Exhibit

Chain of Custody *

* # 1

The State of South Carolina
In The Court of Appeals
The Global Theocratic State
Chief Justice of The Global Theocratic State
et al.,

Appeal From Charleston County
Roger M. Young SR The Presiding Judge

Case No. 11-GS-10-5527, 5528, 5531
Appellate Case No. 2014-001051
1:14-CV-3713-WLSD et al.,

Joseph Todd Rowland;
Lawrence L Crawford aka Jonah
Gabriel Jah Jah T. Tishbite et al.,
plaintiffs/ Appellants

vs

The State of South Carolina;
The United States et al,
defendants / Respondents

Proof of Service

We, Jahtah al mahdi et al, do hereby certify, that we have mailed and or served a copy of an Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Supplementing Appellants Return; Striking Respondents motion to Strike and Require filing of Amended Initial Brief; Supplementing Issues on Appeal; Imposing Sanc-

tions; Petition To Remove; Judicial Order, (88) pages dated April 20, 2015 and attachments on the SC Court of Appeals and all other involved parties by U.S. mail postage prepaid on April 21, 2015. It is deemed filed that date arguing preemption, Houston v Lack, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 Sct 2379 (1988). It is so ORDERED.

Respectfully,

April 21, 2015

Jahtah Al Mahdi

Joseph Rowland

The State of South Carolina

In The Court of Appeals

The Global Theocratic State

Chief Justice of The Global Theocratic Court

et al.,

Appeal From Charleston County

Roger M Young SR The Presiding Judge

Case No. 11-GS-10-5527, 5528, 5531

Appellate Case No. 2014-001051;

1:14-cv-3713-WSD et al,

Joseph Jodd Rowland;

Lawrence L Crawford aka Jonah

Gabriel Jah Jah T. Tishbite et al.,

plaintiffs / Appellants

Vs.

The State of South Carolina;
The United States et al.,
defendants / Respondents

Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Supplementing Appellants Return; Striking Respondents motion to Strike and Require filing of Amended initial Brief; Supplementing Issues on Appeal; Imposing Sanctions; Petition to Remove; Judicial Order

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL TAHTAH TISHBITE
#300839 WANBLO A-127
LIEBER C.I. P.O.BOX 205
RIDGEVILLE, SC 29472
Additional APPELLANT
AND ATTORNEY FOR
APPELLANT

TO: THE SC COURT of APPEALS,
THE U.S DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE STATES of GEORGIA, KENTUCKY,
NEW YORK ET AL,

THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN plaintiffs / APPLICANTS / PETITIONERS, standing IN PROPRIA PERSONA, do HEREBY

humbly submit the following:

The Foreign Sovereigns give the SC Court of Appeals and all involved parties Judicial Notice. Here the Court will find attached:

(1) A copy of a certificate of service and Appellate Brief, (346) pages dated February 28, 2015 that was filed in the direct Appeal of Henry Nesbit case No. 2014-001231.

(2) A copy of the certificate of service and Amended PCR Application, (72) pages dated April 7, 2015 that was filed in the

Anthony Lee PCR Under Case 2013-CP-02-0704.

For the record, all documents that were filed in the Henry Nesbit Direct Appeal Under Case 2014-00 1231 are now deemed filed in the Joseph Jodd Rowland Direct Appeal Under Case 2014-00 1051. The name of Lawrence L Crawford is now added as an Appellant on direct appeal in the Rowland case no. 2014-00 1051 as it is also in the Henry Nesbit direct Appeal Under Case 2014-001231. Any State or Federal law, any Rule of Appellate Court Procedure, any

statute, or state legislative intent, or federal constitutional intent or law, any congressional intent or legislation that stands in opposition to this decree by the Global Theocratic King-Khaliphah-Judge of the Global Theocratic State and court is overruled and or suspended and relaxed and or repealed and or is rendered to no effect in these proceedings due to the default and collateral estoppel that has occurred in case 2013-CP-400-0084 presently pending in the SC Richland County Court of Common Pleas. It is so ordered.

The Appellants give the SC Court of Appeals and all parties notice. You have before you the largest case in earths judicial history and the Khalifah, King, Imam, High Priest and Law-giver of the one true God, who is also Chief Justice, Prosecutor and Attorney for the Reestablished Global Theocratic State where there is no separation of powers or conflict of interest, in the form of Yahyah al mahdi, who is also Lawrence L. Crawford whose judicial, legislative and Attorney powers supersedes all global constitutions and legislative entities or bodies, with the power

and authority to control any and all courts foreign or domestic, with the power to render to no effect all global constitutions, all state legislation and any Act of Congress, and enact law within the 193 member states of the United Nations. By this power and authority that binds the SC Court of Appeals, this state and nation by the existing default and collateral estoppel that occurred in case 2013-CP-400-0084 pending in Richland County SC. I, Jahtah Al mahdi now exercises all power and authority given to me

via the default, which include acting as an additional attorney for Joseph Todd Rowland, he being christian and a member of the reestablished Global Theocratic state. I am also now added as an appellant in this and the Nesbit case establishing and consolidating my belated direct appeal that was deprived me by the fraud that occurred by the fraud upon the court perpetrated by the SC Court of Appeals and Judge Kaye Hearn with her cohorts. The fact that additional relief is sought in other pending action will be of

