F3d. 93(4th. Cir.2016); STATE-v.-FERGUSON, 221 S.C. 300, 70 S.E.2d. 355(S.C.

1952); U.S.-v.-TEJADA, 445 Fed. Appx' 719, 2011 WL 3891825 CA4 (S.C.2011).

THIS IS WHAT HAS TAKEN PLACE HERE. ATTORNEY PEPPER WAS RECENTLY CAUGHT AND ARRESTED ON A DRUG CHARGE HIMSELF. FROM WHAT THE PETITIONER COULD GATHER FROM THE EVENING NEWS, IT WAS COCAINE RELATED. THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, AND THE S.C. APPEALS COURT JUDGES BEING PRIVY TO IT, MAKES A CONCEALED, COVERT DEAL WITH ATTORNEY PEPPER, TO BE LENIENT AND OR DISMISS WHATEVER CHARGES HE HAS PENDING IF THE ATTORNEY FOR THE PETITIONER AID THEM IN THROWING THE PETITIONER UNDER THE BUS ON HIS DIRECT APPEAL TO PREVENT REVIEW OF THE LEGAL ISSUES DUE TO THE MAGNITUDE OF WHAT IS BEING ARGUED BEFORE THIS COURT. I OBJECT. THEY THEN BRING JUDGE ALISON LEE UP TO THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, PROMOTING HER FROM THE RICHLAND COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, WHO SAT ON THE VERY CASE WHICH IS AT THE HEART OF THE CONTROVERSY IN THESE MATTERS, SPECIFICALLY CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, WHERE SHE DROPPED THE BALL ON THAT CASE LEADING TO THE DEFAULT TO WHICH WE ARE EXERCISING, AND WHERE SHE IS NOW A DEFENDANT IN THE PENDING FEDERAL CASES ADDRESSING THE FRAUD AND CRIMINAL ACTS DONE WITHIN THOSE PROCEEDINGS AND WITHIN OTHER JURISDICTIONS TO WHICH SHE HAD NO POWER OR AUTHORITY TO ACT. NOW IN ACTS OF MACHINATION AND CONSPIRACY, SHE ENTERS THE JURISDICTION OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS IN EFFORTS TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS AND CORRECT HER FAILURE IN THE RICHLAND COURT, TO PREVENT REVIEW OF THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHECY AND AID THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO PREVENT AND OR HINDER SUCH REVIEW WHEN SHE IS A DEFENDANT IN CASE 9:17-cv-2897-TLW-BM, THE VERY CASE THAT CASE 2017-002108 IS PETITIONED REMOVED TO, WHICH INCLUDE THE OTHER PENDING FEDERAL PARALLEL CASES. THIS IS OUTRAGEOUS AND AN EGREGIOUS ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND CONSPIRACY, IN THEIR EFFORTS TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW AND 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001. COMPROMISING MY HIRED ATTORNEY TO INVOLVE HIM IN THEIR MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATES THE CODE OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND DEFIES JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS CREATING A MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE, GRAHAM-v.-McFADDEN, 2015 WL 505536(DSC.2015); FOSTER v.-REYNOLDS, 2015 WL 5920736(DSC.2015); STATE-v.-HENDERSON,

205 Kan. 231, 468 P.2d. 136(1970); PEOPLE-v.-BLALOCK, 197 COLO. 320, 592 P.2d. 406(1979); STRICKLAND-v.-WASHINGTON, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d. 674(1984); WILLIAMS-v.-TAYLOR, 529 U.S. 362, 391, 120 S.Ct. 1495, 146 L.Ed.2d. 389(2000); UNITED STATES-v.-ECHLES, 352 F2d. 892(7th.Cir.1965); U.S.-v.-ECCLESTON, --Fed. Appx--,2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); STATE-v.-BRANDT, 393 S.C. 526, 713 S.E.2d. 591(S.C.2011); NORTH-AMERICAN-RESCUE PRODUCTS,-INC.-v.-RICHARDSON, 411 S.C. 371, 769 S.E.2d. 237(S.C. 2015); BARLOW-v.-COLGATE-PALMOLIVE-CO., 772 F3d. 1001, 90 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 85 CA4 (Md.2014).

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT WAS UNEQUIVOCAL WHEN IT COME TO THE ISSUE OF JUDGE LEE SITTING UPON THE PETITIONER'S DIRECT APPEAL. THE COURT DETERMINED:

"NO MAN CAN TRY A CASE TO WHICH HE HAS AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME. EXTRA-JUDICIAL BIAS WAS ONLY **"ONE OUT OF MANY"** EXAMPLES THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT WAS REFERRING TO AND ADDRESSING. WHEN THE OBJECTIVE RISK OF ACTUAL BIAS **"OF ANY KIND"** (EMPHASIS ADDED) RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL, UNDER THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE, THE FAILURE TO RECUSE IS **"[N]OT"** A HARMLESS ERROR BECOMING STRUCTURAL IN NATURE WHICH VOIDS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION". JUDGE LEE SHOULD HAVE RECUSED HERSELF THE MINUTE SHE SAW THE KING-KHALIFAH'S NAME CONNECTED TO MY APPEAL IN ANY MANNER.

