

Exhibit

Fraud #2

==

—

COURT of APPEALS
FOR THE 4th CIRCUIT ET AL.

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA
CASES 2017-CV-1127-JMC-MGB ET AL.

DOCKET NO. 17-7400 ET AL.

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD aka JOYNAH
GABRIEL JAHNAH TISHBITE ET AL.

PETITIONER(S)

VS.

JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD ET AL.
DEFENDANT(S)

Affidavit of Service

I, Jahjah Al Mahdi, do hereby certify, that I have mailed and or served a copy of an Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice, Filing Writ of Error, Supplementing Issues of Appeal and motion so motion therefor on the 4th circuit, the US District Court and all involved parties by US mail postage prepaid by placing it in the institution mailbox on JANUARY 5, 2018. It is deemed filed on that date Houston v Lack, 287

20821

US 266, 273-76, 108 Sct 2379 (1988).

Respectfully,
Jahid Al Mahdi

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jahid Al Mahdi'. The signature is highly stylized and cursive, with a large, prominent loop at the end.

JANUARY 5, 2018

COURT of Appeals
FOR THE 4th CIRCUIT et al.,

PETITIONERS FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

CASES 2017-CV-1127-JMC-MGB et al.

Docket No. 17-7410 et al.

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD aka JONAH GABRIEL
JAHNAH T. TISHBITZ et al.,
PETITIONERS

vs.

JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD et al.,
DEFENDANTS

40821

Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial
Notice; Filing Writ of Error;
Supplementing Issues on Appeal
and motion so motion therefor

To: The 4th Circuit Court of Appeals,
The SC District Court et al.

Attached the 4th circuit will find:
A copy of the transactions entered
on JANUARY 2, 2018 as well as entry
number 45 filed in the district
court.

We supplement the issues on
appeal to address this additional
fraud done by the US District

Court. Writ of ERROR is filed before
both the US District Court and the
4th circuit. Look at the way the
SC District Court has this case constructed
in additional Acts of FRAUD upon the
Court. The Court has the pleading
constructed as a "Notice of Appeal"
when it is clear from the caption
on the document that this is not
the case in Acts of FRAUD upon the
Court. The caption clearly states and
reads, "Affidavit of Facts Giving
Judicial Notice; motion to "Reinstabe"
(Emphasis added) Case 9:17-cv-1140;
motion For Sanctions Due To FRAUD

Upon the court, Notice Seeking
leave to supplement the Appeal
(emphasis added) and motion Jo motion
therefor". It is perspicuous that this
pleading is not a notice of appeal as
the court fraudulently have it constructed
further demonstrating we meet the
criteria established by Williams v.
Pennsylvania, 136 Sct 1899 (2016) Re-
quiring these judges refusal. We
object. First, a motion to reinstate
produces a second final order demont-
strating that the case is not concluded
until that motion to reinstate is ruled
on. Therefore the case cannot
2021

BE DEEMED final warranting a notice of Appeal. It must be submitted as a notice seeking "leave" (emphasis added) to appeal as the document is properly constructed. A motion to reconstitute tolls anytime for appeal, METSAJENA v Holder, 320 Fed App' 94, 2009 WL 943755 (2nd Cir 2009) | Reed Rock Holdings, Ltd v Union Bank Trust Co Ltd, 181 F.3d. 83, 1999 WL 310482 (2nd Cir 1999) | ZHAO v I.P.S., 452 F.3d 154 (2nd Cir 2006).