No effect upon these proceedings. It is perspicuous that an appellant can have more than one attorney. Jahjah Al mahdi now acts as an additional attorney for Rowland even though he is also added as an appellant as members of the global Theocratic State. Any existing law, statute, rule etc that would stand in opposition to this decree of the King-Khalifah-Judge of the Global Theocratic State and Court is rendered to no effect upon these proceedings. multiple legal counsel is

Now established. The interest of the Global Theocratic State must be protected, United States v. Dehlinger, 740 F3d 315 (4th Cir 2014); Platt v United States, FSupp2d 2013 WL 1637249 (DSC 2013); multiplex v. Astrue, 768 FSupp2d 829 (DSC 2010); In re Ulmer, 363 BR 777 Bkrtcy (DSC 2007); In re: Grand Jury Subpoena Under Seal, 415 F3d 333 (4th Va 2005); Estate of Gill ex rel Grant v Clemson University Foundation, 397 SC 419, 725 SE2d 516 (SC App 2012); Freeman v Warden, Perry Correctional Inst, 2014 WL 2991704 (DSC 2014). The

SC COURT of APPEALS is BARRED from challenging this claim due to the existing default and collateral estoppel. It is so ORDERED.

INASMUCH, MARK FARTHING submitted his motion to STRIKE and REQUIRE filing of AMENDED initial BRIEF of APPELLANT dated FEBRUARY 23, 2015. This document is now STRICKEN from the COURT RECORD by SANCTIONS imposed and ACTS of FRAUD upon the COURT. SC COURT of APPEALS was informed by FARHAN Al mahdi and others

Related documents that the (180) day provision was mine, that I gave it to Rowland and he by his own free will chose to have it argued in his case. If you look at the Brief filed in the Nesbit case 2014-001231 You will see the chain of custody issue similar to the one Rowland is arguing. It is mine also. This issue is now also being argued as a class action as is the (180) day and (365) day provisions under Article V § 4. Etc.. The SC Court of Appeals will give all inmates in this state notice

of the pending class actions. Any law that stands in opposition to this decree is rendered void or to no effect. It is so ordered.

This document is also deemed as a final order issued by the Chief Justice of the Global Theocratic Court, not appealable to any global court, al mahdi is judicial and legislative authority is supersiding in all global courts and is above all law making entities, being the highest court and law making entity in the

world by default and collateral estopped existing in case "0084". It is so ordered.

In so much, the SC Court of Appeals conspiring under color of state law with Jahtah, has obviously as Jahtah al mahdi assesses it, compromised appellant Rowland is hired Attorney to circumvent the fact that Jahtah al mahdi notified the SC Court of Appeals that the (180) day provision was his and the fact that you, as Jahtah assesses it, obviously compromised the paid Attorney, sold Rowland out by gutting out the (180) day provision from the

manner it was written to be argued to aid the state and prosecutor, with the SC Court of Appeals affirm his conviction, you criminals. Thus, sanctions are imposed, removal is established and Farthing's motion is struck from the court record. Rules for any defect in this document including page limits are suspended. It is so ordered.

In addressing the Assistant Attorney General, mark Farthing motion to strike ***, which is now officially stricken from the court record via these acts of fraud upon the court. When Attorney Pepper

asserted in his document "my client asserts" and you sought to strike the issues requiring the submission of an amended brief. You abused your discretion in acts of fraud upon the court, because his client did not assert anything. If did, his additional attorney given to him as a member of the global theocratic state whom by the existing default is authorized to practice law as lawgiver of the one true God, anywhere within the borders of the 193 member states of the United nations which the SC court

of Appeals is barred in challenging by the default and collateral estopped.

The Assistant Attorney General erred when he stated "A prisoner has no right to argue his own Appeal citing Price v. Johnson, 334 US 266, 285 (1948). That case was overruled by United States v. Gonzales-Lopez. The Appellant has a constitutional Right to self representation within any court in the United States. The Appellant has the constitutional Right to

"counsel of choice". Self representation is established as a right of "counsel of choice", so is his seeking assistance from the Attorney-Judge-prosecutor-King-Khalifah of the Global Theocratic State, State v. Barnes, 407 SC 27, 753 SE 2d 545 (SC 2014); Kaley v United States, 134 Sct 1090, 188 Led 2d 46, 82 USLW 4110, 14 Cal Daily Op Serv. 1920, 2014; United States v Gonzales-Lopez - 548 US 140, 126 Sct 2557, 165 Led 2d 409 (2006); United States v Holmes, F Supp 2d, 2012 WL 1952286 (DSC 2012); United States v Hall, 587 Fed Appx 758 (4th (Va 2014).