WATCH THE LANGUAGE FURTHER USED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. "ON THE QUESTION OF RECUSAL, THE COURT ASK **"[N]OT"** WHETHER A JUDGE HARBORS AN ACTUAL BIAS (FOR EXAMPLE, JUDICIAL BIAS OR PERSONAL BIAS OR EXTRA-JUDICIAL BIAS) BUT **"INSTEAD"** (EMPHASIS ADDED) WHETHER, AS AN OBJECTIVE MATTER THERE IS A **"[P]OTENTIAL"** FOR BIAS OF **"ANY KIND"**(EMPHASIS ADDED) THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL", WHICH IS PERSPICUOUS THAT SUCH AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL DOES EXIST IN THIS CASE VOIDING THE S.C. APPEALS COURT'S JURISDICTION, CABEATON-v.-A.T.-MASSEY-COAL CO.-INC., 556 U.S. 868, 129 S.Ct. 2252, 173 L.Ed.2d. 1208(U.S. 2009); JOHNSON-v.-STEVENSON, 2016 WL 1156649(DSC.2016); KENWOOD GARDENS-CONDOMINIUMS-INC.-v.-WHALEN-PROPERTIES,-LLC., 2016 WL 6788052, * 11+ (Md.2016).

INASMUCH, DUE TO THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, THE PETITIONER'S DIRECT APPEAL STANDS IN BLATANT VIOLATION OF THE HOLDINGS MADE BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT UNDER WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359 (U.S.2016). THUS, THE PETITIONER AND THE KING-KHALIFAH DEMAND SANCTIONS AND THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BE DEEMED IN FORFEITURE ON ALL ISSUES, CLAIMS AND DEFENSES ARGUED BY THE PETITIONER AND HIS CO-PETITIONERS FOR THE SAKE OF JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT MUST NOW MAKE AND GRANT ALL RELIEF SOUGHT ACTING UPON ITS ORIGINAL JURISDICTION, GRANT ALL RELIEF AND GIVE REVIEW AS IF NO REVIEW OCCURRED IN THE S.C. APPEALS COURT AT ALL WHERE BY THEIR ACTS OF MACHINATION REVIEW WITHIN THAT COURT IS NO LONGER REQUIRED, SEE ROSS v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850 (2016). THEREBY, THESE ISSUES ARE NOW LEGALLY ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, SOUTH-EASTERN-SITE-PREP, LLC v. ATLANTIC-COAST-BUILDERS-AND-CONTRACTORS, LLC, 394 S.C. 97, 713 S.E.2d 650 (S.C.App.2011); BLUE-SKY-TRAVEL-AND-TOURS, LLC v. AL-TAYYAR, --Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); U.S. v. HACKLEY, 662 F3d. 671 CA4 (Va.2011); PCS-NITROGEN, INC. v. ROSS-DEVELOPMENT-CORP. 127 F.Supp.3d. 611 (DSC.2015); CROUCH-CONST.-CO. INC. v. CAUSEY, 405 S.C. 155, 747 S.E.2d. 482 (S.C.2013); MASSI v. WASHINGTON-CO. 2013 WL 5410810 (DSC.2013).

(2) DID THE APPEALS COURT ERR, AND ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 6th. AND 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, BY DENYING THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, ENTRY INTO THE APPEALS PROCESS TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT DUE TO THE LITIGATION PRESENTED IN EXHIBIT(S) "TRUSTEE", "FOREIGN SOVERIGN", "GOURDINE #'S 1 AND 2", WHICH VOID THEIR JURISDICTION FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION?

THE PETITIONER BRINGS THE COURT AND PARTIES ATTENTION TO EXHIBIT(S) "GOURDINE #'S 1 AND 2", WITH EMPHASIS ON EXHIBIT GOURDINE # 2 PAGES [45] THROUGH [50] ISSUE # 5 OF THE GOURDINE

BRIEF. ALSO EXHIBIT(S) "TRUSTEE", AS WELL AS "FOREIGN SOVEREIGN" PAGES [36] THROUGH [70]. EVEN THOUGH THE GOURDINE BRIEF ARGUES HOW HE WAS DENIED COUNSEL OF CHOICE AT CRITICAL STAGES OF HIS PROCEEDINGS. THE SAME APPLIES DIRECTLY TO THE PETITIONER IN THE FORM OF DENIAL OF COUNSEL OF CHOICE VIA THE FIDUCIARY HEIR WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWERS BINDING ON THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA COURTS IN THEIR TOTALITY DUE TO THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 ALSO PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE S.C. CONSTITUTION WHERE BY THIS DENIAL THE COURT BURDENED THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT, VIOLATING DUE PROCESS LAW, VOIDING THEIR JURISDICTION FOR THAT DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. DUE TO THE DEVELOPMENT WHERE THEY COMPROMISED MY OTHER HIRED COUNSEL. THIS PREJUDICED THE PETITIONER CAUSING IRREPARABLE HARM TO THE DIRECT APPEAL PROCESS. THE DOCUMENTS AFOREMENTIONED AS EXHIBITS ARE SUFFICIENT TO SUBSTANTIATE AND ARGUE THIS ISSUE BY THE LITIGATION CONTAINED THEREIN.