The notice to reconstitute the case was deemed filed placed within the institution's mailbox within 60 days

of the order of DECEMBER 23, 2017
THE CHRISTMAS HOLIDAY. IT DOESN'T MATTER
THAT IT WAS TAKEN OUT THE BOX OF
DECEMBER, 27, 2017 DUE TO THE HOLIDAY.
IT WAS IN THE BOX OF DECEMBER 23,
2017 AND THE BENEFIT OF MAILING UNDER
THE MAIL BOX RULE FALLS TO THE PLAINTIFF,
MEARS v MONTGOMERY, 512 Fed Appx 100
(2nd Cir 2013); US v McNeill, 523 Fed Appx
979 (4th Cir 2013); WAPPLEY v FEDERAL
RESERVE BANK of RICHMOND - Fed -, 2016
WL 353 6656 (4th Cir 2016). I object.
WRIT of ERROR is filed to correct this
injustice and fraud. SEE EXHIBIT "Debit"
FURTHERMORE, THE CASE WAS NOT
GRANTED OR DENIED FILING IN FORMA

9 of 21

PAUPERIS. The granting or denying
filing in forma PAUPERIS is jurisdictional
and was not done. I object. The
demon, dog, CORRUPT JUDGES by his actions
adjudicated in Acts of FRAUD the
merits by FRAUDULENTLY ASSERTING
we could not comprehend the claims
when JUDGES WEST and BAKER had
no problem understanding what
was being claimed as did the 4th
circuit by they staying case 17-
6960 and the other related appeals.
The court was required to rule on
the issues of filing in forma PAUPERIS
before it took any action and this is

jurisdictional, widening the District Court jurisdiction for fraud, due process violation as well as for violation of oath of office Thompson v Fitch, 2016 WL 5724369 (2016); West v. United States, 2016 WL 5375782 (2016); MOORE v GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORPORATION, FSUPP3d, 2015 WL 9307307 (2015); IN RE GJEADE, 535 B.R. 329 (2015); BLAKELY v WARD, 738 F.3d 607 (4th Cir 2013).--
Also see attached Affidavit of Facts (34) pages dated DECEMBER 20, 2017. All claims, issues, causes of actions and defenses argued within this document are now being argued in this case.

Lastly, this case was sought leave to appeal establishing case 17-740. The SC District Court was divested of jurisdiction and could only address matters that maintained the status quo of the case being on appeal. The District Court was prohibited from making a final determination of any kind. Subsequent adjudication was prohibited once appeal was filed. Filing notice seeking leave to appeal is event of jurisdictional significance, as it confers jurisdiction on Court of Appeals and divests District Court of its control

over those aspects of case involved
in the appeal. No final determination
in the case can be made. The
District Court does not regain juris-
diction until issuance of the mandate.
Thus the action of the District Court
involving by this fraud, is taken
without jurisdiction and the fraud
vitiates everything produced by it.
These issues are supplemented to
the appeal by ~~the~~ and judgment
of the Chief Justice of the Global
Theocratic Court. It is so ordered,
US v ROGER, 101 F3d 247 (2nd Cir 1996);
Evancho v Pipe-Rich and School District,
237 FSupp.3d, 267, 301 (W.D Pa 2017);

JAYLOR v U.S., 136 Sct 2074, 195 LEd2d
456, 84 US LW 4462 (US 2016) | KLAYMAN
v OBAMA, 142 FSupp.3d 172 (D.D.C 2015);
Lytche v Griffith, 240 F3d 404, 407 n.
(4th Cir 2001) | NORTHROP GAUMAN
TECHNICAL SERVICES INC v. DYN CORP.
INTERNATIONAL LLC, 2016 WL 3346349,
*5, ED Va.; DOE v Public Citizen, 749
F3d 246 (4th Cir 2014) | HUNTER v Town
of Mocksville, North Carolina, - FSUPP3d -
2017 WL 422109 (N.C. 2017) | BERRIOS v
GREEN WIRELESS, LLC, 2017 WL 2120038
(Md 2017) | Newtop v Consolidated Gas
Co of New York, 258 US 165, 42 Sct 264,
66 LEd 538 (US 1922) | BAYOU SHORES SP.F.
LLC v BURWELL, FSUPP3d, 2014 WL

4101761 (DC Fla 2014) ; Eagle View Technologies, Inc v Xactware Solutions, Inc, FSupp2d, 2013 WL 12071668 (2013).

