IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
ROGER M. YOUNG, SR., GENERAL SESSIONS COURT JUDGE

APPELLATE CASE 2014-0001051

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE ET. AL.,

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER DENYING THE REHEARING IN CASE 2014-0001051 AND TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO INTERVENE; MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASE 2014-0001051 AND 2016-000640 ET. AL.,

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

HERE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURIS-

DICTION TO ENTER THE OPINION AND OR ORDER IN THIS CASE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; MOTION TO INTERVENE;***, [14] PAGES DATED FEBRUARY 16, 2018 THAT IS FILED IN CASE 2016-000640 THE JASON GOURDINE DIRECT APPEAL. ON PAGE (2) OF THIS DOCUMENT YOU WILL FIND LISTED;

(2) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO STRIKE THE RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS DUE TO ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE AND ALL PREVIOUSLY FILED OBJECTIONS, CLAIMS, DEFENSES AND MOTIONS; SUPPLEMENTING THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND APPENDIX IN RESPONSE TO THE MOTION TO DISMISS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (15) PAGES DATED JANUARY 27, 2018 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(3) THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION TO STRIKE THE DOCUMENTS IN THE APPENDIX AND DENY THE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME; MOTION TO VACATE THESE ORDERS; MOTION FOR FORFEITURE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (15) PAGES DATED JANUARY 9, 2018 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(4) THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO STRIKE THE RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO STRIKE THE DOCUMENTS IN THE APPENDIX DUE TO ATTEMPTS AT FRAUD AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, FILING OBJECTIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THAT DOCUMENT; MOTION FOR RECUSAL AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (15) PAGES DATED DECEMBER 25, 2017 FILED IN CASE 2017-002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(5) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S RETURN TO THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI; MOTION TO STRIKE ALL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE RESPONDENT; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS; MOTION FOR FORFEITURE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (15) PAGES DATED DECEMBER 27, 2017 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(6) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDI-

CIAL NOTICE; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS DUE TO CONTINUAL ACTS OF FRAUD, EVEN UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR DATED FEBRUARY 12, 2018 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(7) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION TO ENTER THE ORDER DATED FEBRUARY 16, 2018; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER AND TO REINSTATE CASE 2017-0002108 ET. AL.,; MOTION FOR FORFEITURE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT, RENEWING ALL PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTIONS, PETITIONS, OBJECTIONS ETC. AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR DATED MARCH 2, 2018 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(8) THE ORDERS ISSUED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN CASE 2017-0002108 DATED MARCH 29, 2018 AND FEBRUARY 16, 2018 DEMONSTRATING THAT THE MERITS OF THE ISSUES OF CONCERN WERE NEVER ADJUDICATED, THAT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT MERELY STOOD ON ITS INITIAL DECISION THAT THE ISSUES COULD NOT BE HEARD DUE TO THEY NOT BEING A PART OF THE REHEARING PROCESS FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

(9) EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 2". THIS IS THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE, FILING OBJECTIONS TO THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION IN THIS CASE CORRUPT JUDGES, THAT IS FILED IN THE KING-KHALIFAH'S WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDING UNDER CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM PENDING IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT.

(10) EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 3". THIS IS THE APPELLATE BRIEF, (115) PAGES DATED APRIL 25, 2017 THAT WAS BLOCKED FILED IN THE GOURDINE CASE UNDER CASE NUMBER 2016-000640 STILL PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT PURSUANT TO COLLATERAL ATTACK DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHICH IS ALSO FILED UNDER CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(11) EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". THIS IS THE MANDAMUS THAT MAKES UP CASE 16-2299 STILL PENDING IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT. IT EXPLAINS THE "TRUST" TO WHICH THE KING-KHALIFAH IS RESPONSIBLE

FOR. IT EXPLAINS THE INHERITANCE GIVEN TO HIM AS IS ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION. IT EXPLAINS HOW WE ALL AS CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS, JEWS AND AFRICANS AND ITS DIASPORA ARE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST" AS IS ESTABLISHED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD AND HIS SET IN PLACE SOLE CORPORATION CREATED BY "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

(12) EXHIBIT, "S.C. SUPREME COURT FRAUD #1". THIS IS THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO INTERVENE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO REINSTATE;***, [35] PAGES DATED MARCH 9, 2018 THAT IS FILED IN THE KING-KHALIFAH'S FEDERAL CASE UNDER 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM. THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED FOR AMONG MANY THINGS, TO ESTABLISH THAT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS CANNOT DEEM VALID ANY ORDER PRODUCED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2017-0002108 BECAUSE THE DETERMINATION WAS PROCURED BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THIS REQUIRES THAT THIS COURT RENDER A PRISTINE DETERMINATION NOT CORRUPTED BY FRAUD REGARDING ALL ISSUES THAT WERE ATTEMPTED TO BE PRESENTED UNDER CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE SUPREME COURT.

(13) EXHIBIT, "FOREIGN SOVEREIGN # 1". THIS IS THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER CASE(S) 17-7532 AND 17-7186;***, [34] PAGES DATED DECEMBER 20, 2017. THIS DOCUMENT AID TO EXPLAIN THE HOBBS ACT VIOLATION BY ATTACHING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. IT EXPLAINS THE CONSPIRACY INVOLVING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND THIS COURT GOING ON ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS IN THEIR EFFORTS TO PREVENT WHAT THEY KNOW IS THE REALIZATION OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY FROM MANIFESTING BEFORE THE WORLD.

(14) EXHIBIT(S), "FOREIGN SOVEREIGN #'S 2 AND 3". THESE ARE THE [15] PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS DATED NOVEMBER 9, 2017 AND THE [70] PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 FURTHER SUPPORTING THAT WHICH IS STATED IN ITEM # [13] PRIOR LISTED IN THIS DOCUMENT.

(15) EXHIBIT, "ISSUES". THIS IS THE APPENDIX AND WRIT OF CERTIORARI FILED IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT THAT MADE UP CASE 2017-0002108. ALL ISSUES LISTED IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE NOW BEING ARGUED IN CASE 2014-0001051 PURSUANT TO SEEKING TO VACATE THIS COURT'S ORDER RELATED TO THE REHEARING.

(16) EXHIBIT, "INDICTMENTS". THESE ARE A COPY OF THE INDICTMENTS RELATED TO THE ROWLAND DIRECT APPEAL AND A COPY OF INDICTMENTS FROM EVEN AROUND THE NATION TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE LEGAL ISSUE OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY EFFECT MORE THAN ONE STATE.

(17) A COPY OF THE AMENDED COMPLAINT THAT MAKE UP CASE 2006-CP-400-0552 THAT MAKE UP AN INTRINSIC PART OF CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WITH THE INTAKE SHEET FROM SLED FILE 5501014 THAT WILL INDISPUTABLY PROVE THE STATE ESTABLISHED A FICTITIOUS HOMICIDE TO FRAME THE KING-KHALIFAH BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED TO PREVENT HIS ASCENDING THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE FORETOLD TO COME IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL 3:41-43 AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH).

(18) EXHIBIT, "JUDGE LEE # 1". THESE ARE LETTERS FROM THE ATTORNEYS INVOLVED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 AND SCHEDULING NOTICES DEMONSTRATING THAT JUDGE LEE GAVE A ORAL DETERMINATION RELATED TO THE AFFIDAVITS AND HOW THEY ARE TO BE FILED TO BE DEEMED VALID AND OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO THE CASES IN QUESTION. THEY PROVE THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS APPEARANCE.

(19) EXHIBIT, "JUDGE LEE # 2". THIS IS THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; SEEKING DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT ;****, [92] PAGES DATED FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 ON MAY 13, 2014.

(20) EXHIBIT, "JUDGE LEE # 3". THIS IS THE [152] PAGE DOCUMENT EXPLAINING THE LIEN FOR REPARATIONS DUE TO SLAVERY. IT EXPLAINS THE DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND THE MAGNITUDE OF THE CASE JUDGE LEE SAT ON REQUIRING HER RECUSAL FROM CASE 2014-0001051.

(21) EXHIBIT, "JUDGE LEE # 4". THIS IS AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; CHALLENGING THE RICHLAND COURT'S JURISDICTION; RESPONDING TO THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS AND LETTERS, [31] PAGES DATED OCTOBER 7, 2015. THIS IS THE CRUX OF THE MATTER. THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED AS AFFIDAVITS REQUIRING TIMELY RESPONSE OR THEY ARE CONSIDERED TO BE TRUE AND CORRECT. WHEN THE KING-KHALIFAH BROUGHT THE MATTER OF WHAT SHE SAID IN THAT HEARING IN APRIL 2014 RELATED TO HOW THE AFFIDAVITS WERE TO BE FILED TO BE DEEMED TRUE. JUDGE LEE HAD OPPORTUNITY TO TIMELY REBUT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S ASSERTIONS WITHIN (30) DAYS AS IS REQUIRED BY DUE PROCESS LAW OR THE DOCUMENTS MUST BE DEEMED TRUE AND CORRECT. NOT ONLY DID JUDGE LEE FAILED TO TIMELY CHALLENGE THE VERITY OF THE CLAIMS MADE WHEN PLACED BEFORE HER. SO DID THE RESPONDENT. THE STATE NEVER TIMELY REBUTTED ANY OF THE CLAIMS MADE WITHIN THESE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS MAKING ALL CLAIMS TRUE AND CORRECT WHICH IS THE ESSENTIAL REASON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT REFUSED TO GIVE REVIEW BECAUSE IF THE RESPONDENT WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO RESPOND HE NOR THE UNITED STATES WOULD HAVE BEEN ABLE TO PRODUCE ANY EVIDENCE THAT WOULD HAVE DEMONSTRATED THAT ANY OF THEM TIMELY MOVED TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS ESTABLISHING THE KING-KHALIFAH'S GLOBAL SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY , JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND POWER.

I, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES ALONG WITH THE KING-KHALIFAH TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, JAHAH AL MAHDI WHERE HIS ATTORNEY GENERAL IS OFFICIALLY APPOINTED BY WRIT OF COMMISSION FILED IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2017-0002108, THE UNDERSIGNED AFFIANT(S), HEREIN BEFORE AND AFTER, DO HEREBY SOLEMNLY SWEAR AND OR DECLARE AND OR AFFIRM AND OR STATE AS FOLLOWS: (A) AFFIANT(S) ARE COMPETENT TO STATE THE MATTERS SET FORTH HEREWITH; (B) AFFIANT(S) HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS STATED HEREIN; (C) ALL FACTS STATED HEREIN ARE TRUE, CORRECT AND COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFFIANT(S) BEST FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING, AND IF CALLED UPON TO TESTIFY AS WITNESSES AFFIANT(S) SHALL SO STATE;

THESE DOCUMENTS ARE BEING SUBMITTED FOR THE PURPOSE OF SEEKING TO VACATE THE ORDER DENYING THE REHEARING IN CASE 2014-0001051 DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT. JUDGE LEE SHOULD HAVE NEVER

BEEN PERMITTED TO SIT UPON THIS DIRECT APPEAL. SHE IS BEING SUED IN CASES TO WHICH I AM PARTY FOR VIOLATIONS OF HER OATH OF OFFICE AS WELL AS FOR ACTS RELATED TO HER BEING APPOINTED AS TRUSTEE TO THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH TO WHICH I, AS A CHRISTIAN AM A BENEFICIARY OF THE TRUST. THERE IS NO TELLING THE MAGNITUDE OF THE IMPACT HER PRESENCE HAS HAD UPON MY DIRECT APPEAL. SINCE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT BY ITS ORDERS, WHICH ARE VOID FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT ANYWAY, NEVER ADDRESSED THE MERITS OF THE LEGAL ISSUES PRESENTED. THEY CAN BE ADDRESSED NOW BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS PURSUANT TO VACATE YOUR ORDER DENYING THE REHEARING DUE TO THE ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT THAT THIS COURT PLAYED IN RELATED TO THESE MATTERS. SINCE THE SUPREME COURT DETERMINED THE ISSUES MUST BE ADDRESSED PURSUANT TO REHEARING? THUS, WE STAND BEFORE THIS COURT MOTIONING TO VACATE THE ORDER, MOTIONING TO REINSTATE THIS CASE FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING A PRISTINE REHEARING REVIEW NOT CORRUPTED BY EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. YOU ADD TO THIS FACT, THAT THE RESPONDENT AND STATE COMPROMISED MY HIRE ATTORNEY DUE TO HE HIMSELF COMING UP FOR CRIMINAL REVIEW FOR AN ALLEGED INVOLVMENT WITH DRUGS HIMSELF. BY THE APPELLANT'S DUE PROCESS RIGHT, IN THE UTMOST OF CAUTION. IT IS ONLY FUNDAMENTALLY JUST AND FAIR THAT THIS CASE BE REVISITED TO CORRECT THE MANIFEST INJUSTICE THAT HAS OCCURRED WITHIN THIS CASE. JUDGE LEES PRESENCE PRODUCES STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS THIS COURT'S JURISDICTION, UNITED STATES v. QUINONES, 2016 WL 4413149, * 6+ (S.D.Va.2016); WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016); KOLON INDUSTRIES INC. v. E.I. DUPONT De NEMOURS & CO., 748 F3d. 160 CA4 (Va.2014); KENWOOD GARDENS CONDOMINIUMS INC. v. WHALEN PROPERTIES, LLC., 2016 WL 6788052, * 11+ (Md.2016); PAUL ADAMS v. CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; DONATONI v. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,--F.Supp. 3d.--, 2016 WL 1755875; U.S. v. HARE, 820 F3d. 93(4th.Cir.2016); U.S. v. ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015). ACTS OF CONGRESS AND OR THE COURTS THAT ARE REPUGNANT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW, EVANCHO v. PINE RICHLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT, 237 F.Supp.3d. 267(W.D.Pa. 2017); TAYLOR v. UNITED STATES, 136 S.Ct. 2074, 195 L.Ed.2d. 456, 84 U.S.L.W. 4462(U.S.2016).

"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING", AND A JUDGMENT OR ACT PROCURED BY FRAUD MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED. THIS APPLIES TO ACTS OR JUDGMENTS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS, NORBREGA-v.-HINKLE, 576 Fed. Appx' 224 CA4 (Va.2014); BARLOW-v.-COLGATE-PALMOLIVE CO., 772 F3d. 1001, 90 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 85 CA4 (Md.2014); MYLES v.-DOMINO'S-PIZZA-LLC., 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); FIRST TECHNOLOGY-CAPITAL-INC.-v.-BANCTEC,-INC., 2016 WL 7444943(D.C.Ky. 2016); MARTIN-v.-TARGET-CORP.-OF-MINNESOTA, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1187034(D.N.J.2013); McCLAIN-v.-1st.-SECURITY-BANK-OF-WASHINGTON, 2016 WL 8504775(W.D.Wash.2016).

INSOMUCH, THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, RIGHTFUL HEIR AND MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES MOTIONS TO INTERVENE WITHIN THIS DIRECT APPEAL, ALSO BY AND THROUGH HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.. THE (180) DAY RULE ISSUES ESTABLISHING COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL WITHIN THIS DIRECT APPEAL BELONGS TO THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH TO WHICH JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND IS A BENEFICIARY OF THE "TRUST" AS IS ARGUED WITHIN EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". THIS IS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED BY THESE DOCUMENTS NOW SUBMITTED INVOLVING THE CASE THAT JUDGE LEE AT VARIOUS TIMES PRESIDED OVER AND THIS COURT CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW BLOCKED THE ISSUE'S FILING ALONG WITH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL BY ALSO COMPROMISING MY HIRED COUNSEL DUE TO HIS RECENT ARREST ON DRUG RELATED CHARGES AND GOT HIM TO THROW ME UNDERNEATH THE BUS AS A COVERT CONDITION YOU MADE WITH HIM DEALING WITH THOSE PENDING CHARGES. CONSPIRACY CAN BE PROVEN BY CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE WHEN SUCH CAN BE INFERRED BY THE EVENTS THAT PRESENT THEMSELVES. YOUR INTENT ALSO IN ACTS OF MACHINATION IN VIOLATION OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER ROSS-v.-BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850 (U.S.2016), WAS TO CREATE A PROCEDURAL DEFECT RELATED TO EXHAUSTION TO TWART FEDERAL REVIEW ESTABLISHING BEFORE THIS COURT THAT THERE ARE NO AVAILABLE STATE REMEDIES DUE TO YOU CORRUPTING THE ENTIRE STATE PROCESS BY YOUR EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. WE ARE GOING TO GIVE YOU PEOPLE ONE MORE SHOT AT THIS TO CORRECT THE FRAUD. WE MOTION TO STAY THE REMITTITUR. IF SOMEHOW IN YOUR CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY THE REMITTITUR HAS BEEN SENT DOWN TO THE LOWER COURT. WE MOTION TO RECALL THE REMIT-

TITUR DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT. YOUR EFFORTS BEFORE THIS COURT AND THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DEMONSTRATE ACTS OF MACHINATION TO PREVENT REVIEW OF THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY AND TO REMAIN SILENT ON THE MERITS JUST LIKE THAT STUNT YOU PULLED IN THE GOURDINE CASE ATTEMPTING TO DECEIVE AND MANIPULATING HIM TO PROCEDURALLY DEFAULT AND WAIVE THE ISSUES BY MISREPRESENTING THE FACTS, SENDING HIM DOWN TO THE PCR COURT WHEN YOU KNEW GOOD AND WELL IT WAS REQUIRED THAT HE SEEK REHEARING TO ESTABLISH HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO SEEK WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THE "COMMON DESIGN" OF YOU COMPROMISING OUR STATE APPOINTED OR HIRED LEGAL COUNSEL, AS YOU ALSO DID IN THE david duren CASE, IS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE TO ESTABLISH THE CONSPIRACY THAT STANDS IN BLATANT VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242, 1001 AS WELL AS 42 U.S.C. §§ 1985(2), 1985(3) AND 1986. WE ARE GOING TO GIVE YOU ONE MORE OPPORTUNITY TO FIX THIS FIASCO OF AN ADJUDICATION VIA COLLATERALLY ATTACKING WHAT YOU'VE DONE BY YOUR FRAUD UPON THE COURT. FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS STATUTES REQUIRE ONLY THAT STATE PRISONERS GIVE STATE COURTS FAIR OPPORTUNITY TO ACT ON THEIR CLAIMS, O'SULLIVAN v. BOERCKEL, 526 U.S. 838, 119 S.Ct. 1728, 144 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.1999); NEAL v. THORTON, 2018 WL 1403614(N.C.2018). YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE LEAVING YOU OPEN TO DISMISSAL AS WELL AS CIVIL AND OR CRIMINAL PENALTIES. RULE ON THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES!!! ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES THAT ARE ARGUED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS NOW SUBMITTED IN THIS CASE ARE NOW BEING ARGUED WITHIN THIS APPEAL UNDER CASE 2014-0001051, EVEN INVOKING ORIGINAL JURISDICTION CLAIMS AND PUBLIC JURIS CLAIMS AND YOU CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO BLOCK REVIEW AND REMAIN SILENT ON ESSENTIAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHICH VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS PERMITTING US TO SEEK TO VACATE THE ORDER DENYING THE REHEARING IN ORDER THAT THESE MATTERS MAY BE PROPERLY AND FULLY ADDRESSED BEFORE THIS COURT BEFORE WE SEEK FEDERAL REVIEW TO CORRECT THE MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE THAT HAS OCCURRED WITHIN THESE CASES. IT IS REQUIRED BY LAW THAT WE GIVE THE STATE COURTS ONE FULL OPPORTUNITY TO RESOLVE ANY CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE BY INVOKING ONE COMPLETE ROUND OF STATE ESTABLISHED APPELLATE PROCESS. THIS, DUE TO YOUR FRAUD, IS YOUR LAST OPPORTUNITY INVOKING THAT ONE COMPLETE ROUND. REMEDY THE FRAUD AND RULE ON ALL JURIS-

DICTIONAL ISSUES. NEVERTHELESS, DUE TO YOUR FRAUD, AS IS EVIDENT IN YOUR ATTEMPTS TO DECEIVE GOURDINE AND MANIPULATE HIM INTO WAIVING HIS RIGHT TO WRIT OF CERT.. THE FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING AND YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION. THUS, WE ALSO MOTION THAT YOU VACATE THE CONVICTIONS AND RENDER TO A NULLITY ALL SAME SEX MARRIAGE WITHIN THIS STATE THEN LET THE CORRUPT RESPONDENT SEEK HIGHER REVIEW IF HE CHOSE TO DO SO. WE MOTION FOR FORFEITURE OF ALL CAUSES OF ACTION BEFORE THIS COURT, WILAND-v.-CLARK, 2018 WL 1129977(E.D.Va.2018); PASTER-NOSTER-COZART-v.-O'SULLIVAN, 2018 WL 1311999(E.D.Va.2018); HALL v.-ZOOK, 2017 WL 6614622(E.D.Va.2017); McCOY-v.-MARYLAND, 2017 WL 4310082(Md.2017).

WHEN IT COMES TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF WHAT YOU'VE DONE RELATED TO THESE CASE. WE CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION TO ENTER THE ORDER IN THIS CASE DENYING THE REHEARING AND MOVE TO VACATE IT AND REINSTATE THIS APPEAL TO HAVE THIS COURT RULE ON THE JURISDICTIONAL AND OTHER ISSUES PRESENTED, TO INCLUDE VACATING THE CONVICTIONS OF ALL PARTIES INVOLVED WHICH INCLUDE THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH JAHJAH AL MAHDI AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD. WE WANT THAT EVIDENCE, THE DNA TESTED TO MICHAEL LEE, THE ENTIRE SLED FILED 5501014 AND THE SEARCH WARRANT USED TO OBTAIN EVIDENCE FROM HIS HOME. THE FRAUD YOU ENGAGED IN RELATED TO ALL THESE CASES VITIATES THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS RENDERING THEM VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION IN YOU EFFORTS TO ILLEGALLY FRAME, SEIZE AND KIDNAP A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN OFFICIAL IN VIOLATION OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AND TO ATTACH HIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, GARCIA-FINANCIAL-GROUP-INC.-v.-VIRGINIA-ACCELERATORS-CORP., 3 Fed. Appx' 86, 2001 WL 117497(4th.Cir. 2001); BOARD-OF-TRUSTEES-OF-INTERNATIONAL-UNION-OF-OPERATING ENGINEERS, 2016 WL 1253285; WELLS-FARGO-BANK-N.A.-v.-FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561(2016); WHITE-v.-MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280(DSC.2014); U.S.-v.-ALADEKCHA, 2010 WL 4054267(D.C.Md.2010). IT IS AN ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT FOR JUDGES TO SIT UPON CASES TO WHICH THEY HAVE A DIRECT INTEREST IN ENGAGING IN RETALIATION TO TWART OR HINDER FAIR REVIEW AS JUDGE LEE DID IN THIS CASE AND FOR THE RESPONDENT AND STATE TO COMPROMISE STATE APPOINTED OR HIRED ATTORNEYS, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY ACROSS

MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 IN ACTS OF MACHINATION IN VIOLATION OF U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER ROSS-v.-BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850 (U.S. 2016), TO REMAIN SILENT AND CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS AND OR INFORMATION WHERE JUDGE LEE SAT UPON THIS CASE IN VIOLATION OF WILLIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016) RELATED TO THE REQUIREMENT OF RECUSAL, TO ALSO ALLOW THEM TO PRODUCE A FRAUDULENT DECISION TO AVOID SUIT AND PREVENT THE ESTABLISHING OF JURISDICTIONAL FACTS RELATED TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE STATE-v.-GENTRY CASE TO CREATE A DEFECT IN EXHAUSTION TO HALT S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. THIS CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AS WELL AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ON THE PART OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL INVOLVED STATE COURTS REQUIRING SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE AND VACATING OF ALL OF OUR CONVICTIONS WHICH WE MOTION FOR, WHICH ALSO RENDER YOUR JURISDICTION VOID FOR THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHERE YOU ALSO CONSPIRED TO PREVENT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S ENTRY INTO THESE CASES WHEN BY THE DEFAULT AND CLAIMS OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL HE HAS THE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHT AS FIDUCIARY TO DO SO. WE OBJECT AND YOUR ORDERS AND JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID, CHARLEY-ENTERPRISES-INC.-v.-DICKEY-BARBEQUE-RESTAURANTS-INC., 807 F3d. 553(4th.Cir.2015); HUNT-v.-U.S., F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 5131716(DSC.2007); BROWN-v.-U.S., 2014 WL 2871398(DSC. 2014); 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); BLUE-SKY-TRAVEL-AND-TOURS,-LLC.-v.-AL-TAYYAR,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); U.S.-v.-BEASLEY, 495 F3d. 142(4th.Cir.2007); U.S.-v.-$41,320 U.S.-CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240.

INSOMUCH, ALL JUDGMENTS OR ACTS MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT AT ANY TIME. THE POWER TO VACATE JUDGMENTS FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT IS FREE FROM PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS WHICH INCLUDE FRAUD BY OFFICERS OF THE COURT, LIKE JUDGES WHERE YOU CONSPIRED IN COMPROMISING LEGAL COUNSEL, JUDGES WHO SHOULDN'T HAVE SIT UPON THIS CASE CREATING STRUCTURAL ERROR AND FOR THE PURPOSE OF REMAINING SILENT ON THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE STATE-v.-GENTRY CASE WHICH VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION WHERE SUCH ACTS EFFECT THE INTEGRITY OF THE NORMAL PROCESS, IN-RE:-GENESYS-DATA-TECHNOLOGIES,-INC., 204 F3d. 124(4th.Cir.

2000); UNITED-STATES-v.-CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.2017); FOX-EX-REL-FOX-v.-ELK-RUN-COAL-CO.-INC., 739 F3d. 131, 87 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 534(4th.Cir.2014).

SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH SUCH AS THE FACT THAT THE COURT AND OR ATTORNEY GENERAL COMPROMISED OUR STATE APPOINTED AND OR HIRED ATTORNEYS, EVEN AS YOU DID IN THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DIRECT APPEAL, FOR WHICH WE ARE SEEKING TO VACATE THE ORDERS IN HIS DIRECT APPEAL AS WELL, DUE TO YOU EFFORTS TO ALSO SUPPRESS THE TRUTH THAT THE STATE-v.-GENTRY CASE IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BEING A DETERMINATION OBTAINED BY FRAUD ITSELF, TO INCLUDE YOU CONCEALING THAT JUDGE LEE WAS SITTING UPON THIS CASE IN VIOLATION OF HOLDINGS MADE UNDER WILLIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA CREATING STRUCTURAL ERROR RENDERING THESE PROCEEDINGS WHERE HER PRESENCE PRODUCE A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. SHE IS BEING SUED BY US FOR VIOLATIONS OF HER OATH OF OFFICE AND FOR NEGLECTING HER DUTY AS THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DULY APPOINTED "TRUSTEE" WHERE SHE WAS BOUND TO ACT BY HER OATH OF OFFICE. THIS RENDERS THE PROCEEDINGS ILLEGAL AND VOID IN YOUR EFFORTS TO REMAIN SILENT ON JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES AND THE FACT THAT SHE WAS SITTING ON THIS CASE WHEN SHE WAS REQUIRED TO RECUSE WITH THE INTENT TO DECEIVE IS "FRAUD". FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT WITHOUT ANY MISREPRESENTATION, OR DUTY TO DISCLOSE CAN CONSTITUTE FRAUD, EVEN ABSENCE OF FIDUCIARY DUTY, STATUTORY, OR OTHER INDEPENDENT LEGAL DUTY TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION, COMMON LAW FRAUD INCLUDE ACTS TAKEN TO CONCEAL, LIKE JUDGE LEE SITTING ON THE ROWLAND DIRECT APPEAL, OR CREATE A FALSE IMPRESSION LIKE THE PROCEEDINGS WERE LEGAL WHEN YOU COMPROMISED OUR HIRED OR STATE APPOINTED ATTORNEYS TO CIRCUMVENT ADDRESSING JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, OR TO MISLEAD LIKE YOU DID GOURDINE TRYING TO SHIFT HIM TO THE PCR COURT TO AVOID S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW ENGAGING IN CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO BE SILENT ON JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS AS WELL AS FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT CLAIMS IN EFFORTS TO BE SILENT ON ISSUES INTENDED TO BE PRESENTED BEFORE THIS COURT. WE MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE BOTH CASES 2014-0001051 AND 2016-000640 FOR THE PURPOSE OF HAVING THESE MATTERS PROPERLY AND FULLY ADDRESSED BEFORE THIS COURT. YOUR ACTIONS PRODUCE FRAUD UPON THE COURT PLACING THE S.C. COURT

OF APPEALS IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CLAIMS AND CAUSES OF ACTION WITH INCLUDE THE ISSUE OF SAME SEX MARRIAGE AND VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION FOR FRAUD, UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, IN RE: DURAMAX DIESEL LITIGATION, --F.R.D.--, 2018 WL 949856 E.D.MICH.2018); UNITED STATES v. PALIN, 874 F3d. 418(4th.Cir. 2017); UNITED STATES v. LUSK, 2017 WL 508589(S.D.Va.2017); UNITED STATES v. CALLOWAY, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 4269961(N.D.Cal.2016); MORRISON v. ACCUWEATHER, INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 3015226 (M.D.Pa.2016).

JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES ATTACKING THE STRUCTURE OF THE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AT THEY RELATE TO OUR CONVICTIONS OR THE CIVIL PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 ESTABLISHING THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH'S SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY, ADDRESSING CONSTITUTIONAL AND DUE PROCESS CONCERNS ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE ARE NON FRIVOLOUS ISSUES, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH NO COURT UNTIL THIS DAY HAVE ADDRESSED. SILENCE ON THIS ISSUE IS FRAUD AS WELL TO ALLOW THE COURT TO MISREPRESENT THE FACTS IN THESE CASES. YOUR INTENT TO BE SILENT IN ACTS OF MACHINATION REGARDING THE ISSUES ARGUED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS PRESENTED BEFORE THIS COURT IS "FRAUD"; PLACING THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION EVEN ON THE ISSUE ON SAME SEX MARRIAGE DUE TO THE EGREGIOUS DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS RENDERING THESE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS RELATED TO THESE CASES IN QUESTION UNCONSTITUTIONAL VOIDING YOUR JURISDICTION. "EX DOLO MALO NON ORITUR ACTIO"---OUT OF FRAUD NO ACTION RAISES; FRAUD NEVER GIVES A RIGHT OF ACTION. NO COURT SHALL LEND ITS AID TO MAN WHO FOUND HIS CAUSE OF ACTION UPON AN IMMORAL OR ILLEGAL ACT. COURTS HAVE THE INHERENT EQUITY POWER TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENTS WHICH INCLUDE OUR CONVICTIONS WHENEVER THEIR ENFORCEMENT WOULD BE MANIFESTLY UNCONSCIONABLE BECAUSE OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AS YOU CONSPIRED IN TO DENY US THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. WE MOTION TO RECALL THE REMITTITUR IN THE CRAWFORD DIRECT APPEAL ALSO TO INCLUDE SEEKING THE ORDERS IN HIS DIRECT APPEAL BE VACATED ALSO VIA HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL AND HIMSELF RELATED THERETO, U.S. v. COTTON, 231 F3d. 890(4th.Cir.2000); CHRISTIANSON

v.-M.B.N.A.-AMERICAN-BANK-N.A., S.E.2d., 2013 WL 8507850(S.C. App.2013); CALDWELL-v.-WIQUIST, 402 S.C. 595, 741 S.E.2d. 583 (S.C.App.2013); MILLER-v.-COLUMBIA-FOREST,-INC., S.E.2d., 2014 WL 5390504(S.C.App.2014); SPRINGOB-v.-UNIVERSITY-OF-SOUTH-CAROLINA, 407 S.C. 490, 757 S.E.2d. 384(S.C.2014); M.D.C.-INNOVATORS, LLC.-v.-NORTHERN,--FED. Appx'--, 2018 WL 1129607(4th.Cir.2018); HAMER-v.-NEIGHBORHOOD-HOUSING-SERVICES-OF-CHICAGO, 138 S.Ct. 13, 199 L.Ed.2d. 249(U.S.2017); PHILLIPS-v.-BROCK-&-SCOTT-PLLC., 2017 WL 3226866(D.C.Md.2017).

INASMUCH, WE MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE ALL CASES INVOLVED. KNOWING FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION LIKE JUDGE LEE WAS SITTING ON THE ROWLAND DIRECT APPEAL IN VIOLATION OF THE HOLDINGS MADE IN WILLIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA, OR THAT YOU CONSPIRED WITH THE PROSECUTOR TO COMPROMISE OUR STATE APPOINTED ATTORNEYS, OR THAT YOU CONSPIRED TO DENY THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH HIS RIGHT TO SELF REPRESENTATION AND OR RIGHT TO COUNSEL OF CHOICE IN VIOLATION OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER WEAVER-v.-MASSACHUSETTS, 137 S.Ct. 1899, 198 L.Ed.2d. 420, 85 U.S.L.W. 4433(U.S.2017) IN VIOLATION OF HIS FIDUCIARY RIGHTS UNDER TRUSTEES-OF-DARTHMOUTH-COLLEGE-v.-WOODWARD, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201 AND UNDER FIFTH-THIRD-BANCORP-v.-DUDENHOEFFER, 132 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d. 457, 82 U.S.L.W. 4578(U.S.2014) AND UNDER WEARRY-v.-CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016) AIDING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, CONSPIRING TO BE SILENT ON THE FACT THEY WERE CONCEALING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE BY CONCEALING THAT WHICH IS CONTAINED IN THE SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE 5501014, AND THE FACT THAT EVIDENCE IN THAT CASE WAS OBTAINED WITHOUT A VALID SEARCH WARRRANT IS FRAUD. **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING"**. SILENCE BY THE COURT, AS AN ACT OF MACHINATION BY INVOLVING ITSELF AND OR CONSPIRING IN ALL OF THE AFOREMENTIONED WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT AND ITS ATTACHMENTS WILL EQUATE WITH FRAUD WHEN THERE IS A LEGAL AND MORAL DUTY TO SPEAK, WHICH INDEED DID AND DO EXIST, OR WHEN INQUIRY LEFT UNANSWERED WOULD BE INTENTIONALLY MISLEADING TO ALLOW THE COURT TO MISREPRESENT THE FACTS AND AVOID SUIT FOR ONE THING, VIOLATING YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE. THE INQUIRY AS TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE STATE-v.-GENTRY CASE, THE LEGAL ISSUE OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY WHERE THE INDICTMENTS TAKE AWAY THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE

AND ALL OF OUR OTHER INDEPENDENT CLAIMS WERE LEFT UNANSWERED, TO INCLUDE THE ISSUE OF DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL RELATED TO CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH IS WHY THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ATTEMPTED TO MANIPULATE GOURDINE TO FILE A PCR TO PREVENT S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW WHO THEY THEMSELVES WOULD NOT RULE ON THE ISSUES UNTIL THEY WERE MADE A PART OF A REHEARING FROM THIS COURT WHICH HAS NOW OCCURRED PURSUANT TO WE SEEKING TO VACATE YOUR ORDERS FOR YOUR FRAUD. FRAUD AND DECEIT WILL RAISE FROM SILENCE, AS THIS COURT DID IN ACTS OF MACHINATION TO ALLOW YOU TO MISREPRESENT THE FACTS OF THESE CASES IN CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY IN VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE WHERE THERE IS DUTY TO SPEAK THE TRUTH, AS WELL AS FROM SPEAKING UNTRUTH. PARTY IN INTEREST WILL BECOME LIABLE FOR FRAUD MY MERE SILENT ACQUIESCENCE AND PARTAKING IN THE BENEFITS OF THAT FRAUD, SUCH AS YOU USING IT TO MAKE YOUR JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS IN EFFORTS TO AID THE OTHER CONSPIRING PARTIES IN THE PENDING STATE AND FEDERAL CASES AND JURISDICTIONS. FRAUD IN ITS ELEMENTARY COMMON LAW SENSE OF DECEIT....INCLUDE THE DELIBERATE CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS AND OR INFORMATION, SUCH AS JUDGE LEE INAPPROPRIATELY SITTING ON THE ROWLAND DIRECT APPEAL, THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE STATE-v.-GENTRY CASE, EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE REGARDING SLED FILE 5501014, THAT THERE WAS NO SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED IN THE KING-KHALIFAH'S CRIMINAL CASE, AND THAT THE ISSUES WE ALL ARGUED RELATED TO OUR CASES INDEPENDENTLY INVALIDATED ALL OF OUR CONVICTIONS, IN A SETTING OF FIDUCIARY OBLIGATION, A PUBLIC OFFICER SUCH AS A JUDGE, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE STATE APPOINTED COUNSELS IN THE CASES ARE FIDUCIARY TO THE PUBLIC....AND IF HE OR SHE DELIBERATELY CONCEALS MATERIAL INFORMATION FROM THEM, LIKE YOU ALL CONCEALED THE MATTERS AFOREMENTIONED WHICH INCLUDE HAVING THAT DNA TESTED TO MICHAEL LEE WHICH WOULD HAVE PROVEN THE STATE PRODUCED A FICTITIOUS HOMOCIDE TO FRAME THE KING-KHALIFAH BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED AND PREVENT HIS ASCENDING THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES AND PROTECTING HIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, HE OR SHE IS GUILTY OF **"FRAUD"**, 424 F2d. 1021; U.S.-v.-HORTON, R. PRUDDEN, NO. 28140, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, (5th.Cir.1970); RUBINSTEIN-v.-COLLINS, 20 F3d. 160 (1990); BRANSON-v.-STANDARD-HARDWARE-INC., 874 S.W.2d. 919(1994); POINDEXTER-v.-GREENHOW, 114 U.S. 270, 303(U.S.1885); MORRISON v.-CODDINGTON, 662 P.2d. 155, 135 ARIZ. 480 (1983); UNITED-STATES

v.-TWEED, 550 F2d. 297, 299, 300(1977); U.S.-v.-KORN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2898056(W.D.N.Y.2013); TONEY-v.-COM., 1998 WL 684203(4th. Cir.1988); SEC-v.-FARMER, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5838867(S.D.Tex. 2015); U.S.-v.-MOSBERG, 866 F.Supp.2d. 275(D.N.J.2011); U.S. v.-WECHT, F.Supp.2d., 2008 WL 2223869(W.D.Pa.2008).