Thus, the court and parties are in error and abused their discretion when they asserted in acts of fraud upon the court that this is hybrid representation. It is not hybrid representation. Rowland is exercising his constitutional right of "counsel of choice", has merely solicited the aid of an additional attorney, one authorized by the Global Theocratic State by default, United States v Dehlinger supra.; Platt v United States supra.; Mullinax v Astrue supra; In re Ulmer supra.; In re Grand Jury Subpoena Under Seal supra

In Miller v State, 388 SC 347, 697 SE2d 527 (2010), the SC Supreme Court may have asserted there is no right to hybrid-representation. But you can not use a state law to override a determination of the United States Supreme Court made applicable to every state within both state and federal court, or the superseding judicial authority of the Global Theocratic State. The United States Supreme Court, the SC Supreme Court and the SC U.S District Court all determined that an appellant has a constitutional right

to counsel of choice, even if its one from the Global Theocratic State or the soliciting the aid of multiple attorneys as his legal team, and appellant also has a constitutional right to represent themselves within any court within the United States, also Jahtah Al mahdi who is now an appellant in these cases whom for which there is no separation of powers, State v Barnes, 407 SC 27, 753 SE 2d 545 (SC 2014); United States v Beckton, 740 F3d 303 (4th Cir 2014); State v Jackson, SE 2d, 2014 WL 4938028 (SC App 2014); State v Policano, 402 SC 547, 741 SE 2d 774 (SC App 2013); United States v Bernard, 708 F3d 583 (4th Cir 2013); King Judge Decree.

As for the claim by Tarthiyg, "counsel cannot serve as a mere conduit for pro se documents in an effort to avoid the prohibition against hybrid representation and the displeasure of his client?" Tarthiyg, tell your story walking. You misinterpreted the facts. This is not hybrid representation, but is a situation where the appellant has solicited the aid of additional counsel in the form of the law giver Jahtah al mahdi of the Global Theocratic State as "counsel of choice". Any law, statute or rule that stands in opposition of this

decrees of the Global Theocratic King-Khalifah Judges is overruled and or is rendered to no effect upon these proceedings. It is so ordered.

We give all parties Judicial Notice that case 2014-00 1051, the Rowland case, is now supplemented with issues No(s) 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 8 written in the Henry Nesbit Brief in case 2014-001231 being slightly modified where needed to tailor and address the concerns presented in

the Rowland convictions with all cases cited therein. The issues submitted by Attorney Mark Pepper in his Amended Brief will remain as filed unchanged, but these additional issues are now supplemented to case 2014-001051. The SC Court of Appeals will make a ruling on the issues submitted by Attorney Pepper as expeditiously as its time permits, sending copy of its holdings to all parties involved. The additional part of these proceedings containing

The legal issues of Religious prophesy of Christianity, Judaism and Islam are petitioned removed to the State of Georgia initially under case 1:14-cv-3713-WSD; The state of New York secondarily under case 9:15-cv-183 and the state of Kentucky as a final measure under case 3:14-cv-00589 attached to a Writ of Error awaiting Adjudication. Nominal party interest and direct party interest is now established, Hartford Fire Ins Co v Harleysville Mut. Ins Co, 736 F3d 255 (4th Cir 2013); Sizelove-Farmer v Johnson, 2014 WL 4056267 (DSC 2014); Barlow v

Colgate Palmolive Co, 750 F3d 427 CA4 (Md 2014); Williams v Dorchester County Detention Center, 987 FSupp2d 690 (DSC 2013); Flame S.A. v Freight Bulk Pte Ltd, 762 F3d 352, 2014 A.M.C 2014 CA4 (Va 2014); Jaffery v LaSalle Bank Nat Ass'n, 36 FSupp 3d 657 (DSC 2014); Estate of Callaham ex rel Foster v United States, F. Supp2d, 2012 WL 18353366 (DSC 2012); Fulcrum Intern, Inc v Prince George Center I, Inc, 503 Fed Appx 193, 2012 WL 6634915 CA4 (Md 2012); South Carolina v Ali, FSupp2d 2012 WL 6765732 (DSC 2012); Chapman v

Federal Nat'l Mortg Assn, F.Supp2d, 2012 WL 2060729 (DSC 2012); Flying Pigs, LLC v. R.R.A.T. Franchising, LLC, 757 F3d 417 (4th Cir 2014); Palmetto Automatic Sprinkler Co. v. Smith Cooper Int'l, Inc, 995 FSupp2d 492 (DSC 2014); Scarborough v. Lifepoint Inc, FSupp2d, 2012 WL 6470452 (DSC 2012); State v Barnes SUPRA; Johnson v Nash, 2014 WL 12785944 (DSC 2014); Low v Vantage-South Bank, 2014 WL 8239419 (DSC 2014); Barlow v Colgate Palmolive Co, 772 F3d 1001, 90 Fed. R. Serv 3d 85 (4th Cir 2014); In Re Earth

STRUCTURES, Inc, 490 BR 199 Bkrtcy (DSC 2013); ELE GUAM v Long Term Credit BANK JAPAN, 322 F3d 635 (9th Cir 2003); Liu v Republic of China, 892 F2d 1419, 1424 (9th Cir 1989) cert. dismissed - US - 111 SCt 27, 111 Led 2d. 840 (1990). All Rules are suspended.

Referring back to the issue of the chain of custody in the Rowland case. The applicants 5th, 6th, 14th Amendment Rights of the US Constitution as well as Article IV § 2 and his DUE PROCESS Rights were violated, including Rule

403 of SC RULES of EVIDENCE, AS WELL AS RULE 6(b) of SC RULES of CRIMINAL PROCEDURE AS IT PERTAINS to the chain of custody and submission of EVIDENCE without the PROPER chain of custody forms. THESE ARE the RULES REQUIRED by P.D.E.A. and P.N.P. who trained their operatives and all members of the police task force in EXISTENCE at the JUSTICE ACADEMY to be in compliance with. THESE actions in this CASE violate SC Code and 44-53-485; SC Criminal Law Articles RULES 73-80; the duties of seizing officer on handling of controlled substance AS WAS argued in the

Nesbit case. Not only are there violations of SC Code Ann § 44-53-485. There are also violations of Article 6 Rule 73-120 involving substance evidence forensic testing methods and results, holding that an expert cannot testify to an opinion on an unreliable test (see tt pp 162), State v White, 382 SC 265, 676 SE2d 684 (2009).