Judge Wooten Acted to Aid the SC Attorney General to submit responses in a case to which he had no power or jurisdiction, specifically case 2017-0002108 in the SC Supreme Court. He had no jurisdiction to act due to case not-a-uno being before the 4th circuit. By these criminal acts in violation of your oath of office you are subject to dismissal and criminal penalties. Writ of Error is filed. This case is now essentially

ON REMAND limiting your jurisdiction
to do anything except grant the
relief demanded. You are in forfeiture
by your fraud. It is so ordered.

When it comes to the superseding
attorney, judicial and legislative power
and authority of the crown established
by due process law to which the King-
Khalifah Jahoh Al Mahdi aka Law-
rence Crawford, fiduciary foreign
sovereign to the (U) Global Thrones
officially invokes and exercises
before this court. The South Carolina
District Court via this corrupt demon

160821

dog Judge Wootten cannot diminish
the rights of the King-Khalifah JAHJAH
Al Mahdi, and his Holy Common Wealth,
the people, established by contract,
and default which is legally protected
under both Article 1 section 10 and
Article W § 2 of the US Constitution
and DUE PROCESS law. It is established
as both a liberty as a Foreign Sovereign
King-Khalifah and a privilege by what
occurred under case 2013-cr-400-0084
by their fraud. No state shall convert
a liberty in this case protected under
"contract", "covenant", into a privilege,
violate it, and exchange a free

Therefore, MURDOCK v PENNSYLVANIA,
319 US 105 (US 1943) -

A law cannot exceed the authority
of the lawgiver. You have no more
right to decline the exercise of
jurisdiction which is given with
restrictions by this document, than
to usurp that which is not given.

The one or the other would be
treason against the constitution
itself. The several states legislators
and their judiciaries, are bound by
their solemn obligations of an oath
to support the Federal Constitution.
If you willfully legislate, or give a

judicial determinations violating
the King-Khalifahs rights established
by contract, default and DUE PROCESS
protected by the US constitution under
Article I sections 10 and Article III § 2
you ARE guilty of FRAUD, PERJURY and
other FEDERAL and OR STATE CRIMES
which void your jurisdiction, stripping
you of immunity, subjecting you to civil
and criminal penalties for also
breach of contract. Wheat v Virginia,
(6 Wheat) 19 US 264 (1821). The claim
to EXERCISE constitutionally protected
rights cannot be converted into
a crime since the state of South

19 of 21

Carolina and the United States by
their actions under case 2013-CP-
400-0084 has now also converted
this sovereign liberty into an
American privilege, which indeed
they have. The King-Khalifah and
those whom he appoints under his
government can engage in the
rights without impunity. Yet the
rights are still a liberty protected
under contract as well, Hurtado v.
California, 110 US 516 (US 1884); Miller
v US, 230 Fed 486, 489 (5th Cir 1956);
Stutts - Worth v Birmingham, 373 US 262
(US 1963) | Shearer v Collet, 481 F.945, 946)

MIRANDA v ARIZONA, 384 US 436 (US 1966);
STANB v CITY OF BAXLEY, 355 US 313 (US
1958); US v JACKSON, 390 US 570 (US 1968);
BRAY v ALEXANDRIA WOMEN'S HEALTH
CLINIC, 506 US 263, 13 Sct 753, 169 A.L.R.
3d 649 (US 1993); WILTS v JUDGE OF
MARSHALL, N.C. 426 F.2d 251 (4th Cir 2005);
ZINOTOFSKY EX REL ZINOTOFSKY v KERRY,
135 Sct 2076, 192 LEd2d 83, 83 USLW
4391 (US 2015). It is so ORDERED.

Respectfully,

JANUARY 5, 2018

JAHJAH AL MAHDI

THE KING OF THE NORTH, THE
LION AND KHALIFAH OF ALLAH,
CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL
THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT


2018