(3) DID THE APPEALS COURT AND OTHER STATE COURTS ERR, AND ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION, ACTING AS LEGISLATORS, NOT JUDGES, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 4TH., 6th, 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, WHEN THE STATE WAS PERMITTED TO ESTABLISH THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY BY TESTIMONY ALONE, STRIPPING DEFENDANTS OF DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS WHERE THERE ARE ALLEGATIONS OF PLANTING OF EVIDENCE, WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN DIMINISHED OR PREVENTED HAD THE STATE COURTS ADHERED TO THE STATUTORY PROVISIONS PLACED INTO EFFECT BY THE STATE LEGISLATORS, CAUSING EXTREME PREJUDICE TO THE PETITIONER'S DUE PROCESS MATTERS IN VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE?

INSOMUCH, IN THE CASE OF WILEY-V.-CITY-OF-CHICAGO, 361 F3d. 994(7th.Cir.2004). YOU HAVE OFFICERS PLANTING DRUGS TO FRAME A PERSON FOR A CRIME WHICH WAS ALSO REPEATED PATTERN OF OFFICER BRODERICK INVOLVING DEFENDANTS WITHIN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS. THIS PATTERN OF PLANTING EVIDENCE CONTINUED UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE NATIONALLY WHERE IN COOK COUNTY ILL. SGT. RONALD WATTS AND HIS CREW BETWEEN 2003-2008 FRAMED DEFENDANTS BY PLANTING

DRUGS ON THEM. THIS IS A COMMON PRACTICE BY POLICE OFFICERS NATIONALLY. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONE STATE DROPPED (16) CASES THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 13, 2017 WHERE DRUGS WERE PLANTED ON THOSE DEFENDANTS BY STATE OFFICERS.

IN THE STATE OF BALTIMORE MD. ON NOVEMBER 20, 2016 VIDEO SHOWED OFFICERS PLANTING DRUGS AND OTHER EVIDENCE ON SHAMERE COLLINS WHERE THAT CASE HAD TO BE DROPPED. BALTIMORE POLICE COMMISSIONER KEVIN DAVIS SAID THIS WAS A CONSTANT PATTERN THAT HAD TO BE CORRECTED. MARILYN J. MOSBY, THE STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF BALTIMORE ON JANUARY 24, 2017 RELEASED VIDEO DISMISSING DOZENS OF CASES SHOWING OFFICERS PLANTING EVIDENCE. YOU HAVE VIDEO BEING SHOWN NATIONALLY OF OFFICERS PLANTING GUNS AND KNIVES AFTER KILLING INNOCENT VICTIMS.

IN OTHER RELATED NEWS, NOT FAKE NEWS, YOU HAVE OFFICERS IN VIDEO, SCHEDULED TO PARTICIPATE IN OVER (123) CASES WHICH HINGE SOLELY ON OFFICER TESTIMONY, WHERE THOSE CASES HAD TO BE THROWN OUT IN BALTIMORE DUE TO CREDIBILITY ISSUES AND THE PLANTING OF EVIDENCE. ITS UBIQUITOUS. SIMILAR CASES ARE OCCURRING IN NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, PHILADELPHIA, CALIFORNIA, TEXAS AND THE LIST GOES ON AND ON. SIMILAR EVENTS HAPPENED IN THE PETITIONER'S CASE. DUE TO THE STATE COURTS GOING AGAINST THE STATUTES SET INTO PLACE TO ADDRESS THIS CONSTANT THREAT OF ARBITRARY STATE ACTION BY REQUIRING THAT THE CHAIN BE ESTABLISHED BY SIGNED AND NOTARIZED FORMS. THE PETITIONER WAS PREJUDICED IN HIS ABILITY TO ESTABLISH THE CLAIM OF PLANTING OF EVIDENCE DUE TO THE COURTS ASSERTING THAT THE CHAIN CAN BE ESTABLISHED BY TESTIMONY ALONE. THIS STRIPPED ME OF PROTECTIONS PLACED AROUND ME BY THE STATE LEGISLATORS CAUSING SERVE DAMAGE WHERE THE STATE COURTS ACTED AS LEGISLATORS, NOT JUDGES, GOING AGAINST THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT AND PROTECTION PLACED UPON THE PETITIONER BY THE STATUTE, DENYING ME THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. THE CLAIM AND LITIGATION FOR THIS ISSUE IS FURTHER SEEN IN EXHIBIT(S) "CHAIN OF CUSTODY 1 AND 2".