IF ANY REMITTITUR RELATED TO ALL OF THESE CASES INVOLVED HAVE BEEN SENT DOWN WE MOTION TO STAY THEM BEFORE THIS COURT AND RECALL THEM FROM THE LOWER COURT EVEN IF ITS OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT DUE TO THE EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SURROUND THIS CASE ALSO DUE TO THE FACT THAT THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE STATE-v.-GENTRY CASE DATES BACK TO THE TIME WHEN THAT CASE WAS RULED ON OR ENACTED. THE LAW DICTATES THAT NEITHER JUDGES NOR GOVERNMENT ATTORNEYS ARE ABOVE THE LAW, UNITED STATES-v.-ISAAC, 493 F2d. 1124, 1143(7th.Cir.1974); PULLIAM v.-ALLEN, 446 U.S. 522, 536-543, 104 S.Ct. 1970, 1971-1982, 80 L.Ed.2d. 565(U.S.1984). IN OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM, FEW MORE SERIOUS THREATS TO INDIVIDUAL LIBERY THAN A CORRUPT BASTARD JUDGE OR JUDGES ACTING IN COLLUSION OUTSIDE THEIR JUDICIAL AUTHORITY WITH OTHERS AND EVEN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO DEPRIVE CITIZENS AND EVEN SOVEREIGN POWERS OF THEIR RIGHTS EVEN PURSUANT TO THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AS HAS OCCURRED HERE. IN THE CASE OF MARSHAL-SEA, 77 ENG. REP. 1027 (K.B.1613), SIR EDWARD COKE FOUND THAT ARTICLE 39 OF THE MAGNA CARTA RESTRICTED THE POWERS OF JUDGES TO ACT OUTSIDE THEIR JURISDICTION AS DO OTHER LAWS WITHIN THIS NATION. SUCH PROCEEDINGS OR ACTS WOULD BE VOID AND ACTIONABLE. WITHOUT JURISDICTION EXISTING, AND WHERE SUCH JUDGMENTS WERE PROCURED BY FRAUD, SUCH ORDER(S) ENTERED BY THE COURT ARE ABSOLUTELY VOID, IN-RE:-MATTER-OF-HAGUE, 412 MICH. 532, 544; 315 N.W.2d. 524(1982). ALL PROCEEDINGS FOUNDED UPON VOID JUDGMENTS PROCURED BY FRAUD ARE THEMSELVES REGARDED AS INVALID, OLSON-v.-LEITH, 71 WYO. 316, 257 P.2d. 342; ACKERMAN v.-EXXONMOBIL-CORP., 734 F3d. 237(4th.Cir.2013); GIRARDI-v. HEEP, 203 F3d. 820(4th.Cir.1999); QUARLES-v.-MILLER, 86 F3d. 55(4th.Cir.1996); PYNE-v.-UNITED-STATES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 1377402(D.C.Md.2016). THE JUDGMENTS OBTAINED BY ORDER(S) ARE VOID BECAUSE THE COURT EXCEEDED ITS JURISDICTION TO ENTER THEM. WHERE COURT AFTER ACQUIRING JURISDICTION OF A SUBJECT MATTER AS HERE, ALSO INVOLVING INTENTIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT,

TRANSCENDS THE LIMITS OF THE JURISDICTION CONFERRED, AS WHEN A JUDGE SITS UPON A CASE IN VIOLATION OF U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT OR COMPROMISES HIRED OR APPOINTED LEGAL COUNSEL OR CIRCUMVENT RULING ON SUBSTANTIAL STRUCTURAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES, TO INCLUDE ENGAGING IN OUTRAGEOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE BY STEALING, EXECUTING, ARRESTING OR ATTACHING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN AND SOLE CORPORATION. ITS JUDGMENTS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID, ARMSTRONG v. OBUCINO, 300 ILL. 140, 143, 133 N.E. 58(1921); 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.; SANDRA T. KOTTMAN PLAINTIFF v. UNITED STATES, 2017 WL 4185481(W.D.MISSOURI.2017); WARD v. HUERBAUGH, 2017 WL 2724938(D.C.Miss.2017); MONROE v. PAPE, 365 U.S. 167, 183, 81 S.Ct. 473, 482, 5 L.Ed.2d. 492(U.S. 1961); SEBELIUS v. AUBURN REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, 133 S.Ct. 817, 184 L.Ed.2d. 627, 81 U.S.L.W. 4053(U.S.2013); BOLIVIA REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA v. HELMERICH & PAYNE INTERN DRILLING CO., 137 S.Ct. 1312, 197 L.Ed.2d. 663, 85 U.S.L.W. 4221(U.S.2017); DOE v. FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6 (D.D.C.2016).

A COURT CANNOT CONFER OR ESTABLISH JURISDICTION WHERE NONE EXIST AND OR IS MADE VOID FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND A COURT CANNOT MAKE A VOID PROCEEDING VALID WHICH PLACES YOU IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES PRESENTED. TO CONSPIRE TO TAKE AWAY REMEDY LIKE YOU DID HERE COMPROMISING OUR HIRED AND OR STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL IN EFFORTS TO REMAIN SILENT ON JURISDICTIONAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES, JUDGES SITTING ON THE ROWLAND CASE IN VIOLATION OF U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT, CONSPIRING WITH THE STATE CONCEAL EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE, REMEDY GIVEN TO US FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS IS TO TAKE AWAY THE DUE PROCESS RIGHT ITSELF. SUCH WOULD NOT BE WITHIN THE POWER OR DISCRETION OF THE STATE OR THIS COURT. UNDER FEDERAL LAW WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO THE STATES, THAT IF A COURT OR PARTIES IS "WITHOUT AUTHORITY, SUCH AS DUE TO YOUR FRAUD AND THE STRUCTURAL ERRORS RELATED TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE, AND YOU BEING SILENT FINDING EVERY WAY POSSIBLE TO CIRCUMVENT

RULING ON ESSENTIAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES WITHIN THESE CASES IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, WHICH ARE ALL UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATING DUE PROCESS, ITS JUDGMENTS, AND OR ACTS OR ORDERS ARE REGARDED AS NULLITIES. THEY ARE NOT VOIDABLE, BUT SIMPLY VOID, AND FORM NO BAR TO RECOVERY SOUGHT, EVEN PRIOR TO REVERSAL IN OPPOSITION TO THEM. THEY CONSTITUTE NO JUSTIFICATION, AND ALL PERSONS CONCERNED IN EXECUTING SUCH JUDGMENTS OR SENTENCES ARE CONSIDERED IN LAW AS TRESPASSERS". IN REGARD TO THE LEAD ISSUE OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY ATTACKING OUR CONVICTIONS WHERE THE INDICTMENTS BY THEIR LANGUAGE PREDETERMINE IN ADVANCE THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS, CREATING CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTIONS, ESTABLISHING AN INSTANT DOUBLE JEOPARDY CLAIM, SHIFTING THE BURDEN OF PERSUASION UPON THE DEFENDANT RELATED TO THE MENS REA ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE AND INDISPUTABLY TAKING AWAY OUR PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE. WE GIVE YOU JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT THE ESSENTIAL PART OF THIS ISSUE AND LEGAL ARGUMENT WHICH VOIDS THE CRIMINAL COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, HAS BEEN RECENTLY HEARD UNDER THE CASE OF NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249, 197 L.Ed.2d. 611, 85 U.S.L.W. 4205(U.S.2017). THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DETERMINED THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE LIES AT THE **"FOUNDATION"** OF THE **"WHOLE"** CRIMINAL PROCEEDING MAKING IT A STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE. THE COURT FURTHER DETERMINED THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE IS A PRINCIPLE SO ROOTED IN THE TRADITIONS AND CONSCIENCE OF THE PEOPLE AS TO BE FUNDAMENTAL AND TO DEPRIVE SUCH, AS THE LANGUAGE IN THE INDICTMENTS DO, IS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS WHICH VOIDS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. NORMALLY THIS WOULD BE AN AUTOMATIC REVERSIBLE ERROR. BUT DUE TO THE COMPOUNDING FACTORS SUCH AS THE GRAND JURY GOING BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THE POWER AND AUTHORITY GIVEN TO THEM BY DUE PROCESS LAW AND BY THE LANGUAGE ACTUALLY CONVICTING US SUBJECTING US TO A FORM OF MODERN DAY SLAVERY, TAKING AWAY OUR RIGHT TO VOTE IN VIOLATION OF THE 15TH. AMENDMENT VIA EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY THESE VIOLATIONS AND THEY FAILING TO ADDRESS IT AND THE OTHER MATTERS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO AVOID JUDICIAL REVIEW ON THE MERITS OF THESE CLAIMS. THEN YOU ADD ON THE ADDITIONAL COMPOUNDING FACTOR OF THE COURT(S) CONSTRUCTIVELY AMENDING THE INDICTMENTS ON THE MENS REA ELEMENTS EVEN BY ATTEMPTED INSUFFICIENT CURATIVE INSTRUCTION. THE AMOUNT OF PREJUDICE AND DUE

PROCESS VIOLATIONS BECOME SO EGREGIOUS, SO OVERWHELMING, IT REQUIRES THAT THE CONVICTION(S) BE VACATED WHICH WE MOTION FOR. CLASS ACTION MUST BE CERTIFIED DUE TO THE KING-KHALIFAH BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 FROM THE COMMON PLEAS COURT POSSESSING SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER NOW LEGALLY PROTECTED UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WHERE BY YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE YOU SWORE TO UPHOLD. IN THIS CASE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DETERMINED A REVERSIBLE CONVICTION IS REVERSIBLE REGARDLESS OF REASON, AND AN INVALID CONVICTION IS NO CONVICTION AT ALL WHICH ALSO ADD TO PROVING MONTGOMERY-v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599 WAS CORRECT ABOUT UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VOIDING JURISDICTION EVEN IN CRIMINAL CASES ESTABLISHING THAT THE HOLDINGS MADE IN STATE-v.-GENTRY IS AN ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT INTENTIONALLY DONE TO TARGET AFRICAN AMERICANS IN VIOLATION OF THE HOLDINGS MADE UNDER EX PARTE-VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339(U.S.1880). WHEN YOU ADD THE FACT THAT THIS DECISION WAS MADE APRIL 19, 2017 WE ARE TIMELY GETTING THESE MATTERS BEFORE THE COURT WITHIN ONE YEAR OF U.S. SUPREME COURT RULING. YOU ADD TO THIS THAT THESE ACTIONS IN THEIR TOTALITY CONSTITUTE ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS INVOLVED AS ARGUED WITHIN THESE CASES. THIS OPENS ALL JUDGMENTS UP TO COLLATERAL ATTACK THAT IS NOT SUBJECT TO PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION, UNITED-STATES v.-LIBOUS, 858 F3d. 64 (2nd.Cir.2017); CITY-OF-LEBANNON-v.-MILBURN, 286 Or. App. 212, 398 P.3d. 486(2017); NELSON-v.-COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249, 197 L.Ed.2d. 611, 85 U.S.L.W. 4205(U.S.2017).

THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH FULFILLED HIS DUTY BY DUE PROCESS LAW AND LEGALLY PETITIONED TO ESTABLISH THESE RIGHTS BEFORE A COMPETENT COURT HAVING JURISDICTION TO HEAR THE CASE UNDER 2013-CP-400-0084 IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS WHERE THE U.S. ATTORNEYS KRISTY KHOL AND PAUL GUNTER APPEARED AND ARE PARTY TO THE DEFEAULT BINDING YOU AND THIS COURT VIA YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE AS EMPLOYEES OF THIS STATE WHERE YOU SWORE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION WHERE THE KING-KHALIFAH'S FIDUCIARY SUPERSEDING FOREIGN SOVEREIGN RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ARE NOW LEGALLY PROTECTED THEREBY. YOU ARE TO VACATE THE CONVICTIONS AND DISCHARGE OUR DEBTS. ESTABLISH THE LIEN. GIVE US FREE BY DECREE OF THE SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE SOLE

CORPORATION AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN WHERE THE KING-KHALIFAH DENOUNCES HIS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP BEFORE THIS COURT AS HE DID BEFORE ALL FEDERAL COURTS AND ADOPTS THE CITIZENSHIP OF HIS ISRAELI FOREFATHERS AARON OF THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHODD AND KING DAVID INVOKING THE ISRAELI LAW OF RETURN TO ASCEND THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES. PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS DO NOT ATTACH DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURTS AND YOUR JURISDICTION IS VOID FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, RYNE v. UNITED STATES, F.Supp. 3d., 2016 WL 1377402(D.C.Md.2016); VAETH v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 775386(D.C.Md.2016); IN RE: DEY, --B.R.--, 2015 WL 669788(10th.Cir.2015); WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C. LLC, 859 F3d. 295(4th.Cir.2017); MOSELY v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 1187778(N.C.2018); MILFORD v. MIDDLETON, 2018 WL 348059(DSC.2018); RUBIN v. ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, 138 S.Ct. 816, 86 U.S.L.W. 4064(U.S.2018)(ADDRESSING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION IN THE FORM OF THE RIGHT TO MARRY GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS AS A **"GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS WHICH YOU VIOLATED** BY GIVING THIS RIGHT TO SODOMITES AND GOMMORAHRITES OF YOUR NATIONS WITHOUT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S CONSENT).

THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND ALL OTHER COURTS INVOLVED ENGAGED IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT BEING SILENT AND NOT ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL WHICH VITIATES ALL PROCEEDINGS, INCLUDING THIS COURT REGARDING THE GOURDINE CASE PLACING YOU IN FORFEITURE ON THIS ISSUE AS WELL . THE MERITS WERE NEVER ADDRESSED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN RAISED BEFORE THAT COURT FOR THE FIRST TIME AND CANNOT BE WAIVED BY US. THEY ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW AND OR AUTHORITY ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION TO TWART REVIEW AND REMAIN SILENT. THE LAW IS CLEAR ON HOW COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL IS ESTABLISHED AND DETERMINED. THIS IS WHY THE ORDERS ISSUED OUT OF CASE 2017-0002108 OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT NEVER ADDRESSED THE MERITS OF THE ISSUES IN QUESTION BUT SIMPLY MAINTAINED THEIR ORIGINAL POSITION THAT THE ISSUES WERE NOT PRESERVED BY REHEARING BEFORE THIS COURT OF APPEALS. THEY CONSPIRED TO REMAIN SILENT ON THE ISSUE BECAUSE IF THEY WOULD HAVE ADDRESSED IT. THE LAW WOULD HAVE REQUIRED THAT THE RESPONDENT PROVE HE TIMELY REBUTTED THE AFFIDA-

VITS IN QUESTION OR THAT HE WAS NOT GIVEN FAIR OPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE CLAIMS WHICH ALL COURTS INVOLVED KNEW THAT HE NOR THE UNITED STATES COULD DO. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WAS CLEAR ON THIS ISSUE WHEN IT DETERMINED THE BURDEN OF PROVING ESTOPPEL LIES WITH THE PARTY WHOM SEEKS TO ASSERT ISSUE FORECLOSURE WAS NECESSARILY DECIDED AT TRIAL AND OR HEARING. THE (3) DOCUMENTS EXHIBITS, "JUDGE LEE 1-4", THE (92), (152), THE SCHEDULING DOCUMENTS AND (31) PAGE DOCUMENTS MEET THAT BURDEN AND IS BINDING UPON ALL COURTS PURSUANT TO BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WHERE BY YOU OATHS OF OFFICE YOU SWORE TO UPHOLD WHERE THESE SUPERSEDING RIGHTS ARE PROTECTED THEREBY. THE COURT DETERMINED IN ABSENCE OF A WRITTEN DECISION PARTY CAN POINT TO TRANSCRIPT OR COURT DOCUMENTS OR ORAL DECISION (EMPHASIS ADDED) LIKE WHEN JUDGE LEE MADE SUCH IN THE APRIL 3, 2014 HEARING, CONTAINING FINDINGS OF FACT ALSO ESTABLISHED BY UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS. JUDGE LEE NOR THE RESPONDENT EVER TIMELY REBUTTED THE CLAIMS BEFORE JURISDICTION WAS MADE VOID BY UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS AS THE DOCUMENTS EXPLAIN. THUS, COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN TO WHICH THERE IS NO SEPARATION OF POWERS, BINDING UPON ALL GLOBAL COURTS STANDS AND MUST BE GIVEN FULL FAITH AND CREDIT WITHIN ALL COURT RECORDS, IN RE: SMITH, 2016 WL 3943710(Md.2016); IN RE: QIAO LIN, 576 B.R. 32 (N.Y.2017); NEW HAMSHIRE v. MAINE, 532 U.S. 742, 121 S.Ct. 1808, 149 L.Ed.2d. 968(U.S.2001); BAKER BY THOMAS v. GENERAL MOTORS CORP., 522 U.S. 222, 118 S.Ct. 657, 139 L.Ed.2d. 580 (U.S.1998); GATES v. STRAIN, 2017 WL 2417051 (E.D.La.2017).

THE LAW DICTATES THAT FRAUD DESTROYS THE VALIDITY OF EVERYTHING THAT IT ENTERS, WHICH INCLUDE ALL ORDERS ISSUED WITHIN THESE CASES AS WELL AS THE CONVICTIONS ATTACHED TO THEM, ALSO FOR VIOLATIONS OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE. THE FRAUD EFFECTS THE MOST SOLEMN ACTS OR JUDGMENTS OR DECRESS. LABEO DEFINES FRAUD AS ANY CUNNING DECEPTION OR ARTICLE USED TO CIRCUMVENT OR DECEIVE ANOTHER, MR WELLS, IN HIS VERY WORK ON RES JUDICATA SAYS SEC. 49, **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING"**, ELLIOTT v. PIERSOL, 1 PET. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340(U.S.1828); NUDD v. BURROWS, 91 U.S. 667-683(U.S.1875); U.S. v. THROCKMORTON, 98 U.S. 61-67(U.S.1871);

WELLS-FARGO-BANK-N.A.-v.-FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561(2016); 24-SENATORIAL-DIST.-REPUBLICAN-COMMITTEE-v.-ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th. Cir.2016); TRINSEY-v.-PAGLIARO, 229 F.Supp. 647(D.C.Pa.1964); MYLES-v.-DOMONO'S-PIZZA-LLC, 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017).

YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE IS A QUID PRO QUO CONTRACT UNDER U.S. CONST. ARTICLE 6 Cl. 2 AND 3, DAVIS-v.-LAWYERS-SURETY-CORPORATION, 459 S.W.2d. 655 Tex. App., IN WHICH CLERKS, OFFICIALS AND OFFICERS OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PLEDGE TO PERFORM, SUPPORT AND UPHOLD THEIR STATES CONSTITUTIONS AND THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WITH ITS MANDATES AND PROHIBITIONS IN RETURN FOR SUBSTANCES SUCH AS WAGES, PERKS AND BENEFITS. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAS HELD THAT NO STATE, NOR LEGISLATOR, NOR EXECUTIVE, NOR JUDGE CAN WAR AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION WITHOUT VIOLATING ITS UNDERTAKING TO SUPPORT IT WHICH IS THE HEART OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE. BY WARRING AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION YOU'VE ENGAGED IN TREASONOUS ACTS OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE AND DENYING US THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS VOIDING THE COURTS INVOLVED JURISDICTION WHICH INCLUDE ALL CRIMINAL COURTS INVOLVED FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT, UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND ARBITRARY JUDICIAL ACTION AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. REFUSING TO LIVE BY YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE PLACES YOU IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF THAT OATH OF OFFICE IN EVERY CASE WITH PENALTIES AT $1 MILLION PER VIOLATION, SEE 5 U.S.C. §§ 3331, 3333, 7311; S.C. RULE 502.1; COOPER-v.-AARON, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401(U.S.1958); IN-RE:-NEELY, 390 P.3d. 728, 2017 WY. 25; ALLEGANY-CORP.-v.-KIRBY, D.C.N.Y., 218 F.Supp. 164, 183; KEETON-PACKING-CO.-v.-STATE, 437 S.W. 20, 28; U.S. v.-ECCLESTON,--Fed, Appx'--, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); U.S.-v.-WELLS, 578 Fed. Appx' 234 CA4 (Va.2015); SMITH-v.-CLARK/SMOOT/-RUSSELL,--F3d.--, 2015 WL 4717932 CA4 (Md.2015); UNITED STATES-v.-WILL, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d. 392, 406(U.S.1980).

THE LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS ON ISSUES SUCH AS THE ONES BEING ARGUED WITHIN THIS CASE. IF A RULING HAS BEEN OBTAINED BY AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION AND OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW AND OR ACT, WHICH INCLUDE

FRAUD. THE LAW EXPLAINED IF THIS POSITION IS WELL TAKEN, WHICH IT IS, IT EFFECTS THE **"FOUNDATION"** OF THE **"WHOLE"** (EMPHASIS ADDED) PROCEEDINGS, CONFORMING THAT **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING".** AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND OR ACT AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IS **"VOID"** AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO LAW AND OR ACT OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION MADE OR DONE AT ALL, BEING A STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE. THE GENERAL RULE IS THAT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR STATUTE AND OR ACT AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION OF LAW, THOUGH HAVING THE FORM AND NAME OF LAW, IT IS IN REALITY NO LAW BY SUCH ACTS, BUT IS **"WHOLLY VOID"** AND INEFFECTIVE FOR ANY PURPOSE, TO INCLUDE MAKING AN APPELLATE REVIEW FROM IT OR ATTACHING A CONVICTION TO IT, SINCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY DATES FROM THE TIME OF ITS ENACTMENT AND OR WHEN IT WAS DONE....IN LEGAL CONTEMPLATION, IT IS INOPERATIVE AS IF IT HAD NEVER BEEN PASSED OR DONE....SINCE AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR LAW AND OR ACT IS VOID, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE FOLLOWS THAT IT IMPOSES NO DUTY (NO DUTY TO MAINTAIN THE CONVICTIONS OR THE ORDER DENYING REHEARING DUE TO THE COLLATERAL ATTACK FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT), CONFERS NO RIGHTS (YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO THE CAUSES PRESENTED BY THE STATE PLACING YOU IN FORFEITURE), CREATES NO OFFICE (JUDICIAL, S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE ATTORNEYS.), BESTOWS NO POWER OR AUTHORITY ON ANY PERSON [EMPHASIS ADDED] (WHICH MEANS YOUR JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID PLACING YOU IN FORFEITURE.), AFFORDS NO PROTECTION (YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF YOU OATHS OF OFFICE. YOU ARE NOT IMMUNE IF YOU FAIL TO CORRECT THIS AND GRANT RELIEF SOUGHT.), AND JUSTIFIES NO ACTS PERFORMED UNDER IT (THIS INCLUDES THE CONVICTIONS AND ISSUING YOUR ORDERS TAINTED BY THE FRAUD.)....A VOID ACT CANNOT BE LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH A VALID ONE BY YOUR FRAUD UPON THE COURT EVEN IN THE CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW CANNOT OPERATE TO SUPERSEDE AN EXISTING LAW. INDEED INSOFAR AS A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION (LIKE THE REHEARING ORDER IN THE ROWLAND APPEAL, THE ORDERS RELATED TO ALL OF OUR CONVICTIONS IN THE CRIMINAL COURT, THE GOURDINE ORDER ETC.) AND OR STATUTE AND OR ACT AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION RUNS COUNTER TO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE LAND (THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, DUE PROCESS LAW, YOU DON'T OBTAIN JUDICIAL DECISION TAINTED BY FRAUD, SCHWARE, McBURNEY, INDICTMENTS ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER

JURISDICTION WHICH VOIDS THE CRIMINAL COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS), IT IS SUPERSEDED THEREBY. NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY FRAUD OR AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION (LIKE YOU CONSPIRED BY THE ACTIONS AFORESAID TO REMAIN SILENT ON ADDRESSING THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE STATE-v. GENTRY CASE BY EVEN TRYING TO MANIPULATE GOURDINE TO FILE PCR TO TRICK HIM INTO FORFEITING S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW AND DENY ALL OF US REVIEW ON THE ISSUE TO INCLUDE BEING SILENT ON THE LEAD ISSUE OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY), AND ALL SUCH DETERMINATIONS, STATUTES, LAWS, PRACTICES (LIKE THE FRAUD AND MACHINATION YOU'VE ENGAGED IN INVOLVING ALL OF THESE CASES), WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION ARE **"NULL"** AND **"VOID"**, PYNE-v.-UNITED-STATES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 1377402(D.C.Md.2016); MARBURY-v.-MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; VINES-v.-UNITED-STATES, 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1163(1), 1165(1); ROBINSON-v.-ARVONIO, 27 F3d. 877 REHEARING DENIED CERT. GRANTED VACATED 115 S.Ct. 1247, 513 U.S. 1186, 131 L.Ed.2d. 129; LOUMIET-v.-UNITED-STATES, 65 F.Supp. 3d. 19(2014); JOHNSON-v.-UNITED-STATES,--S.Ct.--, 2015 WL 2473450 (U.S.2015); MONTGOMERY-v.-LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016); GEFT-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); 24-SENATORIAL-DIST. REPUBLICAN-COMMITTEE-v.-ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016); VAETH-v.-BOARD-OF-TRUSTEES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 775386(D.C.Md. 2016); WELLS-FARGO-BANK-N.A.-v.-H.M.H.-ROMAN-TWO-N.C.-LLC., 859 F3d. 295(4th.Cir.2017); MOSELY-v.-UNITED-STATES, 2018 WL 1187778(N.C.2018); STATE-v.THOMPSON, 2018 WL 1702406, * 6+, W.Va..

THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH BY AND THROUGH HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES AS DO HIS ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL DO INDEPENDENTLY, ALONG WITH JASON M. GOURDINE A BENEFICIARY OF THE TRUST, THE UNDERSIGNED AFFIANT(S), HEREIN DO HEREBY SOLEMNLY SWEAR AND OR DECLARE AND OR AFFIRM AND OR STATE AS FOLLOWS: (A) AFFIANT(S) ARE COMPETENT TO STATE THE MATTERS SET FORTH HEREWITH; (B) AFFIANT(S) HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS STATED HEREIN; (C) ALL FACTS STATED HEREIN ARE TRUE, CORRECT AND COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFFIANT(S)

BEST FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING, AND IF CALLED UPON TO TESTIFY AS WITNESSES AFFIANT(S) SHALL STATE THE SAME TO PROVE AND ESTABLISH YOUR FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT AND YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; MARTIN-v.-UNITED-STATES, 2018 WL 1626578, * 2, D.Md.; DIXON-v.-YORDY, 2018 WL 1526006, * 5, D.IDAHO.

RESPECTFULLY,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI, THE FIDUCIARY
KING-KHALIFAH TO THE (4) THRONES

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, ACTING
ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE
(4) GLOBAL THRONES

JASON MORRIS GOURDINE
BENEFICIARY OF THE TRUST

APRIL 9, 2018

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM CHARLESTON COUNTY
ROGER M. YOUNG, SR., GENERAL SESSIONS COURT JUDGE

APPELLATE CASE 2014-0001051

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND ET. AL.,

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,


RESPONDENT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE


WE, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER DENYING REHEARING IN CASE 2014-0001051 AND TO REINSTATE THE APPEAL DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO INTERVENE; MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AT 1015 SUMTER STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201 AND AT POST OFFICE BOX 11549 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON APRIL 10, 2018.

RESPECTFULLY,


JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND



JAHJAH AL MAHDI



JASON MORRIS GOURDINE



APRIL 10, 2018

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

IN RE: CASE(S) 2014-0001051, 2016-000640 ET. AL.,

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,

THE (27) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED APRIL 9, 2018 IS THE LEAD DOCUMENT. THE REMAINDER OF THEM ARE ATTACHMENTS. DUE TO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S RECENT DETERMINATION IN CASE 2017-002108 , THAT COURT DETERMINED MY ISSUES FOR WRIT OF CERT. COULD NOT BE REVIEWED BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT PRESERVED IN THE REHEARING WITHIN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. THEREFORE, THESE PLEADINGS ARE BEING SUBMITTED TO REMEDY THEIR CONCERNS BY COLLATERALLY ATTACKING THE ORDER ISSUED FROM THIS COURT FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT. IF ANY REMITTITUR INVOLVED IN THESE CASES HAVE BEEN SENT DOWN THE DOCUMENT IS ALSO A MOTION TO STAY ALL REMITTITURS INVOLVED AND ALSO TO RECALL ANY REMITTITUR THAT HAS BEEN SENT DOWN EVEN OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT. PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH AKA JAHJAH AL MAHDI AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD'S APPEAL WAS ADJUDICATED IN 2006 OUT OF KERSHAW COUNTY. THAT REMITTITUR IS BEING SOUGHT RECALLED OUT OF TIME AND OR BEYOND THE TIME LIMIT DUE TO THE EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SURROUNDS THESE CASES. PLEASE FILE A COPY OF THE PLEADINGS IN EACH CASE THAT IS INVOLVED. BY WRIT OF COMMISSION FILED IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2017-0002108 I AM LEGALLY ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE KING-KHALIFAH UNTIL THE COURT DETERMINES OTHERWISE BY CLEAR CITING OF LAW THAT WOULD DICTATE TO THE CONTRARY DUE TO THE CLAIMS OF DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING OUT OF CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 FROM THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT. THE DOCUMENT IS APPROPRIATELY SIGNED BY ALL NECESSARY PARTIES. PLEASE SEE THAT A COPY IS FILED WITHIN ALL CASES INVOLVED. I HAVE ALREADY ENSURED THAT A COPY OF THE

PLEADING IS ALREADY SERVED UPON THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AS RULES OF COURT REQUIRE. WE THANK YOU IN ADVANCE FOR YOUR KIND ASSISTANCE. STILL REMAIN,

RESPECTFULLY,
JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND

PS# ATTACHED IS AN ADDITIONAL SHEET TO THE (27) PAGE DOCUMENT. PLEASE CLOCK STAMP THE ADDITIONAL PAGE AND RETURN IT IN THE SELF ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE.

APRIL 9, 2018

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

The State, Respondent,

v.

Joseph Todd Rowland, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No. 2017-002108

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals


ORDER

After careful consideration of the Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; and Motion to Motion Therefor dated February 2, 2018; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Renewing the Motion for Sanctions Due to Continual Acts of Fraud, Even Upon the Court, Criminal Conspiracy and Obstruction of Justice; Renewing the Motion for an Injunction and Protective Order and Motion to Motion Therefor dated February 12, 2018; and Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to Challenge the S.C. Supreme Court's Jurisdiction to Enter the Order Dated February 16, 2018; Motion to Vacate the Order and to Reinstate Case 2017-000218 et. al.; Motion for Forfeiture Due to Fraud Upon the Court, Renewing All Previously Filed Motions, Petitions, Objections Etc. and Motion to Motion Therefore dated March 2, 2018, which we have construed together as a petition for rehearing, we are unable to discover that any material fact or principle of law has been either overlooked or disregarded, and hence, there is no basis for granting a rehearing. Accordingly, the petition for rehearing is denied.

_____ C.J.

_____ J.

_____ J.



J.

J.

Columbia, South Carolina

March 29, 2018

cc:
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire
Scarlett Anne Wilson, Esquire
Joseph Todd Rowland, 290065
The Honorable Julie J. Armstrong

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

The State, Respondent,

v.

Joseph Todd Rowland, Petitioner.

Appellate Case No. 2017-002108
Lower Court Case No's 2011-GS-10-05527; 2011-GS-10-05528 and 2011-GS-10-05531

ORDER

By order dated January 5, 2018, the State's motion to strike the appendix filed in this matter was granted. We also struck the petition for a writ of certiorari because it made reference to the materials that were not properly included in the appendix and raised questions not raised to the court of appeals in the petition for rehearing. Petitioner was given thirty days to file an amended appendix that contains only the materials specified by Rule 242(e), SCACR. He was given thirty days after the filing of the amended appendix to serve and file an amended petition for a writ of certiorari that does not reference any material that is not in the amended appendix or contain any question or argument unrelated to the issues raised to the court of appeals in the petition for rehearing. *Petitioner was warned that his failure to strictly comply with the requirements of the order may result in the dismissal of this matter.*

In response to our order, petitioner filed a motion entitled "Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion for Recusal; Motion to Challenge the S.C. Supreme Court's Jurisdiction to Strike the Documents in the Appendix and Deny the Motion for an Extension of Time; Motion to Vacate those Orders; Motion for Forfeiture and Motion to Motion Therefor" with exhibits. To the extent the motion challenges the January 5, 2018 order, it is denied. Rule 240(i), SCACR (This Court will not entertain petitions for rehearing on a motion or petition unless the action of the Court on the motion or petition has the effect of dismissing or finally deciding the party's appeal.). Petitioner's motions for recusal, for an extension of time, and for "a reset" are denied.

The State has filed a motion to dismiss this matter. In response to the motion to dismiss, petitioner filed an "Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to Strike the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Due to Additional Acts of Fraud Upon the Court; Renewing the Motion for Sanctions and Forfeiture and All Previously Filed Objections, Claims, Defenses and Motions; Supplementing the Writ of Certiorari and or Appendix in Response to the Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Motion Therefor" with exhibits. Petitioner has *not* filed an amended appendix as required by this Court's order of January 5, 2018. Petitioner's motions to strike the State's motion to dismiss and to impose sanctions are denied. Based on petitioner's failure to file an amended appendix as required and the reasons set forth in the State's motion to dismiss, we grant the State's motion and dismiss this matter.

C.J.

J.

J.

J.

J.

Columbia, South Carolina

February 16, 2018

cc:
The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire
Scarlett Anne Wilson, Esquire
Joseph Todd Rowland, 290065
The Honorable Julie J. Armstrong

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit
Item # 6
listed in the head
document

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

FEB 21 2018

S.C. SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2014-0001051

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2017-0002108 ET. AL.,

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

Vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND,

PETITIONER(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE


I, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES ET AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED, A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS DUE TO CONTINUAL ACTS OF FRAUD, EVEN UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT POST OFFICE BOX 11330 COLA., S.C. 29211, ON THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL POST OFFICE BOX 11549 COLA., S.C. 29211 AND ON THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS VIA BRYAN STIRLING AT 4444 BROAD RIVER ROAD COLA., S.C. 29221, BY U.S. MAIL AND OR CERTIFIED, BY PLACING THEM IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON FEBRUARY 12, 2018.

I ACT ON BEHALF AND COMMAND OF THE CROWN OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH AND THE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST", WHICH INCLUDE MYSELF, AS IS INDICATED BY MY AND THE KING-KHALIFAH'S SIGNATURE ON THIS DOCUMENT OF SERVICE DUE TO THE FRAUD PERPETRATED BY JUDGE TOAL ETC. BLOCKING HIM VOIDING THAT ORDER ALSO BEING CHALLENGED VIA JURISDICTION. THERE IS NO ORDER BLOCKING ME, AND THERE IS JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE TO THE ESTABLISHING OF ALL ORDERS CONNECTED IN ANY MANNER TO THESE CASES AFFIRMED BY ME AS ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, AS ALSO SOUGHT BY MOTION TO INTERVENE IN ALL MATTERS.