Inasmuch, the chemical analyst, Elizabeth mitchell was ruled as "an expert witness" at trial voir dired (see tt pp 170). Yet, by her own testimony at trial, Elizabeth mitchell the chemical analyst on

CROSS-direct testified she did not consider herself as an expert witness, (SEE TTPP 171, 242) which violated RULE 702 "Testimony by Expert" also Article 6, 73-120. The Analyst Elizabeth Mitchell also testified that she wasn't sure if the scales or test were up to date making the validity of the test unreliable (SEE TTPP 169, 242), State v White SUPRA.

Inasmuch, there was no physical proof produced pertaining to the chain of custody by submitting the forms into evidence where the SC State courts have abused

their discretion acting as a legislator, violating legislative intent, stripping the appellant of the protections placed upon him by the state legislator in violation of DUE PROCESS and the EQUAL protection of the laws clauses by asserting mere testimony alone can establish proof that the state was in compliance to the applicable statutes which in fund a material fairness to the appellant must be proven by both the testimony as a proffer to submission of the forms that would substantiate that testimony. The courts abused their discretion by violating clearly

established legislative intent, acting as legislator not judge voiding their jurisdiction for DUE PROCESS violations by not giving weight to the statutory requirements which resulted in no foundation being properly established (emphasis added) producing a broken chain of custody. United States v Jurpin, 65 F3d 1207 (4th (Va 1995); US v Rod Pair Enterprises Inc, 489 US 235, 109 Sct 1027, 103 Led 2d 290 (US 1989); In re Argon Credit, LLC - BR -, 2017 WL 4404269 (2017); Lovmet v United States 65 FSupp3d 19 (2014); US v $41,320 US Currency, 9 FSupp3d 582, 2014 WL 12662640.

The SC legislators were fully cognizant as to the potentiality of arbitrary state action involving officers who may be operating under ulterior motives and therefore by clearer legislation never intended for the chain involving the seizure of controlled substance to be established by testimony alone in their efforts to ensure that the accused due process rights are not forgotten via also the equal protection of the laws. The proving of ill intent or bad faith is irrelevant in this instance. The intent was to ensure fair due process and

Equal protections of the laws. It must be established as a "[j]urisdictional (p)rerequisite" (emphasis added) that there was no tampering with this evidence of any kind which goes to substantiating the jurisdictional prerequisite as to specific drug amounts, which is an essential element of the offense which cannot be left to speculation requiring both testimony and properly documented forms by DUE PROCESS LAW and the equal protections of the laws. I am arguing against the precedent, established by STATE V. TRAPP, 420 SC 217, 801 SE2d 742 (SC 2017) where the

courts established that testimony alone is sufficient to establish the chain, White v Maxis, 2014 WL 1513280 (DSC 2014); South Carolina Dept. of Social Services v Irani, 418 SC 308, 792 SE2d 254 (SC App. 2016); McCain v Bright Harp, 399 SC 240, 720 SE2d 916 (SC App. 2012); Joseph v South Carolina Dept. of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, 417 SC 436, 790 SE2d 763 (SC App. 2016); Stokes-Carveel Holdings Corp v Robinson, 416 SC 517, 787 SE2d 485 (SC App. 2016); Johnson v Johnson, SE2d, 2014 WL 2721680 (SC App. 2014).

The chain of custody was also broken on grounds that there

was no "affidavit" to accompany the chemical analyst report given via discovery or presented at trial that demonstrate the analyst was certified by SLED to analyze these substances, which is a clear violation of South Carolina Rules and Criminal Procedure Rule 6(A), the 6th Amendment and Due Process Law.

Further, Elizabeth Mitchell the chemical analyst on cross-direct via the solicitor. When asked via the solicitor did she sign the report(s). She stated

"I believe at the time 2011 we were using "electronic signatures" (see TT pp 156-157) and (State exhibit 32). This places the analyst Elizabeth Mitchell in violation of SC Rules of Criminal Procedure [Rule 36 Form(s)] which plainly state that the Supreme Court shall provide the content and format of forms required by these Rules, and that the use of these forms is mandatory. The use of an electronic signature does not alleviate the problem of evidence tampering set in place by the

state legislators to protect individuals due process rights under the equal protection of the laws clause, where any person who obtained her computer access number or other unknown party or event "hacker" (ei like occurred with Russians in political party matters), can simply hit a button and make use of her electronic signature creating a falsified document. To alleviate any concern of evidence tampering and to ensure that the person who did the analysis the physical signature is required to protect the

constitutional DUE PROCESS Rights of the ACCUSED AS IS REQUIRED by the applicable RULES and STATUTE SC CODE ANNS 44-53-485. The CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT cannot be PERMITTED to USE their own forms OR COMPUTER format in SUBSTITUTION of the PROPER FORMS MANDATED and PROVIDED to all STATE AGENCIES ISSUED by the SUPREME COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR of STATE LAW, AS A MEANS to CIRCUMVENT this ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENT and applicable STATUTES that PROTECTS the DUE PROCESS Rights and INTEGRITY of the EVIDENCE

submitted diminishing any concerns with tampering or condition as it relates to the deficiency without proper amendment to the statute demonstrating that such revision is sanctioned by the state legislators whose intent was to ensure that the requested rights under the equal protection of the laws are not denied.