(4) DID THE APPEALS COURT ERR IN THEIR DETERMINATION, AND DID THEY ABUSE THEIR DISCRETION, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 4th., 6th., AND 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED BY THE COURT(S) VALIDATING THE SEARCH WARRANT AS IS ARGUED IN EXHIBIT(S), "SEARCH WARRANTS #'S 1 AND 2"?

INASMUCH, IT IS THE PETITIONER'S CONTENTION THAT THE COURT(S) ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION BY NOT INVALIDATING THE SEARCH WARRANT THEREBY ALLOWING THE EVIDENCE TO ENTER INTO THE COURT RECORD. IMMEDIATELY AFTER TRIAL THE JUDGE MADE HIS DETERMINATION AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER THE TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES TO VALIDATE THE SEARCH WARRANT AND MAKE HIS FINAL RULING PROBABLE CAUSE EXISTED, WHICH ALLOWED THE EVIDENCE TO COME IN. (SEE TT.PP. 48-49).

SUBSEQUENTLY, AFTER THE SUPPRESSION HEARING THE PROSECUTION'S OPENING ARGUMENT AT THE BEGINNING OF THE HEARING CALLED UPON HER FIRST WITNESS INV. COBB (JENNIFER HABBSTAD) FOR TESTIMONY AND PRESENTMENT OF EVIDENCE. (SEE TT.PP.53). THE PETITIONER'S TRIAL LAWYER PROPERLY OBJECTED TO THE INTRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE AND LAID THE FOUNDATION THAT THE STATE HAS NOT ESTABLISHED THE CHAIN OF EVIDENCE ON THE GROUNDS INV. COBB'S TESTIMONY WAS "HEARSAY" AND WAS INSUFFICIENT BECAUSE SHE WAS THE RECOVERY AGENT AT THE END OF THE CHAIN AND NOT THE OFFICER WHO FOUND THE SEIZED DRUGS. (SEE TT.PP. 57, 59-62, 67).

BY THESE EVENTS THAT OCCURRED BEFORE THE COURT, THE COURT THEREBY MADE A RULING OF LAW ON THIS ISSUE DETERMINING THAT THE DRUGS COULD NOT COME INTO EVIDENCE RIGHT NOW UNTIL SOMEBODY COULD COME IN HERE AND SAY THEY PICKED UP THE DRUGS AND HANDED IT TO HER. (SEE TT.PP. 62).

THUS, BY THIS ACTION, THE JUDGE DID INDEED MAKE A RULING ON THE ADMISSIBILITY OF THE EVIDENCE THAT THE CHAIN WAS INSUFFICIENT AND NOT PROPERLY ESTABLISHED AS FACTS OF EVIDENCE, BY THE TRIAL JUDGE'S OWN DETERMINATION.

THEN THE STATE RESTED AND THE COURT PROCEEDINGS STOPPED

AND ABOUT AN HOUR LATER THE PROSECUTION CALLED UPON DET. OLSON AND DET. SUMNER TO PROVIDE TESTIMONY WHERE THERE IS QUESTION OF PLANTING OF EVIDENCE OR THEY BEING ACTUALLY THE ONE WHO FIRST FOUND THE EVIDENCE AND THERE WAS NO INITIAL FORM SIGNED TO SUBSTANTIATE OR AID IN PROVING EITHER PRODUCING THIS MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE. SGT. BRANDON RATCLIFF, PARTY TO THE WARRANT, WAS DEMOTED AS A NARCOTIC AGENT FOR POLICE MISCONDUCT SIMILAR TO THE BALTIMORE AND ILLINOIS OFFICERS JUSTIFYING THE CLAIM HE POTENTIALLY LIED TO OBTAIN THE WARRANT IN THE FIRST PLACE WHICH GIVES FURTHER REASON AS TO WHY THEY FAILED TO INITIATE THE PROPER FORMS IN DISCOVERY OF THE ALLEGED DRUGS. THIS DEMOTION OCCURRED A YEAR BEFORE I WENT TO TRIAL.