RESPECTFULLY,
JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND



JAHJAH AL MAHDI



FEBRUARY 12, 2018

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2014-0001051

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2017-0002108 ET. AL.,

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

Vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND,

PETITIONER(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS DUE TO CONTINUAL ACTS OF FRAUD, EVEN UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

TO: THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ET. AL.,

I, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, THE UNDERSIGNED AFFIANT, HEREINAFTER DOES HEREBY SOLEMNLY SWEAR AND OR DECLARE AND OR STATE AS FOLLOWS: (A) AFFIANT IS COMPETENT TO STATE THE MATTERS SET FORTH HEREWITH;

(B) AFFIANT HAS PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS STATED HEREIN; (C) ALL FACTS STATED HEREIN ARE TRUE, CORRECT AND COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFFIANT'S BEST FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING, AND IF CALLED UPON TO TESTIFY AS A WITNESS AFFIANT SHALL SO STATE;

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES GIVE THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE. WE PREVIOUSLY INFORMED THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ON THE COURT RECORD, ABOUT THE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE INVOLVING THE RESPONDENT WITH S.C.D.C. HINDERING AND IMPEDING OUR ACCESS TO THE COURT(S), HINDERING AND IMPEDING OUR PROSECUTING THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND THE COURT'S DEMANDS UPON US TO BE IN COMPLIANCE TO PROCEDURAL RULES OF COURT AND THE MANDATES OF DUE PROCESS LAW, PRODUCING STATE INTERFERENCE THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL, HODGKINS v. PETERSON, F.Supp. 2d., 2000 WL 3312826(S.D.Ind.2000); U.S. v. SCOTT, 958 F.Supp. 761(1997); HANKINS v. WETZEL, 2014 WL 4918813(D.C.Pa.2014).

ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2018, OFFICER MEGGETT COMES TO WANDO DORM, TO INFORM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, THAT SHE AND S.C.D.C. WILL STOP AND HALT THEIR OBSTRUCTIONIST AND CONSPIRATORIAL BEHAVIOR. OFFICER MEGGETT THEN INFORMS ME, WITH THE KING-KHALIFAH AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD BEING PRESENT, THAT WHATEVER COPIES I NEEDED. ALL I HAVE TO DO IS GIVE THEM TO "COLONEL", AN INMATE HERE, AND HE WILL BRING THEM TO HER TO MAKE ANY NEEDED COPIES. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES THEN GOT WITH THE KING-KHALIFAH AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, AND GATHERED UP THE NEEDED COPIED DOCUMENTS OFFICER MEGGETT INSTRUCTED ME SHE, THEY, WOULD MAKE THE COPIES OF, AND WE GOT THEM TO HER ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2018. OFFICER MEGGETT THEN CALLS S.C.D.C. GENERAL COUNSEL. S.C.D.C. GENERAL COUNSEL THEN CALLS THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE. THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE THEN CALL THE CONSPIRING JUDGES IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO CONDUCT A SECRET, MEETING OF THE MINDS, EX PARTE HEARING AND OR MEETING. ONCE THE RESPONDENT AND THE PARTIES NOW DETERMINE THE MAGNITUDE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS INTENDED TO BE FILED TO FURTHER ESTABLISH THE COURT RECORD AND JURISDICTIONAL FACTS. THEY INFORMED S.C.D.C. GENERAL COUNSEL

TO INSTRUCT OFFICER MEGGET NOT TO COPY THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO PREVENT THIS ESSENTIAL EVIDENCE FROM BEING MADE A PART OF THE COURT RECORD TO PREVENT JUDICIAL REVIEW AND IMPEDE OUR ABILITY TO BE FULLY HEARD ON THE ISSUES THAT ARE PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT. I OBJECT TO THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. I MOTION FOR SANCTIONS, FORFEITURE AND IMMEDIATE RELIEF IN THE FORM OF AN INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER TO STOP THE FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY. NEXT THING YOU KNOW THEY WILL ATTEMPT TO TRANSFER ONE OF US, SEPARATE ME FROM THE KING-KHALIFAH, TO HINDER THIS CASE FROM MOVING FORWARD AND TO ITS PROPER RESOLUTION. I MOTION FOR SANCTIONS DUE TO THE CONTINUAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION BEFORE THIS COURT. YOU ARE IN ADDITIONAL VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE SUBJECTING YOU TO CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES ALSO FOR VIOLATIONS OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, BENTON-v.-BURNS, 2017 WL 491251(D.C.Md.2017); REGG-v.-HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112(4th.Cir.2017); GRAHAM-v.-GAYRON 831 F3d. 176(4th.Cir.2016); U.S.-v.-TEJADA, 455 Fed. Appx' 719, 2011 WL 3891825 CA4 (S.C.2011); U.S.-v.-ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'---, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); STATE-v.-FERGUSON, 221 S.C. 300, 70 S.E.2d. 355(S.C.1952); ARATA-v.-VILLAGE-WEST-OWNERS ASS'N-INC., S.E.2d., 2011 WL 11735004(S.C.App.2011); IN-RE: BUILDING-MATERIAL-CORP.-OF-AMERICAN-ASPHALT-ROOFING-SHINGLE PRODUCTS, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1827923(DSC.2013); 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); SOUTHEASTERN-SITE-PREP.-LLC.-v.-ATLANTIC-COAST-BUILDERS AND-CONTRACTORS,-LLC., 394 S.C. 97, 713 S.E.2d. 650 (S.C. App.2011).

ONCE THE RESPONDENT, AND POTENTIALLY, THE JUDGES SOUGHT RECUSED WITHIN THIS COURT, IN AN EX PARTE SECRET COUNSEL IN THEIR "MEETING OF THE MINDS", IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, DETERMINED WHAT WE INTENDED TO FILE USING OFFICER MEGGETT, AND CONSPIRED TO CIRCUMVENT FULL, PROPER AND FAIR REVIEW, SUCH ACTION IS EGREGIOUSLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL, COMPROMISING THE **"ENTIRE"** PROCEEDINGS AND CONSTITUTE A DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS. THE KING-KHALIFAH AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, GATHERED THE DOCUMENTS THEY THEMSELVES INFORMED US THAT THEY WOULD COPY BEFORE WE GATHERED THEM

AS REFERRED TO IN THE DOCUMENTS PLACED BEFORE THE COURT AS EXHIBITS. OFFICER MEGGETT AND S.C.D.C. AGREED TO COPY THE DOCUMENTS BEFORE WE GATHERED THEM. YET, NOW THAT THEY DETERMINED THAT THEY COULD NOT DEFEAT OR COUNTER THIS EVIDENCE OR THE CLAIMS, DEFENSES AND CAUSES OF ACTION CONTAINED THEREIN. THE CONSPIRING JUDGES OF THIS COURT AND THE RESPONDENT, THEN INSTRUCT S.C.D.C. AND OFFICER MEGGETT NOT TO MAKE THE COPIES TO CREATE AN INCOMPLETE RECORD AND PREVENT AND OR OBSTRUCT JUDICIAL REVIEW. WE OBJECT. DUE TO THESE RECENT AND CONTINUAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. I MOTION FOR AND RENEW THE PREVIOUS FILED MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND FOR FORFEITURE AGAINST THE STATE, JOHNSON v. BYRD, 2016 WL 6839410(N.C.2016); BLUE SKY TRAVEL AND TOURS, LLC v. AL TAYYAR,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); BARLOW v. COLGATE PALMOLIVE CO., 772 F3d. 1001, 90 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 85 CA4 (Md.2014); ARBY CONST. LLP v. ORR, 358 S.C. 10, 594 S.E.2d. 478(S.C.2004).

"EX DOLO MALO NON ORITUR ACTIO"---OUT OF FRAUD NO ACTION ARISES; FRAUD NEVER GIVES A RIGHT TO ACTION. NO COURT SHALL LEND ITS AID TO MAN WHO FOUND HIS CAUSE OF ACTION UPON AN IMMORAL OR ILLEGAL ACT. FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING. SILENCE OF THE COURT IN CORRECTING THIS INJUSTICE WILL EQUATE WITH FRAUD WHEN THERE IS A LEGAL AND MORAL DUTY TO SPEAK OR WHEN INQUIRY LEFT UNANSWERED WOULD BE INTENTIONALLY MISLEADING. FRAUD AND DECEIT WILL ARISE FROM SILENCE WHERE THERE IS A DUTY TO SPEAK THE TRUTH, AS WELL AS FROM SPEAKING UNTRUTH. PARTY IN INTEREST WILL BECOME LIABLE FOR FRAUD BY MERE SILENT ACQUIESCENCE AND PARTAKING IN THE BENEFITS OF THAT FRAUD, SUCH AS USING IT TO MAKE JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. FRAUD IN ITS ELEMENTARY COMMON LAW SENSE OF DECEIT...INCLUDES THE DELIBERATE CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL INFORMATION, SUCH AS THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS WE SEEK COPIED AND FILED, IN A SETTING OF FIDUCIARY OBLIGATION, SUCH AS THE KING-KHALIFAH BEING ABLE TO COPY AND FILED THESE LEGAL DOCUMENTS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF THE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST". BUT MORE THAN THIS, A PUBLIC OFFICIAL, SUCH AS A JUDGE OR S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL IS A FIDUCIARY TOWARDS THE PUBLIC...AND IF HE DELIBERATELY CONCEALS MATERIAL INFORMATION FROM THEM HE IS GUILTY OF FRAUD, 424 F2d. 1021 U.S. v. HORTON,

R. PRUDDEN, NO. 28140, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, (5th.Cir.1970); RUBINSTEIN v. COLLINS, 20 F3d. 160 (1990); McNALLY v. UNITED STATES, 483 U.S. 350, 371-372, QUOTING UNITED STATES v. HOLZER, 816 F2d. 304, 307; BRANSON v. STANDARD HARDWARE, INC., 874 S.W.2d 919 (1994); POINDEXTER v. GREENHOW, 114 U.S. 270, 303 (U.S. 1885); MORRISON v. CODDINGTON, 662 P.2d. 155, 135 ARIZ. 480 (1983); UNITED STATES v. TWEEL, 550 F2d. 297, 299, 300 (1977).

MEN ARE ENDOWED BY THEIR CREATOR WITH CERTAIN UNALIENABLE RIGHTS, LIFE, LIBERTY AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPINESS; AND TO SECURE, NOT GRANT OR CREATE THESE RIGHTS, GOVERNMENTS ARE INSTITUTED. THAT PROPERTY OR INCOME, WHICH A MAN HAS HONESTLY ACQUIRED AS THE KING-KHALIFAH DID BY PEACEFULLY FILING ACTION TO PETITION FOR AND ESTABLISH THESE RIGHTS BY DUE PROCESS LAW WHICH WAS DEFAULTED ON BY THE PARTIES WHICH INCLUDE THIS STATE AND THE UNITED STATES, THE KING-KHALIFAH RETAINS FULL CONTROL OF...WHICH INCLUDE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, BUDD v. PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, 143 U.S. 517 (U.S.1892).

IT HAS NOW BECOME PAINFULLY OBVIOUS THAT THE ONLY WAY TO SECURE THE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS OF THE PETITIONERS AND LEVEL THE EVIDENTIARY PLAYING FIELD, IS FOR THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO GRANT THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER THAT WE SEEK, FILED IN THE APPENDIX TO PROTECT OUR CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, TO ALLOW US TO SUBMIT THE EVIDENCE WE SEEK TO FILE AND PLACE THIS CASE IN PROPER FORM AND TO PREVENT ANY FURTHER RETALIATORY, CONSPIRATORIAL AND FRAUDULENT ACTION FROM OCCURRING IN THIS CASE. WE SEEK THAT THE MOTION FOR THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER BE RULED ON BEFORE THIS CASE PROCEED ANY FURTHER, TO HALT THE FRAUD AND MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE CONTINUALLY OCCURRING AND TO LEVEL THE EVIDENTIARY PLAYING FIELD BY SANCTIONS SOUGHT. WHERE WE HAVE BEEN DEPRIVED OF PROPER AND FULL OPPORTUNITY TO SUBMIT DEPOSITIONS, ADMISSIONS AND AFFIDAVITS IN THE FORM OF THESE DOCUMENTS SOUGHT AND BLOCKED COPIED, OBSTRUCTING THE FILING OF EVIDENCE IN ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY. THE COURT DO NOT HAVE THE FULL FACTS TO RELY UPON FOR SUMMARY DETERMINATION. TO TAKE AWAY ALL REMEDY FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF A RIGHT IS TO TAKE AWAY THE RIGHT ITSELF. SUCH WOULD NOT BE WITHIN THE POWER OR DISCRETION OF THE STATE, TRINSEY v. PAGLIARO,

229 F.Supp. 647 (D.C.Pa.1964); POINDEXTER-v.-GREENHOW, 114 U.S. 270(U.S.1885).

THE NEXT THING YOU KNOW THESE DEVILS WILL BE TRYING TO TRANSFER THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES FROM THE KING-KHALIFAH AND THE OTHER PETITIONERS IN THIS CASE TO CAUSE IRREPARABLE DAMAGE TO THIS CASE IN FURTHER ACTS OF RETALIATION LIKE THEY DID david duren UNDER CASE 2017-000605 WHICH IS ANOTHER REASON WE WERE FORCED TO FILE MOTION TO INTERVENE IN THAT CASE AND SEEK TO CONSOLIDATE IT WITH CASE 2017-0002108. UNLESS THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER TO STOP THE RETALIATORY, OBSTRUCTIVE AND FRAUDULENT ACTS IS GRANTED. A COURT CANNOT CONFER OR ESTABLISH JURISDICTION WHERE NONE EXIST AND OR IS MADE VOID FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND A COURT CANNOT MAKE A VOID PROCEEDING VALID, MYLES-v.-DOMINO'S-PIZZA,-LLC, 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); FIRST-TECHNOLOGY-CAPITAL-INC.-v.-BANC-TEC-INC, 2016 WL 7444943(D.C.Ky.2016); ORLANDO-RESIDENCE,-LTD.-v.-HILTON-HEAD-HOTEL-INVESTICATORS, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1103027 (DSC.2013); NUDD-v.-BURROWS, 91 U.S. 677-683(U.S.1875); 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); 24-SENATORIAL-DIST.-REPUBLICAN-COMMITTEE-v.-ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016).

I, WE, MOTION THAT THE INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER FILED IN THE APPENDIX WHICH WAS ALREADY SERVED UPON THE RESPONDENT AND S.C.D.C. BE IMMEDIATELY GRANTED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT VIA SANCTIONS SOUGHT. WE ALSO GIVE JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT WE DO NOT WAIVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE THESE LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND EVIDENCE COPIED AND SUBMITTED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT BEFORE THIS CASE MOVES FORWARD. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAS WARNED, BECAUSE WHAT APPEARS TO BE LAWFUL COMMANDS BY THE COURT ON THE SURFACE, MANY CITIZENS, BECAUSE OF RESPECT FOR WHAT APPEARS TO BE THE LAW, YET IN THIS CASE WE HAVE FRAUD UPON THE COURT, ARE CUNNINGLY COERCED OR MANIPULATED INTO WAIVING THEIR RIGHTS DUE TO IGNORANCE. WE ARE NOT IGNORANT. WE DO NOT WAIVE OUR RIGHT TO HAVE THESE LEGAL DOCUMENTS COPIED AND SUBMITTED AS EVIDENCE REQUIRING THE COURT TO GRANT THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER. TO TAKE AWAY ALL REMEDIES FOR THE ENFORCE-


MENT OF A RIGHT IS TO TAKE AWAY THE RIGHT ITSELF. SUCH IS NOT WITHIN THE POWER OF THE STATE. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT SHALL GRANT THIS BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT WHOSE SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY IS BINDING UPON THIS COURT BY CONTRACT, DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 TO WHICH THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ARE PARTIES TO THE DEFAULT NOW PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION UNLESS THE RESPONDENT CAN PRODUCE EVIDENCE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT HE OR THE UNITED STATES TIMELY MOVED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS, WHICH INCLUDE S.C.D.C BEING PARTY TO THE DEFAULT. THEY MUST PROVE THEY MOVED TO TIMELY DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 OR ALL RELIEF SOUGHT MUST BE GRANTED. **IT IS SO ORDERED,** HURTADO v. CALIFORNIA, 110 U.S. 516(U.S.1884); MILLER v. UNITED STATES, 230 F2d. 486, 489 (5th.Cir.1956); SHUTTLE WORTH v. BIRMINGHAM, 373 U.S. 262(U.S. 1963); SHERER v. CULLEN, 481 F. 945, 946; MIRANDA v. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 436(U.S.1966); STAUB v. CITY OF BAXLEY, 355 U.S. 313 (U.S.1958); UNITED STATES v. JACKSON, 390 U.S. 570 (U.S. 1968); UNITED STATES v. ETENYI,--Fed. Appx'--, 2017 WL 6523328(10th.Cir. 2017); EL AMEEN BEY v. STUMPF, 825 F.Supp.2d. 537(D.N.J.2011); UNITED STATES v. MINKER, 350 U.S. 179, 187(U.S.1956); MILLER v. PARRISH, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1868028(Va.2013); IN RE: OUTDOOR R.V. AND MARINE, LLC, 2012 WL 345366(DSC.2012); ANDERSON v. LIBERTY LOBBY, INC, 477 U.S. 242, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d. 202(U.S.1986); BRADRES v. HALEY, 58 F.Supp.3d. 514(DSC.2014); LORD & TAYLOR, LLC v. WHITE FLINT, L.P, 780 F3d. 211 CA4 (Md. 2015); BUFF v. STERLING, 2015 WL 1578845(DSC.2015); U.S. v. SOUTH CAROLINA, 720 F3d. 518 CA4 (S.C.2013); WALL v. WADE, 741 F3d. 492 CA4 (Va.2014).

REFERRING BACK TO THE RESPONDENT'S CLAIM IN HIS PREVIOUS FILINGS THAT WE ARE USING "BIBLE VERSES". THOSE SAME "SO-CALLED" BIBLE VERSES ESTABLISH THE VATICAN ITSELF AS A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN NATION. ISRAEL IS A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN NATION. THE KING-KHALIFAH'S RIGHTS ARE EVEN PROTECTED BY "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" UNDER THEIR LAWS AS WELL ALSO PROTECTED UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY

ACT. TO DENY SUCH WOULD ALSO VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. BIBLICAL LAW AT COMMON LAW SUPERSEDES ALL LAWS AND CHRISTIANITY, JUDAISM AND ISLAM IS CUSTOM, AND CUSTOM IS LAW AS WAS PREVIOUSLY ARGUED BY US IN PRIOR PLEADING, ESPECIALLY SINCE IT IS PROTECTED UNDER CONTRACT AND YOU DEFAULTED ON ALL OF THIS, ROBIN v. HARDAWAY, (1790) 424 F2d..

INASMUCH, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, THE UNDERSIGNED, DOES HEREWITH SWEAR AND OR DECLARE AND OR AFFIRM THAT AFFIANT ISSUES THIS AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS WITH SINCERE INTENT, THAT AFFIANT IS COMPETENT TO STATE THE MATTERS SET FORTH HEREIN, THAT THE CONTENTS ARE TRUE, CORRECT, COMPLETE, AND CERTAIN, ADMISSIBLE AS EVIDENCE OF THE CONTINUAL ACTS OF FRAUD, EVEN UPON THE COURT, INVOLVING OFFICER MEGGETT, THE RESPONDENT AND S.C.D.C. REQUIRING SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES AND THE GRANTING OF THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER, AND IS REASONABLE AND JUST IN LIGHT OF THE CONTINUAL MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE MANIFESTING THEMSELVES BY THE CONSPIRING PARTIES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFFIANT'S BEST FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING. YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE STRIPPING YOU OF IMMUNITY, SUBJECTING YOU TO CIVIL AS WELL AS CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, ACTING
ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4)
GLOBAL THRONES OF THE
RE-ESTABLISHED THEOCRATIC STATE
AND COURT BY COMMAND OF THE
CROWN



FEBRUARY 12, 2018

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

Courtesy #1

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY

KRISTI LEA HARRINGTON, CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2016-000640

RECEIVED
FEB 22 2018
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

Vs.

JASON MORRIS GOURDINE, ET. AL.,

APPELLANT(S)


AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, JASON MORRIS GOURDINE ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION TO ENTER THE OPINION AND OR ORDER IN THIS CASE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; MOTION TO INTERVENE; MOTION TO STAY AND OR RECALL THE REMITTITUR; MOTION TO VACATE THE OPINION AND OR ORDER RELATED THERETO; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION FOR A REHEARING; MOTION TO STAY DUE TO FRAUD IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND STILL PENDING REVIEW AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS 1015 SUMTER STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201 AND THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL POST OFFICE BOX 11549 BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID

BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON FEBRUARY 16, 2018.

RESPECTFULLY,


JASON MORRIS GOURDINE



JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND



JAHJAH AL MAHDI



FEBRUARY 16, 2018

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

APPEAL FROM BERKELEY COUNTY
KRISTI LEA HARRINGTON, CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2016-000640

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

Vs.

JASON MORRIS GOURDINE ET. AL.,

APPELLANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION TO ENTER THE OPINION AND OR ORDER IN THIS CASE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; MOTION TO INTERVENE; MOTION TO STAY AND OR RECALL THE REMITTITUR; MOTION TO VACATE THE OPINION AND OR ORDER RELATED THERETO; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION FOR A REHEARING; MOTION TO STAY DUE TO FRAUD IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND STILL PENDING REVIEW AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE LETTER DATED FEBRUARY 7, 2018 SENT TO GOURDINE BY THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE, ATTORNEY SUSAN B. HACKETT.

(2) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO STRIKE THE RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS DUE TO ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE AND ALL PREVIOUSLY FILED OBJECTIONS, CLAIMS, DEFENSES AND MOTIONS; SUPPLEMENTING THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND APPENDIX IN RESPONSE TO THE MOTION TO DISMISS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (15) PAGES DATED JANUARY 27, 2018 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(3) THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION TO STRIKE THE DOCUMENTS IN THE APPENDIX AND DENY THE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME; MOTION TO VACATE THESE ORDERS; MOTION FOR FORFEITURE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (15) PAGES DATED JANUARY 9, 2018 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(4) THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO STRIKE THE RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO STRIKE THE DOCUMENTS IN THE APPENDIX DUE TO ATTEMPTS AT FRAUD AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, FILING OBJECTIONS IN OPPOSITION OF THAT DOCUMENT; MOTION FOR RECUSAL AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (15) PAGES DATED DECEMBER 25, 2017 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(5) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING REPLY TO RESPONDENT'S RETURN TO THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI; MOTION TO STRIKE ALL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE RESPONDENT; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS; MOTION FOR FORFEITURE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (15) PAGES DATED DECEMBER 27, 2017 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(6) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER CASE(S) 17-7532 AND 17-7186;***, [34] PAGES DATED DECEMBER 20, 2017 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(7) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO AMEND PARTIES; MOTION FOR RECUSAL;***, [70] PAGES DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

WE MOTION TO EXPAND THE SCOPE AND FOR INCLUSION. ANY DOCUMENT REFERRED TO THAT IS NOT PRESENTLY SUBMITTED WITH THIS FILING IS BEING OBSTRUCTED FILING BY THE RESPONDENT IN THIS CASE, CONSPIRING WITH THE JUDGES OF BOTH THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND S.C. SUPREME COURT AND S.C.D.C. TO WHICH WE OBJECT TO THIS CONTINUAL FRAUD UPON THE COURT(S), MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE PRODUCING STATE INTERFERENCE THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL BY THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND PARTIES. THEREFORE, ANY LEGAL DOCUMENT NOT PRESENTLY SUBMITTED WE SEEK THAT THE COURT OBTAIN IT ELECTRONICALLY FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2017-0002108 AND 2017-000605, HODGKINS v. PETERSON, F.Supp.2d., 2000 WL 3312826(S.D.Ind.2000); U.S. v. SCOTT, 958 F.Supp. 761(1997); HANKINS v. WETZEL, 2014 WL 4918813(D.C.Pa.2014).

INSOMUCH, I, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, WITH THE CONSENT OF JASON GOURDINE, AND BY COMMAND OF THE CROWN MOTIONS TO INTERVENE IN CASE 2016-000640. I, WE, MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION TO ENTER THE OPINION AND OR ORDER IN THIS CASE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. IF THE REMITTITUR HAS NOT BEEN SENT DOWN. I, WE, MOTION TO STAY IT. IF IT HAS BEEN SENT DOWN. I, WE, MOTION TO RECALL IT. I, WE, MOTION TO VACATE THE OPINION AND OR ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 2016-000640 PENDING REVIEW OF THESE MATTERS BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ADDRESSING THE FRAUD THAT JUST OCCURRED INVOLVING THEM. I, WE, MOTION TO EXPAND THE SCOPE AND FOR INCLU-

SION AND ALL DOCUMENTS FILED IN CASE 2017-0002108 ARE NOW DEEMED FILED IN CASE 2016-000640. ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES ARGUED IN THE DOCUMENTS ARE NOW ARGUED IN CASE 2016-000640. I, WE, MOTION FOR THE RECUSAL AND OR DISQUALIFICATION OF THE JUDGES OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS DUE TO YOUR ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO CIRCUMVENT OR ABSTAIN FROM ANSWERING ESSENTIAL FEDERAL QUESTION TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS AND JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001. I, WE, MOTION FOR A REHEARING OF CASE 2016-000640, BRAZDELL v. WINDSOR, 384 S.C. 502, 682 S.E.2d. 824(S.C.App.2009); EPSTEIN v. WORLD ACCEPTANCE CORP., 2015 WL 2365701(DSC.2015); LAKE CARRIER ASS'N v. MacMILLIAN, 406 U.S. 498, 92 S.Ct. 1749(U.S.1972); BLUE SKY TRAVEL AND TOURS, LLC v. AL TAYYAR,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); MR. T. v. MRS. T., 378 S.C. 127, 662 S.E.2d. 413(S.C.2008); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016); LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp. 3d. 19 (2014).

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AT ANY STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS, EVEN FOR THE FIRST TIME ON DIRECT APPEAL, CANNOT BE WAIVED BY THE APPELLANT, EVEN WITH HIS CONSENT, WHICH YOU DON'T HAVE, AND THE COURT SHALL NOT FAIL TO TAKE NOTICE, EX PARTE CANNON, 685 S.E.2d. 814, 820 (S.C.App. 2009); McCANN v. BRIGHTHARP, 399 S.C. 240, 730 S.E.2d. 916(S.C. App.2012); SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES v. TRAN, 418 S.C. 308, 792 S.E.2d. 254(S.C.App.2016); ARNAL v. FRASER, 371 S.C. 512, 641 S.E.2d. 419(S.C.2007).

THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS HAS THE INHERENT AUTHORITY TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENTS PROCURED BY FRAUD. DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SURROUND THIS CASE. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, CONSPIRING WITH THE RESPONDENT IN THIS CASE, AND THE STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, CIRCUMVENTED RULING, ABSTAINING FROM ANSWERING SUBSTANTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL AND FEDERAL QUESTION RELATED TO "JURISDICTION" THAT WERE PRESENTED IN THIS CASE, BECAUSE THEY KNEW OF THIS CASE'S DIRECT CONNECTION TO THE CASE IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE

2017-0002108. THEN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, CONSPIRING WITH THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE AND THE RESPONDENT, CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT GOURDINE WAS ENTITLED TO SEEK REHEARING WHERE THEY GAVE HIM A FRAUDULENT IMPRESSION IN AN ACT OF MISREPRESENTATION, THAT THE DIRECT APPEAL PROCESS WAS OVER TO DECEIVE AND MANIPULATE HIM INTO WAIVING ISSUES FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI. THE APPEALS COURT DISMISSED THE ACTION CONCEALING THIS FACT, THEN THEY GOT THE APPELLATE DEFENSE OFFICE TO SEND THIS FRAUDULENT LETTER INFORMING GOURDINE THAT HIS ONLY OPTION WAS PCR, WHEN IN TRUTH, HE HAD OPTION TO SEEK REHEARING. THEIR INTENT WAS ALSO TO PREVENT REVIEW WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN FUTURE APPEAL BY MANIPULATING GOURDINE INTO A PROCEDURAL DEFECT BY NOT SEEKING REHEARING WHERE THERE WOULD BE NO FINAL ORDER FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WHICH IS A JURISDICTIONAL PREREQUISITE FOR REVIEW IN THE SUPREME COURT. I, WE, OBJECT. **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING", AND THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND THE RESPONDENT IS IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT.** I, WE, MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE RELATED TO THOSE SANCTIONS, ROBINSON v. ESTATE OF HARRIS, 389 S.C. 360, 698 S.E.2d. 801(S.C.App.2010); CHRISTIANSON v. M.B.N.A. AMERICAN BANK N.A., S.E.2d., 2013 WL 8507850(S.C.App. 2013); SPRINGOB v. UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 407 S.C. 490, 757 S.E.2d. 384(S.C.2014); STRATTEN v. MECKLENBERG COUNTY DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES, 521 Fed. Appx' 278, 2013 WL 2364587 CA4 (N.C.2013); GENTRY TECHNOLOGY OF SOUTH CAROLINA INC. v. BAPTIST HEALTH SOUTH FLORIDA, 2015 WL 1219251(DSC.2015); LOUGMAN v. U.S., 134 S.Ct. 2384(U.S.2014); NORTH AMERICAN RESCUE PRODUCTS INC. v. RICHARDSON, 411 S.C. 371, 769 S.E.2d. 237(S.C.2015).

THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JUDGES ARE IN VIOLATION OF RULE 502.1 OATH OF OFFICE AND THESE MATTERS ARE PRESENTLY BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO RULE 245 EXERCISING OF ORIGINAL JURISDICTION EVEN THOUGH IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT THEY DISMISSED THAT CASE. MOTION TO REINSTATE AND CHALLENGE THEIR JURISDICTION BY THEIR FRAUD IS IN THE PROCESS OF BEING FILED. I, WE, MOTION TO VACATE THE OPINION AND ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 2016-000640 DUE TO THE FRAUD, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT PRODUCED IT. BY YOUR

FRAUD, CIRCUMVENTING RULING ON THESE SUBSTANTIAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES THAT ALSO PRODUCE SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL QUESTION. THIS RENDERS THE PLEADINGS UNDER CASE 2016-000640 IN THEIR TOTALITY VOID AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATING DUE PROCESS. THIS APPLIES TO CASE 2017-0002108 ALSO. BY SUCH ACTIONS YOU HAVE ILLEGALLY PLACED THE KING-KHALIFAH IN FORCED BREACH OF HIS FIDUCIARY DUTY BY THAT FRAUD, VIOLATING THE "TRUST" WHICH IS ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, IN YOUR ACTS OF FRAUD, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, WHICH PLACES YOU IN FORFEITURE, IN VIOLATION OF YOUR CONTRACTS VIA YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE, STRIPPING YOU OF IMMUNITY, SUBJECTING YOU TO CIVIL AS WELL AS CRIMINAL PENALTIES, BENNETT v. CARTER, 807 S.E.2d. 197(S.C.2017); PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE DIOCESE OF SOUTH CAROLINA v. EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 421 S.C. 211, 806 S.E.2d. 82(S.C.App.2017).

THE FRAUD UPON THE COURT THAT YOU ALL JUST TRIED TO PULL VITIATES EVERYTHING AND PLACES THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE RESPONDENT IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION PRESENTED BEFORE ALL COURTS BY SANCTIONS DEMANDED. JUDGMENTS PROCURED BY FRAUD MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED, AND THIS APPLIES TO JUDGMENTS AND DECREES OF ALL COURTS, MYLES v. DOMINO'S PIZZA LLC, 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); FIRST TECHNOLOGY CAPITAL, INC. v. BANCTEC, INC., 2016 WL 7444943(D.C.Ky.2016); MARTIN v. TARGET CORP. OF MINNESOTA, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1187034(D.N.J.2013); McCLAIN v. 1st SECURITY BANK OF WASHINGTON, 2016 WL 8504775 (W.D.Wash.2016).

YOU CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO DENY ME, GOURDINE, MY ACCESS INTO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT BY REMAINING SILENT ON KEY, CRUCIAL, ESSENTIAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES IN YOUR FRAUD, AS USUAL COMPROMISING OUR STATE APPOINTED ATTORNEYS IN OUR CASES, DEMONSTRATING "COMMON DESIGN" RELATED TO CONSPIRACY, WORKING WITH THE RESPONDENT IN THESE CASES, VIOLATING MY, OUR, DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, DENYING US THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS BEHIND RACIAL AND OR PROTECTORATE PURPOSES, WHICH VOID YOUR JURISDICTION, PAUL ADAMS v. CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; DONATONI v. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, --F.Supp.3d.--,

2016 WL 1755872; U.S. v. ECCLESTON, --Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); WHITE v. MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280 (DSC.2014); BENTON v. BURNS, 2017 WL 491251 (D.C.Md.2017); REGG v. HEARN-BERGER, 845 F3d. 112(4th.Cir.2017). I, WE, OBJECT AND MOTION FOR A REHEARING ON CASE 2016-000640.

KNOWING FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION NECESSARY TO PREVENT STATEMENT FROM BEING MISLEADING, LIKE YOU FAILED TO INFORM ME OF RIGHT AND TIME TO SEEK A REHEARING, TO PREVENT THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES FROM BEING PROPERLY PRESERVED FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN CASE 2016-000640 IS "FRAUD", PLACING YOU, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE RESPONDENT IN FORFEITURE. YOU HAVE CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS IN FRAUD TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS CIRCUMVENT, ABSTAIN FROM RULING ON THE SPECIFIC FEDERAL QUESTIONS PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT. "EX DOLO MALO NON ORITUR ACTIO"---OUT OF FRAUD NO ACTION ARISES; FRAUD NEVER GIVES A RIGHT OF ACTION. NO COURT SHALL LEND ITS AID TO MAN WHO FOUND HIS CAUSE OF ACTION UPON AN IMMORAL OR ILLEGAL ACT. **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING".** SILENCE OF THE COURT BY ABSTAINING FROM RULING ON THE JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS EQUATE WITH FRAUD WHEN THERE WAS LEGAL AND MORAL DUTY TO SPEAK OR WHEN INQUIRY LEFT UNANSWERED WOULD BE INTENTIONALLY MISLEADING LIKE YOU PEOPLE TRYING TO MISLEAD ME, GOURDINE, INTO FILING PCR WHEN REHEARING BEFORE THE COURT OF APPEALS WAS AVAILABLE AS WELL AS S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. FRAUD AND DECEIT WILL ARISE FROM SILENCE WHERE THERE IS A DUTY TO SPEAK THE TRUTH, AS WELL AS FROM SPEAKING UNTRUTH. PARTY IN INTEREST WILL BECOME LIABLE FOR FRAUD BY MERE SILENT ACQUIESCENCE AND PARTAKING IN THE BENEFITS OF THAT FRAUD, SUCH AS USING IT TO RENDER JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. FRAUD IN ITS ELEMENTARY COMMON LAW SENSE OF DECEIT...INCLUDES THE DELIBERATE CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL INFORMATION, SUCH AS THE RIGHT FOR REHEARING AND S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW, IN A SETTING OF FIDUCIARY OBLIGATION, SUCH AS THE KING-KHALIFAH AND HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL BEING ABLE TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS OF THE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST". BUT MORE THAN THIS, A PUBLIC OFFICIAL, SUCH AS A JUDGE OR THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL OR APPELLATE COUNSEL, IS A FIDUCIARY TOWARDS THE

PUBLIC...AND IF HE DELIBERATELY CONCEALS MATERIAL INFORMATION FROM THEM, HE OR SHE IS GUILTY OF FRAUD, 424 F2d. 1021; U.S. v. HORTON, R. PRUDDEN, NO. 28140, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, (5th. Cir.1970); RUBINSTEIN v. COLLINS, 20 F3d. 160 (1990); BRANSON v. STANDARD-HARDWARE, INC., 874 S.W.2d. 919 (1994); POINDEXTER v. GREENHOW, 114 U.S. 270, 303(U.S.1885); MORRISON v. CODDINGTON, 662 P.2d. 155, 135 ARIZ. 480 (1983); UNITED-STATES v. TWEEL, 550 F2d. 297, 299, 300(1977); U.S. v. KORN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2898056(W.D.N.Y.2013); TONEY v. COM., 1998 WL 684203 (4th.Cir. 1998); SEC v. FARMER, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5838867(S.D.Tex.2015); U.S. v. MOSBERG, 866 F.Supp.2d. 275 (D.N.J.2011); U.S. v. WECHT, F.Supp.2d., 2008 WL 2223869(W.D.Pa.2008).