Additionally there is another issue that potentially calls into question the integrity of the link in regard to the chain of custody which also relates to the prevention of evidence tampering. the condition of the evidence.

which is essential to establishing the crucial elements of establishing the crucial elements of the offense as to specified drug amounts, which is also a "jurisdictional prerequisite" issue that can be raised on appeal for the first time as is this issue in its totality.

Elizabeth mitchell, the chemical analyst on cross by the appellants attorney, testified she received the drugs on June 6, 2011 from the evidence custodian (TT pp 160). Yet if the court and parties would take notice. The analysis on the

drugs were not made until June 28, 2011. There is a missing link as to who exactly was in possession of these drugs from June 6, 2011 until June 28, 2011 of (22) days. Because of this gap and or time period creating a missing link. The court or state cannot act as clairvoyants and speculate that these drugs were in the analyst possession all this substantial time. Especially since there was no sworn signed affidavit or any other documented paper trail that demonstrate that this was the case (see my Rule 5 p. 43). All the aforementioned

stands in egregious violation of the applicable statutes as well produces violations of DUE PROCESS, RULES pursuant to discovery, the 6th, 14th Amendments, RULE 6(B), RULE 6(C) and RULE 53 (73-120) Article 6 SC Criminal Law Articles in handling of controlled substances for chemical analysis (SEE SC Code Ann's 44-53-485).

The statute clearly provides that the properly sworn and "notarized signature" of the evidence custodian in possession of the controlled substance evidence is required, if the provisions

of the law and or rule for chemical analysis and chain of custody as set forth in the south carolina criminal practice rules are to be effective. The signature alone is insufficient to maintain the written record of the chain of custody which is determined by the court. Except this violates statutes that requires it be notarized. Again the courts acted as legislator. There must be a written signature or if its electronic, testimony by the analyst stating "yes, it was me who pushed that button to

place the signature on that document", if the integrity of the evidence is to be maintained diminishing any questions which include tampering or conditions of drugs in light of the lawless police officers, even captured on video planting evidence documented around the nation. The lack of the aforementioned strips the appellant of due process protections placed upon him by the state legislators where the courts have illegally acted as a legislator in violation of the separation of

powers provisions denying the Appellant the Equal Protection of the laws, violating Article 6 (Rules 73-90) (Duties of Evidence Custodian) which clearly demands the original signed, initial chain of custody (form) shall accompany the evidence until presented to the forensic laboratory for analysis. Without any proof of physical chain of custody all the State has is a chemical analysis report which violates SC Code Ann § 44-53-485 and DUE PROCESS law. The courts have abused their

discretion acting as a legislator in determining that testimony alone can substantiate the charge when the statute establishes otherwise, conspiring under color of law to circumvent the requirements of the applicable statute also producing a jurisdictional due process defect violating the appellants rights to equal protection of the laws, State v Covert, 382 SC 205, 675 SE2d 740 (2009); Jamison v Morris, 385 SC 215, 684 SE2d 168 (SC 2009); State v Smith, 326 SC 39, 482 SE2d 777 (SC 1999) [holding although

Wassinteh testified she could not remember actually drawing the blood sample, she did identify her "signature" on the forms (written) (not computerized) filled out when the blood was drawn], State v. Williams, 301 SC 369, 392 SE2d 181; South Carolina Dept. of Social Services v. Church, 364 SC 621, 614 SE2d 642 (SC 2005) (where the chain of custody "form" (emphasis added) and the witness testimony both indicated the two samples were delivered to Jackie Johnson and Corey Sweeney); State v.

Williams, 297 SC 290, 376 SE2d 773 (1989) (the initial form (emphasis added) complied with the hospital protocol and nurse Yorkels testimony sufficiently established a chain of custody).

Furthermore, violations of the chain of custody occurred in that there was no physical proof of chain of custody forms submitted by Detective Olson presented via rules and discovery in violations of due process law, nor presented at trial, where Olson then testified finding 10.5 grams of powdery

substance which the chemical analyst could not say whether it was cocaine or not violated SC Code Anns 44-53-485, 120; SC Rules of Criminal law Article Rules) 73-80, the 6th, 14th Amendments and Due Process Law. Testimony alone cannot be permitted to circumvent the Due Process protections and requirements of the legislative statutes that the state legislators set in place to ensure no ill will or bad faith takes place involving the state officials. This deprives the appellant the equal protection

of the laws (See TT pp 176).

Additionally, there was no physical proof of chain of custody forms submitted from the seizing officer Detective Summer given pursuant to Rule 5 nor was such presented at trial. The drugs could have been tampered with or planted. Who can say without this essentially required document. This is the officer who supposedly found the Gucci handbag with cocaine in it (See TT pp 185, 186, 243 and 244). This also violates SC Code Ann §§ 44-53-485, 120, Rule 6(B)

and RULE 73-80 related to duties of a seizing officer as well as the 6th, 14th Amendments and Due Process Law, United States v Jurp inf, 65 F3d 1201 (4th Cir 1995) (requires that the prosecutor seeking to admit seized evidence must establish a chain of custody from the time the items were seized to show that they are "substantially" in the same condition as when they were seized), State v Gibb, 303 N.W.2d 673, 681 (Iowa 1981); State v. Lamp, 322 N.W.2d 48, 57 (Iowa 1982).