NEVERTHELESS, LET THE RECORD REFLECT THAT THE JUDGE DID INDEED MAKE A RULING ON THE ADMISSIBILITY OF THE EVIDENCE BY INSTRUCTING THE PROSECUTOR INSOMUCH THAT THE CHAIN WAS INSUFFICIENT. AND BY THESE TWO ELEMENTS BEING ESTABLISHED THAT THE PETITIONER'S TRIAL LAWYER PROPERLY OBJECTED TO THE INTRODUCTION OF THE EVIDENCE AND TO THE HEARSAY OF THE FIRST WITNESS TESTIMONY NOT ESTABLISHING THE CHAIN BECAUSE SHE DID NOT FIND THE DRUGS, AND THEN FOR THE JUDGE TO MAKE A RULING ON THE ADMISSIBILITY OF THE EVIDENCE TO BE INSUFFICIENT WHEN THE PROSECUTION TRIED TO HAVE THE DRUGS ADMITTED WITHOUT ESTABLISHING THE CHAIN. WITH ALL THAT BEING SAID THE PETITIONER'S ATTORNEY SUBSEQUENT TO THE OTHER OFFICERS TESTIMONY AFTER THE JUDGE ALREADY MADE HIS RULING ON THE ADMISSIBILITY PRIOR, WAS NOT REQUIRED TO CONTINUALLY KEEP OBJECTING BECAUSE THE ATTORNEY OBJECTED (3) DIFFERENT TIMES TO THE INTRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE WHICH CAUSED THE JUDGE TO MAKE A RULING ON THE ADMISSIBILITY OF THE EVIDENCE. THEREFORE, THE PETITIONER'S TRIAL LAWYER WAS NOT REQUIRED TO RENEW HIS OBJECTION TO THE DRUGS BEING ADMITTED INTO EVIDENCE AND THE JUDGE WAS NOT REQUIRED TO MAKE A FINAL RULING TO PRESERVE THE ISSUE, AND THE TWO ELEMENTS STANDING ALONE PRESERVE THE ISSUE FOR REVIEW ON APPEAL. LASTLY, IT IS THE PETITIONER'S CLAIM THAT BY SUCH INJUSTICE, HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED WHERE THIS MATTER RELATED TO THE SEARCH WARRANT AND EVIDENCE BECOMES JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE BEING ARGUED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND DO NOT HAVE TO BE PRE-

SERVED BY A TIMELY OBJECTION, VOIDING JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, WHICH CAN BE RAISED FOR THE FIRST TIME ON APPEAL, STATE-v.-TRAPP, 420 S.C. 217, 801 S.E.2d. 742(S.C.2017); SOUTH CAROLINA-DEPT.-OF-SOCIAL-SERVICES-v.-TRAN, 418 S.C. 308, 792 S.E.2d. 254(S.C.App.2016); U.S.-v.-\$41,320-U.S.-CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240; WHITE-v.-MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280 (DSC.2014); U.S.-v.-ALADEKCHA, 2010 WL 4054267(D.C.Md.2010); BROWN-v.-U.S., 2014 WL 2871398(DSC.2014); STATE-v.-WOOD, NO. 3900 Dec. 6, 2004(S.C.Ct.App.); STATE-v.-MUELLER, 319 S.C. 266, (Ct.App.1995); STATE-v.-FORRESTER, 343 S.C. at 642, 541 S.E.2d. at 840; STATE-v.-WILES, 383 S.C. 151(2009); RENO-v.-RENO, 249 Ga. 855(1982); STATE-v.-MOORE, 357 S.C. 458(2004).

(5) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 13th., 14th., 15th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, REGARDING THE INDICTMENT(S) AS CONSTRUCTED, BY THE LANGUAGE AND OR CHARGE CONTAINED THEREIN, WHICH DID CREATE AND OR FORM CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTION(S), THAT TOOK AWAY THE PETITIONER'S PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, AND AUTOMATICALLY SHIFT THE BURDEN OF PERSUASION TO THE DEFENDANT, IN REGARD TO THE CRUCIAL ELEMENTS OF DISPUTE, PREDETERMINING IN ADVANCE THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS?

THIS ISSUE AND LITIGATION IS SEEN WITHIN EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 2", ON PAGES (1) THROUGH (21). THIS ISSUE APPLIES TO MY CASE, THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ALL CO-PETITIONERS. IT IS SOUGHT CLASS ACTION REVIEW.

(6) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, BY THE INDICTMENT FOR TRAFFICKING COCAINE'S FAILURE TO PROPERLY ALLEGE THE DRUG AMOUNTS AND THE SUB SECTION THE PETITIONER WAS SAID TO HAVE VIOLATED; THE INDICTMENT FOR POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE MARIJUANA'S FAILURE TO PROPERLY

LIST THE DRUG AMOUNT AND SUB SECTION ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN VIOLATED; THE INDICTMENT FOR POSSESSION OF A FIREARM DURING THE COMMISSION OF A VIOLENT CRIME ALLEGING, "DID POSSESS A .45 CALIBER HAND GUN OR VISIBLY DISPLAY WHAT APPEARED TO BE A KNIFE DURING THE COMMISSION, OR ATTEMPTED COMMISSION, OF TRAFFICKING*** **", GIVING WAY TO CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT OF THE INDICTMENTS, IN THE BODY OF THE CHARGING INSTRUMENT?