I, WE, MOTION FOR THE RECUSAL AND OR DISQUALIFICATION OF ALL JUDGES WITHIN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, SINCE YOU CONSPIRED WITH THE RESPONDENT AS YOU SAT ON CASE 2014-0001051 DIRECTLY CONNECTED TO CASE 2016-000640 IN ACTS OF FRAUD CREATING A STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR THAT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE. THE MATTERS WILL BE HEARD BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ONCE WE DEAL WITH THAT RECENT, STUPID ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT THEY JUST TRIED TO PULL. YOUR PRESENCE, IN LIGHT OF YOUR FRAUD, PRODUCES A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. YOU ARE ALSO BEING SUED AS PARTIES IN THE PENDING PARALLEL CASES BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURT ALONG WITH JUDGE LEE WHO FAILED IN HER DUTY AS THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DULY APPOINTED "TRUSTEE" WHERE SHE WAS BOUND BY HER OATH OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION WHERE THE RIGHTS OF THE KING-KHALIFAH BY THE CONTRACT, DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION EMERGING OUT OF CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 ARE LEGALLY PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016); IN-RE:-SYNTAX-BRILLIAN CORPORATION, 2016 WL 7177615(D.Md.2016).

A COURT CANNOT CONFER OR ESTABLISH JURISDICTION WHERE NONE EXIST AND OR IS MADE VOID FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND A COURT CANNOT MAKE A VOID PROCEEDINGS VALID. TO CONSPIRE TO TAKE AWAY REMEDY LIKE MY, GOURDINE'S, REHEARING AND S.C. SUPREME

COURT REVIEW FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF A RIGHT IS TO TAKE AWAY THAT DUE PROCESS RIGHT ITSELF. SUCH IS NOT WITHIN THE POWER OR DISCRETION OF THE STATE. UNDER FEDERAL LAW WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO THE STATES, THAT IF A COURT OR PARTIES IS "WITHOUT AUTHORITY, SUCH AS DUE TO YOUR FRAUD WHICH IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATING DUE PROCESS, ITS JUDGMENTS AND OR ACTS OR ORDERS ARE REGARDED AS NULLITIES. THEY ARE NOT VOIDABLE, BUT SIMPLY VOID, AND FORM NO BAR TO A RECOVERY SOUGHT, EVEN PRIOR TO REVERSAL IN OPPOSITION OF THEM. THEY CONSTITUTE NO JUSTIFICATION, AND ALL PERSONS CONCERNED IN EXECUTING SUCH ACTS, JUDGMENTS OR SENTENCES ARE CONSIDERED IN LAW AS TRESPASSERS". THE LAW DICTATES THAT FRAUD DESTROYS THE VALIDITY OF EVERYTHING IT ENTERS, INCLUDING THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT GRANTING THE DISMISSAL IN CASE 2017-002108 AND THE OPINION PRODUCED IN CASE 2016-000640 SUBJECTING THE COURT(S) AND PARTIES TO CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES AS WELL AS FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION. THE FRAUD FATALLY EFFECTS EVEN THE MOST SOLEMN ACTS OR JUDGMENTS OR DECREES. LABEO DEFINES FRAUD AS ANY CUNNING DECEPTION OR ARTICLE USED TO CIRCUMVENT OR DECEIVE ANOTHER, MR. WELLS, IN HIS VERY WORK ON RES JUDICATA SAYS SEC. 499, **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING"**, NUDD-v.-BURROWS, 91 U.S. 667-683(U.S.1875); U.S.-v.-THROCKMORTON, 98 U.S. 61-71 (U.S.1871); WELLS-FARGO BANK-N.A.-v.-FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561(2016); 24-SENATORIAL-DIST. REPUBLICAN-COMMITTEE-v.-ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016); TRINSEY-v.-PAGLIARO, 229 F.Supp. 647(D.C.Pa.1964); MYLES-v. DOMINO'S-PIZZA,-LLC, 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017).

THE APPELLANT GOURDINE RECEIVED THE OPINION AND OR ORDER ON FEBRUARY 11, 2018. THIS WOULD GIVE HIM (10) DAYS UNTIL FEBRUARY 21, 2018 TO SEEK REHEARING AND IT BE TIMELY. THUS, THIS PLEADING IS TIMELY BEING PLACED IN THE MAILBOX ON FEBRUARY 16, 2018 WHERE IT SHOULD BE TAKEN OUT OF THE MAILBOX ON FEBRUARY 19, 2018. I, WE, INVOKE THE DOCTRINE OF COMITY AND MOTION THAT YOU ALSO STAY THIS CASE. THESE MATTERS ARE PRESENTLY UNDER REVIEW IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHERE THOSE CORRUPT CONSPIRING JUDGES GOT JUDGE WOOTEN, CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS TO CLOSE CASE 2:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM TO KILL THE REMOVAL AND ALLOW THEM TO ISSUE THE ORDER DISMISSING CASE 2017-0002108. THE FRAUD THEY JUST PULLED TAINTS ALL ORDERS ISSUED

IN CASE 2017-0002108 WHERE RES JUDICATA CANNOT ATTACH DUE TO THE FRAUD, NOR CAN THE COURT OF APPEALS OR ANY OTHER COURT USE THAT FRAUDULENTLY OBTAINED DETERMINATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADJUDICATING ANY MATTER BEFORE THESE COURTS AND YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE DUE TO THESE RECENT ACTS OF FRAUD WHERE YOU COURTS ARE CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY ACROSS MULTIPLE JURISDICTIONS. WE DON'T NEED YOU DEVILS STEPPING ON EACH OTHER'S TOES IN YOUR CONTINUAL ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. I, WE, GIVE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE. MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER AND JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE IS FORTHCOMING REGARDING CASE 2017-0002108 WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. BY YOUR RECENT ACTIONS YOU HAVE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT WE ARE CORRECT OR YOU WOULD NOT HAVE HAD TO ENGAGE IN THE FRAUD. BY YOUR ACTIONS YOU'VE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THE RESPONDENT, THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE UNITED STATES AND REMAINING (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ARE IN DEFAULT AND THE RESPONDENT AND PARTIES CAN PRODUCE NO EVIDENCE THAT WOULD DEMONSTRATE THEY TIMELY RESPONDED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. THEREFORE, THE JUDGES OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FELT IT NECESSARY TO CONTACT JUDGE WOOTEN UNDER CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM WITH THE RESPONDENT, TO DISMISS THAT HABEAS CORPUS BECAUSE CASE 2017-0002108 WAS PETITIONED REMOVED THERE AND THEY COULD NOT DISMISS CASE 2017-0002108 UNTIL THE REMOVAL WAS DETACHED. THEY COULD NOT LET THE RESPONDENT BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND OR EVERY ACTION WE WERE TAKING BEFORE ALL COURTS WOULD INDEED BE DEEMED LEGAL, TRUE AND CORRECT. I, WE, OBJECT TO THE FRAUD. I, WE, TO INCLUDE JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, THE ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, THE UNDERSIGNED AFFIANT(S), HEREIN DO HEREBY SOLEMNLY SWEAR AND OR DECLARE AND OR STATE THESE FACTS, TO WIT, (A) AFFIANT(S) ARE COMPETENT TO STATE THE MATTERS SET FORTH HEREWITH; (B) AFFIANT(S) HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS STATED HEREIN; (C) ALL FACTS STATED HEREIN ARE TRUE, CORRECT AND COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFFIANT(S) BEST FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING, AND IF CALLED UPON TO TESTIFY AS WITNESSES AFFIANT(S) SHALL STATE THE SAME. NOW STAY CASE 2016-000640. WE INVOKE THE DOCTRINE OF COMITY , ULMET-v.-UNITED-STATES, 888 F2d. 1028(4th.Cir.1989); SMITH

v.-BAYER-CORP.,--S.Ct.--, 131 S.Ct. 2368, 2382, 180 L.Ed.2d. 341(2011).

THE LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR ON ISSUES SUCH AS THE ONES BEING ARGUED WITHIN THESE CASES. IF RULING HAS BEEN OBTAINED UNDER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OR STATUTE OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW OR ACT, WHICH INCLUDE FRAUD. THE LAW EXPLAINED IF THIS POSITION IS WELL TAKEN, WHICH IT IS, IT EFFECTS THE **"FOUNDATION"** OF THE **"WHOLE"** (EMPHASIS ADDED) PROCEEDING. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT OR LAW OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IS **"VOID"** AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO ACT OR DETERMINATION MADE OR DONE AT ALL. THE GENERAL RULE IS THAT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OR STATUTE OR ACT OR LAW, THOUGH HAVING THE FORM AND NAME OF LAW, IT IS IN REALITY NO LAW BY SUCH ACTION, BUT IS WHOLLY VOID AND IS INEFFECTIVE FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHICH INCLUDE THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 2016-000640 AND THE ORDER DISMISSING CASE 2017-0002108, SINCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY DATES FROM ITS ENACTMENT OR WHEN IT WAS DONE...IN LEGAL CONTEMPLATION, IT IS INOPERATIVE AS IF IT HAD NEVER BEEN PASSED OR DONE...SINCE AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION, OR LAW OR ACT IS VOID, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE FOLLOWS THAT IT IMPOSES NO DUTY (SUCH AS ISSUING ORDERS OR OPINIONS), CONFERS NO RIGHTS, CREATES NO OFFICE (JUDICIAL FOR YOU), BESTOWS NO POWER OR AUTHORITY ON ANY PERSON (YOUR JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID.), AFFORDS NO PROTECTION (YOU ARE NOT IMMUNE IF YOU FAIL TO CORRECT IT.), AND JUSTIFIES NO ACTS PERFORMED UNDER IT (THIS INCLUDES ALL OF YOUR RULINGS.)...A VOID ACT CANNOT BE LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH A VALID ONE. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OR LAW CANNOT OPERATE TO SUPERSEDE AN EXISTING LAW (THE LAW SET BEFORE THE GENTRY CASE STANDS.). ANY JUDICIAL DETERMINATION, STATUTE, LAW OR ACT THAT RUNS COUNTER TO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE LAND (THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, SCHWARE, McBURNEY, INDICTMENTS ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION), IT IS SUPERSEDED THEREBY. NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY FRAUD OR UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAWS OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS. NO COURT IS BOUND TO ENFORCE THEM. ALL LAWS, STATUTES, JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS, RULES AND PRACTICES THAT ARE REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION ARE **"NULL"** AND **"VOID"**, MARBURY

v.-MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; VINES-v.-UNITED-STATES 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1163(1), 1165(1); LOUMIET-v.-UNITED-STATES 65 F.Supp.3d. 19 (2014); MONTGOMERY-v.-LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016); GEFT-OUTDOORS LLC.-v.-SNYDER, 821 F3d. 763, 765+ (6th.Cir.MICH.); PEOPLE-v.-SOLO, N.E.3d., 2017 WL 1838423(2017); 24-SENATORIAL-DIST.-REPUBLICAN-COMMITTEE-v.-ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016); ROBINSON v.-ARVONIO, 27 F3d. 877 REHEARING DENIED CERT. GRANTED VACATED 115 S.Ct. 1247, 513 U.S. 1186, 131 L.Ed.2d. 129; JOHNSON-v.-UNITED-STATES,--S.Ct.--, 2015 WL 2473450 (U.S.2015).

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAS WARNED, BECAUSE WHAT APPEARS TO BE LAWFUL COMMANDS BY THE COURT ON THE SURFACE, MANY CITIZENS, BECAUSE OF RESPECT FOR WHAT APPEARS TO BE LAWFUL, YET IN THIS CASE WE HAVE FRAUD IN BOTH HIGH COURTS, MANY CITIZENS ARE CUNNINGLY COERCED AND MANIPULATED INTO WAIVING THEIR RIGHTS DUE TO IGNORANCE. WE ARE NOT IGNORANT. WE CHALLENGE THE JURISDICTION OF BOTH COURTS AND WE DO NOT WAIVE THE RIGHT TO SEEK REHEARING IN CASE 2016-000640 OR VACATING THE ORDER IN CASE 2017-002108 DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT EXERCISING THAT RIGHT OF COLLATERAL ATTACK TO REMEDY THE FRAUD. YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE "CONTRACT", OF THE "GRANT", GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT IN VIOLATION OF BOTH THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE OF ARTICLE IV § 2 AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ESTABLISHING CAUSE BEFORE THE COURT(S) ALLOWING THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH VIA HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL TO INTERVENE AND CORRECT THE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT CONSISTENTLY MANIFEST ITSELF WITHIN THESE CASES. I DEMAND THAT YOU PRODUCE YOUR BOND OR WRIT OF COMMISSION OR OATH OF OFFICE THAT WOULD PERMIT YOU TO GO AGAINST THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH OR STAND DOWN. DUE TO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, TO PREVENT THE RESPONDENT FROM RESPONDING BECAUSE THE COURT KNEW THEY WERE IN DEFAULT IS **"FRAUD"** AND VOIDS ANY AND ALL ORDERS ISSUED IN CASE 2016-000640 AND 2017-0002108 PLACING YOU IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION


PLACED BEFORE ALL COURTS INVOLVED. **IT IS SO ORDERED,** PRESAULT v. I.C.C., 494 U.S. 1, 110 S.Ct. 914, 108 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.1990); BROWN v. BROWN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); HARRIS v. HHGREGG, F.Supp.2d., WL 1331166(N.C.2013); ORARAH v. NEW YORK DEPT. OF EDUC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 4240733(N.Y.D.C.2015); AMERICAN MUT. LIBERTY INS. CO. v. PLYWOOD PLASTICS CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157 (DSC.1948).

UNLESS THE RESPONDENT, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE OR THE UNITED STATES, NOT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2017-0002108 IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT DISMISSING THE CASE TO PREVENT THE REQUIREMENT THEY PRODUCE EVIDENCE TO DEMONSTRATE THEY TIMELY MOVED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY ARE INDEED IN DEFAULT. THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL., SHALL GRANT ALL RELIEF SOUGHT BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT WHOSE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER IS BINDING UPON THIS COURT BY CONTRACT, DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 UNLESS THE RESPONDENT CAN DEMONSTRATE BY CLEAR EVIDENCE THAT HE TIMELY MOVED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT, SCHWARE v. BOARD OF EXAMS OF THE STATE OF N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 77 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); McBURNEY v. YOUNG, 569 U.S. 221, 133 S.Ct. 1709, 185 L.Ed.2d. 758(U.S.2013); HENRY v. VERMONT 2017 WL 2167123(2017); COHEN v. VIRGINIA, (6 WHEAT) 19 U.S. 264(U.S.1821); MILLER v. UNITED STATES, 230 F2d. 486, 489 (5th. Cir.1956); UNITED STATES v. ETENYI,--Fed. Appx'--, 2017 WL 6523328 (10th.Cir.2017).


INASMUCH, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, JASON MORRIS GOURDINE ET. AL., THE UNDERSIGNED, DO HEREWITH SWEAR AND OR DECLARE AND OR AFFIRM THAT AFFIANT(S) ISSUES THIS AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS AND ITS ATTACHMENTS WITH SINCERE INTENT TO SEEK REHEARING IN CASE 2016-000640 AND ADDRESS OTHER RELEVANT MATTERS, THAT THE AFFIANT(S) ARE COMPETENT TO STATE THE MATTERS SET FORTH HEREIN, THAT THE CONTENTS ARE

TRUE, CORRECT, COMPLETE, AND CERTAIN, ADMISSIBLE AS EVIDENCE OF THE CONTINUAL ACTS OF FRAUD, CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, EVEN UPON THE COURTS INVOLVED, ALSO INVOLVING THE RESPONDENT AND EVEN S.C.D.C., REQUIRING SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT AND THE GRANTING OF THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER SOUGHT, AND IS REASONABLE AND JUST IN LIGHT OF THE CONTINUAL MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE MANIFESTING THEMSELVES BY THE CONSPIRING PARTIES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFFIANT(S) BEST FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING AND IF CALLED UPON WE SHALL TESTIFY AS TO THE SAME. YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE STRIPPING YOU OF IMMUNITY, SUBJECTING YOU TO CIVIL AS WELL AS CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

RESPECTFULLY,
JASON MORRIS GOURDINE



JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT, FOR HIMSELF AND THE KING-KHALIFAH BY COMMAND OF THE CROWN



FEBRUARY 16, 2018.

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

SC SUPREME COURT

~~FRAUD #~~ 1

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T.
TISHBITE; JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

C/A 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM

RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE
2018 MAR 21 A 8:54
DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON, SC

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO INTERVENE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO REINSTATE; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER(S); RENEWING THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL AND TRANSFER OF VENUE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES, BY U.S. MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, BY PLACING IT IN THE MAILBOX ON MARCH 9, 2018. IT IS DEEMED FILED ON THAT DAY FRIDAY BEFORE THE WEEKEND, HOUSTON v. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379(1988).

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND

MARCH 9, 2018

RESPECTFULLY,

JAHJAH AL MAHDI

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE
2018 MAR 15 A 9:09
DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE; JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND PETITIONER(S) Vs. JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD ET. AL., DEFENDANT(S)	C/A 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO INTERVENE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO REINSTATE; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER(S); RENEWING THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL AND TRANSFER OF VENUE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

TO: THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO INTERVENE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO REINSTATE; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER(S); RENEWING THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL AND TRANSFER OF VENUE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, [24] PAGES THAT IS FILED IN CASES 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM.

I GIVE THE COURT JUDICIAL NOTICE. ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES, MOTIONS, PETITIONS ETC. THAT ARE ARGUED IN THIS ATTACHED DOCUMENT, TO INCLUDE THOSE ASSERTED WITHIN ALL EXHIBITS AND OR DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO THEREIN, ARE NOW BEING ARGUED WITHIN CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM SEEKING TO REINSTATE THIS CASE. THE

PETITIONER RECEIVED THE COURT'S ORDER IN THIS CASE ON MARCH 1, 2018. THIS GIVES ME UNTIL MARCH 11, 2018 TO SEEK TO REINSTATE THIS CASE AND TOLL ANY TIME FOR APPEAL. THUS, THIS FILING IS TIMELY PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT WITHIN (10) DAYS PURSUANT TO HOUSTON-V.-LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379(1988).

I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, AND HIS DULY APPOINTED BY WRIT OF COMMISSION ATTORNEY GENERAL, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, THE UNDERSIGNED AFFIANT(S), HEREINAFTER DO HEREBY SOLEMNLY SWEAR AND OR DECLARE AND OR AFFIRM AND OR STATE AS FOLLOWS: (A) AFFIANT(S) ARE COMPETENT TO STATE THE MATTERS SET FORTH HEREWITH; (B) AFFIANT(S) HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS STATED HEREIN; (C) ALL FACTS STATED HEREIN ARE TRUE, CORRECT AND COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFFIANT(S) BEST FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING, AND IF CALLED UPON TO TESTIFY AS WITNESS(ES) AFFIANT(S) SHALL SO STATE;

I, WE, MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER(S) DISMISSING CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM AND I, WE, MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THE ORDER IN THIS CASE. ONCE JUDGE WOOTEN AND MARCHANT, IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRED ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, BY WHAT THEY DID WITHIN THIS CASE AND EVEN FILING AN APPEAL OF CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM ESTABLISHING CASE 17-1695 BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT. THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT DONE BY THEIR CONSPIRATORIAL ACTION, TO DETACH THE REMOVAL OF THE STATE CASES INVOLVED, INCLUDING THOSE BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO ALLOW THEM TO INAPPROPRIATELY ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER CASE 2017-0002108, AS SIMILAR FRAUD THEY DID RELATED TO THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 17-7410 AND THIS CASE. THE FRAUD MADE THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM; 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM IRREGULAR VITIATING THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS. THEREFORE, JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID FOR ARBITRARY JUDICIAL ACTION, FRAUD UPON THE COURT, VIOLATIONS OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, VIOLATIONS OF THEIR OATH OF OFFICE AND OTHER UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING".** A JUDGMENT PROCURED BY FRAUD MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED, AND THIS APPLIES TO ACTS OR JUDGMENTS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS,

MYLES v. DOMINO'S PIZZA, LLC, 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); FIRST TECHNOLOGY CAPITAL INC. v. BANCTEC INC, 2016 WL 7444943 (D.C.Ky.2016); MARTIN v. TARGET CORP. OF MINNESOTA, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1187034(D.N.J.2013); McCLAIN v. 1st. SECURITY BANK OF WASHINGTON, 2016 WL 8504775(W.D.Wash.2016).

INSOMUCH, BY THE ATTACHED (24) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2018, TO WHICH ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES, CAUSES OF ACTION ARGUED WITHIN THAT DOCUMENT, TO INCLUDE ALL THOSE ARGUED WITHIN THE EXHIBITS REFERRED TO THEREIN, ARE BEING ARGUED IN CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM FOR THE PURPOSE OF VACATING THE ORDER(S) ISSUED IN THIS CASE AND TO HAVE CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM REINSTATED. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES , JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, DULY ASSIGNED BY WRIT OF COMMISSION, MOTIONS TO INTERVENE TO PROTECT ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE CROWN. JUDGE WOOTEN, CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, ACTING UNDER COLOR OF LAW OR AUTHORITY, TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, DISMISSED THIS CASE IN AN ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, TO SILENCE THE DEFENDANTS AND TO PREVENT EVIDENCE OF THE DEFAULT FROM BEING ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD WITH THE CRIMINAL, OBSTRUCTIVE INTENT TO PREVENT THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN FROM BEING ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD AND FROM ATTACHING TO CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM BECAUSE THE PLAINTIFF(S) WERE ARGUING BEFORE THESE COURTS THAT THE PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ. IN THESE AND ALL OTHER PARALLEL RELATED CASES, SANDRA T. KOTTMAN PLAINTIFF v. UNITED STATES, 2017 WL 4185481(W.D.MISSOURI.2017); WARD v. HUERBAUGH, 2017 WL 2724938(D.C.Miss.2017); MONROE v. PAPE, 365 U.S. 167, 183, 81 S.Ct. 473, 482, 5 L.Ed.2d. 492(U.S.1961); SEBELIUS v. AUBURN REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, 133 S.Ct. 817, 184 L.Ed.2d. 627, 81 U.S.L.W. 4053(U.S.2013); BOLIVIA REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA v. HELMERICH & PAYNE INTERN DRILLING CO, 137 S.Ct. 1312, 197 L.Ed.2d. 663, 85 U.S.L.W. 4221(U.S.2017); DOE v. FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6 (D.D.C.2016).

FURTHER PROOF OF THE FRAUDULENT INTENT CONSPIRED AND

ENGAGED IN BY JUDGE WOOTEN, MARCHANT AND THEIR FEDERAL AND OR STATE CO-CONSPIRATORS, IS THAT THE COMPLAINT FILED UNDER CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM IS EXACTLY IDENTICAL TO THE COMPLAINTS FILED UNDER CASES 2:17-cv-1300-RMG-MGB AND 5:17-cv-01363-BHH-KDW AND WAS PRESENTED BEFORE ALL COURT ALSO AS AN "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS". BOTH MAGISTRATE JUDGES BAKER AND WEST DETERMINED BY FINAL ORDER ON THIS NON DISPOSITIVE ISSUE, THAT THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS ALONE WAS SUFFICIENT TO DEFEAT A SUA SPONTE DISMISSAL AND OR SUMMARY DISMISSAL, AND REQUIRED THAT THE CASE BE PLACED IN PROPER FORM BY SUBMITTING THE NECESSARY SUMMONS AND U.S. MARSHAL FORMS TO ALLOW THE DEFENDANTS TO BE SERVED AND THEY BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO THE COMPLAINT BEFORE THE CASE CAN EVER BE DISMISSED, S.F.S. CHECK, LLC. v. FIRST BANK OF DELAWARE, 990 F.Supp.2d. 762(E.D. MICH.2013); AKBAR v. BANGASH, 2017 WL 4334912 (S.D.MICH.2017); McKELVEY v. REYNOLDS, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6518337(DSC.2016); SINGLETON v. DOBEY, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2285956(DSC.2013); GLANTON v. DOBEY, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1786416(DSC.2013); DEL-ZOTTO v. UNIVERSAL PHYSICIANS SERVICES, LLC, 214 F.Supp.3d. 499 (DSC.2016).

THEREFORE, JUDGE WOOTEN ABUSED HIS DISCRETION IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHERE HIS INTENT WAS TO CRIMINALLY SILENCE THE RESPONDENT, THE DEFENDANTS AND THE UNITED STATES, TO KEEP HIMSELF FROM BEING SUED, TO PREVENT THE FACTS FROM BEING ESTABLISHED IN THE COURT RECORD, TO DETACH THE REMOVAL OF CASE 2017-0002108 TO ALLOW THOSE STATE CO-CONSPIRATORS TO ACT, AND TO PREVENT EVIDENCE OF THE DEFAULT AND SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN FROM ATTACHING IN THIS CASE AND CASES 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM, CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, VOIDING THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT, VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT CONSPIRING TO HAVE AN EFFECT UPON INTERSTATE COMMERCE, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, UNCONSTITUTIONAL, ARBITRARY JUDICIAL ACTION AND VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS. I, WE OBJECT. JUDGE WOOTEN, WHO IS EVEN A DEFENDANT IN THESE CASES REQUIRING THAT HE RECUSE, WAS PROCEDURALLY BARRED FROM RAISING OR EVEN ADJUDICATING ANY ISSUE WHICH WAS DETERMINED IN A FORMER SUIT WHICH IS JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE, VOIDING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION ALSO DUE TO THE INTENTIONAL FRAUD.

THE KING-KHALIFAH AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD IS A PARTY IN CASE 2:17-cv-01300-RMG-MGB BY MOTION TO INTERVENE AND IN CASE 5:17-cv-01363-BHH-KDW VIA THE (70) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS***, DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 FILED IN THAT CASE. RES JUDICATA ATTACHES FROM THOSE CASES. I, WE, OBJECT. THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF RES JUDICATA ARE IDENTITY OF PARTIES, IDENTITY OF SUBJECT MATTER, AND ADJUDICATION BY OR IN A FORMER SUIT. THE MERITS AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THE COMPLAINTS CONSTITUTE AN AFFIDAVIT, WHICH STAND ALONE TO DEFEAT ANY SUMMARY DISMISSAL REQUIRING THE ACTION(S) BE SERVED AND THE PARTIES RESPOND BEFORE DISMISSAL CAN OCCUR WAS ALREADY DETERMINED BY BOTH MAGISTRATE JUDGES BAKER AND WEST UNDER CASES 5:17-cv-01363-BHH-KDW AND 2:17-cv-1300-RMG-MGB JURISDICTIONALLY BARRING JUDGE WOOTEN FROM DISMISSING THIS CASE UNTIL THE PARTIES ARE REQUIRED TO RESPOND DUE TO RES JUDICATA EMERGING FROM BOTH OF THE CASES AFOREMENTIONED. I, WE, OBJECT, FORD v. WATSON, 282 S.C. 66, 316 S.E.2d. 429(S.C.App.1984). ONCE THE COURT HAS DECIDED AN ISSUE OF FACT OR LAW NECESSARY TO ITS JUDGMENT. THAT DECISION PRECLUDES RELITIGATION OF THE ISSUE IN A SUIT ON A DIFFERENT CAUSE OF ACTION INVOLVING A PARTY TO THE FIRST CASE, IN RE: GUY, 552 B.R. 89(DSC.2016); SAN REMO HOTEL, L.P. v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., 545 U.S. 323, 125 S.Ct. 2491, 162 L.Ed.2d. 315(U.S.2005). EVEN THOUGH MAGISTRATE JUDGES DO NOT HAVE THE POWER TO ENTER A FINAL JUDGMENT ON DISPOSITIVE MATTERS IN A CASE. THE TWO, NOT ONE, MAGISTRATE JUDGES, WHICH DEMONSTRATE THE VALIDITY OF THEIR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION, DO HAVE JURISDICTION TO ENTER FINAL JUDGMENT ON ALL NON DISPOSITIVE PRE-TRIAL MATTERS. THESE TWO MAGISTRATE JUDGES, WEST AND BAKER, BY THE CONGRUENCY OF THEIR DETERMINATION, DEMONSTRATE THE VERITY AND SOUNDNESS OF THAT JUDGMENT, WHICH SUCH JUDICIAL DECISION CAN ONLY BE OVER RULED IF THAT DETERMINATION WAS CLEARLY ERRONEOUS OR CONTRARY TO LAW, WHICH NEITHER OF THESE CIRCUMSTANCE EXIST IN THEIR DETERMINATIONS, MAKING JUDGE WOOTEN'S DECISION PROCEDURALLY, JURISDICTIONALLY BARRED, AN ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION PRODUCING ARBITRARY UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL ACTION AND VOID'S THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VILATION AND VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, PAUL ADAMS v. CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; DONATONI v. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECUR-

ITY,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 1755875; U.S.-v.-HARE, 820 F3d. 93(4th.Cir.2016); TORKORNOO-v.-HELWIG, 2017 WL 4898260(D.C.Md. 2017); BONNER-v.-KILGORE, 2017 WL 1057633, * 11 N.D.Ala.; STRONG v.-U.S., 57 F.Supp.2d. 908, 1999 WL 543737(N.D.Cali.1999); GREAT-WEST-LIFE-&-ANNUITY-INS.-CO.-v.-AMERICAN-ECONOMY-INS.-CO., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 5954470(D.C.Nev.2013).

JUDGE WOOTEN KNEW EXACTLY WHAT HE WAS DOING, IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. HE COULD NOT ALLOW HIMSELF TO BE SUED FOR VIOLATIONS OF HIS OATH OF OFFICE. NOR COULD HE LET THE PARTIES RESPOND BECAUSE EVIDENCE WOULD HAVE BEEN PRODUCED DEMONSTRATING THAT THE PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ. ATTACHED TO THESE CASES, INCLUDING ALL SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN WOULD HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED BEFORE ALL COURTS INVOLVED. SO JUDGE WOOTEN AND THE CONSPIRING PARTIES, CRIMINALLY, FRAUDULENTLY SILENCED THE DEFENDANTS AND AVOIDED SUIT BY DISMISSING THE ACTION, WHICH INCLUDED BY DETACHING THE REMOVAL OF CASE 2017-0002108 AND 2013-CP-400-0084, TO PREVENT THEM FROM ANSWERING WHEN THERE WAS LEGAL AND MORAL DUTY FOR THEM TO ANSWER, WHEN RES JUDICATA ATTACHED ON THE ISSUES OF THE COMPLAINTS BEING ALSO ACTUAL AFFIDAVITS WHICH MAY ALONE DEFEAT SUMMARY DISMISSAL REQUIRING SERVICE OF THE PLEADINGS AND THE PARTIES BE REQUIRED TO ANSWER BEFORE THE CASE CAN BE PROPERLY DISMISSED. WE OBJECT. ANY FINAL, VALID JUDGMENT ON THE MERITS OF A PARTICULAR ISSUE BY A COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION PRECLUDES ANY FURTHER SUIT BETWEEN THE PARTIES OR THEIR PRIVIES ON THE SAME CAUSE OF ACTION, PROGRESS-BULK-CARRIERS-v.-AMERICAN-S.S.-OWNERS-MUT.-PROTECTION AND-INDEM.-ASS'N-INC., 2 F.Supp.3d. 499(E.D.N.Y.2014); INTELLIGENT-VERIFICATION-SYSTEMS,-LLC.-v.-MICROSOFT-CORP., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 846012(E.D.Va.2015); MONTGOMERY-v.-INTERNAL-REVENUE SERVICE,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2018 WL 953331(D.D.C.2018); HAY-GROUP MANAGEMENT,-INC.-v.-SCHNEIDER,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2018 WL 655595 (E.D.Pa.2018).

FURTHER, IF THE COURT WOULD TAKE NOTICE OF THE LITIGATION THAT ESTABLISHES THE COMPLAINT IN THIS CASE AND EXHIBIT # 7, THE 3rd. CIRCUIT DOCUMENT FILED IN CASES 14-2811 AND 14-1364. ONCE THE SNAKE, BASTARD, CORRUPT JUDGE WOOTEN MADE USE OF THE PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT PROVISIONS ORIGINATING FROM THE

OMNIBUS CRIME BILL UNDER 51 A.L.R. Fed.2d. 143. THE PROCEEDINGS PRODUCED A STRUCTURAL ERROR WHICH VOIDED THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION WHERE THIS LEGISLATION WAS DESIGNED TO DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGET AFRICANS BY THE EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY MICHELLE ALEXANDER IN THE BOOK ENTITLED MASS INCARCERATION DURING THE AGE OF COLORBLINDNESS THE NEW JIM CROW ISBN NO. 978-1-59558-643-8, AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATOR AND THE DOCUMENTARY "13" WHICH AIRED ON PBS WHICH VIOLATE THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER EX-PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339, 348-349, 25 L.Ed. 676(U.S.1880) AND THE-SLAUGHTER-HOUSE-CASES, 83 U.S. (16 WALL) 36, 1873. THE CONSPIRING JUDGES KNEW THIS BEFORE THEY DID IT BY THE LITIGATION PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT WHICH IS A JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE. I, WE, OBJECT AND CHALLENGE THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION. THIS PLACES THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT IN FORFEITURE CORRUPT, BASTARD, DOG OF JUDGES AND ALSO CONSTITUTE AN ADDITIONAL ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY KNOWING USE OF AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE. THE PREJUDICE IS ESTABLISHED BY YOUR FRAUD AND VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. ACTS OF CONGRESS AND OR THE COURTS THAT ARE REPUGNANT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW. THE U.S. CONSTITUTION IS SUPREME TO ANY ACT OF THE COURTS OR LEGISLATURE. I, WE, MOTION TO REINSTATE CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM AS WE DID FOR CASE 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM ALSO BECAUSE YOU DISMISSED THESE CASES IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND RETALIATION FOR THE USE AND EXERCISE OF PROTECTED SPEECH IN VIOLATION OF THE 1st. AMENDMENT BECAUSE YOU DID NOT LIKE THE WAY YOU WERE TALKED TO AND TO AID IN CONCEALING THE FACT THAT YOU WERE DISMISSING CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, ALSO IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, TO CONCEAL WHAT YOU WERE DOING RELATED TO CASE 2017-0002108 PENDING IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, EVANCHO-v.-PINE-RICHLAND-SCHOOL-DISTRICT, 237 F.Supp.3d. 267(W.D.Pa.2017); TAYLOR v.-U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2074, 195 L.Ed.2d. 456, 84 U.S.L.W. 4462(U.S. 2016); U.S.-v.-ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); U.S.-v.-RON-PAIR-ENTERPRISES-INC., 489 U.S. 235, 119 S.Ct. 1027, 103 L.Ed.2d. 290(U.S.1989); IN-RE:-ARGO-CREDIT, LLC,--B.R.--, 2017 WL 4404269(2017); 1997 WL 10291 U.S.-(APPELLATE-BRIEF)-BRIEF-OF-SENATORS-ORIN-G.-HATCH,-STROM-THURMOND

ET.-AL.,; PULLIAM-v.-ALLEN, 466 U.S. 522, 536-543, 104 S.Ct. 1970, 1971-1982, 80 L.Ed.2d. 565(U.S.1984); FORRESTER-v.-WHITE, 484 U.S. 219, 108 S.Ct. 538(U.S.1988); U.S.-v.-LAWRENCE, F.Supp. 3d., 2015 WL 856866(S.D.Va.2015); BENTON-v.-BURNS, 2017 WL 491251 (D.C.Md.2017); SABATINA-v.-REINSTEIN,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 8716594(E.D.Pa.2016); DOE-v.-RECTOR-AND-VISITORS-OF-GEORGIA MASON-UNIVERSITY, 149 F.Supp.3d. 602(E.D.Va.2016); SNYDER-v. PHELPS, 580 F3d. 206(4th.Cir.2009).

FURTHER, ONCE JUDGE WOOTEN AND PARTIES ENGAGED IN THE FRAUD UPON THE COURT THAT ESTABLISHED A FRAUDULENT APPEAL CREATING CASE 17-1695 AND THAT FRAUD WHICH IS ARGUED UNDER CASES 17-7410 AND 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, AND A MOTION FOR RECUSAL WAS APPROPRIATELY AND TIMELY SOUGHT WHERE IN THIS INSTANCE HE ALSO SAT UPON HIS OWN CASE TO AVOID BEING SUED. HIS PRESENCE WITHIN THESE CASES CREATED A STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE WHICH ALSO VOIDS THE DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR ARBITRARY JUDICIAL ACTION, FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. NOT ONLY DID HE SIT UPON HIS OWN CASE, BUT HIS PRESENCE ALSO PRODUCED A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL WHICH IS SELF EVIDENT BY THE EVENTS THAT MANIFESTED THEMSELVES WITHIN THESE CASES, VOIDING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION, UNITED-STATES-v.-QUINONES, 2016 WL 4413149, * 6+ (S.D.Va.2016); WILLIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016); KOLON-INDUSTRIES-INC.-v.-E.I.-DUPONT-De-NEMOURS-&-CO., 748 F3d. 160 CA4 (Va.2014); KENWOOD-GARDENS-CONDOMINIUMS-INC.-v.-WHALEN PROPERTIES,-LLC., 2016 WL 6788052, * 11+ (Md.2016).

THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD PULLED AN UNPRECEDENTED LEGAL MOVE BY APPOINTING AN ATTORNEY GENERAL IN THE FORM OF JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND ESTABLISHING HIS AUTHORITY BY WRIT OF COMMISSION BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2017-0002108. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT JUDGES INVOLVED, THEN CALL JUDGE WOOTEN AND OTHER INVOLVED JUDGES OF THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT. THEREUPON, THE RESPONDENT AND THE S.C. SUPREME COURT JUDGES AND THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGES, IN THEIR "MEETING OF THE MINDS", IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND MACHINATION, DETERMINED THAT THEY COULD NOT LET IT BE PER-

MITTED THAT THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL OR THE UNITED STATES BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND IN CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM, 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM AND 2017-0002108 BECAUSE IT WOULD HAVE INSTANTLY BEEN PROVEN THAT THE UNITED STATES, THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS WERE IN DEFAULT, THAT COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHED AND ALL CLAIMS OF FIDUCIARY FOREIGN SOVEREIGN SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY BINDING UPON ALL GLOBAL COURTS, WHICH INCLUDE THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM AND THE PARALLEL CASES, AS WELL AS CASES 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM WAS TRUE, CORRECT AND VALID. THEREFORE, JUDGE WOOTEN MADE FRAUDULENT RULING UNDER CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM TO PERMIT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT INAPPROPRIATELY ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER CASE 2017-0002108 TO DISMISS THAT CASE TO PREVENT EVIDENCE FROM APPEARING ON THE COURT RECORD IN CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM, 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM AND 2017-0002108 THAT THE PARTIES WERE IN DEFAULT UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, WHICH WOULD HAVE IMMEDIATELY ESTABLISHED ALL SUPERSEDING FIDUCIARY FOREIGN SOVEREIGN POWER, AUTHORITY, RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE CROWN WHICH IS ARGUED UNDER CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND ALL OTHER RELATED STATE AND FEDERAL CASES BEFORE THE COURTS. THUS, THIS ACTION IMPAIRS THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT AND IS ANNULLED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, ~~POINDEXTER v. GREEHOW~~, 114 U.S. 270, 5 S.Ct. 903, 29 L.Ed. 185(U.S.1885); ~~ALDEN v. MAINE~~, 527 U.S. 706, 119 S.Ct. 2240, 144 L.Ed.2d. 636(U.S.1999); ~~WILL v. MICHIGAN DEPT. OF STATE POLICE~~, 491 U.S. 58, 109 S.Ct. 2304 (U.S.1989).

JURISDICTION UNDER CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM IS VOID FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT, VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT WHERE BY THEIR ACTIONS THEY CONSPIRED TO EFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE BY GIVING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION IN THE FORM OF THE RIGHT TO MARRY TO GAYS AND LEBIANS, FOR VIOLATIONS OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS, FOR CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, VIOLATIONS OF THE HOLDINGS MADE IN ~~EX PARTE VIRGINIA~~, ~~WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA~~ AND OTHER STRUCTU-

RAL ERRORS ARGUED WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT AND PRIOR PLEADINGS. THESE STRUCTURAL ERRORS DEFIES ANALYSIS BY HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THERE IS "TRUSTEE" APPOINTED OVER THESE CASES IN THE FORM OF JUDGE JACQUELYN AUSTIN WHO IS LEGALLY BOUND BY HER OATH OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTIONS WHERE THESE RIGHTS OF THE CROWN ARE NOW LEGALLY PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WHERE BY YOUR FRAUD YOU PLACED THE KING-KHALIFAH IN FORCED BREACH OF HIS FIDUCIARY DUTY. JUDGE AUSTIN IS BEING SUED IN THIS CASE NOT AS A JUDGE, BUT AS A "TRUSTEE" FOR VIOLATIONS OF HER OATH OF OFFICE FOR NEGLECTING HER DUTY AS DULY APPOINTED "TRUSTEE" APPOINTED BY THE KING-KHALIFAH HIMSELF. THUS, SHE IS NOT IMMUNE FROM SUIT AS A "TRUSTEE" AND FOR VIOLATIONS OF HER OATH OF OFFICE. THE FIDUCIARY SOVEREIGN POWER HAS PARAMOUNT RIGHT TO PROTECT THE LIVES, HEALTH, MORALS COMFORT AND GENERAL WELFARE OF HIS HOLY COMMONWEALTH, THE PEOPLE, WHO ARE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST"AS IS EXPLAINED IN "EXHIBIT TRUSTEE" PREVIOUSLY FILED IN THIS CASE, EDEN v. GOOD YEAR TIRE & RUBBER CO., 858 F2d. 198(4th.Cir.1988); CURTIS v. CAFE' ENTERPRISES INC., 2016 WL 6916786(N.C.2016); ELLIOTT v. BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES OF MADISON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS,--F3d.--, 2017 WL 5988226(7th.Cir.2017); WEAVER v. MASSACHUSETTS, 137 S.Ct. 1899, 198 L.Ed.2d. 420, 85 U.S.L.W. 4433(U.S.2017); PIRELA v. HORN,--Fed. Appx'--, 2017 WL 4176224(3rd.Cir.2017); GARCIA FINANCIAL GROUP v. VIRGINIA ACCELERATORS CORP., 3 Fed. Appx' 86, 2001 WL 117497(4th.Cir.2001); TRUSTEES OF DARTHMOUTH COLLEGE v. WOODWARD, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201; SPIRES v. SCHOOLS, F.Supp 3d.--, 2017 WL 41274774(DSC.2017); FIFTH THIRD BANCORP v. DUDENHOEFFER, 132 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d. 457, 82 U.S.L.W. 4578 (U.S.2014).

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, BEFORE ANY COURT, CANNOT BE WAIVED, CAN BE RAISED TO VACATE YOUR ORDERS AND STOP YOUR FRAUD AND ARBITRARY, CAPRICIOUS, UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL ACTION AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS DONE IN THIS CASE, BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INTERNATIONAL UNION OPERATING ENGINEERS, 2016 WL 1253285; WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561(2016); STRATTEN v. MECKLENBERG COUNTY DEPT.

OF SOCIAL-SERVICES, 521 Fed. Appx' 278, 2013 WL 2364587 CA4 (N.C.2013); GENTRY-TECHNOLOGY-OF-S.C.-INC.-v.-BAPTIST-HEALTH SOUTH-FLORIDA, 2015 WL 1219251(DSC.2015); LOUGHMAN-v.-U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2384(U.S.2014); WHITE-v.-MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280(DSC. 2014); GRUPO-DALAFLUX-v.-ATLAS-GLOBAL-GROUP-L.P., 124 S.Ct. 1920(U.S.2004); SEBELIUS-v.-AUBURN-REGIONAL-MEDICAL-CENTER, 133 S.Ct. 817, 184 L.Ed.2d. 627, 81 U.S.L.W. 4053(U.S.2013).

KNOWING FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION NECESSARY TO PREVENT STATEMENT FROM BEING MISLEADING, LIKE YOU DISMISSED THESE CASES TO DETACH THE REMOVAL OF CASE 2017-0002108 TO ALLOW IT TO BE DISMISSED TO PREVENT DISCLOSURE THAT THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES ARE IN DEFAULT TO PREVENT THE RIGHTS FROM ATTACHING IN CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM IS "FRAUD"; PLACING THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE UNITED STATES AND THE RESPONDENT IN FORFEITURE. YOU HAVE CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING COMMERCE AS WELL AS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS, ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, TO STEAL AND OR ATTACH AND OR ARREST AND OR EXECUTE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE CROWN AND SOLE CORPORATION AND TO PREVENT THE TRUTH OF THE DEFAULT AND SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN FROM BEING ESTABLISHED BEFORE ALL COURTS INVOLVED. "EX DOLO MALO NON ORITUR ACTIO"---OUT OF FRAUD NO ACTION RAISES; FRAUD NEVER GIVES A RIGHT OF ACTION. NO COURT SHALL LEND ITS AID TO MAN WHO FOUND HIS CAUSE OF ACTION UPON AN IMMORAL OR ILLEGAL ACT. **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING".** SILENCE BY THE COURT, AS AN ACT OF MACHINATION, INTENTIONALLY, PURPOSELY, SILENCING THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT EVIDENCE OF THEIR DEFAULT FROM BEING REVEALED AND PREVENT THE ESTABLISHING OF JURISDICTIONAL FACTS EQUATE WITH FRAUD WHEN THERE WAS LEGAL AND MORAL DUTY FOR THE RESPONDENT AND DEFENDANTS TO SPEAK, AND BY YOUR FRAUD YOU SILENCED THEM AND THE UNITED STATES, OR WHEN INQUIRY LEFT UNANSWERED AS YOU DID CONCEALING THE TRUTH OF THE DEFAULT WOULD BE INTENTIONALLY MISLEADING TO ALLOW THE COURT TO MISREPRESENT THE FACTS. THE INQUIRY WAS LEFT UNANSWERED ALLOWING YOU TO FRAUDULENTLY MISREPRESENT THE FACTS IN THESE CASES. FRAUD

AND DECEIT WILL RAISE FROM SILENCE, AS THE DISTRICT COURT SILENCED THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES IN ACTS OF MACHINATION WHERE THERE IS DUTY TO SPEAK THE TRUTH, AS WELL AS FROM SPEAKING UNTRUTH. PARTY IN INTEREST WILL BECOME LIABLE FOR FRAUD BY MERE SILENT ACQUIESCENCE AND PARTAKING IN THE BENEFITS OF THAT FRAUD, SUCH AS USING IT TO RENDER JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. FRAUD IN ITS ELEMENTARY COMMON LAW SENSE OF DECEIT...INCLUDE THE DELIBERATE CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL INFORMATION, SUCH AS AIDING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN CASE 2017-0002108 CONCEAL THE DEFAULT AND BY THE DISTRICT COURT SILENCING THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES, IN A SETTING OF FIDUCIARY OBLIGATION, SUCH AS THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH AND HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL BEING ABLE TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS OF THE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST". BUT MORE THAN THIS, A PUBLIC OFFICIAL, SUCH AS A JUDGE OR THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, IS A FIDUCIARY TOWARDS THE PUBLIC....AN IF HE OR SHE DELIBERATELY CONCEALS MATERIAL INFORMATION FROM THEM, LIKE CONCEALING THE FACT THAT THE DEFAULT IS INDEED LEGALLY BINDING UPON THIS COURT ESTABLISHING SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN, THE SOLE CORPORATION, HE OR SHE IS GUILTY OF "FRAUD", 424 F2d. 1021; U.S. v. HORTON, R. PRUDDEN, NO. 28140, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, (5th.Cir.1970); RUBINSTEIN v. COLLINS, 20 F3d. 160(1990); BRANSON v. STANDARD HARDWARE INC., 874 S.W.2d. 919(1994); POINDEXTER v. GREENHOW, 114 U.S. 270, 303(U.S.1885); MORRISON v. CODDINGTON, 662 P.2d. 155, 135 ARIZ. 480(1983); UNITED STATES v. TWEEL, 550 F2d. 297, 299, 300(1977); U.S. v. KORN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2898056(W.D.N.Y. 2013); TONEY v. COM., 1998 WL 684203(4th.Cir.1988); SEC v. FARMER F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5838867(S.D.Tex.2015); U.S. v. MOSBERG, 866 F.Supp.2d. 275 (D.N.J.2011); U.S. v. WECHT, F.Supp.2d., 2008 WL 2223869(W.D.Pa.2008).

THE HOUR IS AT HAND CORRUPT, BASTARD, GOING TO HELL JUDGES . ITS TIME FOR ME TO USHER IN THE GLOBAL RULE OF MY GREAT ETC. GRAND UNCLE, JESUS CHRIST OF NAZARETH. ITS FOR THIS PURPOSE THAT I HAVE COME INTO THE WORLD!!! IT TIME TO KICK THE TIRES AND LIGHT THE FIRES!!! OUR GOD LIVETH!!! HE RISES ABOVE HIS THRONE IN HONOR AND GLORY!!! WHO IS GREATER THAN HE!!! THAT WHICH IS WRITTEN CANNOT BE BROKEN!!! ONCE MORE TO THE BRINK!!!

BEFORE THE ONE TRUE GOD STANDING IN JUDGMENT IS THE END OF ALL JOURNEYS!!! A COURT CANNOT CONFER OR ESTABLISH JURISDICTION WHERE NONE EXIST AND OR IS MADE VOID FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND A COURT CANNOT MAKE A VOID PROCEEDING VALID. TO CONSPIRE TO TAKE AWAY REMEDY LIKE THE KING-KHALIFAH'S HABEAS CORPUS AND THE PARALLEL § 1983 ACTIONS BY THE FRAUD YOU JUST ENGAGED IN, GIVEN TO HIM FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS IS TO TAKE AWAY THE DUE PROCESS RIGHT ITSELF. SUCH WOULD NOT BE WITHIN THE POWER OR DISCRETION OF THE STATE OR THIS COURT. UNDER FEDERAL LAW WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO THE STATES, THAT IF A COURT OR PARTIES IS "WITHOUT AUTHORITY, SUCH AS DUE TO YOUR FRAUD AND THE STRUCTURAL ERRORS RELATED TO WILLIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA AND THE USE OF PLRA AND OR AEDPA PROVISIONS WHICH VIOLATE EX-PARTE-VIRGINIA, WHICH ARE ALL UNCONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATING DUE PROCESS, ITS JUDGMENTS, AND OR ACTS OR ORDERS ARE REGARDED AS NULLITIES. THEY ARE NOT VOIDABLE, BUT SIMPLY VOID, AND FORM NO BAR TO A RECOVERY SOUGHT, EVEN PRIOR TO A REVERSAL IN OPPOSITION TO THEM. THEY CONSTITUTE NO JUSTIFICATION, AND ALL PERSONS CONCERNED IN EXECUTING SUCH ACTS, JUDGMENTS OR SENTENCES ARE CONSIDERED IN LAW AS TRESPASSERS". THE LAW DICTATES THAT FRAUD DESTROYS THE VALIDITY OF EVERYTHING IT ENTERS, INCLUDING THE DETERMINATIONS MADE UNDER CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM, 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM AND 2017-0002108, SUBJECTING YOU TO CIVIL AS WELL AS CRIMINAL PENALTIES AS WELL AS FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION, ALSO FOR VIOLATIONS OF YOUR OATH OF OFFICE, YOU CORRUPT, BASTARD, GOING TO HELL JUDGES. MAY YOU ROAST IN THE FIRES OF HELL FOREVER, BUT NOT UNTIL YOUR BODIES ARE INFLICTED WITH TERMINAL DISEASE AS YOU HAVE THUS BEEN JUDGED BY GOD'S PROPHET AND APPOINTED KING-KHALIFAH. THE FRAUD YOU'VE ENGAGED IN FATALLY EFFECTS EVEN THE MOST SOLEMN ACTS OR JUDGMENTS OR DECREES. LABEO DEFINES FRAUD AS ANY CUNNING DECEPTION OR ARTICLE USED TO CIRCUMVENT OR DECEIVE ANOTHER, MR. WELLS, IN HIS VERY WORK ON RES JUDICATA SAYS SEC. 499, **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING"**, ELLIOTT-v.-PIERSOL, 1 PET. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340(U.S.1828); NUDD-v.-BURROWS, 91 U.S. 667-683(U.S.1875); U.S. v.-THROCKMORTON, 98 U.S. 61-67(U.S.1871); WELLS-FARGO-BANK-N.A. v.-FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561(2016); 24-SENATORIAL-DIST.-REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE-v.-ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016); TRINSEY-v. PAGLIARO, 229 F.Supp.647(D.C.Pa.1964); MYLES-v.-DOMINO'S-PIZZA,

LLC., 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017).

THE LAW DICTATES THAT NEITHER JUDGES OR GOVERNMENT ATTORNEYS ARE ABOVE THE LAW, UNITED STATES v. ISAACS, 493 F2d. 1124, 1143(7th.Cir.1974); PULLIAM v. ALLEN, 466 U.S. 522, 536-543, 104 S.Ct. 1970, 1971-1982, 80 L.Ed.2d. 565(U.S.1984). IN OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM, FEW MORE SERIOUS THREATS TO INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY THAN A CORRUPT, BASTARD JUDGE OR JUDGES ACTING IN COLLUSION OUTSIDE OF THEIR JUDICIAL AUTHORITY WITH OTHERS AND EVEN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO DEPRIVE CITIZENS OF THEIR RIGHTS AS HAS OCCURRED HERE. IN THE CASE OF MARSHAL-SEA, 77 ENG. REP. 1027 (K.B.1613), SIR EDWARD COKE FOUND THAT ARTICLE 39 OF THE MAGNA CARTA RESTRICTED THE POWERS OF JUDGES TO ACT OUTSIDE THEIR JURISDICTION. SUCH PROCEEDINGS WOULD BE VOID, AND ACTIONABLE. WITHOUT SUCH JURISDICTION EXISTING, AND WHERE SUCH JUDGMENTS ARE PROCURED BY FRAUD, SUCH AN ORDER ENTERED BY THE COURT IS ABSOLUTELY VOID, IN RE: MATTER OF HAGUE, 412, MICH. 532, 544; 315 N.W.2d. 524 (1982). ALL PROCEEDINGS FOUNDED UPON VOID JUDGMENTS PROCURED BY FRAUD ARE THEMSELVES REGARDED AS INVALID, OLSON v. LEITH, 71 WYO. 316, 257 P.2d. 342. THE JUDGMENTS OBTAINED BY THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT WERE VOID BECAUSE THE DISTRICT COURT EXCEEDED ITS JURISDICTION TO ENTER THEM. WHERE A COURT AFTER ACQUIRING JURISDICTION OF A SUBJECT MATTER AS HERE, ALSO INVOLVING INTENTIONAL FRAUD UPON THE COURT, TRANSCENDS THE LIMITS OF THE JURISDICTION CONFERRED, AS WHEN A JUDGE SITS UPON HIS OWN CASE, OR MAKES USE OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTES SUCH AS THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA, TO INCLUDE ENGAGE IN OUTRAGEOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE BY STEALING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN CROWN AND SOLE CORPORATION, ITS JUDGMENTS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID, ARMSTRONG v. OBUCINO, 300 Ill. 140, 143, 133 N.E. 58(1921).

INSOMUCH, THE ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, THE UNDERSIGNED AFFIANT(S), HEREIN DO HEREBY SOLEMNLY SWEAR AND OR DECLARE AND OR AFFIRM AND OR STATE THESE FACTS, TO WIT, (A) AFFIANT(S) ARE COMPETENT TO STATE THE MATTERS SET FORTH HEREWITH; (B) AFFIANT(S) HAVE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS STATED HEREIN; (C) ALL

FACTS STATED HEREIN ARE TRUE, CORRECT AND COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AFFIANT(S) BEST FIRSTHAND KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING, AND IF CALLED UPON TO TESTIFY AS WITNESS(ES) AFFIANT(S) SHALL STATE THE SAME TO PROVE YOUR FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE ACTIONS OF THE CONSPIRING JUDGES AND PARTIES INFRINGE UPON THE "TRUST" AND VIOLATE THEIR OATH OF OFFICE SUBJECTING ALL PARTIES TO CHARGES ACCORDANCE WITH FEE OF $1 MILLION PER VIOLATION. UNREBUTTED AFFIDAVITS AS THOSE THAT ESTABLISH THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 AND THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES ARE REQUIRED TO TIMELY RESPOND AND REBUT THE TRUTHS EXPRESSED IN EACH PARAGRAPH, CATEGORICALLY AND ON EACH POINT FOR POINT BASIS WITHIN THE AFFIDAVITS , 5 U.S.C. §§ 3331, 3333, 7311; S.C. RULE 502.1; DEL-ZOTTO-v. UNIVERSAL-PHYSICIANS-SERVICES,-LLC., 214 F.Supp.3d. 499(DSC. 2016).

WHEN AN ACT OF PARLIAMENT OR LEGISLATORS OR JUDGES IS AGAINST THE COMMON RIGHT OF THE FIDUCIARY SOVEREIGN CROWN AND REASON, OR REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION SUCH AS UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10, OR IS IMPOSSIBLE TO PERFORM BY GAYS AND LESBIANS AS IS INDICATED BY THE "GRANT" GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION, SPECIFICALLY, THAT THOSE WHO MARRY **"[M]UST"** "BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY", MEANING BE ABLE TO SEXUALLY PROCREATE , THE COMMON LAW, EVEN AS THAT RELATED TO THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" SHALL CONTROL IT, AND ADJUDGE SUCH TO BE VOID.

ACCORDING TO VAN-HORNE'S-LESSEE-v.-DORRANCE, 2 U.S. 304, 316 (F.CAS.) 2 DALL 304(U.S.1895). A STATUTE, AND WE CAN ADD "LAW" SHALL NEVER HAVE AN EQUITABLE CONSTRUCTION IN ORDER TO OVERTHROW OR DIVEST AN ESTATE, ESPECIALLY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS, ESPECIALLY ONE GIVEN BY CLEAR "CONTRACT", "COVENANT", WHICH INCLUDES THE KING-KHALIFAH'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GIVEN TO HIM BY INHERITANCE VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION. EVERY STATUTE AND OR LAW, DEROGATORY TO THE RIGHTS OF PROPERTY, WHICH INCLUDE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE CROWN, OR THAT TAKES AWAY THE ESTATE OF A CITIZEN, OUGHT TO BE CONSTRUED STRICTLY AND IN FAVOR OF THE CROWN OR YOU VIOLATE THE CONTRACT WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS AS WELL AS THE EXPROPRIATION EXCEPTION

UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT. SEE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY OF STATES AND THEIR PROPERTY, SUPP. A/59/22 NO. 1, PP.7-11 (MAR. 1-5, 2004); THE U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY, CONVENTION ON JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY OF STATES AND THEIR PROPERTY, RES. 59/38, ARTS. 5, 10-12 (DEC. 2, 2004)(ADOPTING A RESTRICTIVE THEORY OF IMMUNITYAND WITHDRAWING IMMUNITY FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY WHERE, AMONG OTHER REQUIREMENTS, "THE ACT OR OMISSION OCCURRED IN WHOLE OR IN PART IN THE TERRITORY OF THE OTHER STATE"). ALSO SEE EXHIBIT "TRUSTEE". ALSO SEE THE "CONTACT", THE "COVENANT" UNDER LUKE 11:52; ISAIAH 11:1-5; ISAIAH 14:29-32; ZECHARIAH 6:12-13; ISAIAH 16:5; ISAIAH 32:1-4; ISAIAH 42:18-22; JEREMIAH 23:5-6; JEREMIAH 33:15-21 (CRUCIAL ONE); EZEKIEL 34:22-30; EZEKIEL 37:22; DANIEL 11:1-3; MALACHI 4:4-6. ALSO SEE SIMON-v.-REPUBLIC-OF-HUNGARY,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2017 WL 4402293 (D.D.C.2017); ZSCHERNIG-v.-MILLER, 389 U.S. 429, 88 S.Ct. 664, 19 L.Ed.2d. 683(U.S.1968).

IF THE STATE OR GOVERNMENT CAN COMPEL THE SURRENDER OF ONE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT AS A CONDITION OF ITS FAVOR, IT MAY, IN LIKE MANNER, COMPEL A SURRENDER OF ALL, TO INCLUDE THE LAWS OF NATURE WHICH REFLECT THE LAWS OF GOD. CAN MAN CAUSE GOD TO SURRENDER HIS RIGHTS OR HIS LAWS? SUCH AN ATTEMPTED OFFENSE WOULD BE UNPARDONABLE. THE POSITION LUDICROUS. IT IS INCONCEIVABLE THAT GUARANTEES EMBEDDED WITHIN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, WHICH INCLUDE THAT ALL SOVEREIGN NATIONS ARE ANSWERABLE TO NO ONE, EXCEPT GOD WHICH EQUATE TO HIS LAWGIVER, MAY BE THUS MANIPULATED OUT OF EXISTENCE, WHICH IN THIS CASE ARE NOW "LEGALLY" PROTECTED BY "CONTRACT", BY "COVENANT", SECURED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, ALSO NOW UNDER ARTICLE IV § 2 BY DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, WHICH INCLUDE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE CROWN GIVEN TO THE KING-KHALIFAH AS PART OF HIS INHERITANCE VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION, cf. PUBLIC-LICENSES-AND-PRIVATE-RIGHTS (BARNETT 1953); 33 OLR 10n. 32. STATES POWER TO GRANT PRIVILEGES ON ITS OWN CONDITION IS LIMITED, SO IT MAY NOT THEREBY REQUIRE RELINQUISHMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. YET, IN THIS CASE THE UNITED STATES AND (193) MEMBERS STATES OF THE U.N. ARE PARTY TO THE DEFAULT LEGALLY ESTABLISHING ALL SUPERSEDING RIGHTS, TITLES,

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE CROWN WHICH IS CONFIRMED BY THE CONTRACT AND INHERITANCE ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION, BOLIVIA-REPUBLIC-OF-VENEZUELA-v.-HELMERICH-&-PAYNE-INTERN.-DRILLING-CO., 137 S.Ct. 1312, 197 L.Ed.2d. 663, 85 U.S.L.W. 4221(U.S. 2017); DOE-v.-FEDERAL-DEMOCRATIC-REPUBLIC-OF-ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6 (D.D.C.2016); ARMIDILLO-DISTRIBUTION-ENTERPRISE INC.-v.-HAIYUN-MUSICAL-INSTRUMENTS-MANUFACTURE-CO.-LTD., F.Supp. 3d., 2014 WL 2815943(D.C.Fla.2014); CASSIER-v.-THYSSEN-BORNE-MISZA-COLLECTION-FOUNDATION, 737 F3d. 613(9th.Cir.2013); AL SHIMARI-v.-C.A.C.I.-INTERN.-INC., 679 F3d. 205(4th.Cir.2012).

THE COURTS HAVE EXPLAINED, THE HISTORY OF THE REMEDY CLAUSE INDICATES THAT ITS PURPOSE IS TO PROTECT ABSOLUTE COMMON-LAW RIGHTS RESPECTING PERSONS, PROPERTY (INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY), AND REPUTATION (FRAMING THE KING-KHALIFAH AND PLACING HIM IN FORCED BREACH OF HIS FIDUCIARY DUTY AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES), AND THOSE RIGHTS EXISTED BY CONTRACT WHEN THE CONSTITUTION WAS ESTABLISHED WHICH YOU ALSO PROTECTED UNDER THE 1st. AMENDMENT RELIGION AND ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE. THE FILING OF A § 1983 IS APPROPRIATE, NOT SUBJECT TO HECK v. HUMPHREYS OR PRIESER WHERE ALL OF OUR CONVICTIONS ARE ALREADY INVALIDATED BY CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH IS A FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT SEEKING RELIEF FROM CONVICTION AND THE STATE IS IN DEFAULT AND FORFEITURE AND THE COURT'S JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. THE COURT HAS STATED THAT THE GUARANTEE OF REMEDY BY DUE COURSE OF LAW FOR INJURY TO PERSON, PROPERTY OR REPUTATION, LIKE YOU FRAMED THE KING-KHALIFAH FOR MURDER BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED TO PREVENT HIS ASCENT TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, "IS ONE OF THE MOST SACRED AND ESSENTIAL OF ALL THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES" AND THAT "WITHOUT IT A FREE GOVERNMENT CANNOT BE MAINTAINED OR INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY BE PRESERVED", SMOTHERS-v.-GRESHAM-TRANSFER-INC., 332 OR. 83, 23 P.3d. 333(2001); GEARIN v.-MARION-COUNTY, 110 OR. 390, 396, 233 P. 929.

THE COURTS ALSO STATED THAT THE PURPOSE OF THE REMEDY CLAUSE IS TO MAKE THE COMMON LAW MAXIM "THAT THERE IS NO WRONG WITHOUT REMEDY" A FIXED AND PERMANENT RULE OF LAW IN THIS STATE", PLATT-v.-NEWBERRY-ET.-AL., 104 OR. 148, 153, 205 P. 296(1922)

WHICH SUCH UNDERSTANDING APPLIES TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THOSE STATEMENTS REFLECTS THIS COURT'S UNDERSTANDING THAT CERTAIN COMMON LAW RIGHTS, SUCH AS THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN, TO INCLUDE HIS RIGHT TO SECURE HIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, ALL NOW LEGALLY PROTECTED BY BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND DUE PROCESS LAW ARE "ABSOLUTE RIGHTS" THAT MUST BE PROTECTED FROM INFRINGEMENT ALSO PROTECTED UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT. "BIBLICAL LAW AT COMMON LAW SUPERSEDES ALL LAWS AND CHRISTIANITY, JUDAISM AND ISLAM IS CUSTOM, AND CUSTOM IS LAW". SO MUCH FOR THE CLAIM OF USING BIBLE VERSES, ROBINS v. HARDAWAY, 1 JEFFERSON 109, 1 Va. REPORTS ANN. 58, 61(1772); GREGORY v. BAUGH, 29 Va. 681, 29 Va. REP. ANN. 466, 2 LEIGH 665(1831). THE CONSTITUTION IS TO BE INTERPRETED ACCORDING TO COMMON LAW RULES, SCHICK v. U.S., 195 U.S. 65, 24 S.Ct. 826, 49 L.Ed. 99. THE UNITED STATES ADOPTED COMMON LAW OF ENGLAND WITH THE CONSTITUTION, CALDWELL v. HILL, 178 S.E. 383 (1934). THE U.S. CONSTITUTION MUST BE INTERPRETED IN LIGHT OF THE COMMON LAW AND PRINCIPLE AND HISTORY OF WHICH THE FRAMERS OF THE CONSTITUTION WERE FAMILIAR WITH, THE LANGUAGE OF THE CONSTITUTION COULD NOT BE UNDERSTOOD WITH REFERENCE TO THE COMMON LAW, U.S. v. WONG-KIM, ARK. 169 U.S. 649, 18 S.Ct. 456.

AS TO ESTABLISH BY EVIDENCE THAT SUCH STATE AND GOVERNMENTAL ACTION ARRESTING, ATTACHING, EXECUTING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE KING-KHALIFAH AND THE SOLE CORPORATION. SIX UPSTATE LAWMAKERS, WHICH BY THE MULTIPLE STATES ESTABLISH EFFECT UPON INTERSTATE COMMERCE CLAIM, PURSUANT TO THE "PARODY MARRIAGE BILL" AND OR "MARRIAGE AND CONSTITUTION RESTORATION ACT", BY THESE LEGISLATIONS PRODUCED BY VARIOUS STATES LEGISLATORS. THEY SEEK TO ESTABLISH MARRIAGE AS A UNION BETWEEN A MAN AND A WOMAN ASSERTING THAT SAME SEX MARRIAGE WOULD BE CONSIDERED A "PARODY MARRIAGE" AND NOT TO BE RESPECTED, OR RECOGNIZED BY ANY STATE. REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATIVE STEVEN LONG, A SPONSOR OF THE BILL SAID THE PROPOSAL IS ABOUT PUTTING AN END TO THE LEGAL MESS HE BELIEVES NON-TRADITIONAL MARRIAGES HAVE CREATED. WE HAVE SITUATIONS WHERE PEOPLE ARE LOSING BUSINESSES AND LOSING JOBS SAID REPRESENTATIVE LONG. ALL BECAUSE THEY HAVE A DIFFERENT

STANDARD OF BELIEF. THUS, BY THIS EVIDENCE VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT IS ESTABLISHED, GUSTO-v.-U.S., 523 U.S. 1011, 118 S.Ct. 1201 (MEM) 140 L.Ed.2d. 329(U.S.1998); U.S.-v.-MILES, 122 F3d. 235(5th.Cir.1997); U.S.C.A. CONST. ART. 1, § 8 CL. 3; 18 U.S.C.A. § 1951; UNITED-STATES-v.-HENDERSON, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6084637(S.D.Tex.2016); UNITED-STATES-v.-RUE, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5007930(S.D.Tex.2015); SIBLEY-v.-HERGENROEDER, F.Supp.2d., 2006 WL 3354137(D.C.Md.2006).

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

NOW ALL ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE AND OR COURT APPARENTLY CONTRARY TO NATURAL RIGHT OF JUSTICE, ARE, IN OUR LAWS, AND MUST BE IN THE NATURE OF THINGS, CONSIDERED VOID. THE LAWS OF NATURE ARE THE LAWS OF GOD; WHOSE AUTHORITY CAN BE SUPERSEDED BY NO POWER ON EARTH WHICH MUST INCLUDE HIS LAWGIVER. THE KING-KHALIFAH AS GOD'S LAWGIVER IS TANTAMOUNT TO THAT POWER AND AUTHORITY VIA THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER GIVEN TO HIM BY CONTRACT OF THE SOLE CORPORATION ALSO NOW ESTABLISHED BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. YOUR LAWS CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO EXCEED THE AUTHORITY OF GOD'S LAWGIVER. NO COURT ON EARTH OR LEGISLATIVE BODY, BY THE CONTRACT ESTABLISHED, WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS CAN OBSTRUCT OUR DUTY AS BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST" TO PROTECT GOD'S LAWS AND THAT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN QUESTION, NOR CAN THEY OBSTRUCT OUR OBEDIENCE TO THE ONE TRUE GOD FROM WHOSE PUNISHMENTS THEY CANNOT PROTECT US. ALL LAWS OR HUMAN CONSTITUTIONS WHICH CONTRADICTS GOD'S LAWS, WE ARE IN CONSCIENCE BOUND TO DISOBEY, AND THEY ARE RENDERED VOID BY DECREE OF THE SUPERSEDING AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN WHERE THEY VIOLATE THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION. SUCH HAVE BEEN THE ADJUDICATION OF OUR COURTS OF JUSTICE AND MUST REMAIN SO DUE TO THE CONTRACT AND DEFAULT BINDING UPON ALL COURTS, 8 CO. 118 A BONHAM'S CASE. HOB. 87; 7 CO. 14 A CALVIN'S CASE; COHEN-v.-VIRGINIA, (6 WHEAT) 19 U.S. 264(U.S.1821). THIS SYSTEM, MATURED BY THE WISDOM OF AGES, FOUNDED ON PRINCIPLES OF TRUTH, JUSTICE, FAIRNESS, SOUND REASON, HAS RUTHLESSLY ABOLISHED IN MANY OF OUR STATES, ACTING LIKE A BUNCH OF BROKE BACK FAGOTS, RETARDED CRABS, CREATING LAWS THAT SPEAK BLASPHEMY, SPITTING IN THE FACE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, HAVE RASHLY SUBSTITUTED IN ITS PLACE THE SUGGESTIONS OF REPROBATE MIND SOCIAL WORKERS,

AND SCHOLIASTS, WHO INVENT NEW CODES AND SYSTEMS OF PLEADINGS TO ORDER. BUT THIS ATTEMPT TO ABOLISH ALL SPECIES, AND ESTABLISH A SINGLE SPECIES OR GENUS, MAN WITH MAN, WOMAN WITH WOMAN, IS FOUND TO BE BEYOND THE POWER OF COURTS AND LEGISLATIVE OMNIPOTENCE. YOU CANNOT COMPEL THE HUMAN MIND NOT TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THINGS THAT DIFFER. THERE IS A HIGHER LOYALTY THAN LOYALTY TO THIS COUNTRY, AND THAT'S LOYALTY TO GOD. SAMUEL ADAMS STATED, "THE NATURAL LIBERTY OF MAN IS TO BE FREE FROM ANY SUPERIOR POWER ON EARTH, BUT NOT TO THE SUPERIOR POWER OF GOD WHO RESIDES ABOVE THE EARTH OR HIS LAWGIVER WHO HE HAS SENT. MAN IS NOT TO BE UNDER THE WILL OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY OF MAN, BUT ONLY TO THE LAWS OF NATURE AS HIS RULE". THE LAWS OF NATURE ARE THE LAWS OF GOD, AND WHAT IS THE LAW OF GOD? THAT NO MAN SHALL LAY WITH A MAN AS HE LAYETH WITH A WOMAN AND NO WOMAN SHALL LAY WITH A WOMAN AS SHE LAYETH WITH A MAN. SEE THE CONTRACT UNDER DEUTERONOMY 22:5 AND 23:17. ALSO SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD; U.S. v. SEEGER, 380 U.S. 163 (U.S.1965); McFAUL v. RAMSEY, 61 U.S. (20 HOW) 523, 525, 15 L.Ed. 1010, 1011(U.S.1858).