To add additional injury to the appellant's trial. The chain

of custody was also broken due to Investigator Cobb also known as Jennifer Habbersted, the recovery agent who dropped off the drugs to the drop box locker failed to make a chain of custody form which violated Rule 6(B) of South Carolina Rules of Criminal Procedure, the 6th, 14th Amendments, Due Process and Again deny the appellant the Equal Protection of the laws, State v Chisolm, 355 At 180, 584 S.E.2d At 404.

The chain was also broken on grounds the "evidence custodian"

Linda Wilson who retrieved the drugs from Investigator Cobb out of evidence locker June 6, 2011 at 5:44 am. There was no sworn or notarized statement forms from the evidence custodian Linda Wilson produced pursuant to Rule 5 or Due Process law, nor was such presented at trial which also violated SC Code Ann §§ 44-53-485, 120 Under Article 6 Procedures for handling of a controlled substance Rule 23-90 And Rule 6(B) (See tpp 194). The court at trial did err in not finding the chain of custody was

broken in an abuse of discretion by allowing testimony by officers without any proof of physical chain of custody forms (emphasis added) where testimony alone does not demonstrate compliance to the stated statutes where any prior determination otherwise by any court produced an abuse of discretion and does not warrant non compliance to the relevant statutes. such testimony given by the officers without the physical forms being submitted to prove that the specific officer found

the drugs which are being called into question since a table was set up to receive them in the house and there was a mix up and or challenge by the appellant as to who found what, and to prove there was no tampering or planting of evidence, the aforementioned establishing ill will and bad faith, without the required forms and or sworn affidavits of documentation. This violated the appellants due process Rights by the introduction of this evidence and allowing the case to go to trial after the

suppression hearing where the testimony alone as proffer do not properly by statute verify the allegations of drugs except existed without a physical documented chain of custody being established from beginning to end which results in no foundation being produced by all seizing officers creating the broken chain of custody. This is further exasperated by allowing the chemical analyst to testify as and expert when she clearly stated by her own admission that she did not

consider herself to be an expert, State v Cribb, 310 SC 518, 426 SE2d 306 (1992); State v Joseph, 328 SC 352, 491 SE2d 275 (1997); State v Chisolm, 355 at 180, 584 SE2d at 404.

The Solicitor stephanie Bianca was aware there was no chain of custody forms and attempted to aid and abet Detective Olson and cross examination conspiring under color of state law to commit fraud upon the court. When the solicitor asked Detective Olson where the drugs were found, he stated he had to look at his notes which did

not prove the facts, where he knew there was no proper form filled out to show the initial finding establishing the physical chain. The solicitor then instructed the officer to look at the search warrant return, which is irrelevant, and by the legislature intent, cannot be permitted to substitute for the required forms. This too demonstrates ill intent and bad faith in efforts to defraud the appellant of his DUE PROCESS Rights also tainting the evidences (SEE TTPP 35), BLUE SKY TRAVEL and TOURS,

LLC v Al Jaylyan — Fed Appx —, 2015 WL 1456136 (4th Cir 2015); Silvestri v General Motors Corp, 271 F3d 583, 590 (4th Cir 2001); Screws v United States, 325 US 91, 65 S Ct 1031 (1945); Lyman v Edmondson Oil Co, 457 US 922, 928-30, 102 S Ct 2744, 2749-50, 73 L Ed 2d 482 (1982); Chewning v Ford Motor Company, 345 SC 72, 579 SE2d 605 (SC 2003); Brown v United States, 2014 WL 2871398 (DSC 2014); Mooney v Holohan, 294 US 103, 55 S Ct 340 (US 1935); White v Mathis, 2014 WL 5133280 (DSC 2014); Fox ex rel Fox v Elk Run Coal Co Inc, 739 F3d 131

(4th Cir 2014); Christianson v. Nebraska American Bank N.A., SE2d WL 8507850 (SC App 2013); Caldwell v Wiquist, 402 SC 595, 741 SE2d 583 (SC App 2013); Miller v Columbia Forrest Lyle, SE2d, 2014 WL 5390504 (SC App. 2014).

For the Record the Appellant is not arguing the weight of evidence towards its admissibility. The Appellant is arguing the Due Process protections place upon him by statute to ensure there's no arbitrary state action, ill will or bad faith and the courts acting as a legislator stripping him of these protections denying the Applicant the equal protection of

the laws where in this instance they had an officer lie to establish he placed drugs on the table to fraudulently establish the chain and the prosecutor conspiring under color of law during the trial to conceal this material fact and because they failed to follow the statute it prejudiced the appellant in establishing these facts. It does not go to the weight of evidence but to the fraud and conspiring under color of state law obstructing fair and proper justice, Holloway v Perry, 2016 WL 4074149; US. v Hare, 820 F3d 93 (4th Cir 2016); US v Tejada

445 Fed Appx' 719, 2011 WL 3891825 (4th Cir 2011); Norbrega v Hinkle, 576 Fed Appx' 224 (4th Cir 2014).

Under South Carolina Criminal law statute SC Code Ann § 44-53-485, more specific Article 6 (Rules 73-80) duties of a serving officer of handling of a controlled substance requires:

(1) The name of the seizing officer;
(2) Name of Law Enforcement Agency;
(3) Date of seizure;
(4) Name of person who specifically located the contraband substance;
(5) State what was seized subject to warrant, lawful arrest;

(6) PLACE WHERE CONTRABAND WAS FOUND AND SEIZED;
(7) DESCRIPTION of the SUBSTANCE.