THE LITIGATION FOR THIS ISSUE IS SEEN IN EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 2", ON PAGES (28) THROUGH (35). EVEN THOUGH GOURDINE ARGUED THIS LITIGATION FOR HIS INDICTMENT DEFECTS RELATED TO HIS ATTEMPTED MURDER CHARGE. THE CRUCIAL ELEMENTS RELATED TO MY DRUG CHARGE, DRUG AMOUNTS WITH THEIR LIMITATIONS, SUB SECTIONS ARE ARGUED IN THE SAME VEIN. THUS, THE LITIGATION IN EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 2", ON PAGES (28) THROUGH (35) IS SUFFICIENT TO ADDRESS MY INDICTMENT DEFECT ISSUES. THE INDICTMENT DEFECT ISSUE IS ALSO A CLASS ACTION ISSUE, ALSO BEING ARGUED FOR THE KING-KHALIFAH, WHERE HIS INDICTMENT DOES NOT PROPERLY LIST THE "TIME AND PLACE" OF THE ASSAULT AND DEATH FOR THE CHARGE OF MURDER WHERE THE ASSAULT AND DEATH OCCURRED ON TWO DIFFERENT DATES IN TWO DIFFERENT COUNTIES. ITS BEING ARGUED FOR THE DEFECTS IN THE INDICTMENTS OF THE CO-PETITIONERS.

(7) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, AS WELL AS RULES OF COURT, RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, THE S.C. CONSTITUTION, AS WELL AS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION BEING MADE VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, AND OR THEY WERE PROHIBITED FROM ENACTING AND OR INVOKING AND OR CONTINUING THEIR SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTIONARY "[P]OWERS" DUE TO THE "[P]ROCEDURAL [D]EFECT" IN THAT THERE WAS NO "[W]RITTEN"(EMPHASIS ADDED) ORDER OF CONTINUANCE OBTAINED PURSUANT TO ARTICLE V § 4 OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONSTITUTION?

THE LITIGATION FOR THIS ISSUE IS SEEN IN EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 2", ON PAGES (52) THROUGH (61). IT APPLIES TO THE PETI-

TIONER WHERE I FALL UNDER THE RULE BEFORE THE 2013 REVISION
THOUGH THAT REVISION IS TO BE RENDERED VOID AND INVALID DUE
TO VIOLATION OF THE HOLDINGS MADE UNDER EX-PARTE-VIRGINIA, 100
U.S. 339(1880). I WAS ARRESTED ON JUNE 11, 2011. THE CASE WASN'T
CONCLUDED UNTIL MAY 13, 2014. IT APPLIES TO THE KING-KHALIFAH
WHERE HE SPENT 4½ YEARS IN THE COUNTY JAIL AS A PRETRIAL DETAINEE
FALLING UNDER THE OLD LAW CONVICTED IN 2004. THIS IS A CLASS
ACTION ISSUE THAT WAS ALREADY DEFAULTED ON BY THE S.C. ATTORNEY
GENERAL AND S.C. SUPREME COURT AND JUDGES UNDER CASE 2013-CP-
400-0084 AS WERE ALL ISSUES ARGUED FOR CLASS ACTION IN THIS
DOCUMENT. RES JUDICATA AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHES TO ALL
OF THE CLASS ACTION SOUGHT ISSUES. YOU ARE GIVEN NOTICE.

(8) DID THE TRIAL COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER'S
5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, AND HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS
VIOLATED, BY THE TRIAL COURT AND OR PLEA COURT ALLOWING CONSTRUC-
TIVE AMENDMENT OF THE INDICTMENT(S) AT THE PETITIONER'S TRIAL
AND OR PLEA HEARING?

THE LITIGATION FOR THIS ISSUE IS FOUND WITHIN EXHIBIT,
"GOURDINE # 2", ON PAGES (65) THROUGH (77). LIKE GOURDINE AND
THE KING-KHALIFAH, CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT OF THE INDICTMENTS
OCCURRED ON MY CRUCIAL ELEMENTS AND OR FACTS WHICH WAS NOT PASSED
UPON BY THE GRAND JURY IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW. THIS
IS A CLASS ACTION ISSUE ALSO AS SUCH DID OCCUR RELATED TO THE
CO-PETITIONERS CASES.

(9) DID THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN STATE-V.-GENTRY-SUPRA
ERR, ENGAGING KNOWINGLY, INTENTIONALLY IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON
THE COURT, IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ESSENTIALLY ESTABLISH MODERN
DAY SLAVERY IN VIOLATION OF THE RICO ACT AND ANTI-PEONAGE ACT,
AND ABUSED THEIR DISCRETIONARY POWERS, WHICH THEY EVEN CONSPIRED
TO TAKE AWAY OUR RIGHT TO VOTE, AND OR DONE SURREPTITIOUSLY,
IN VIOLATION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT. AND IN SUCH, THE COURT'S
JURISDICTION WAS MADE VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, AND THE

STATE COURTS WERE PROHIBITED FROM ENACTING AND OR INVOKING AND OR CONTINUING THEIR SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTIONARY POWERS, EVEN THOUGH THEY DO INDEED POSSESS SUCH POWER VIA STATE LEGISLATIVE STATUTES AND OR CONGRESSIONAL INTENT, DUE TO THE INDICTMENT DEFECTS ARGUED WITHIN THIS CASE, IN VIOLATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 4th., 5th., 6th., 13th., 14th., 15th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, ALSO 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(2), 1985(3), 1986; 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242, 1001 AND THE LAWS OF DUE PROCESS?