REFERRING BACK TO THE ISSUE OF THE REMEDY CLAUSE. THE HISTORY OF THE REMEDY CLAUSE INDICATES THAT ITS PURPOSE IS TO PROTECT ABSOLUTE COMMON LAW RIGHTS, SUCH AS THE RIGHTS OF GOD WHICH INCLUDE HIS SENT LAWGIVER, WHICH IN THIS CASE, ARE ALSO ESTABLISHED BY FEDERAL AND INTERNATIONAL PROBATE LAW, CONTRACT, DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, RESPECTING PERSONS, PROPERTY AND REPUTATION, IN WHICH THIS STATE FRAMED THE KING-KHALIFAH BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED AND ILLEGALLY ATTACHED, ARRESTED OR EXECUTED THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN STATE IN VIOLATION OF THE EXPROPRIATION EXCEPTION UNDER THE F.S.I.A. IN THE FORM OF THE RIGHT TO MARRY GIVING IT TO GAYS AND LESBIANS ALSO VIOLATING THE HOBBS ACT. "CONSENSUS FACIT LEGEM"---CONSENT MAKES THE LAWS, AND YOU NEVER HAD THE KING-KHALIFAH'S CONSENT AS THE SOLE CORPORATION. "FICTIO CREDIT VERITALI"---FICTION YIELDS TO TRUTH, AND THE TRUTH OF THE MATTERS PLACED BEFORE ALL COURTS IS THAT ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ARE NOW LAW, "LEGALLY" ESTABLISHED BY DUE PROCESS UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH ARE BINDING UPON ALL COURTS CREATING AND SETTING INTO EFFECT AND FORCE ALL SUPERSEDING AT-

TORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY NOW EXERCISED BEFORE THIS COURT. "NIHIL POSSUMUS CONTRA VERITATEM"-- WE CAN DO NOTHING AGAINST THE TRUTH.

THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH AS ESTABLISHED LEGAL DOCUMENTS VIA "CONTRACT", "COVENANT", ARE MORE THAN SUFFICIENT TO PROVE PEDIGREE AND ALL RIGHTS ESTABLISHED THEREBY. THE FACT THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S ANCESTORS WERE KIDNAPPED AND BROUGHT HERE AGAINST THEIR WILL AND ENSLAVED SHALL HAVE NO ADVERSE EFFECT UPON THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION BEING THE LAW OF THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" WAS MADE AND THE LAW AT THE TIME THE CONTRACTS WERE ESTABLISH STANDS AS THE LAW HONORED TODAY AND THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH) STANDS AS SUFFICIENT TO MEET THE MINIMUM PRIMA FACIE REQUIREMENT TO INVOKE THE PROVISIONS OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT TO ESTABLISH THE PROTECTION OF HIS LEGALLY DESIGNATED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY BY PEDIGREE, GREGORY v. BAUGH, 2 LEIGH 665, 1831 WL 1924 (Va.1831); U.S. v. MID-CONTINENT PETROLEUM CORP., 67 F2d. 37(10th.Cir.1933); FOLKERSON v. HOLMES, 117 U.S. 389, 6 S.Ct. 780, 29 L.Ed. 915(U.S.1886); BREWSTER v. VILLA, 90 F2d. 853(5th.Cir.1937).

INSOMUCH, YOUR OATH OF OFFICE IS A QUID PRO QUO CONTRACT UNDER U.S. CONST. ARTICLE 6 Cl. 2 AND 3, DAVIS v. LAWYERS SURETY CORPORATION, 459 S.W.2d. 655 Tex. App., IN WHICH CLERKS, OFFICIALS AND OFFICERS OF THE STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PLEDGE TO PERFORM, SUPPORT AND UPHOLD THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION WITH ITS MANDATES AND PROHIBITIONS IN RETURN FOR SUBSTANCES SUCH AS WAGES, PERKS AND BENEFITS. THIS INCLUDE OATH TO UPHOLD THE VARIOUS STATES CONSTITUTIONS. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAS HELD THAT NO STATE, NOR LEGISLATOR, NOR EXECUTIVE, NOR JUDGE CAN WAR AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION WITHOUT VIOLATING HIS UNDERTAKING TO SUPPORT IT WHICH IS THE HEART OF YOUR OATH OF OFFICE. BY WARRING AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION YOU'VE ENGAGED IN TREASONOUS ACTS OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE DENYING US THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. REFUSING TO LIVE BY YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE PLACES YOU IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF THAT OATH OF OFFICE IN EVERY CASE, COOPER v. AARON, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401(1958); IN RE: NEELY, 390 P.3d. 728, 2017 WY. 25; AUERBOCK v. SAMUELS, 10 UTAH.

2d. 152, 349 P.2d. 1112, 1114; ALLEGANY-CORP.-v.-KIRBY, D.C.N.Y. 218 F.Supp. 164, 183; KEETON-PACKING-CO.-v.-STATE, 437 S.W. 20, 28; U.S.-v.-ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); U.S.-v.-WELLS, 578 Fed. Appx' 234 CA4 (Va.2014); SMITH-v.-CLARK/-SMOOT/-RUSSELL,--F3d.--, 2015 WL 4717932 CA4 (Md.2015); U.S.-v.-HARE, 820 F3d. 93(4th.Cir.2016); DONATONI v.-DEPARTMENT-OF-HOMELAND-SECURITY,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 1755871; WHITE-v.-MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280(DSC.2014); U.S.-v. ALEDEKCHA, 2010 WL 4054267(D.C.Md.2010); UNITED-STATES-v.-WILL, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d. 392, 406(1980).

BY JUDGE WOOTEN AND THE OTHER FEDERAL AND OR STATE JUDGES ACTIONS CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS TO PREVENT AND SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES FROM RESPONDING TO PROVE THEY TIMELY CHALLENGED THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION. THIS ESTABLISHES COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN WHICH IS BINDING UPON THIS COURT DUE TO THE UNITED STATES BEING PARTY TO THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. BY THEIR FRAUDULENT ACTIONS THE UNITED STATES AND STATE COURTS ARE IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CLAIMS AND CAUSES INCLUDING HABEAS CORPUS, INCLUDING ESTABLISHING THAT THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID, TO INCLUDE ALL STATE AND FEDERAL CONVICTIONS ADJUDICATED UNDER THEM SINCE 1996. YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE. THE PARTIES WERE REQUIRED TO RESPOND AND YOU SILENCED THEM IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO CONCEAL EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND TO ILLEGALLY SEIZE A FOREIGN OFFICIAL CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING COMMERCE AND IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, WHICH ALSO VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION, UNITED STATES-v.-BURNS, 2016 WL 3910273; DENNIS-v.-SECRETARY-PENNSYLVANIA-DEPARTMENT-OF-CORRECTIONS,--F3d.--, 2016 WL 4440925(3rd. Cir.2016); WEARRY-v.-CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78(U.S. 2016); U.S.-v.-BANK-OF-AMERICA, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 2777397(N.C. 2014). A FOREIGN GOVERNMENT MEANS A FOREIGN STATE IRRESPECTIVE OF RECOGNITION BY THE UNITED STATES. NOTICE BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT IS NOT A CONDITION PRECEDENT TO EFFECTIVE NOTIFICATION OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN OFFICIAL TO THE UNITED STATES YOU RAT, STINKING, CORRUPT, BASTARD, DEMON DOG OF JUDGES, INHABITANTS

OF THE FIRES OF HELL, WHERE YOU CONSPIRED WITH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES IN CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM, 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM AND 2017-0002108 BY DETACHING THE REMOVAL TO ALLOW THEM TO DISMISS CASE 2017-0002108 TO CONCEAL EVIDENCE OF DEFAULT WHICH IS DIRECTLY CONNECTED TO THE FEDERAL CASES TO PREVENT IT FROM BEING REVEALED THAT THE PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ. DO INDEED ATTACH TO CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, UNITED STATES v. DIZDAR, CA2 (N.Y.) 1978, 581 F2d. 1031; 18 U.S.C. § 1116; WEEPE v. UNITED STATES, --U.S.--, 106 S.Ct. 179, 88 L.Ed.2d. 148(U.S.1985).

DID NOT THE ONE TRUE GOD AND HIS HOLY PROPHETS TELL YOU THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH SHALL COME? DID NOT THE ONE TRUE GOD AND HIS HOLY PROPHETS TELL YOU THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH SHALL ASCEND THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES YOU RAT, STINKING, CORRUPT, BASTARD GOING TO HELL JUDGES? I AM FIRE!!! LET US FINISH THIS DISCOURSE BETWEEN ME AND THEE TERMINAL DISEASE BODY DOGS. IN SCHEVER, v. RHOADES, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S.Ct. 1683(U.S.1974) ADJUDICATED THAT "WHEN A STATE OFFICIAL, LIKE THE RESPONDENT AND EVEN THE UNITED STATES CONSPIRING WITH YOU TO REMAIN SILENT TO CONCEAL THE DEFAULT GIVING THE KING-KHALIFAH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY BINDING UPON THIS COURT, WHEN THEY ACT UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY IN A MANNER VIOLATIVE OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, THEY COME INTO CONFLICT WITH THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF THAT CONSTITUTION, AND THEY ARE IN THAT CASE, EVEN PURSUANT TO THE C.A.T. TREATY AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT, THEY IN THAT CASE ARE SURELY NOT IMMUNE AND OR ARE STRIPPED ON THEIR OFFICIAL OR REPRESENTATIVE CHARACTER AND IS SUBJECT IN THEIR PERSON TO THE CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR INDIVIDUAL CONDUCT. THE STATE AND OR GOVERNMENT HAS NO POWER TO IMPART TO THEM ANY IMMUNITY FROM RESPONSIBILITY TO THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES AND IN THIS CASE, TO THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND KING-KHALIFAH OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES. BY LAW A JUDGE IS A STATE OFFICER AND OR FEDERAL EMPLOYEE. THE JUDGE THEN ACTS NOT AS A JUDGE BUT AS A PRIVATE INDIVI-

DUAL AS THEY ALL DID CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, 5 U.S.C. §§ 3331, 3333, 7311; S.C. RULE 502.1; BLUE-SKY-TRAVEL-AND-TOURS, LLC, v. AL-TAYYAR,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); U.S. v. $41,320 U.S. CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240.

WHEN JUDGES ACT WHERE THEY DO NOT HAVE JURISDICTION TO ACT, OR ENGAGE IN FRAUD, OR THEY ENFORCE A VOID ORDER OR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION THEY BECOME TRESPASSERS OF THE LAW, AND ARE ENGAGED IN ACTS OF TREASON SET AGAINST THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE AND THE CONSTITUTION. THE COURT IN YATES v. VILLAGE OF HOFFMAN ESTATES, ILLINOIS, 209 F.Supp. 757(N.D.Ill. 1962) HELD THAT "NOT EVERY ACTION BY A JUDGE IS IN EXERCISE OF THEIR SPECIFIC FUNCTION...IT IS NOT A JUDICIAL FUNCTION FOR THEM TO COMMIT AN INTERNATIONAL TORT EVEN IF THAT TORT OCCURS IN THE COURTHOUSE". WHEN A JUDGE ACTS AS A TRESPASSER OF THE LAW OR HIS OATH OF OFFICE, WHEN THAT JUDGE DOES NOT FOLLOW THE LAW OR HIS OATH OF OFFICE. THE JUDGE IS SUBJECT TO DISMISSAL, CRIMINAL PENALTIES AND LOSES SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND THE JUDGE'S ORDERS ARE VOID AND ARE OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT. ALL ACTS ARE ILLEGAL AND VOID WHERE IN CONFLICT WITH THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. NO MAN SHALL BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY OR PROPERTY, WHICH INCLUDE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE CROWN ARGUED IN THIS CASE BY WRIT OF ERROR AND IN ALL PENDING RELATED § 1983 ACTIONS, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW, NOR SHALL HE BE ADJUDICATED OF OR TRIED FOR AN OFFENSE BY EX POST FACTO LAW WHERE EX POST FACTO LAW SHALL BE PASSED AND ALL SAID RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ARE INVIOLATE AND WOULD VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE WHERE THESE SUPERSEDING FOREIGN SOVEREIGN RIGHTS ARE NOW LEGALLY PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, R.A.M. OF SOUTH FLORIDA, INC. v. W.C.I. COMMUNICATORS, INC. 869 SO.2d. 1210, 29 FLA. L. WEEKLY D. 761; SCHOONER EXCHANGE v. McFADDON, 7 CRANCH 116, 11 U.S. 116, 1812 WL 1310, 3 L.Ed. 287(U.S.1812); DOE v. FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6, 16(D.D.C.2016); DOGAN v. BARAK, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6024416 (C.D.2016); U.S. v. STERLING, 724 F3d. 482 CA4 (Va.2013); BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS, 2016 WL 1253285; NELSON v. U.S. BANK N.A., 2015 WL 685271(DSC.2015).

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAS WARNED, BECAUSE WHAT APPEARS TO BE LAWFUL COMMANDS OF THE COURT ON THE SURFACE, MANY CITIZENS, BECAUSE OF RESPECT FOR WHAT APPEARS TO BE LAWFUL, YET IN THIS CASE WE HAVE FRAUD UPON THE CONSPIRING COURTS INCLUDING THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT, MANY CITIZENS ARE CUNNINGLY COERCED AND OR MANIPULATED INTO WAIVING THEIR RIGHTS DUE TO IGNORANCE. THE KING-KHALIFAH AND HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES ARE NOT IGNORANT. WE CHALLENGE THE JURISDICTION OF THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT, AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, MOTIONS TO INTERVENE IN THESE CASES TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF THE CROWN. WE MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER(S) AND TO REINSTATE CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM. WE MOTION FOR RECUSAL OF JUDGES WOOTEN AND MARCHANT AND FORFEITURE. THE STRUCTURAL ERRORS VOID YOUR JURISDICTION AS WELL DUE TO YOUR FRAUD. WE MOTION FOR CHANGE OF VENUE TO NEW JERSEY VIA THE WRIT OF ERROR DUE TO YOUR FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHICH MUST BE ADJUDICATED UNDER § 1983, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT OUR CONVICTIONS ARE ALREADY INVALIDATED BY CASE 2013-CP-40-0084 WHICH IS A FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT CHALLENGING CONVICTION AND WHERE THE STATE IS IN DEFAULT ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION. WE EXERCISE THE RIGHT OF COLLATERAL ATTACK TO REMEDY THE FRAUD. YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE "CONTRACT", OF THE "GRANT", GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT IN VIOLATION OF BOTH THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE OF ARTICLE IV § 2 AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ESTABLISHING CAUSE BEFORE THIS COURT CORRUPT BASTARD JUDGES ALLOWING THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH AND HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, TO INTERVENE AND CORRECT THE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT CONSISTENTLY MANIFEST ITSELF IN THESE CASES. WE DEMAND THAT YOU PRODUCE YOUR BOND OR OATH OF OFFICE OR WRIT OF COMMISSION THAT WOULD PERMIT YOU TO GO AGAINST THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH OR STAND DOWN! DUE TO YOU CORRUPT, BASTARD, DEMON DOG JUDGES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY, TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT AND IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, TO PREVENT AND SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES

FROM RESPONDING IN CASES 2017-0002108, 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM BECAUSE ALL OF YOU KNEW GOOD AND WELL THEY WERE IN DEFAULT IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IS **"FRAUD"** AND **"VOIDS"** ANY AND ALL ORDERS ISSUED WITHIN THESE CASES PLACING YOU IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSES OF ACTION LAID BEFORE ALL COURTS INVOLVED. **IT IS SO ORDERED,** PRESAULT v. I.C.C., 494 U.S. 1, 110 S.Ct. 914, 108 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.1990); BROWN v. BROWN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); HARRIS v. HHGREGG, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1331166(N.C.2013); OPARAH v. NEW YORK DEPT. OF EDUC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 4240733(N.Y.D.C. 2015); AMERICAN MUT. LIBERTY INS. CO. v. PLYWOOD PLASTICS CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157 (DSC.1948).

UNLESS THE RESPONDENT, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE OR THE UNITED STATES, NOT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2017-0002108 OR THIS CORRUPT, BASTARD, COCKROACH OF JUDGES UNDER CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM DISMISSING THE CASES IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS AND INFORMATION AND TO SILENCE THEM TO PREVENT THE REQUIREMENT THAT THEY PRODUCE EVIDENCE THAT DEMONSTRATE THEY TIMELY MOVED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTS TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY ARE INDEED IN DEFAULT. THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT AND ALL OTHER COURTS SHALL VACATE OUR CONVICTIONS AND GRANT ALL RELIEF DEMANDED IN ALL PENDING PARALLEL § 1983 ACTIONS SOUGHT BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT WHOSE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY IS BINDING UPON THIS COURT BY CONTRACT, DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 OUT OF RICHLAND COUNTY S.C.. UNLESS THE RESPONDENT OR THE UNITED STATES CAN DEMONSTRATE BY CLEAR EVIDENCE THAT THEY TIMELY MOVED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISSDICTION. CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM LIKE THE OTHERS ARE ESSENTIALLY ON REMAND, LIMITING YOUR JURISDICTION TO DO NOTHING EXCEPT GRANT THE RELIEF DEMANDED. "NIHIL POSSUMUS CONTRA VERITATEM"---YOU CAN DO NOTHING AGAINST THE TRUTH. **IT IS SO ORDERED,** SCHWARE v. BOARD OF EXAMS OF THE STATE OF N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 77 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.D.C.2015); BOLLS v. VIRGINIA BD. OF BAR EXAMINERS, 811 F.Supp.2d. 1260(E.D.Va. 2011); PEREZ v. CHIMES DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6124679(D.C.Md.2016); IN RE: GREEN, 980 F2d. 590(9th.Cir. 1992).

I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, FULFILLED MY DUTY BY YOUR NATION'S DUE PROCESS LAWS AND PEACEFULLY, AS A NON COMBATANT, FILED LEGAL ACTION TO ESTABLISH ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES BEFORE A COMPETENT COURT HAVING JURISDICTION TO HEAR THE MATTERS, WHICH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES WILL VERIFY. I GAVE PROPER NOTICE AND PROPERLY SERVED ALL PARTIES INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES WHO APPEARED ON THE RECORD AND BROUGHT THE MATTERS TO ALL PARTIES UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, WHERE WE WERE SUBJECTED TO OUTRAGEOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, WHERE THEY DEFAULTED AND JURISDICTION WAS MADE VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND OTHER UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THEREUPON, THAT CASE WAS REMOVED TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT WITHIN THE PARALLEL § 1983 ACTIONS PENDING, INCLUDING THE HABEAS CORPUS UNDER CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND THESE CORRUPT, BASTARD, DOG JUDGES CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO INAPPROPRIATELY ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER THESE CASES TO ENGAGE IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND TO CONCEAL THE DEFAULT AND SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, ALSO IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE BY GIVING THESE SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHRITES (GAYS AND LESBIANS) THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY WHICH IS THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE CROWN BY INHERITANCE GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS WHERE YOU VIOLATED THE TERMS OF THE "CONTRACT", "GRANT", ALLOWING THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH AND HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL TO LEGALLY INTERVENE AND CORRECT THE INJUSTICE. THE RIGHT TO SOVEREIGNTY EXTENDS TO ALL THINGS AND PERSONS NOT PRIVILEGED, THAT ARE WITHIN THE TERRITORY OR BORDERS, AS THE BORDERS AND TERRITORY OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE EXIST WITHIN EVERY NATION ON THE FACE OF THE PLANET. THEY EXTEND TO ALL STRANGERS RESIDENT

HEREIN WHEN YOU WERE REPEATEDLY TOLD THAT THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD DENOUNCE THE AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP YOUR NATION FORCED UPON HIM AND HIS ANCESTORS BY SLAVERY AND THE KING-KHALIFAH ADOPTS THE CITIZENSHIP OF HIS ISRAELI FOREFATHERS KING DAVID AND KING SOLOMON INVOKING THE ISRAELI LAW OF RETURN TO SIT UPON THEIR THRONE AS THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" COMMANDS. THE SOVEREIGN RIGHT BY THE DEFAULT DO NOT ONLY EXTEND TO THOSE WHO ARE NATURALIZED, AND TO THOSE WHO ARE DOMICILED THEREIN, HAVING TAKEN UP THEIR ABODE WITH THE INTENTION OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE, BUT ALSO TO THOSE WHO RESIDENCE IS TRANSITORY. ALL STRANGERS ARE UNDER THE PROTECTION OF THE SOVEREIGN, AND EVEN MORE SPECIFIC, UNDER THE PROTECTION OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND ALSO UNDER THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY WHICH IS HIS CONSTITUTION, WHILE THEY ARE WITHIN ITS BORDERS OR TERRITORIES. THE CONSTITUTION PROVISIONS EMPLOY THE WORD "PERSON", THAT IS ANYONE WHO WE HAVE PERMITTED TO PEACEFULLY RESIDE WITHIN OUR BORDERS, AS IS FOR THE KING-KHALIFAH, AND MAY RESORT TO THE COURTS FOR REDRESS OF INJURY DONE HIM IN HIS LANDS, AS HIS HOME WAS LOST, HIS GOODS AS THE ITEMS CONTAINED THEREIN WERE LOST AND THOSE DESTROYED BY S.C.D.C., HIS PROPERTY AS THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY YOU GAVE THESE SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHMITES, HIS PERSON OR REPUTATION AS YOU FRAMED HIM PRODUCING A FICTITIOUS HOMICIDE BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED WHICH IS ANOTHER REASON YOU CRIMINALLY SILENCED THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES TO KEEP THESE FACTS FROM BEING REVEALED CORRUPT , BASTARD JUDGES. THE REAL PARTY PLAINTIFF FOR WHO THE NOMINAL PLAINTIFF SUES IS NOT SHOWN TO HAVE ENTERED OUR LAND IN AN UNLAWFUL MANNER. UNLESS YOU COUNT THIS NATION'S TREACHEROUS, UNLAWFUL, CRIMINAL, TORTUROUS ACTS RELATED TO THE U.S. SLAVE TRADE. THUS, HE, THE KING-KHALIFAH TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, MAY ENTER AND RESIDE IN THE LAND OF THE UNITED STATES AND BE EQUALLY PROTECTED BY THE LAWS, ALLOWING HIM TO EXERCISE ALL SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY GIVEN TO HIM SO AS LONG AS HE CONFORMED TO THE DUE PROCESS MECHANISM OF THE COURT UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 THAT ESTABLISH ALL RIGHTS AND TITLES ARGUED, WHICH THE KING-KHALIFAH DID INDEED DO. THE FIDUCIARY FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH MAY OWN PROPERTY AND THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES, EVEN PURSUANT TO THE F.S.I.A., WILL PROTECT HIS "PROPERTY", "RIGHTS", "TITLES", "PRIVILEGES" AND "IMMUNITIES". THE UNITED

STATES HAS SAID, WE AS A PEOPLE HAVE SAID TO THOSE OF FOREIGN NATIONS AND BIRTHS THAT THESE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES SHALL ASSURE YOU OF OUR GOOD FAITH THEY ARE THE WRITTEN SURETY TO YOU OF OUR PROUD BOAST THAT THE U.S. IS THE HAVEN OF REFUGE OF THE OPPRESSED OF MANKIND, BUT I CAN'T TELL BY THE FRAUD UPON THE COURT YOU CONTINUALLY ENGAGE IN. THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE PROTECTS RIGHTS OF CITIZENS, TO INCLUDE OUT OF STATE AND OR EVEN FOREIGN STATE CITIZENS, IN THIS INSTANCE VIA 28 U.S.C. § 2679 AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT CONNECTIONS, TO PROTECT THEIR PROPERTY AND PLY THEIR TRADE, PRACTICE THEIR OCCUPATION AND PURSUE A COMMON CALLING. IN THIS INSTANCE, THE COMMON CALLING OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE SOLE CORPORATION IS THAT OF FIDUCIARY PROPHET, KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, LAWGIVER AND HIGH PRIEST OF THE ONE TRUE GOD WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY BINDING UPON ALL GLOBAL COURTS AND NATIONS AND THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT VIA THESE CORRUPT, BASTARD, COCKROACH, GOING TO HELL, DEMON DOG JUDGES CANNOT IMPAIR THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH WHO IS UNDER "CONTRACT", "COVENANT", OR HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL ON ACCOUNT OF THE KING-KHALIFAH'S OUT OF STATE CITIZENSHIP ACTING FOR PROTECTORATE PURPOSES, VAN-HORNE'S-LESSEE-v.-DORRANCE, 2 U.S. 304(U.S.1795); PERRY-v.-U.S., 294 U.S. 330, 353(U.S.1935); LEIBERG-v.-VITANGELI, 70 OHIO App. 479, 47 N.E.2d. 235, 238-239(1942); McBURNEY-v.-YOUNG, 569 U.S. 221, 133 S.Ct. 1709, 185 L.Ed.2d. 758(U.S.2013); HENRY-v.-VERMONT, 2017 WL 2167123(2017); SCHOENFELD-v.-SCHNELDERMAN, 821 F3d. 273(2nd.Cir.2016); CARLISLE-v.-U.S., 83 U.S. 147, 154(U.S.1873).

THE LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS ON ISSUES SUCH AS THE ONES BEING ARGUED WITHIN THESE CASES. IF RULING HAS BEEN OBTAINED BY AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION AND OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW AND OR ACT, WHICH INCLUDE FRAUD. THE LAW EXPLAINED IF THIS POSITION IS WELL TAKEN, WHICH IT IS, IT EFFECTS THE **"FOUNDATION"** OF THE **"WHOLE"** (EMPHASIS ADDED) PROCEEDING. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND OR ACT AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IS **VOID** AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO LAW OR ACT OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION MADE OR DONE AT ALL, BEING A STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS

ERROR DOCTRINE. THE GENERAL RULE IS THAT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR STATUTE AND OR ACT AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION OF LAW, THOUGH HAVING THE FORM AND NAME OF LAW, IT IS IN REALITY NO LAW BY SUCH ACTS, BUT IS **WHOLLY VOID** AND INEFFECTIVE FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHICH INCLUDE MAKING RULINGS IN CASES 2017-0002108, 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM AND ALL RELATED STATE AND FEDERAL CASES, SINCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY DATES FROM THE TIME OF ITS ENACTMENT AND OR WHEN THE ACT WAS DONE....IN LEGAL CONTEMPLATION, IT IS INOPERATIVE AS IF IT HAD NEVER BEEN PASSED OR DONE....SINCE AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR LAW AND OR ACT IS VOID, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE FOLLOWS THAT IT IMPOSES NO DUTY (THERE IS NO DUTY TO REGARD IT AS VALID.), CONFERS NO RIGHTS (YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO THE FRAUD YOU PRODUCED AND YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE.), CREATES NO OFFICE (JUDICIAL, S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL ETC.), BESTOWS NO POWER OR AUTHORITY ON ANY PERSON [EMPHASIS ADDED] (WHICH MEANS YOUR JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID), AFFORDS NO PROTECTION (YOU ARE NOT IMMUNE CORRUPT, BASTARD, COCKROACHES OF JUDGES SINCE YOU VIOLATED YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE AND CONSPIRED WITHIN STATE COURTS WHERE YOU HAD NO JURISDICTION), AND JUSTIFIES NO ACTS PERFORMED UNDER IT (YOUR JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID BY USE OF THE PLRA AND OR THE AEDPA, ALSO FOR VIOLATING THE HOLDINGS UNDER EX PARTE VIRGINIA AND WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA AND THE ISSUES ARGUED RELATED TO THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE.)....A VOID ACT CANNOT BE LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH A VALID ONE IN YOUR FRAUD UPON THE COURT YOU RATS AND SNAKES. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW CANNOT OPERATE TO SUPERSEDE AN EXISTING LAW (THIS MEANS THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY ESTABLISHED BY DUE PROCESS LAW BEFORE YOUR FRAUD STANDS. THE LAW ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE AEDPA, THE PLRA AND THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE WAS INITIATED STANDS, ALLOWING US TO JOINTLY FILE, SEEK CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION, ARGUE INDICTMENTS UNDER SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION ETC. STANDS.). INDEED INSOFAR AS A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION AND OR ACT RUN COUNTER TO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE LAND (THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, EX PARTE VIRGINIA, SCHWARE, McBURNEY, INDICTMENTS ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, ALL CITED FRAUD CASES.), IT IS SUPERSEDED THEREBY. NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY FRAUD OR AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL

DETERMINATION OR LAW AND NO COURTS ARE BOUND TO ENFORCE IT. ALL LAWS (LIKE THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE), JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS, (LIKE WHAT YOU DID IN THESE CASES.), RULES, STATUTES (LIKE THE CLINTON BILL THAT PRODUCED THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA.) AND PRACTICES (LIKE YOUR FRAUD CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS TO SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY ARE IN DEFAULT ESTABLISHING THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH'S SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY BINDING UPON ALL GLOBAL COURTS AND NATIONS, TO ALSO CONCEAL YOUR NATIONS VIOLATING THE TERMS OF THE "GRANT" BY GIVING GAYS AND LESBIANS THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY IN VIOLATION OF ALSO THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE AS ARGUED IN CASE 2017-0002108 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, AND IN VIOLATION OF THE EXPROPRIATION EXCEPTION TO THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT.), WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION ARE **"NULL"** AND **"VOID"**. WRIT OF ERROR IS NOW FILED IN CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM AS IS FOR THE OTHER CASES TO ALLOW THESE ISSUES AND YOUR FRAUD TO BE APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSED, MARBURY-v.-MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; VINES-v.-UNITED-STATES, 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1163(1), 1165(1); ROBINSON-v.-ARVONIO, 27 F3d. 877 REHEARING DENIED CERT. GRANTED VACATED 115 S.Ct. 1247, 513 U.S. 1186, 131 L.Ed.2d. 129; LOUMIET-v.-UNITED-STATES, 65 F.Supp. 3d. 19 (2014); JOHNSON-v.-UNITED-STATES,--S.Ct.--, 2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015); MONTGOMERY-v.-LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016); GEFT-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); 24-SENATORIAL-DIST.-REPUBLICAN-COMMITTEE-v.-ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th. Cir.2016); IN-RE:-BARTLEY, 2016 WL 6068862(4th.Cir.2016); UNITED STATES-v.-DENEDO, 556 U.S. 904, 129 S.Ct. 2213, 173 L.Ed.2d. 1235(U.S.2009); UNITED-STATES-v.-APPLE-MAC-PRO-COMPUTER,--F3d.---, 2017 WL 1046105(3rd.Cir.2017); UNITED-STATES-v.-GREGORY HOLT-AKA-ABDUL-MAALIK-MUHAMMAD, 2017 WL 1181509(W.D.La.2017); STERN-v.-UNITED-STATES, 2016 WL 6986704(N.C.2016); CLARKE-v. UNITED-STATES, 2017 WL 390294(N.C.2017).

WHEN IT COMES TO THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN BINDING UPON THIS


COURT ESTABLISHED BY DUE PROCESS LAW TO WHICH THE KING-KHALIFAH, JAHJAH AL MAHDI AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, THE FIDUCIARY FOREIGN SOVEREIGN TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES AND HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, OFFICIALLY INVOKES AND EXERCISES BEFORE THIS COURT. THIS COCKROACH, BASTARD OF A JUDGE , CORRUPT PISS ANT AND HIS SLIME BALL SLUG OF A FLUNKY JUDGE MARCHANT, TERMINAL DISEASE STRICKEN BODIES GOING TO HELL JUDGES AND THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT NOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA NOR THE STATES OF THIS NATION NOR ANY OTHER NATION SINCE THE (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ARE PARTIES TO THE DEFAULT AS WELL, CANNOT DIMINISH THE RIGHTS OF THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH JAHJAH AL MAHDI, THE KING OF THE NORTH, AND HIS HOLY COMMONWEALTH, THE PEOPLE, ESTABLISHED BY CONTRACT AND DEFAULT WHICH IS NOW LEGALLY PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND DUE PROCESS LAW. IT IS ESTABLISHED AS BOTH A "LIBERTY" AS A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH AND AS A "PRIVILEGE" BY WHAT OCCURRED UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE COURT BY THEIR FRAUD WHICH THESE BASTARD, CORRUPT, COCKROACHES OF JUDGES IN THESE CASES CONSPIRED TO CONCEAL IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT AND 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001. NO STATE SHALL CONVERT A LIBERTY INTO A PRIVILEGE, LICENSE IT, AND EXCHANGE A FEE THEREFOR, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE UNITED STATES IS IN DEFAULT AND THE DECREE OF THE CROWN SUPERSEDE AND ESTABLISH THIS FACT FOR THESE CASES, MURDOCK v. PENNSYLVANIA, 319 U.S. 105 (U.S.1943).

YOUR LAWS AND JUDICIAL DETERMINATION CANNOT EXCEED THE AUTHORITY OF THE LAWGIVER, WHICH THE KING-KHALIFAH INDEED IS BY CONTRACT, DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL. 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, WHICH INCLUDE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THOSE COCKROACH, BASTARD, CORRUPT, DEMON DOGS OF JUDGES IN THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT, ALL STATE AND FEDERAL JUDGES ARE BOUND BY THEIR SOLEMN OBLIGATION OF AN OATH TO SUPPORT THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION. IF YOU WILLFULLY LEGISLATE, OR GIVE A JUDICIAL


DETERMINATION VIOLATING THE KING-KHALIFAH'S RIGHTS LEGALLY ESTABLISHED THEREBY, YOU ARE GUILTY OF FRAUD, PERJURY AND OTHER FEDERAL AND OR STATE CRIMES WHICH VOID YOUR JURISDICTION, STRIPPING YOU OF IMMUNTY, SUBJECTING YOU TO CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES AS WELL AS DISMISSAL FOR ALSO BREACH OF THAT CONTRACT. I AM SURE THAT VILLAGE IDIOT RACIST, BASTARD, DAVID DUKES, KU KLUX KLANSMAN, DEMON DOG, DONALD DUCK, DUNCE TRUMP, YOUR TWIN BROTHER, WILL ENJOY PLACING OTHER JUDGES IN YOUR SPOTS. THAT FOOL LOVES THIS SORT OF THING YOU SODOMITE AND GOMORRAHRITE PROTECTING DEVILS. IF HE DON'T DO IT, BY SUPERSEDING AUTHORITY I WILL DO IT. I'LL SE YA' AT THE PARTY. THE LAWGIVER OF GOD HAS SPOKEN, COHEN-v.-VIRGINIA, (6 WHEAT) 19 U.S. 264 (U.S.1821). THE CLAIM TO EXERCISE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS CANNOT BE CONVERTED INTO A CRIME. SINCE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE NEW JERSEY AND OTHER STATES COURTS, THE UNITED STATES AND REMAINING (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, BY THEIR ACTIONS IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 HAS NOW ALSO CONVERTED THIS FIDUCIARY SOVEREIGN LIBERTY INTO A NATIONAL AND GLOBAL PRIVILEGE, WHICH INDEED THEY HAVE. THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH, HIS HOLY COMMONWEALTH, AND ALL THOSE WHOM HE APPOINTS, CAN ENGAGE IN THE RIGHTS WITH IMPUNITY. YET, IT IS STILL A FIDUCIARY SOVEREIGN LIBERTY PROTECTED UNDER CONTRACT AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AND SOVEREIGN VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, HURTADO v.-CALIFORNIA, 110 U.S. 516 (U.S.1884); MILLER-v.-UNITED-STATES, 230 F2d. 486, 489(5th.Cir.1956); SHUTTLES-WORTH-v.-BIRMINGHAM, 373 U.S. 262(U.S.1963); SHERER-v.-CULLEN, 481 F. 945, 946; MIRANDA-v.-ARIZONA, 384 U.S.436(U.S.1966); STAUB-v.-CITY-OF-BAXLEY, 355 U.S. 313(U.S.1958); UNITED-STATES-v.-JACKSON, 390 U.S. 570 (U.S.1968); UNITED-STATES-v.-ETENYI,--Fed. Appx'--, 2017 WL 6523328(10th.Cir.2017); EL-AMEEN-BEY-v.-STUMPF, 825 F.Supp.2d. 537 (D.N.J.2011). **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

RESPECTFULLY?,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI, THE KING OF THE NORTH, THE LION AND KHALIFAH OF ALLAH, CHIEF JUSTICE TO THE (4)

THRONES OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL
THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT



JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, ACTING ATTORNEY
GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES OF THE
RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC
STATE AND COURT



MARCH 9, 2018

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

Item # 2 listed

in lead document

2

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED
FEB 01 2018
S.C. SUPREME COURT

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
APPELLATE CASE NO. 2014-0001051

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2017-0002108 ET. AL.,

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

Vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND,

PETITIONER(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO STRIKE THE RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS DUE TO ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT; RENEWING THE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE AND ALL PREVIOUSLY FILED OBJECTIONS, CLAIMS, DEFENSES AND MOTIONS; SUPPLEMENTING THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND OR APPENDIX IN RESPONSE TO THE MOTION TO DISMISS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

TO: THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ET. AL.,


FIRST, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES, RENEWS ALL PREVIOUSLY FILED OBJECTIONS, CLAIMS, DEFENSES AND

MOTIONS PREVIOUSLY FILED RELATED TO VACATING THE ORDERS FOR ALL REASONS PREVIOUSLY ASSERTED WHICH INCLUDE ALL JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES CONTAINED THEREIN, BECAUSE NOW THAT THE RESPONDENT HAS SUBMITTED THIS MOTION TO DISMISS. HE HAS NOW OPENED THE DOOR FOR ALL DOCUMENTS FILED SUBMISSION TO RESPOND IN OPPOSITION TO HIS MOTION AS WELL, U.S. v. WILLIAMS, 106 F3d. 1173(4th.Cir. 1997); U.S. v. CRAIG, 358 Fed. Appx' 446, 2009 WL 5175592(4th. Cir.2009); U.S. v. LEIGH, 61 Fed. Appx' 854, 2003 WL 1711227 (4th.Cir.2003); WILLIAMS v. BISHOP, 2015 WL 4984396(Md.2015).