THE PROPERLY SWORN AND NOTARIZED SIGNATURE of the SEIZING OFFICER IS REQUIRED in CHAIN of CUSTODY AND CHEMICAL ANALYSIS to BE EFFECTIVE UNDER SOUTH CAROLINA CRIMINAL PRACTICE RULES....

SC CODE ANN § 44-53-480 PROVIDES: HANDLING of SEIZED CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES; USE of PHOTOGRAPHS OR VIDEO TAPES of SUBSTANCES AT TRIAL ADMISSIBILITY:
(A) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

SEIZED PURSUANT to this ARTICLE must (EMPHASIS ADDED) BE INVENTORIED, REPORTED, AUDITED, HANDLED (EMPHASIS ADDED), TESTED, STORED, PRESERVED, OR DESTROYED PURSUANT to PROCEDURE PROMULGATED by the SLED.

(E) IN ALL SUBSEQUENT COURT PROCEEDINGS following the disposition of the CASE, ALL EVIDENCE PRESENTED at the ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS is ADMISSIBLE through introduction of the CERTIFIED (EMPHASIS ADDED) (AFFIDAVITS) RECORD of the CASE.

SC CODE ANN § 44-53-120 PROVIDES: "THE STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT

Division "shall" (emphasis added):

(2) coordinate and cooperate in training programs on controlled substance law enforcement at the local and state levels;

(5) promulgate regulations to provide uniform (emphasis added) procedures for the seizing (emphasis added), inventory (emphasis added), reporting, auditing, handling, testing, storage, preservation for evidentiary use, and destruction or other lawful disposition of controlled substance. Requirement that controlled substances be

seized (emphasis added), inventoried (emphasis added), reported, handled, etc. pursuant to procedures promulgated pursuant to this section, see SC Code Ann. § 44-53-485.

The language of these statutes is clear and unambiguous. In the interpretation of statutes, our sole function is to determine, and within constitutional limits, give effect to the intent of the legislature, with reference to the meaning of the language used and the subject matter and purpose of the statute. State v.

Ramsey, 311 SC 555, 561, 430 SE2d 511, 515 (1993). The words of the statute(s) must be given their ordinary meaning unless something in the statute indicates that the legislature intended a different meaning, Mid State Auto Auction of Lexington, Inc. v. Altman, 324 SC 65, 69, 476 SE2d 690, 692 (1996); Town of Mt Pleasant v Roberts, 393 SC 332, 342, 713 SE2d 278, 283 (2011); Bessinger v. R-N-M Builders & Associates, LLC - SE2d -, 2017 WL 4799350 (2017).

When an officer of the state and/or state actor, shall use their

instrument of arrest and or prosecution in egregious acts of prosecutional misconduct, fraud upon the court and machination, for ulterior motives and incarcerate and or prosecute and accused for the purpose of engaging in malicious, arbitrary, fraudulent and criminal acts, willfully subjecting an appellant to deprivations of rights, immunities or privileges secured by the constitution and laws of the United States within any state, district or territory. They shall be subject to state and federal penalties. By what has been done here producing overwhelming prejudice such actions is indisputably deprivation of rights,

privileges and immunities of the accused of liberty and a violation of 18 USC §§ 242 and 1001; neither threat, nor violence is a necessary ingredient of the offense under these circumstances where the individuals were clearly acting arbitrarily under color of state law for ulterior motives creating a fraudulent chain of custody by an officer saying he initially found and received the drugs and the state courts gutted the protection placed upon me which would have allowed me to prove the claims by the state legislator requirement of the forms which would have proved

the officer was lying, Williams v United States (CA5 (Fla) 1950, 179 F2d 656 cert. granted 71 S Ct 70, 340 U.S. 97, 95 L Ed 774; BROWN v United States (CA6 (Tenn) 1953, 204 F2d 247; United States v RAMEY, (CA4 (W. Va) 1964, 336 F2d 512, 108 S Ct 2751, 46 CCH E.P.D. ¶ 38067 on remand (1988 CA6 Mich) 852 F2d 1288; 18 USC §§ 242, 1001; United States v Otherson (1980 CA9 (Cal.) 637 F2d 1276 cert. denied (1981) 454 U.S. 840, 70 L Ed 2d 123, 102 S Ct 149; United States v Ste Bri Enterprise, Inc, 2017 WL 4226873 (D.C. Ohio 2017).