THE LITIGATION FOR THIS ISSUE IS SEEN WITHIN EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 2", ON PAGES (84) THROUGH (115). WE ARE ARGUING AGAINST THE PRECEDENT RELATED TO MANY OF THESE ISSUES INCLUDING THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE. THIS ISSUE APPLIES TO THE PETITIONER, THE KING-KHALIFAH, THEIR CO-PETITIONERS AND IS A CLASS ACTION SOUGHT ISSUE.

(10) DID THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ERR, AND WAS THE PETITIONER AS A BENEFICIARY OF "THE TRUST", AND THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AS A BENEFICIARY OF "THE TRUST", 1st., 4th., 5th., 6th., 14th. AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATED, AS WELL AS ARTICLE IV § 2, ALSO THEIR DUE PROCESS RIGHTS VIOLATED, AS WELL AS THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, ALSO ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, BY THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA VIA THE SUPREME COURT, PERMITTING SAME SEX MARRIAGE, WHEN SUCH WAS GIVEN TO THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS THAT IS UNDER "CONTRACT" VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION, WHERE SUCH ACTION VIOLATED THE TERMS AND WOULD BURDEN THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS; AND MUST ALL RELIEF SOUGHT VIA THE WRIT OF COMMISSION BE GRANTED?

THE LITIGATION FOR THIS ISSUE IS SEEN IN BOTH EXHIBIT(S) "TRUSTEE" AND "FOREIGN SOVEREIGN". WE WANT OUR GOD'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY BACK GIVEN TO THE KING-KHALIFAH AS AN INHERITANCE VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION ESTABLISHED BY "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND

ALL OTHER RELIEF DEMANDED IN THE WRIT OF COMMISSION.

CONCLUSION

INSOMUCH, I, AS APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE BY AUTHORITY GIVEN TO ME BY THE KING-KHALIFAH HEREBY INVOKE AND EXERCISE ALL SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN BY WRIT OF COMMISSION AND FILE THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI ALSO AS AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS. YOU HAVE ILLEGALLY SEIZED, EXECUTED, ATTACHED THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE CROWN AND SOLE CORPORATION. THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL MUST RESPOND, NOT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. STILL, THE ATTORNEYS FOR BOTH OF YOU WHO IS ONE IN THE SAME PERSON, MUST DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY TIMELY SOUGHT TO DEFEAT THE DEFAULT AND THE VOIDING OF JURISDICTION BY UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 OR ALL RIGHTS, TITLES AND PRIVILEGES STAND. IN SUCH, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, NOR ANY STATE MAY EXCLUDE A PERSON, NAMELY I AND THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY BINDING UPON THIS COURT BY THE DEFAULT AND CONTRACT PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10, BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED, OR TO ME BY WRIT OF COMMISSION, TO PRACTICE LAW (ei. A.G., LAWGIVER, ATTORNEY, JUDGE, LEGISLATOR OF GOD WHEN THESE TOO ARE OUR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS WITH RESTRICTIONS), OR ANY OTHER OCCUPATION GIVEN TO HIM BY "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" (ei. FIDUCIARY, KING, KHALIFAH), IN A MANNER FOR REASONS THAT CONTRAVENE THE DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, POWER AND AUTHORITY GIVEN TO HIM OR IN A MANNER THAT VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE OR ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THE ATTORNEY, FIDUCIARY AND JUDICIAL DUTY COMMANDS IT, 29 U.S.C.A. § 1104; SPIRES-v.-SCHOOLS, --F.Supp. 3d.--, 2017 WL 4174774(DSC.2017); FIFTH-THIRD-BANCORP.-v.-DUDEN-HOEFFER, 132 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d. 457, 82 U.S.L.W. 4578(U.S. 2014); PEREZ-v.-CHIMES-DISTRICT-OF-COLUMBIA-INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6124679(D.C.Md.2016); McKELVEY-v.-REYNOLDS, 2016 WL 6518337(DSC.2016); IN-RE:-CLEAN-FUELS,-LLC. 2014 WL 2987330 (N.C.2014).