LETS DEAL WITH THE RESPONDENT'S CONCERNS SYSTEMATICALLY, LOGICALLY, ONE BY ONE BUT BEFORE THAT, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS AGAIN TO STRIKE HIS MOTION TO DISMISS, BECAUSE LIKE ITS PRE-DECESSOR, IT TOO, IS CORRUPTED BY FURTHER ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT DONE IN EFFORTS TO AID THE RESPONDENT TO SUBMIT THIS DOCUMENT AS AN ACT OF MACHINATION, MISREPRESENTATION AND CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN HIS ABUSIVE, OPPROBRIOUS CONDUCT TO INTERFERE WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND TO PREVENT HIS REQUIRE-MENT AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR COMPLYING WITH SUBSTANTIVE AND PRO-CEDURAL DEMANDS OF DUE PROCESS LAW, TO CONCEAL HIS ARBITRARY , CAPRICIOUS BEHAVIOR IN THE CASES INVOLVED SUBJUDICE, AND HIS UNWILLINGNESS TO RESPOND WHICH WOULD PRODUCE OVERWHELMING EVI-DENCE THAT ALL FACTS STATED ARE TRUE AND BY FAR, THEY ARE NOT FRIVOLOUS. THE RESPONDENT IS BLOWING SMOKE AND IS WORSE THAN A PAPER TIGER. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES ON THE RECORD CHALLENGES THE RESPONDENT BEFORE THIS COURT. DON'T JUST TALK ABOUT IT,...BE ABOUT IT. PRODUCE THE EVIDENCE THAT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES SEEK WITHIN THESE DOCUMENTS. OR THE RESPONDENT'S PLEADINGS ARE JUST A BUNCH OF FRAUD AND EMPTY RHETORIC DESIGNED TO CONCEAL HIS INABILITY TO MEET THE CHALLENGE AND HIS INVOLVEMENT DURING AND OR AFTER THE FACT IN CLASS A, B AND C FELONIES WHICH WOULD ALSO INDISPUTABLY PROVE, THAT IF ANY ONE TO THESE PROCEEDINGS ABUSED THE COURTS AND HOLD THE SANCTITY OF ITS STRUCTURAL APPARATUS IN CONTEMPT,...IT IS HE THAT IS BLATANTLY GUILTY OF THIS CHARGE AND NOT THE APPELLANT, AND IT IS HE WHO IS CONSPIRING TO DISRUPT THE COURT, AND THAT IT IS HIS CLAIMS THAT ARE MESMERIZINGLY FANTASTIC AND DELUSIONAL. HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "RAGE!!! #1". THIS IS THE [34] PAGE COMPLAINT THAT WAS FILED IN CASE 2016-CP-400-0552. DON'T LET THE CASE NUMBER FOOL YOU. THIS IS THE ORIGIN OF ALL THAT IS PLACED BEFORE US. OBSERVE THAT IT IS CLOCKED STAMPED BY THE COURT FILED MARCH 13, 2007. IF YOU LOOK AT PAGE(S) 17-18 OF THIS DOCUMENT. HERE IS THE FIRST CONNECTION BETWEEN THE KING-KHALIFAH AND HIS DULY APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL, AS IS FOR THOSE OTHERS SOUGHT RELEASED. IT IS THE (180) DAY RULE LITIGATION. IT WAS FILED BY THE KING-KHALIFAH since 2006 RESUBMITTED IN THIS DOCUMENT UPON REQUEST TO MAKE MORE DEFINITE AND CERTAIN. IT WAS GIVEN TO HIS PRESENT ATTORNEY GENERAL AND ALL OTHERS REFERRED TO IN THIS CASE AND THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE APPLIES TO ALL OF OUR CONVICTIONS DESPITE ANY VARIANCE AN ALLEGED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY. THUS, I OBJECT TO THAT LUDICROUS CLAIM THAT THE DOCUMENTS HAVE NO CONNECTION TO THE ROWLAND DIRECT APPEAL, WHEN THEY BLOCKED ITS REVEIEW BY DENYING THE KING-KHALIFAH'S MOTION TO INTERVENE AS FIDUCIARY HEIR WHERE COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHED WHICH IS A JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE. DON'T LET THE CASE NUMBER ON THE ACTION FOOL YOU. JUDGE CHILDS INITIALLY SAT ON THIS CASE. SHE DISMISSED IT. THE KING-KHALIFAH THEN BROGHT THE MATTER BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURT ALONG WITH (3) OTHER RELATED CASES COMPLAINING ABOUT THEIR DISMISSAL. THE FEDERAL COURT REMANDED THE (4) CASES STATING THEY SHOULD HAVE NOT DISMISSED THE CASES WHICH ESTABLISHED NEW CASES NUMBERS, 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568 AND 3569 WHERE THE FEDERAL COURT COMBINED TWO OF THE FOUR BECAUSE THEY WERE SIMILAR INVOLVING THE RESPONDENT CONSPIRING WITH S.C.D.C.. THE CASES WERE REINSTATED IN 2008 WHERE THE COURT HELD THEM IN LIMBO FOR (5) ADDITIONAL YEARS FORCING THE KING-KHALIFAH TO FILE INDEPENDENT ACTION FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT, INORDINATE DELAY AND AMONG OTHER THINGS FAILURE TO ALLOW DISCOVERY TO ISSUE WHICH CAUSED DELAY IN TRIAL. THEY ARE IN DEFAULT ON THESE MATTERS FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, FRAUD AND IT BEING INEXCUSABLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL TO HOLD THESE CASES PENDING FOR (12) YEARS. DON'T LET THE "2013" PREFIX FOOL YOU. THE CASE IS OVER (12) YEARS OLD. BY THIS DOCUMENT ALONE, THE FRAUD THEY CONSPIRED IN IS CLEAR, DEFINITE AND CERTAIN TO ADD WHAT WAS DONE DIRECTLY IN OUR EFFORTS TO BRING THIS CASE. THE "CLARITY", NOT "NEBULOUS", HAS ALREADY BEEN DETERMINED BY THE LOWER COURT INVOLVED. BY THE (180) DAY ISSUE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES

AND THOSE OF US INVOLVED SHOULD BE HOME NOW BY THIS LEGAL ISUUE DUE TO RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHERE THESE PLEADINGS ARE AN INTRINSIC PART OF THAT CASE WHICH TAINTS THE RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS DUE TO HE BEING PROCEDURALLY BARRED IN RAISING SUCH BY LAW. THUS, AGAIN, I OBJECT TO ANY CLAIM THE ACTS OF FRAUD ARE NEBULOUS OR FRIVOLOUS AND THE ATTORNEY TO THE (4) THRONES IS JUST GETTING STARTED.



(2) EXHIBIT, "RAGE!!! # 2". THIS IS THE INTAKE SHEET FROM SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE 5501014. YOU MUST UNDERSTAND THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS DOCUMENT AS IT IS EXPLAINED IN EXHIBIT, "RAGE!!! # 1". THIS IS WHY THE RESPONDENT'S OFFICE COMPROMISED THE KING-KHALIFAH'S TRIAL TRANSCRIPT ON DIRECT APPEAL WHICH JUDGE HEARNS WAS PARTY TO THIS CONSPIRACY BEING GIVEN KNOWLEDGE OF THE WRONG ON THE COURT RECORD PURSUANT TO SEEKING LEAVE TO TERMINATE COUNSEL. THE KING-KHALIFAH ARGUED BEFORE THE TRIAL COURT THAT THEY DID NOT PROVE THE ELEMENTS OF "TIME AND PLACE" FOR THE MURDER WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE. THEY TOOK THE PRESERVATION OF THE ISSUE OUT OF THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT, DELETED IT, FROM THE KING-KHALIFAH'S TRIAL TRANSCRIPT IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND MACHINATION, THEN KEPT THE TRANSCRIPT FROM HIM UNTIL WELL OVER (6) MONTHS. BY THAT TIME, THE COURT REPORTER SAID THE AUDIO NO LONGER EXISTED TO DO A RECONSTRUCTION HEARING, AND THEY FORCED AND KEPT STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL ON HIM AGAINST HIS WILL, TO KEEP HIM FROM ADDRESSING IT. THE INDICTMENT ALLEGED SHE DIED ON JANUARY 25, 2001 AND THAT SHE DIED IN KERSHAW COUNTY. IN TRUTH, SHE DIED ON JANUARY 26, 2001 AND SHE DIED IN RICHLAND COUNTY AS IS FURTHER PROVEN BY THE ACTUAL DEATH CERTIFICATE. JOHN MEADORS LIED ON THE COURT RECORD AT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S COMPETENCY HEARING AND STATED THIS FILE DID NOT EXIST. THE CORONER'S NOTES ARE IN THIS FILE DENYING HIM ESSENTIAL DISCOVERY EVIDENCE. IT IS CLEAR FROM THIS DOCUMENT THAT THE FILE DO INDEED EXIST DESPITE MEADOR'S PERJURY. LOOK AT THE CAUSE OF DEATH, AND NOTE THAT IT CLEARLY STATES IT IS AFTER THE AUTOPSY WAS DONE. THE CAUSE OF DEATH IS LISTED AS MALNOURISHMENT AND THERE IS A "QUESTION MARK" BY THE WORD "TRAUMA", WHICH SUPPORTS THE KING-KHALIFAH'S CLAIM THAT THE CORONER, JOHNNY FELLORS, SHOWED UP AT HIS BOND HEARING AND STATED, "NO ALLEGED BEATING KILLED

HIS CHILD. AT MOST IT MAY HAVE BEEN A CONTRIBUTING FACTOR." IF THE "TRAUMA" OR "ALLEGED BEATING"IS QUESTIONABLE, WHAT IS THE KING-KHALIFAH DOING BEING CONVICTED FOR MURDER? WHAT DOES THIS DOCUMENT MEAN WHEN IT ASSERTS THAT THE INITIAL CAUSE OF DEATH IS "MALNOURISHMENT"? ITS DIABETES, WHICH IS THE EXACT QUESTION THE CORONER ASKED THE KING-KHALIFAH IF SHE HAD THIS THE NIGHT OF HER DEATH. IT DON'T ADD UP. SHE WAS 180 LBS. AT 11 YEARS OLD WITH THE BODY OF A GROWN WOMAN WHO ATE LIKE A HORSE. THE ONLY WAY TO POTENTIALLY PROVE THE TRUE CAUSE OF DEATH NOW IS TO TEST THAT DNA TO MICHAEL LEE AS IS SOUGHT BY THE CROWN. THIS IS WHAT THE RESPONDENT IS TRYING TO AVOID IN ACTS OF FRAUD BECAUSE IT WOULD PROVE THEY CONSPIRED TO CREATE A FICTITIOUS HOMICIDE. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES WANT THIS EVIDENCE AND THE SEARCH WARRANT THEY USED TO OBTAIN EVIDENCE FROM THE KING-KHALIFAH'S HOME PRODUCED NOW!!! STOP PLAYING THESE GAMES!!! PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) WE SOUGHT TO HELP HIM GET THIS ESSENTIAL EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE BY HAVING THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY HEARD IN OUR CASES BECAUSE JUDGE TOAL BLOCKED THE FILING OF HIS PCR BY FRAUD AND THE ISSUES ARE JURISDICTIONAL EFFECTING US ALL DESPITE ANY DIFFERENCES IN ALLEGED [redacted] ILLEGAL ACTIVITY AND THE RESPONDENT AND JUDGES CONSPIRED TO ATTACK OUR CASES, TO INCLUDE MY DIRECT APPEAL, TO PREVENT THIS EVIDENCE FROM SURFACING. THIS IS THE OTHER CONNECTION AND THE RELEVANCE OF THE DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED. THUS, I OBJECT TO THE CLAIM THERE IS NO CONNECTION TO MY CHARGES AND THE KING-KHALIFAH'S CONVICTION. I OBJECT TO THE CLAIM THAT THE ACTS OF FRAUD ARE NEBULOUS. THE STATE MUST PROVE THE CAUSE OF DEATH AND THEY FABRICATED IT AND ATTACKED MY DIRECT APPEAL TO PREVENT THIS FROM BEING REVEALED, ZIGGLER v. BUSH, 2015 WL 3775901(DSC.2015); RIFE v. BLANKENSHIP, 721 F2d. 983 CA4 (Va. 1983); BURBAGE v. U.S., 134 S.Ct. 881(U.S.2014); U.S. v. WHITEHEAD, 695 F3d. 288 CA4 (N.C.2012). THESE ARE CLEAR AND DEFINITE ACTS OF FRAUD ACCEPTED BY THE RICHLAND COURT AS NOT BEING FRIVOLOUS. THUS, RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHES TAINTING HIS SUBMISSION RENDERING THE DOCUMENT UNCONSTITUTIONAL, INADMISSIBLE AND VOID. I MOVE TO STRIKE IT.

CONTEMPT?,...ABUSIVE BEHAVIOR? MY CONTEMPT IS WITH JUDGES AND STATE AND OR FEDERAL OFFICIALS WHO THINK THAT THEY CAN ENGAGE

IN PRACTICES AND ISSUES OF JUDICIAL DETERMINATION THAT SPIT IN THE FACE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" AND STAND IN BLATANT DEFIANCE TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND DUE PROCESS LAW, AND BY SUCH, "THEY" ENGAGE IN OUTRAGEOUS BEHAVIOR. MY CONTEMPT IS WITH GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, LIKE THE RESPONDENT, WITH THE OTHER OFFICIALS INVOLVED HERE, AND A SYSTEM OF JUSTICE WHICH IN ITS ORIGINAL CONCEPTION WAS DESIGNED TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF THE COMMON PEOPLE, BUT HAS NOW BECOME A CESS POOL, A SWAMP OF FOUL, RAT, STINKING DEVILS AND DEMON DOGS, BENT ON A MISSION TO OBTAIN CORRUPT, FRAUDULENT, UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DECISION BY MANIPULATING THE INTEGRITY OF THE SYSTEM ITSELF FOR THEIR ULTERIOR MOTIVES IN EFFORTS TO RAPE AND PILLAGE THE POPULOUS. CONTEMPT?,...MY CONTEMPT IS WITH JUDGES AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO BLOODY THEIR ROBES LIKE A BUNCH OF RECREANT BASTARDS AND JUST BECAUSE THEY KNOW SOME LAW, THEY TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE PUBLIC WHO BY OATH THEY WERE TO PROTECT AND SERVE, LEAVING THEM IN DIRE STRAITS BECAUSE THEY, THE PEOPLE, DO NOT THEMSELVES KNOW LAW. MY CONTEMPT IS WITH COURTS WHO DESTROY PEOPLES LIVES AND FAMILIES, LIKE YOUR FOREFATHERS DID DURING THE TIME OF SLAVERY AND JIM CROW LAWS BEHIND LIES AND OPPROBRIOUS GOVERNMENTAL ACTION WITH NO MERCY OR REGARD FOR TRUTH OR WHAT IS "JUST AND FAIR" BEFORE THE FACE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD. MY CONTEMPT IS WITH TREACHEROUS, UNSCRUPULOUS INDIVIDUALS AND DEMON DOGS OF THIS WORLD THAT MAKE JUDICIAL AND LIFE DECISIONS WITHOUT TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THAT GOD IS REAL AND HE IS WATCHING THEM, AND THEY ACT OR LEGISLATE OR MAKE JUDICIAL DETERMINATION LIKE THEY KNOW BETTER THAN GOD, LIKE YOUR GLOBAL LAWS ARE BETTER THAN GOD'S LAWS, AND TO ME THAT IS THE HIGHEST CONTEMPT AND ABUSIVE BEHAVIOR OF THE HIGHEST COURT OF JUSTICE IN EXISTENCE IN THE ANNULS OF HUMAN THOUGHT. SO DON'T YOU RESPODENT, AND THESE CORRUPT STATE OFFICIALS, RECREANT DEVILS, HYPOCRITICAL MOCKERS AT FEAST, TELL ME ABOUT CONTEMPT OR ABUSIVE BAHAVIOR. I AM HERE TO ADDRESS THE MOST EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CONTEMPT AND ABUSIVE BEHAVIOR LAID BEFORE US, THE COMPROMISING OF MY DIRECT APPEAL AND THE FRAMING OF THE KING-KHALIFAH TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED AS WELL AS THE CONTEMPT FOR THE LAWS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD. WHEN YOU HEAR ME SPEAK AS HIS ATTORNEY GENERAL, YOU HEAR THE VOICE OF THE KING-KHALIFAH SPEAKING UNDER GOD'S LAWS WHICH SUPERSEDE YOUR LAWS. I SPEAK IN THE VOICE OF THE

CROWN. "ACTUS SERVI IN IIS QUIBUS OPERA EJUS COMMUNITER ADHIBITA EST, ACTUS DOMINI HABETUR"---THE ACTS AND WORDS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES, IN WHICH HE IS EMPLOYED BY THE CROWN ARE THE WORDS AND ACTS OF THE CROWN ITSELF. THEREBY, THEY ARE ACTS OF GOD, AS HIS LAWGIVER PROTECTED UNDER CONTRACT. "ACTUS DELNEMINI FACIT INJURIAM"---ACTS OF GOD DOES WRONG TO NO ONE. THUS, THE WORDS I SPEAK ARE PROTECTED SPEECH INVOLVING MORAL, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL INTEREST PRODUCING PUBLIC JURIS CLAIMS WHERE IT WOULD BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID YOUR JURISDICTION IF THE COURT PENALIZED THEIR EXERCISE BURDENING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT WHICH WOULD VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE AND ARTICLE IV § 2 AS WELL AS ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10. "LEGITIME IMPERANTI PARERE NECESSE EST"---THE ONE WHO COMMANDS BY THE DECREE OF GOD, MUST BE OBEYED. "CONSUETUDO VINCIT COMMUNEM LEGEM"---THE CUSTOMS OF THE KING-KHALIFAH ARE THE LAWS OF THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ARE THE ACTS OF HIS ATTORNEY GENERAL. "DORMIUNT ALIQUANDO LEGES NUNQUAM MORIUNTUR"---GOD'S LAWS MAY SOMETIMES SEEMINGLY SLEEP, BUT THEY NEVER DIE. THE KING-KHALIFAH THROUGH HIS ATTORNEY GENERAL RESTORES ALL THINGS AS THE CONTRACT COMMANDS. THE SLEEPER HAS AWAKEN. "DROIT NE DONE PLUIS QUE SUIT DEMAUDE"---GOD'S LAWS THAT SUPERSEDE THIS COURT'S GIVE NO MORE THAN WHAT IS DEMANDED. "LE LEY EST LE PLUS HAUT ENHERITANCE QUE LE ROY AD, CAR PAR LE LEY, IL MESME ET TOUT SES SUJETS SONT RULES, ET SI LE LEY NE FRUIT, NUL ROY NE NUL ENHERITANCE SERRA"---THE LAWS OF GOD IS THE HIGHEST INHERITANCE THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH POSSESS (WHICH INCLUDE THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY); FOR BY THE LAWS OF GOD, THE KING-KHALIFAH, AND HIS HOLY COMMONWEALTH ARE RULED; AND IF THERE WERE NO LAWS OF GOD, THERE WOULD BE NEITHER GOD APPOINTED KING-KHALIFAH, NOR INHERITANCE. THIS INCLUDES THAT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY YOU GAVE THEM SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHRITES ESTABLISHED BY CONTRACT VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION. THIS IS NOT FRIVOLOUS HAVING LEGAL BASIS IN PROBATE LAW AND FOUND IN BLACK LAW DICTIONARY. "NECESSITAS SUB LEGE NON CONTINETUR, QUIA QUOD ALIAS NON EST LICITUM NECESSITAS FACIT LEITUM"---NECESSITY IS NOT RESTRAINED BY LAW, SINCE WHAT OTHER WISE IS NOT LAWFUL NECESSITY MAKES LAWFUL. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES SPEAK IN SERVICE OF THE CROWN AS THE KING-KHALIFAH ESTABLISHES HIS GOVERNMENT AS IS HIS RIGHT PROTECTED BY DEFAULT AND CONTRACT AS WELL AS UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10

AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THAT WHICH IS PROTECTED UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION CANNOT BE CONVERTED INTO A CRIME JUSTIFYING PENALTY OR SANCTION. BY JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS THE VOICE OF THE CROWN IS NOT TO BE RESTRAINED. "FIAT JUSTITIA PEREAT MUNDUS"---LET JUSTICE BE DONE THOUGH THE WORLD PERISH!!!, SCHOONER-EXCHANGE-v.-McFADDEN, 7 CRANCH 116, 11 U.S. 116, 1812 WL 1310, 3 L.Ed. 287(U.S.1812); DOE-v.-FEDERAL-DEMOCRATIC-REPUBLIC-OF-ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6, 16 (D.D.C.2016); DOGAN v.-BARAK, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6024416(C.D.2016); SABATINA-v.-REINSTEIN,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 8716594(E.D.Pa.2016); SNYDER v.-PHELPS, 580 F3d. 206(4th.Cir.2009); LAROCHELLE-v.-WILMAC CORPORATION, 210 F.Supp.3d. 658(E.D.Pa.2016); DOE-v.-RECTOR AND-VISITORS-OF-GEORGE-MASON-UNIVERSITY, 149 F.Supp.3d. 602(E.D. Va.2016).

(3) EXHIBIT, "COMPLEX CASE". THESE ARE COPIES OF LETTERS SENT TO THE COURT IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 BY ATTORNEY HALL WHO IS THIS COURT'S ATTORNEY AS IS THE RESPONDENT'S IN THAT CASE. THIS DEMONSTRATES THAT THE CASE IS COMPLEX AND THAT THE FEDERAL AGENTS KRISTY KHOL AND PAUL GUNTER APPEARED IN THIS CASE MAKING THEM PARTIES TO THE DEFAULT. THUS, I OBJECT TO HIS CLAIM ITS HUNDREDS OF PAGES. THE DOCUMENTS ARE ONLY THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG AS TO WHAT IS FILED IN THIS CASE. IT IS A COMPLEX CASE, POTENTIALLY THE LARGEST CASE IN THIS NATION'S HISTORY. THE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED TO SHOW THE COURT THE MAGNITUDE OF THE CASE JUDGE LEE SAT ON TO SUBSTANTIATE THE STRUCTURAL ERROR IN THE ROWLAND DIRECT APPEAL AND ESTABLISH THE JURISDICTIONAL FACTS AS REQUIRED BY LAW.

(4) EXHIBIT, "NEBULOUS/FRIVOLOUS-NOT! #1". THESE DOCUMENTS PROVE THE MATTERS WERE HEARD IN FULL HEARING BEFORE JUDGE LEE AND A SUBSEQUENT HEARING WAS ATTEMPTED UNDER JUDGE GRIFFITH WHERE THE JUDGES FAILED TO THROW THE CASE OUT, THOUGH THEY CANNOT BE THROWN OUT DUE TO THE FEDERAL REMAND, AND THE RESPONDENT MADE THESE SAME CLAIMS OF FRIVOLOUS AND SOUGHT TO DISMISS BUT IT WAS NOT GRANTED. THE JUDGES AGREED THAT THE CASE WAS NOT NORMAL, THAT IT WAS COMPLEX, BUT DID NOT DETERMINE THAT THE CASE WAS FRIVOLOUS NOR DID THEY GRANT THE STATE AND OR RESPONDENT'S MOTIONS OF DISMISSAL IN THAT APRIL 3, 2014 HEARING WHICH IS THE ESSENTIAL REASON THE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THESE MATTERS PRESENT THEMSELVES NOW. JUDGE TOAL ATTEMPTED TO SIT ON THIS CASE BUT WAS FORCED TO RECUSE. SHE AND HEARNS DUE TO PAST INVOLVEMENT MUST RECUSE NOW. RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHES. THE RESPONDENT IS PROCEDURALLY BARRED FROM RAISING THESE ISSUES AND OR CLAIMS WHICH WERE ADJUDICATED IN A FORMER SUIT AND ANY ISSUE WHICH MIGHT HAVE BEEN RAISED IN THE FORMER SUIT, SARA-Y.-WILSON-APPELLANT,-v.-CHARLESTON-COUNTY SCHOOL-DISTRICT-RESPONDENT,--S.E.2d.--, 2017 WL 1075196(S.C. 2017); HARDWICK-v.-BANK-OF-AMERICA,-N.A., 2016 WL 3563083(DSC. 2016); EICHMAN-v.-FOTOMAT-CORP., 147 Cal. App.3d. 1170, 1174 (1983); KEARNEY-v.-FOLEY-AND-LARDNER-LLP., 2016 WL 5405552(2016). HIS MOTION TO DISMISS IS TAINTED BY THIS FRAUD AND MUST BE STRUCK.

(5) EXHIBIT(S), "NEBULOUS/FRIVOLOUS-NOT! #'S 2-4". THIS IS ONE OF THE GREATER ACTS OF FRAUD, CONTEMPT AND ABUSIVE BEHAVIOR DONE BY THE RESPONDENT. THESE DOCUMENTS INVOLVE JUDGE LEE WHO SAT ON MY DIRECT APPEAL. THE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED TO CHALLENGE JURISDICTION IN ORDER THAT THE COURT WOULD HAVE

ON THE RECORD THE MAGNITUDE OF THE CASE TO WHICH JUDGE LEE WAS INVOLVED IN WITHIN THE RICHLAND COURT PROCEEDINGS CONNECTED TO THE KING-KHALIFAH WHICH MADE IT ESSENTIAL THAT SHE RECUSE OFF MY DIRECT APPEAL CREATING A STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOID THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899(2016) VOIDING THE ORDER THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IS USING AS A JURISDICTIONAL PREREQUISITE REQUIRING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO ENTERTAIN THESE MATTERS INVOKING THEIR ORIGINAL JURISDICTION. THIS TOO, TAINTS THE RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND THE PROCEEDINGS PLACING HIM IN FORFEITURE. **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING."** IN ACTS OF FRAUD, CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS, HE PURPOSELY IN EFFORTS TO DECEIVE THIS COURT, DID NOT ADDRESS OR RESPOND TO THIS KEY ISSUE SOUGHT REVIEW PLACING HIM IN FORFEITURE. IF HE DID ADDRESS THIS SPECIFIC ISSUE. HE WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO ASSERT THAT THE DOCUMENTS HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH MY DIRECT APPEAL. JUDGE LEE WAS APPOINTED "TRUSTEE" BY THE KING-KHALIFAH AND FAILED IN HER DUTY AS TRUSTEE FOR WHICH SHE IS BEING SUED, NOT AS A JUDGE, BUT AS TRUSTEE. THE DEFAULT ESTABLISHING THE POWER THAT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES PRESENTLY EXERCISES, WAS DONE IN [4] PARTS. THE [92] PAGE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT FILE MAY 2014; THE [95] PAGE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT FILED DIRECTLY AFTER; THE [152] PAGE DOCUMENT ATTACHED; AND THE [31] PAGE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT FILED DECEMBER 1, 2015 WHICH COMPLETELY VOIDED THEIR JURISDICTION THAT THEY BLOCKED FILING FOR TWO MONTHS ATTEMPTING TO PERPETRATE MORE FRAUD TRYING TO FALSELY ALLEGE COOK DID NOT SIGN IT WHEN HE DID. THIS ACT OF FRAUD IS NOT NEBULOUS DESIGNED TO HAVE A DIRECT IMPACT ON MY APPEAL TO PREVENT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S ENTRY INTO THE CASE. THE INITIAL DEFAULT DOCUMENT WAS FILED MAY 2014. THEY NEVER TIMELY FILED TO CHALLENGE THIS UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT NOR THE SUBSEQUENT [95] PAGE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT EXERCISING POWER. THE "GENTRY CODE" WAS NOT CRACKED BY THE KING-KHALIFAH UNTIL OCTOBER 2015 WHERE IT WAS FILED IN THE FORM OF THE [152] PAGE DOCUMENT. THE FINAL AND COMPLETE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT WAS NOT FILED UNTIL DECEMBER 1, 2015 DUE TO THEY BLOCKING ITS FILING FOR TWO MONTHS AS INDICATED BY THE DATE OF THAT DOCUMENT. JUDGE LEE AND THE RESPONDENT HAD [30] DAYS TO RESPOND OR THE AFFIDAVITS STAND AS LAW. THEY WERE SO MYSTIFIED AT HOW THE KING-KHALIFAH DID THE LEGAL MOVE THAT THEY MISSED THE WINDOW TO RESPOND. THE FEDERAL JUDGES INVOLVED SCREAMED, AND JUDGE LEE THEN REALIZED THE MAGNITUDE OF THE POWER THEY INADVERTENTLY PERMITTED THE KING-KHALIFAH TO ACHIEVE. SO THEY CHOSE AN ACT OF FRAUD TO NEGATE THE VERITY OF THE DEFAULT BY TRYING TO OBTAIN FRAUDULENT PROTECTIVE ORDERS FORCING THE KING-KHALIFAH TO REMOVE THE CASE BY PETITION TO PROTECT THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION WHICH ALSO VOIDED ANY ATTEMPT THEY MADE TO CORRECT THEIR ERROR. THE FEDERAL COURTS AGREED THAT THEIR ACTIONS WERE VOID. JUDGE LEE'S SILENCE IS ACCEPTANCE TO ACT AS TRUSTEE, WHICH IS OF NO CONSEQUENCE, BECAUSE BY THE DEFAULT VIEWED THROUGH THE [70] PAGE DOCUMENT IN THE APPENDIX, THEY ARE BOUND WITHOUT THEIR CONSENT. JUDGES BENJAMIN AND TOAL SUBSEQUENTLY TRIED TO FIX JUDGE LEE'S MISTAKE IN ALLOWING THE KING-KHALIFAH TO ACHIEVE THAT SUPERSEDING POWER IN THEIR PROCEEDINGS, BUT BOTH JUDGES BENJAMIN AND TOAL FAILED DUE TO THE CASE BEING REMOVED. EVEN THE FEDERAL JUDGES TRIED TO AID THEM CORRECT THEIR ERROR, BUT THEY FAILED ALSO TO THIS PRESENT DATE. DUE TO THIS, THE RESPONDENT DOES NOT WANT TO BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO THIS ISSUE, TO HIDE THE FACT THAT ALL OF THESE DOCUMENTS ARE ADMISSIBLE

AS JURISDICTIONAL EVIDENCE TO ESTABLISH THE CONNECTIONS HE FRAUDULENTLY STATES DO NOT EXIST AND THE MAGNITUDE OF THE STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT PRESENTS ITSELF BY JUDGE LEE SITTING ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES DIRECT APPEAL, AND TO ALSO CONCEAL THE FACT THAT IF HE IS REQUIRED TO RESPOND. THERE WOULD THEN INDEED BE PLACED ON THE COURT RECORD EVIDENCE THAT WOULD DEMONSTRATE THEY ARE INDEED IN DEFAULT, AND THAT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S TITLE AND THE RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES WITH ALL OF ITS SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY, WHICH INCLUDE EVERY ACT WE DO BEFORE THIS COURT, IS JUST, VALID AND CORRECT, DESPITE THE ACTS OF FRAUD HE IS ATTEMPTING BEFORE THIS COURT. DUE TO THIS ATTEMPTED FRAUD, HIS MOTION TO DISMISS IS CORRUPTED, ILLEGAL, VOID AND INADMISSIBLE. YOU ADD TO THIS INJUSTICE THE FACT THAT RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHES. THE MOTION FOR DISMISSAL MUST BE STRICKEN. HE MUST BE DEEMED IN FORFEITURE AND IT IS "HE", WHO ENDEAVORS TO ABUSE THE COURT, SHOW CONTEMPT OF ITS FUNCTIONS, DEMONSTRATING IMPROPER BEHAVIOR AND DISPLAYING REPENTANT DISREGARD FOR THE REQUIREMENTS OF LAW. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CANNOT OBTAIN RULING PROCURED BY FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. I OBJECT TO ANY CLAIM THAT A TRUSTEE IS NOT APPOINTED. ALL THAT THE LAW REQUIRES IS THAT THERE BE A "TRUST", WHICH THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES EXPLAINED BY EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE" IN THE APPENDIX; THAT THERE ARE BENEFICIARIES, WHICH THERE ARE ALSO EXPLAINED BY THAT DOCUMENT; THAT THERE BE ONE WHO IS OVER THAT "TRUST", WHICH THERE IS VIA THE FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH; AND HIS INTENT IS TO APPOINT A "TRUSTEE", WHICH THE EXHIBITS PROVE. THE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED TO ESTABLISH THAT JURISDICTIONAL FACT ALSO, WHICH IS WHY THE APPENDIX CANNOT BE STRICKEN. JUDGE LEE DIVIDED HER LOYALTIES AND WAS REMOVED AS TRUSTEE. THEREUPON, THE KING-KHALIFAH APPOINTED JUDGE JACQUELYN AUSTIN IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT WHICH THE MANDAMUS PROVES WHERE BY DEFAULT SHE IS LEGALLY BOUND EVEN WITHOUT HER CONSENT BEING AN EMPLOYEE OF THE UNITED STATES BOUND BY HER OATH OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION WHERE THESE RIGHTS ARE NOW ESTABLISHED THEREBY, BENTON v. BURNS, 2017 WL 491251(D.C.Md.2017); REGG v. HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112(4th.Cir.2017); CHRISTIANSON v. M.B.N.A. AMERICAN BANK N.A., S.E.2d., 2013 WL 8507850(S.C.App. 2013); CALDWELL v. WIQUIST, 402 S.C. 595, 741 S.E.2d. 583(S.C. App.2013); FERRARA v. QUADROZZI EQUIPMENT LEASING CORP., 2013 WL 3226755(E.D.N.Y.2013); MILLER v. PARRISH, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1868028(Va.2013); GILLIAM v. GREENWOOD PROFESSIONAL INVESTIGATORS, INC., S.E.2d., 2013 WL 8481972(S.C.App.2013); IN RE: BRANNON, 383 S.C. 374, 680 S.E.2d. 776(S.C.2009); MASSI v. WASHINGTON CO., 2013 WL 5410810(DSC.2013); IN RE: BLACKWATER SECURITY CONSULTING LLC., 460 F3d. 576 CA4 (N.C.2006). HERE THE COURT WILL FIND:

[7] (6) EXHIBIT, "NEBULOUS/FRIVOLOUS-NOT! # 5". THESE ARE THE INDICTMENTS FROM VARIOUS STATES. THERE ARE [33] STATES THAT ADOPT THE FEDERAL PROVISIONS OF AN INDICTMENT VIA THEIR STATES CONSTITUTIONS. OF THE [33] STATES INVOLVED, ABOUT [25] HAVE THIS FATAL DEFECT OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY IN THEIR INDICTMENTS WHERE THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE IS TAKEN AWAY, THE BURDEN BY THE LANGUAGE IS SHIFTED, THE OUTCOME IS PREDETERMINED AND THE COURTS CONSTRUCTIVELY AMEND THE INDICTMENTS ON THE MENS REA ELEMENTS IN ATTEMPTS TO FIX IT BY INSUFFICIENT CURATIVE INSTRUCTION. THE FACT THAT ALL STATES THAT MAKE USE OF AN INDICTMENT DO NOT POSSESS THIS FATAL CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR

IS SUFFICIENT PROOF THIS IS NOT A FRIVOLOUS ISSUE BECAUSE THOSE STATES KNEW YOU COULD NOT DO THIS AND IT BE CONSTITUTIONAL. CLAIMS THAT CHALLENGE CONVICTION ARE HISTORICALLY NON FRIVOLOUS. SOUTH CAROLINA IS ONE OF THE STATES THAT FAILED TO CATCH UP. THIS ISSUE APPLIES TO ALL OF US DESPITE ANY VARIANCE IN ALLEGED CRIMINAL ACTIVITY, AS THE RESPONDENT SO IGNORANTLY PUT IT. THIS IS A CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR, NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE IF YOU MUST CONSTRUCTIVELY AMEND THE INDICTMENTS ON THE MENS REA ELEMENTS IN EFFORTS TO CURE IT. THE CONSTRUCTIVE AMENDMENT TRAPS YOU IN A QUAGMIRE OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL ACTION WHICH VOID YOUR JURISDICTION DUE TO IT EFFECTING THE **"FOUNDATION"** OF THE **"WHOLE"** PROCEEDINGS. THIS IS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT OF SUCH A MAGNITUDE IT VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION. EVERY COURT AND STATE AROUND THE NATION IS VOIDING JURISDICTION FOR AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT OR ACTIONS, WHICH INCLUDE CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS, WHICH FALL UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. SEE 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); HUNT v. U.S., F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 5131716(DSC.2007); BROWN v. U.S., 2014 WL 2871398(DSC.2014); WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561(N.C.2016); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016); WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78(U.S.2016); WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899(U.S.2016); WEAVER v. MASSACHUSETTS, 137 S.Ct. 1899 (U.S.2017). FOR THE RESPONDENT TO ASSERT THAT THESE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS ARE FRIVOLOUS, IS NOT ONLY DUMB, STUPID AND PSYCHOTIC. IT IS ALSO FANTASTIC, DELUSIONAL AND A STRONG INDICATION THAT HIS MIND IS IN TRANSMIGRATIONAL FLUX IN ANOTHER DIMENSION OR ON ANOTHER PLANET. PERHAPS HE'S ON THE PLANET "ZOTT", DRINKING "MONKEY PEE" IN A COCONUT.