The state legislators intent should be ascertained from the

plain language of the statutes. The language must also read in a sense which harmonizes with its subject matter and accords with its general purpose. Once the SC legislators made a choice, there was no room for the courts to impose a different judgment based upon their own notions. If the provision of law's language is unambiguous and clear, there is no need to employ the rules of statutory and or common law construction, even pursuant to the various state courts notions, the court under cases like State v Trapp 420 SC 217, 801 SE2d 742 (SC2017) and

other such cases had no right to look for or impose another meaning. Where the language of these provisions of law are clear and explicit, the court "cannot" rewrite SC Code Ann §§ 44-53-485 and 44-53-120 and interject matters in the state legislators language. Under the plain meaning rule, it is not the court's place to change a meaning of a clear and unambiguous provision of law. Bass v. Isochem, 617 SE2d 369 (SC App 2005); State v. Brannon, 666 SE2d 272 (SC App 2008); State v. Pittman, 647 SE2d 144 (SC 2007); Liberty Mut Ins v. Second Inquiry Fund, 611 SE2d 297

(SC App 2005); US v Ron Pair Enterprises Inc, 489 US 235, 109 SCt 1026, 103 LEd2d 290 (US 1989); In re Argo Credit, LLC — BR —, 2017 WL 4404269 (2017); Hodges v Rainey, 341 SC 79, 533 SE2d 578 (SC App 2000); miller Compstr Co v PL Compstr of Greenwood Inc, 418 SC 186, 204, 791 SE2d 321, 331 (Ct App 2016); Charlestop County Assessor v University Ventures, LLC — SE2d —, 2017 WL 4051740 (SC 2017).

What the legislator says in the text of a statute is considered the best evidence of the legislative intent or will; therefore, the courts are bound to give effect to the expressed intent of the legislature,

State v Miles, ___ SE2d ___, 2017 WL 3611694 (SC 2017); Smith v Tiffany, 419 SC 548, 799 SE2d 479 (SC 2017); Wilson v Charleston County School District, 419 SC 442, 798 SE2d 449, 342 Ed. Law Rep. 453 (SC 2017); Signor v Keel, SE2d, 2017 WL 4771411 (SC 2017).

All expert testimony must satisfy criteria of Rules of Evidence governing testimony of experts, and that includes the trial court's gate keeping function in ensuring the proposed expert testimony meets a reliability threshold for the jury's ultimate consideration. Due to the change not being properly

established where the seizure was not properly certified upon initial contact with the drugs and ill intent and bad faith is alleged where such was prevented being properly documented by the state courts violating the legislative intent of the statutes designed to prevent such arbitrary state action. The appellant was prejudiced in establishing the facts in violation of due process law and the equal protections of the laws clause, State v McDonald, SE2d 2017 WL 479456 (SC 2017); Founders Federal Credit Union v Irving, SE2d, 2017 WL 4619210 (SC 2017).

Chain of custody variations of authentication principle requires that prosecutor seeking to introduce seized evidence must establish chain of custody from time items were taken to show there is no tampering, bad faith, ill motive and that they are in substantially the same condition as when they were seized. We are arguing against the precedent. When and analyzed substance has past through several hands, the identity of individuals who acquired the evidence and what was done with the evidence between the taking and the analysis

must not be left to conjecture, State v Jrapp, 420 SC 217, 801 SE2d 742 (SC 2017); State v Taylor, 360 SC 18, 25, 598 SE2d 735, 738 (Ct App 2004); US v Solorio, 669 F3d 943, 87. Thus the conviction must be vacated. It is so ordered.

Inasmuch, you have fraud upon the court. You have the SC Court of Appeals being given notice by Crawford that the issues presented were his and part of the presently pending Writ of Habeas Corpus class actions pending in the various US District Courts. You have their being given notice by Crawford of Rowland by his

religious beliefs being a member of the Reestablished Global Theocratic State being bound without his consent. By the power and authority now established via Crawford, the default that exist in case 2013-CP-400-0084 and collateral estoppel. That legislative, judicial and attorney power and authority is hereby exercised in this case and removal as previously designated within this document pursuant to the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act is established. Sanctions are officially imposed. With Rowland not being amenable

to any global court without the consent of JAH-JAH Al mahdi, which you do not have and or is withdrawn, the conviction and sentence must be vacated as determined by the decree of the King-Khalifah-Judge of the Global Theocratic State and court whose power is binding on the SC Court of Appeals and supersedes the SC Court of Appeals and all global courts by default and collateral estoppel. The SC Court of Appeals is barred from

challenging these claims. Once a copy of the Rowland indictments are received additional supplement will be permitted and submitted. All § 1983 and State Tort Actions pending nationally are supplemented with the contents of this document. Any law or statute standing in opposition to this decree of the Global Theocratic Kingdom Khalifah Judge is of no effect.

The Foreign Sovereign plaint-

tiffs bring the parties attention to the attach order issued by Jeanjoal that went into effect January 4 2014. This is Judge Joal's attempt at additional fraud upon the court in effort to gut out the provisions of the Article V § 4 order previously issued. Note this time she did not tie this provision to the SC Constitution in response to our argument. This further substantiates our argument that the provision argued is draconian. It is a conflict of interest for Joal

to produce this order when she is being sued for violations of the prior order to aid the state escape the miscarriages of justice created by their failure to be in compliance, conspiring under color of law. This order produced by this fraud and conspiracy is rendered void and or of no effect. It does not rescind the prior order.

Joseph Rowland

Joseph Rowland

April 20, 2015

IT IS SO ORDERED

Jahmah Al mahdi, The King of The North, The Khalifah and Lion of Allah, Chief Justice of The Global Theocratic State and Court by default and collateral estoppel