THE KING-KHALIFAH FULFILLED HIS DUTY BY THIS NATION'S DUE PROCESS LAWS AND PEACEFULLY, AS A NON-COMBATANT, FILED LEGAL ACTION TO ESTABLISH THE RIGHTS BEFORE THE GLOBAL NATIONS. HE GAVE ALL REQUIRED PARTIES FAIR AND PROPER NOTICE. HE PROPERLY SERVED THE PARTIES AND BROUGHT THE MATTERS TO THEM UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 TO WHICH THEY APPEARED AND WHERE HE WAS SUBJECT TO EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, AND THEY DEFAULTED IN THAT STATE CASE AND IT WAS REMOVED TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT CREATING THOSE PENDING PARALLEL CASES. TO EXCLUDE ME FROM ACTING AS A.G. AND JAHJAH AL MAHDI FROM PRACTICE OF LAW AS KING, KHALIFAH AND LAWGIVER OF GOD WITH HIS SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY GIVEN VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION BINDING UPON THIS COURT BY CONTRACT; TO HINDER ME AS A.G. OR HIM AS FIDUCIARY HEIR ESTABLISHED BY DUE PROCESS VIA CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, JUST LIKE YOUR NATION DID FOR THEM SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHRITES WHEN IT CAME TO SAME SEX MARRIAGES, WOULD VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED. TO THIS WE VEHEMENTLY OBJECT. AS A MATTER OF LAW LET IT BE KNOWN IN AND FOR THE RECORD. THE A.G. AND KING-KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, DEMAND THAT THE JUDGES OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT PRODUCE YOUR BOND OR OATH OF OFFICE OR WRIT OF COMMISSION AND CITING OF LAW THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT JUDGES OR THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL CAN VIOLATE THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE DECREES OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH WHO BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS IS SOVEREIGN WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY BY CONTRACT AND DEFAULT OR STAND DOWN!!! THIS POWER IS HEREBY INVOKED, SCHWARE v. BOARD OF EXAM OF STATE OF N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 72 S.Ct. 752, 64 A.L.R.2d. 288, 1 L.Ed.2d. 796(U.S.1957); FACIRE v. SULLIVAN, 2017 WL 3710066(D.C.Nev.2017); VIRGINIA BOARD OF MEDICINE v. ZACKRISON, 67 Va. App. 461, 796 S.E.2d. 866(2017); DOE v. ROGERS, 139 F.Supp.3d. 120(D.C.C.2015); BOLLS v. VIRGINIA BD. OF EXAMINERS, 811 F.Supp.2d. 1260(E.D.Va.2011); IN RE: GREEN, 980 F2d. 590(9th.Cir.1992); COOPER v. AARON, 358 U.S. 78 (U.S.1958).

THE GENERAL RULE IS THAT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE

OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION, THOUGH HAVING THE FORM AND NAME OF LAW, IT IS IN REALITY NO LAW, BUT IS WHOLLY VOID AND INEFFECTIVE FOR ANY PURPOSE, SINCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY DATES FROM THE TIME OF ITS ENACTMENT...IN LEGAL CONTEMPLATION, IT IS INOPERATIVE AS IF IT HAD NEVER BEEN PASSED BEING JURISDICTIONAL EFFECTING THE FOUNDATION AND WHOLE OF THE PROCEEDINGS...SINCE AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW IS VOID, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE FOLLOWS THAT IT IMPOSES NO DUTY, CONFERS NO RIGHTS, CREATES NO OFFICE (JUDICIAL FOR YOU), BESTOWS NO POWER (JURISDICTION) OR AUTHORITY ON ANYONE, AFFORDS NO PROTECTION (YOU ARE NOT IMMUNE ONCE NOTIFIED OF THE PROBLEM AND YOU FAIL TO CORRECT) AND JUSTIFIES NO ACTS (THE GENTRY CASE AND ALL OTHER MATTERS ARGUED) PERFORMED UNDER IT...A VOID ACT CANNOT BE LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH A VALID ONE. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW CANNOT OPERATE TO SUPERSEDE AN EXISTING LAW (THIS MEANS THE LAW ESTABLISHED BEFORE GENTRY STANDS). INDEED INSOFAR AS A STATUTE OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION RUN COUNTER TO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE LAND (ei. THE CONSTITUTION, EX PARTE VIRGINIA, SCHWARE), IT IS SUPERSEDED THEREBY, NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND NO COURTS ARE BOUND TO ENFORCE IT. ALL LAWS, RULES, STATUTES AND PRACTICES WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION ARE NULL AND VOID, BONNETT-v. VALLER, 116 N.W. 885, 136 Wis. 193(1908); NORTON-v.-SHELBY-COUNTY 118 U.S. 425(U.S.1886); MARBURY-v.-MADISON, 5th. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; MONTGOMERY-v.-LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016); GETT-OUTDOORS-LLC.-v.-CONSOLIDATION-CITY-OF-INDIANAPOLIS***, 187 F.Supp.3d. 1002, 1012, S.D. ILL.; HILL-v.-SNYDER, 821 F3d. 763, 765+ (6th.Cir.MICH.); PEOPLE v.-SOLO, N.E.3d., 2017 WL 1838423(2017).

RESPECTFULLY,
JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND

NOVEMBER 14, 2017



THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

NOV 30 2017

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2014-001051

S.C. SUPREME COURT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2017-002108

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

VS.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND,

PETITIONER(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, DO HERBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED, A COPY OF A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI, ITS APPENDIX ETC., ON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT P.O. BOX 11330 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211, ON THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID OR CERTIFIED, BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON NOVEMBER 23, 2017.

NOVEMBER 23, 2017

RESPECTFULLY,

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND

x Joseph Rowland