INSOMUCH, IN ORDER FOR A CASE TO BE DEEMED FRIVOLOUS, ESSENTIALLY TWO PRONGS MUST EXIST. (1) WE MUST BE MAKING EFFORTS TO SUE SOMEONE WHO CANNOT BE SUED. THE RIGHTS WERE LEGALLY PETITIONED FOR WHERE THEY DEFAULTED. (2) IF WE ARE INFRINGING UPON RIGHTS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED. THIS IS ONE OF THE REASONS WHY HE MUST RESPOND TO PROVE THEY TIMELY RESPONDED TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT. THERE ARE NON GOVERNMENT PARTIES AND JUDGES CAN BE SUED FOR VIOLATIONS OF THEIR OATH OF OFFICE, WHERE THEY ACTED WITHOUT JURISDICTION, WHERE THEY DID NON JUDICIAL ACTS, THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS UNDER THE F.S.I.A. AND C.A.T. TREATY. CONGRESS CARVED EXCEPTIONS THERE. YOU HAVE THE HOBBS ACT VIOLATIONS AND THERE IS A CONSISTENT ARGUABLE BASIS IN LAW THROUGHOUT THE DOCUMENTS PRESENTED. HERE THE COURT WILL FIND:

(7) EXHIBIT, "NEBULOUS/FRIVOLOUS-NOT! #'S 6-12". THESE DOCUMENTS ALSO INTRINSICALLY MAKE UP CASE "0084" EXPLAINING WHAT JUDGE LEE WAS OVER WHEN SHE SAT UPON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4) THRONES DIRECT APPEAL. THE MOMENT SHE SAW THE KING-KHALIFAH'S NAME APPEAR ON ANY DOCUMENT BEFORE THAT COURT, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT DOCUMENT WAS FILED BEFORE THE COURT AT THE TIME OF HER ENTRY INTO THE COURT. SHE KNEW BETTER, AND SHE WAS REQUIRED TO RECUSE. THE DAMAGE BY HER PRESENCE CANNOT BE DETERMINED PRODUCING A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL, TO INCLUDE THE FACT THAT THERE IS SUIT AGAINST HER BY US PENDING. THE [152] PAGE DOCUMENT EXPLAINS THE CONCEPT OF FRIVOLOUS. IT EXPLAINS THE JUSTIFICATION AMOUNT

FOR THE LIEN. IT EXPLAINS ALSO HOW THE DEFAULT OCCURRED. IT EXPLAINS THE ISSUE OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, ALL OF IT SUBSTANTIALLY ROOTED IN AN ARGUABLE BASIS OF LAW. THE DOCUMENT GIVES GREATER DETAIL AS TO THE ADDITIONAL FRAUD THE RESPONDENT IS INVOLVED IN. HIS MOTION TO DISMISS IS PRESENTED BASED UPON FRAUD AND IS VOID, ILLEGAL AND MUST BE STRUCK. HE CAN TELL HIS STORY WALKING TO GET THAT EVIDENCE AND PREPARING FOR OUR RELEASE IMMEDIATELY!!! I FURTHER OBJECT TO THE RESPONDENT'S CLAIM THAT WE ARE USING BIBLE VERSES AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE [4] THRONES WILLINGNESS TO COMPLY IS BASED UPON A NON EXISTENT TITLE. "NEMO TENETUR INFORMARE QEI NESCIT SED QUISQUIS SCIRE QUOD INFORMAT"-- NO ONE WHO IS IGNORANT OF A THING IS BOUND OR PERMITTED TO GIVE INFORMATION OF IT, BUT EVERYONE IS BOUND TO KNOW WHAT HE GIVES INFORMATION OF. THE RESPONDENT HAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT SPECIFICALLY HE IS DEALING WITH HERE. THE TORAH, THE BIBLE, THE QURAN AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH) ARE NO MERE VERSES. THEY ARE THE ESTABLISHING OF "CONTRACT", OF "COVENANT", OF "COMPACT", OF "GRANTS". THEY ARE WILLS AND TESTAMENTS OF THE EARTH'S GREATEST PROPHETS AND KINGS, MEMBERS OF THE SOLE CORPORATION PROTECTED UNDER LAW, EVEN UNDER THIS NATION'S CONSTITUTION, ESPECIALLY UPON THE EMERGING OF THE RIGHTFUL HEIR AND SOVEREIGN. THE HEIR AND KING-KHALIFAH HAS COME. FURTHER, HE IS IN DEFAULT WHICH PROCEDURALLY BARS HIM FROM MAKING THIS CLAIM ALSO BY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL UNTIL HE PRODUCES PROOF BEFORE THIS COURT HE TIMELY RESPONDED TO DEFEAT THOSE AFFIDAVITS. I OBJECT. THE MOTION IS SUBMITTED AS AN ACT OF FRAUD AND MACHINATION TO EVADE THE ESTOPPEL AND OR RES JUDICATA. IT IS FRAUD. IT MUST BE STRUCK. HE IS IN DEFAULT ON THE DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY. I BRING THE COURT AND PARTIES ATTENTION BACK TO EXHIBIT(S), "NEBULOUS/FRIVOLOUS-NOT! # 6"; THE [152] PAGE DOCUMENT; AND THOSE SENT TO JUDGE LEE. WE HAVE [3] DOCUMENTS IN QUESTION HERE GENTLEMEN. THE [92] PAGE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT OF DEFAULT FILED MAY 2014. THE SUBSEQUENT [95] PAGE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT FILED ABOUT A MONTH LATER GIVING NOTICE OF THE EXERCISING OF SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY. THE [31] PAGE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVIT FILED DECEMBER 1, 2015 VOIDING THE COURT'S JURISDICTION. PRODUCE BEFORE THIS COURT ANY DOCUMENTATION THAT PROVE YOU TIMELY (EMPHASIS ADDED) SOUGHT TO CHALLENGE THESE [3] DOCUMENTS THEN I WILL CONCEDE. UNTIL THEM HE CAN TELL HIS STORY WALKING WHILE HE GOES AND GET THAT EVIDENCE WE SEEK AND PREPARE FOR OUR RELEASE . IF YOU FAIL AT THIS CHALLENGE, SINCE YOU NEVER ACTUALLY AND OR INADEQUATELY REBUTTED THE CLAIMS AND OR TERMS OF THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT" AND "GRANT" GIVEN, WHICH WOULD ALSO REQUIRE THAT YOU PROVE THAT THE [3] HOLY BOOKS ARE FALSE, WHICH YOU CANNOT DO, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE KING-KHALIFAH'S APPEARANCE. FAIL AT THIS. THEREUPON, BY SUCH FAILURE, BY WRIT OF COMMISSION SIGNED BY THE CROWN. MY TITLE STANDS AS A MATTER OF LAW SINCE THESE RIGHTS WERE LEGALLY PETITIONED FOR BEFORE A RELIABLE COURT OF LAW AND DEFAULTED ON BY DUE PROCESS OF LAW. THE "CONTRACT" STANDS AND YOU NOR THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CAN IMPAIR RIGHTS PROTECTED UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 IN VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. HOW DO YOU KNOW A REAL PROPHET OF GOD?,...WHEN THAT WHICH HE TELLS YOU COMES TO PASS (DEUT.18:21-22). RETURN OUR GOD'S, THE KING-KHALIFAH'S AS THE SOLE CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, TOLBERT-v.-STEVENSON, 635 F3d. 646(4th.Cir. 2011); FOX-v.-VICE, 563 U.S. 826, 131 S.Ct. 2205(U.S.2011);

HIDRIA,-U.S.A.-INC.-v.-DELO, 415 S.C. 533, 783 S.E.2d. 839(S.C. 2013)(THE BURDEN WAS ON THE APPELLANT, SINCE HE CONSPIRED TO GIVE ANSWERS THROUGH HIS FRAUD MOTION. NOW IT SHIFTS BACK TO THE RESPONDENT BY THE DOCUMENTS NOW SUBMITTED OR YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE); GOURDINE-v.-KARL-STORZ-ENDOSCOPE-AMERICA,-INC., 223 F.Supp.3d. 475(DSC.2016); BRAZDELL-v.-WINDSOR, 384 S.C. 502, 682 S.E.2d. 824(S.C.App.2009); STATE-v.-BENNETT, 393 S.C. 526, 713 S.E.2d. 591(S.C.2011); McKELVEY-v.-REYNOLDS, 2016 WL 6518337(DSC.2016); DEL-ZOTTO-v.-UNIVERSAL-PHYSICIAN-SERVICES, LLC,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 5868547(DSC.2016); CHIMEBY'S-MANAGEMENT,-CO.-LLC.-v.-AFFILIATED-INSURANCE-CO., 152 F.Supp.3d. 159 (2016); FOBES-v.-FORBES, 341 P.3d. 1041, 2015 Wy. 13 (2015); FIFTH-THIRD-BANCORP-v.-DUDENHOEFFER, 134 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d. 457(U.S.2014); N.L.R.B.-v.-AMAX-COAL-CO.,,,,, 453 U.S. 322, 101 S.Ct. 2798(U.S. 1981); U.S.-v.-ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015). HERE THE COURT WILL FIND:

(9) EXHIBIT(S), "NEBULOUS/FRIVOLOUS-NOT! #'S 13 AND 14. I OBJECT TO ANY CLAIM THAT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE [4] THRONES FAILED TO BE IN COMPLIANCE TO ANY ORDER. YOU HAVE FRAUD. THE ORDERS ARE NOT VOIDABLE, BUT SIMPLY VOID. NO ORDER OR DETERMINATION CAN STAND IN VIOLATION OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND IT IMPOSES NO DUTY. IN ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD IN YOU PRODUCING THIS DOCUMENT WITH WHATEVER JUDGE IS OVER CASE 2017-000605. YOU HAVE THAT ATTORNEY FILING BRIEF OVER [60] DAYS PAST THE DEADLINE ORDERED WITHOUT AN EXTENSION OF TIME BEING ISSUED. YOU DID NOT SEEK TO DISMISS HER DUE TO NON COMPLIANCE TO ORDER. THE QUESTION BECOMES WHY? AND WHY FILE THAT BRIEF ONE DAY AFTER I FILED THE LAST PLEADING? ITS BECAUSE BY MY LAST PLEADING I ARGUED THAT THE S.C. SUPREME KNEW TO STAY THAT CASE PENDING APPEAL. SO YOU, BREAKING THE LAW AS USUAL, CONSPIRING, IGNORING THE APPEAL WHICH DIVEST THIS COURT'S JURISDICTION, TO NEGATE MY LAST FILING, YOU PEOPLE CRIMINALLY INSTRUCT HER TO FILE THE BRIEF NOW. THIS TOO, PROVES FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE. HER BRIEF IS VOID AND THESE TWO CASES ARE NOW CONSOLIDATED. **IT IS SO ORDERED. "FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING."** STOP THIS FOOLISHNESS AND GET THAT EVIDENCE, THE SEARCH WARRANT RELATED TO THE CROWN AND PREPARE FOR OUR RELEASE CORRUPT STATE OFFICIAL. MY CONTEMPT IS WARRANTED AND IT IS "YOU" WHO HAVE A DISREGARD FOR THE LAW. YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE. WE DON'T FEAR YOU DEVILS. WE FEAR THE ONE TRUE GOD. I MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE. UNLESS YOU MEET THIS CHALLENGE WITHOUT ANY ADDITIONAL FRAUD. ALL RELIEF IS IMMEDIATELY GRANTED. THE SAME LAWS YOU CALL BIBLE VERSES ESTABLISH THE VATICAN AS A SOVEREIGN NATION . THEY HAVE AN ATTORNEY GENERAL. BY CONTRACT THE KING-KHALIFAH ASCENDS ABOVE THE POPE, AN UNPRECEDENTED ADVENT FORETOLD BY RELIGIOUS PROPHESY. IF THIS IS PERMITTED FOR THE VATICAN AND INDIAN NATIONS AS SOVEREIGN NATIONS. SUCH RIGHT OF APPOINTMENT OF AN ATTORNEY GENERAL IS OURS AS WELL BY THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. THE KING-KHALIFAH WANTS TO SEE HIS BABIES YOU RATS, SNAKES AND SCORPIONS STOLE FROM HIM, AND GET HIS MONEY. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**, 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); PAUL-ADAMS-v.-CALIFORNIA-INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; HOLLOWAY-v.-PERRY, 2016 WL 4074149; BODMAN v.-STATE, 403 S.C. 60, 742 S.E.2d 363(S.C.2013); STERNS-BANK NAT'L-ASS'N-v.-GREENWOOD-FALLS,-L.P., (S.C.App.2007) 373 S.C. 331, 644 S.E.2d. 793; ELLIOTT-v.-PIERSOL, 1 PET. 328, 340, 26

; U.S. v. THROCKMORTON, 98 U.S. 61-71(U.S.1871); NUDD v. BURROWS, 91 U.S. 667-683(U.S.1875); TAYLOR v. U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2074, 195 L.Ed.2d. 456, 84 U.S.L.W. 4462(U.S.2016); SCHWARE v. BOARD OF EXAMS OF THE STATE OF N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 77 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); IN RE: GREEN, 980 F2d. 590(9th.Cir. 1992); McBURNEY v. YOUNG, 569 U.S. 221, 133 S.Ct. 1709, 185 L.Ed.2d. 758(U.S.2013); HENRY v. VERMONT, 2017 WL 2167123(2017); MARBURY v. MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; JOHNSON v. UNITED STATES, --S.Ct.--, 2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063 (U.S.2016); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016).

ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES, CAUSES OF ACTION ON THE STATE LEVEL THAT ARE ARGUED AND PRESENTED WITHIN ALL DOCUMENTS NOW FILED IN THIS CASE ARE NOW BEING ARGUED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN ITS ORIGINAL JURISDICTION. THIS CASE IS ESSENTIALLY ON REMAND BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT RESTRICTING YOUR JURISDICTION TO DO NOTHING EXCEPT GRANT THE RELIEF DEMANDED UNLESS THE RESPONDENT CAN PRODUCE EVIDENCE THEY TIMELY RESPONDED TO DEFEAT THOSE AFFIDAVIT ESTABLISHING THIS POWER AND AUTHORITY EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. THE LAW DICTATES THAT FRAUD DESTROYS THE VALIDITY OF EVERYTHING IT ENTERS, INCLUDING THIS MOTION TO DISMISS THE RESPONDENT NOW SUBMITS. ANSWER THE DOGGON' PLEADINGS!!! PRODUCE THAT EVIDENCE CORRUPT STATE OFFICIAL. BY YOUR ACTIONS "YOU" ARE THE ONE WHO ABUSED THE COURTS IN YOUR SHAM LEGAL PROCESS. YOUR FRAUD EFFECTS EVEN THE MOST SOLEMN ACTS OR JUDGMENTS OR DECREES. LABEO DEFINES FRAUD AS ANY CUNNING DECEPTION OR ARTICLE USED TO CIRCUMVENT OR DECEIVE ANOTHER AND IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL WHICH VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION PLACING YOU IN FORFEITURE. MR. WELL, IN HIS VERY WORK ON RES JUDICATA SAYS, SEC. 499, **"FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING."**, NUDD v. BURROWS SUPRA.; U.S. v. THROCKMORTON SUPR.; 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCON SUPRA.. THE SERVANTS OF THE MOST HIGH GOD DON'T DO ANY RUMP KISSING. DO YOUR DOGGON' JOB AND GET THAT EVIDENCE AND STOP YOUR FRAUD. YOU DEVILS PUT YOUR PANTS ON ONE LEG AT A TIME THE SAME WAY AS DO THE KING-KHALIFAH. WHO HAS MORE RIGHT, YOU OR YOUR COURT, OR GOD AND HIS COURT? YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE "CONTRACT", THE "GRANT", GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT IN VIOLATION OF BOTH THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE OF ARTICLE IV § 2 AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ESTABLISHING CAUSE BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ALLOWING THE KING-KHALIFAH VIA HIS APPOINTED ATTORNEY GENERAL TO INTERVENE AND CORRECT YOUR FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. I DEMAND THAT YOU PRODUCE YOUR OATH OF OFFICE THAT WOULD ALLOW YOU TO GO AGAINST THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE DECREES AND JUDGMENT OF THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH ESTABLISHED THEREBY OR STAND DOWN!!! PRESAULT v. I.C.C., 494 U.S. 1, 110 S.Ct. 914, 108 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.1990); BROWN v. BROWN, F.Supp.2d. , 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); HARRIS v. HHGREGG INC., F.SUPP.2d WL 1331166(N.C.2013); OPARAH v. NEW YORK DEPT. OF EDUC., F.Supp. 3d., 2015 WL 4240733(N.Y.D.C.2015); AMERICAN MUT. LIBERTY INS. CO. v. PLYWOOD PLASTICS CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157(DSC.1948).

YOUR LAWS CANNOT EXCEED THE AUTHORITY OF THE LAWGIVER, WHICH THE KING-KHALIFAH BY CONTRACT, DEFAULT AND THE VOIDING

OF JURISDICTION IS. THUS, BY WRIT OF COMMISSION MY TITLE IS ESTABLISHED UNTIL YOU CAN PROVE YOU TIMELY RESPONDED TO DEFEAT THE UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT OR THIS CORRUPT OFFICIAL HAVE NO MORE RIGHT TO DECLINE THE EXERCISE OF JURISDICTION WHICH IS GIVEN WITH RESTRICTIONS BY THE DOCUMENTS FILED, THAN TO USURP THAT WHICH IS NOT GIVEN. THE ONE OR THE OTHER WILL BE TREASON AGAINST THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ITSELF. THE SEVERAL STATES LEGISLATORS AND THEIR JUDICIARIES, WHICH INCLUDE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, ARE BOUND TO THEIR SOLEMN OBLIGATION OF AN OATH TO SUPPORT THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION. IF YOU WILLFULLY LEGISLATE OR GIVE A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION VIOLATING THE KING-KHALIFAH'S RIGHTS ESTABLISHED THEREBY. YOU ARE GUILTY OF FRUAD, PERJURY AND OTHER FEDERAL AND OR STATE CRIMES WHICH VOID YOUR JURISDICTION, STRIPPING YOU OF IMMUNITY, SUBJECTING YOU TO CIVIL AND CRIMINAL PENALTIES AS WELL AS DISMISSAL FOR ALSO BREACH OF THAT CONTRACT, COHEN v. VIRGINIA, (6 WHEAT) 19 U.S. 264(U.S.1821). THE CLAIM TO EXERCISE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS CANNOT BE CONVERTED INTO A CRIME NOR CAN YOU CALL ARGUABLE BASIS IN LAW CLAIMS FRIVOLOUS, ESPECIALLY SINCE YOU HAVE FRAUD AND THEY ARE PROCEDURALLY BARRED FROM MAKING SUCH CLAIMS BY RES JUDICATA AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL. SINCE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE UNITED STATES AND REMAINING [192] MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS BY THEIR ACTIONS UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 HAS NOW ALSO CONVERTED THE SOVEREIGN LIBERTY INTO A NATIONAL AND GLOBAL PRIVILEGE, WHICH INDEED THEY HAVE. THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ALL WHOM HE APPOINTS, AND HIS HOLY COMMONWEALTH CAN ENGAGE IN THE RIGHTS WITHOUT IMPUNITY. YET, IT IS STILL A "LIBERTY" PROTECTED UNDER CONTRACT, HURTADO v. CALIFORNIA, 110 U.S. 56(U.S.1884); EL-AMEEN-BEY v. STUMPF, 825 F.Supp.2d. 537(D.N.J.2011); UNITED STATES v. ETENYI,--Fed. Appx'--, 2017 WL 6523328(10th.Cir.2017); SHUTTLE-WORTH v. BIRMINGHAM, 373 U.S. 262(U.S.1963); SHERER v. CULLEN, 481 F. 945, 946; MIRANDA v. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 436(U.S.1966); STAUB v. CITY OF BAXLEY, 355 U.S. 313(U.S.1958); UNITED STATES v. JACKSON, 390 U.S. 570 (U.S.1968). LASTLY, HE FAILED TO RAISE THESE CLAIMS IN HIS FIRST MOTION WHEN HE COULD HAVE RAISED THEM THEN. RES JUDICATA ATTACHES THERE AS WELL. WE OBJECT.

IN THE NAME OF THE ONE TRUE GOD,
THE MOST MERCIFUL, THE MOST GREAT.
JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND ACTING
ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE GLORIOUS
(4) THRONES OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED
GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT

JANUARY 27, 2018

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

J RUSTEE

Court Of Appeals
For The 4th. Circuit Et. Al.,

Petition From South Carolina
Case 8:16-cv-3327, 3194, 3328-
RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-
MBS-TER; 0:16-cv-992, 1429, 1428,
1424, 1425; The New Jersey
Supreme Court case 077386; 16-1519;
16-1953; 16-2141; 2015-CP-46-415;
2013-CP-400-0084 Et. Al.,

DOCKET No. 16-2299

Yahya MuQuit #318455; Anthony Cook #115157; Lawrence L. Crawford aka Jonah Gabriel Jahjah T. Tishbite #300839

petitioners

Vs.

JUDGES WHO ISSUED ORDER IN CASE 16-1953 Et. Al.,

defendants

SUMMONS

TO: Judges Austin, Harwell, Seymour and Rogers,

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED AND REQUIRED, to answer and be in compliance (emphasis added) to this Writ Of Mandamus and all documents served upon you related to cases 16-1519, 16-1953 , 16-2141, a copy of which is herewith served upon you, and or was previously served upon you, and you are to serve a copy of your answer and proof of compliance (emphasis added) upon the subscribers at the addresses shown below within (30) days after service thereof, exclusive of the day of such service, and if you fail to answer and be in compliance (emphasis added) to the documents in question, judgment and default shall be rendered against you for the relief demanded within this Mandamus and documents filed in case 16-1519, 16-1953, 16-2141.

Lawrence L. Crawford
aka Jonah Gabriel Jahjah T. Tishbite
#300839 Wando A-127
Yahya MuQuit
#318455 Ashley B-
Anthony Cook
#115157 Stono A-56
Lieber C.I. P.O. Box 205
Ridgeville, S.C. 29472

4th. Circuit
November 3, 2016

Court Of Appeals
For The 4th. Circuit Et. Al.,

Petition From South Carolina
Cases 8:16-cv-3327, 3194, 3328-
RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-
MBS-TER; 0:16-cv-992, 1429, 1428,
1424, 1425; The New Jersey Supreme
Court case 077386; 16-1519; 16-1953;
16-2141; 2015-CP-46-415; 2013-CP-
400-0084 Et. Al.,

DOCKET No. 16-2299

Yahya MuQuit #318455; Anthony Cook #115157; Lawrence L. Crawford aka Jonah Gabriel Jahjah T. Tishbite #300839

petitioners

Vs.

JUDGES WHO ISSUED ORDER IN CASE 16-1953 Et. Al.,

defendants

Affidavit Of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Filing Writ Of Mandamus; Motion For Declaratory Judgment; Motion For Recusal; Motion For Consolidation; Motion To Transfer Venue; Motion To Ensure And Or Require The Trustee Austin To Act In A Proper Or Restored Manner

Pursuant To Her Corporate And Or Visitatorial etc. Powers; Motion To Challenge Jurisdiction; Motion To Vacate The Separation Order And Motion To Motion Therefor

---

IN RE: Crawford, Cook, MuQuit and cases 8:16-cv-3194, 3327, 3328-RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-MBS-TER.

TO: The 4th. Circuit Court Of Appeals,
The S.C. District Court Et. Al.,

In pursuant to Article 4 § 20 powers of justices and or judges at chambers, each of the justices and or judges at chambers, including the 4th. Circuit Court of Appeals, and all other courts on record. Shall have the same powers at chambers, to issue Writ Of Habeas Corpus, Mandamus, Quo Warranto, Certiorari,....and pursuant to Rule 65 and 21 of State and or Federal Rules of Procedure.

Pursuant to rule 57 of state and or federal rules of Civ. Procedure and or S.C. Code Ann § 15-53-10 through § 15-53-140 and or 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202. In cases of actual controversy,....any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading, may declare the right and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such Declaration whether or not further relief is or could be sought****.

The petitioners give all parties judicial notice. Here attached the 4th. Circuit will find:

(1) The separation orders issued in cases 8:16-cv-3327-RBH-JDA; 8:16-cv-3194-RBH-JDA; 8:16-cv-3328-RBH-JDA.

(2) A copy of The affidavit Of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Seeking To Suspend Or Relax The Appellate Court Rules; Seeking To Expand The Scope And For Inclusion****, (58) pages

dated July 21, 2016.

This document is also being filed as a challenge to both the S.C. District Court and 4th. Circuit's jurisdiction and or limitations placed thereupon which will be elaborated on later. Subject Matter Jurisdiction can be raised at anytime, cannot be waived and the court shall not fail to take notice, Grupo Dalaflux v. Atlas Global Group,L.P., 541 U.S. 567, 124 S.Ct.1920, 158 L.Ed.2d. 866(U.S.2004); Loumiet v. United States, 65 F.Supp.3d 19(2014); U.S. v. Tisdale, F.Supp.2d 2007 WL 2156666 (DSC.2007); Sebelius v. Auburn Regional Medical Center, 133 S.Ct. 817, 184 L.Ed.2d 627, 81 U.S.L.W. 4053(U.S.2013); Sizward v. Riddle, F.Supp.2d 2013 WL 707018 (DSC.2013).

First, we motion for both Judges Austin and Harwell's recusal as judges on this case and motion that Judge Austin be required to fulfill her duties as Trustee appointed by the King-Khalifah. They both are defendants. Austin is being sued for injunctive relief to require her to fulfill her duties as Trustee. The U.S. Supreme Court was unequivocal in the case of Trustees Of Darthmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201. A Mandamus is an appropriate vehicle to use to ensure and or require that Trustee Austin act in a proper or restored manner pursuant to her corporate and or visitatorial powers given to her by the King-Khalifah established by the default and claims of collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084, that they conspired in fraud, criminal conspiracy and obstruction of justice to negate but failed. She cannot sit as Trustee and Judge. We object. A Trustee's duty of loyalty prohibits both self dealing and conflicts of interest: Thus, the Trustee must neither (1) deal with the Trust property or designated matters related to the Trust for the benefit of himself or third parties; (2) or place herself in a position inconsistent with the interest of the Trust, Omoa Wireless, S. de R.L. v. U.S., 244 F.R.D. 303(M.D.2004); Kreman v. Blank, 55 B.R. 1018(MD.1985); Quick v. Formula Telecom Inc, F.Supp.2d 2011 WL 572513(2011); Forbes v. Forbes, 341 P3d 1041, 2015 Wy. 13 Jan. 23, 2015.

Insomuch, pursuant to legal documents filed in case 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA. Judge Austin via the superseding legislative and judicial powers of the King-Khalifah via the default to which The United States and other 192 Member States of The U.N. are party to. Judge Austin now has powers pursuant to S.C. Code Ann § 25-1-2820; S.C. Const. Art. XVII § 1A; S.C. Code Ann § 14-23-1080(By this she cannot sit); S.C. Code Ann § 62-7-816 paragraph (24); S.C. Code Ann § 17-17-30 To grant Habeas Corpus; S.C. Code Ann § 14-5-380 (By commission of the King and Global Theocratic Court her powers reach Globally); S.C. Code Ann § 38-14-70 (She can make laws consistent with the King-Khalifah's decrees). Judge Lee was Trustee the time the Georgia case was filed. Her misdealings led to her being replaced by Judge Austin, S.C. Public Interest Foundation v. S.C. Transp. Infrastructure Bank, 403 S.C. 640, 744 S.E.2d 521(S.C.2013); A. Cruickshank, IV, Esquire, 2010 WL 3505049; University Of Southern California v. Movan, 617 S.E.2d 135(S.C.App2005); Wilson v. Dallas, 743 S.E.2d 746, 754+ (S.C.2013); Phillip v. Quick, 731 S.E.2d 327, 328(S.C.App.2012); Bennett v. Carter, 2015 WL 5968253, *2 (S.C. App.2015); American Sur. Co. v. Hamrick Mills, 9 S.E.2d 433(S.C. App.1940); Draughan v. U.S., 113 F.Supp.3d 1266, 1278(D.Kan.2015)

Judge Austin's jurisdiction was limited, restricted to releasing us, ordering our removal and seeing that relief sought was granted, not to issue a separation order. Thus, the act is void. Once jurisdiction is acquired, in this case given to her to discharge all matters and debts, it is exclusive. Thus, this even places a limit on the 4th. Circuit's jurisdiction other than the terms specified by the King-Khalifah, whose powers now legally supersedes all Global Courts by the default. The court had jurisdiction over us by appearance. Thus, the claims of Sovereign power and other attributes given to the King-Khalifah via the default and collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084 must be given full faith and credit, to include Austin's appointment as Trustee, Mints v. U.S., 842 F2d 1291, 1291 CA4(S.C.1988); Dawson Ex Rel. Estate Of Dawson v. U.S., 333 F.Supp.2d 488, 492(DSC.2004); Campeau v. U.S.,

2015 WL 1308282, *9(N.D.Ga.2015); Brown v. TransSuburban U.S.C., Inc., 2015 WL 6675088 CA4(Va.2015); Baron v. Brackis, 312 F.Supp. 2d 808 CA4(Va.2004); Anderson v. LeGrand, 2012 WL 529812 *4(ED. Va.2012).

Austin is also given power and authority under 11 U.S.C.A. § 1104; 11 U.S.C.A. § 1302; 11 U.S.C.A. § 727; 15 U.S.C.A. § 78 fff-1; 15 U.S.C.A. § 704; S.C. Code Ann § 11-37-50; S.C. Code Ann § 11-50-60; S.C. Code Ann § 49-17-1400(For lien assessment and remedies on default); S.C. Code Ann § 14-23-370(Order or Decree as a lien or Judgment); 11 U.S.C.A. § 1141; S.C. Code Ann § 14-23-260. Thus, jurisdiction is impeached by review of the Chief Justice of The Global Theocratic Court being the highest court by default and collateral estoppel, Knight v. Episcopal Church Of U.S., 2010 WL 2926156 (DSC.2010). She has jurisdiction, but only to act in accordance to the wishes of the King-Khalifah, IN RE: Southern Metal Products Corporation, 26 F.Supp. 666(Ala. 1939); Republic Of Iraq v. ABB, AC, 920 F.Supp.2d 517(N.Y.D.C. 2013); Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino, 376 U.S. 398, 84 S.Ct. 923, 11 L.Ed.2d 804(U.S.1964)(where acts of King-Khalifah in his home must be deemed on Foreign soil); Remington Rand Corporation-Delaware v. Business System Inc., 830 F2d 1260(3rd. Cir.1997).

She also has power under U.S.C.A. Amend. 13 and 36 U.S.C. A. § 140405. She must be made to fulfill her duties. We motion for Declaratory Judgment and seek Mandamus to require this, Herring Asociates, Inc v. Gervais, 2016 WL 475174; IN RE: Vaugh, 536 B.R. 670; IN RE: Melito, 2015 WL 6142959, *1+ Bkrpcy MD.Fla.; IN RE: Christianson, 2015 WL 6125537, *1 Bkrpcy W.D.N.Y.; Willes v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A., 2012 WL 5250553, *6 D.Md.; El-Bey v. Rolgalski, 2015 WL 1393580, *3 D.Md.; Babatunde v. Ward, 2016 Wl 375045 *6(DSC). Judge Austin was without jurisdiction to issue that separation order because it was in violation of the Trustee duty to do so, conflicting with the King-Khalifah's decrees who is the Fiduciary Heir of The (4) Global Thrones. WE motion for Declaratory Judgment and seek to remedy this via Mandamus.

WE motion to consolidate all cases together for several reasons. (1) The parties are indispensable to the action and complete relief cannot be granted where the Crawford case in Richland County establishes the rights of collateral estoppel and default for all parties. Race is a predominating factor and religious hatred where they framed the King-Khalifah and attacked the other plaintiffs cases compromising case 2013-CP-400-2294 to which we all are joint parties. The few who were not officially made a part of the record in case 2013-CP-400-2294 were blocked by acts of fraud upon the court where that case was removed to the Kentucky District Court at the time it was dismissed divesting them of jurisdiction at the time they fraudulently acted. Further, that court failed to bring before it all the involved plaintiffs. Thus, any order produced by them cannot be deemed a final order where the rights of all parties were never adjudicated voiding their jurisdiction for Due Process violation. In such, our convictions are already invalidated via the False Imprisonment Tort which is case 2013-CP-400-0084. We motion for Declaratory Judgment, Surrato v. Building Service 32 B.J. Pension Fund, 554 F.Supp.2d 399; Ocampu v. Building Service 32 B.J. Pension Fund, F.Supp.3d, 2014 WL 687227(2014); Cejaj v. Building Service 32 B.J. Health Fund, F.Supp.2d 2004 WL 414834; Stewart v. Abend, 495 U.S. 207, 110 S.Ct. 1750(U.S.1990); Martin v. Waddell's Lesee, 41 U.S. 367, 16 Pet. 367, 1842 WL 5744; Virginia Marine Resources Comm'n v. Chincoterger Inn, 287 Va. 371, 757 S.E.2d 1 (2014).

Collateral estoppel attaches to all parties since the S.C. Attorney General and The United States were party to the default. We further seek the consolidation because in truth, the separation order issued by Judge Austin do not establish a complete separation. When you look at the order. It is perspicuous that the separation only involves the (117) page Writ Of Error. There are two Writs of Errors filed in case 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA, where all (3) of us are party to each. Since the order does not address the severing of the first Writ Of Error filed January 2016 and only addresses the one they in acts of

fraud upon the court filed in case 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA. Then we are, Cook and Crawford, still attached to the MuQuit case since the order does not address that January 2016 filing. Do you see the mess they made of our Due Process matters? We motion for sanctions and the court and all parties be deemed waived any opposition in this case going forward, that discovery issues, Attorney be appointed and we be removed to a pre-release camp pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c), Stillwagon v. City Of Deleware, 2016 WL 6094157(2016); Lennar Mare Island, LLC. v. Steadfast Insurance Company, 2016 WL 5847010(2016).

We further seek to vacate the separation order because in order to issue it. Judge Austin had to make a determination on some of the underlying merits of the case to do so, and no filing fee was paid, nor were there any filing in forma pauperis documents filed. This is jurisdictional and is required before she can say anything to the merits. Once she made effort to separate us when we are suing the United States for initiating PLRA and AEDPA. By her making use of this provision to separate us. She is by her order essentially saying our claim that the provision is unconstitutional has no merit. See attached (58) page document dated July 21, 2016. This taints the order voiding it where the fee was not paid, nor were there any in forma pauperis documents filed. See (40) page document dated October 25, 2016 for citing of law. We motion for Declaratory Judgment on this issue. Also see Thompson v. Finn, 2016 WL 5724369(2016).

Further, the PLRA only speak to inmates who are inmates in name only. Nothing in the PLRA speak to as to whether or not the plaintiffs are prohibited from filing jointly if they are all beneficiaries to a Trust seeking joint relief pursuant to that Trust, which is also what this case represents. There is Trustee appointed. Nothing in the PLRA gives any impression that Congress intended to invalidate joint filing under Federal Probate and International Probate laws. We are beneficiaries to a Trust which will be elaborated on further. Nothing in the PLRA demonstrates that Congress intended to invalidate Probate statutes and International law that permit joint filing, IN

RE: Gentry, 2016 WL 4061248(2016); IN RE: Edwards, 501 B.R. 666(2013); Chabot v. Chabot, F.Supp.2d 2011 WL 1706744(2011) ; Jakoblec v. Merrill Lynch Life Ins. Co., F.Supp.2d 2011 WL 1706744(2011); Marcus v. Quattrocchi, 715 F.Supp.2d 524(2010); Parrish v. Alameda County, F.Supp.2d 2007 WL 2904253(2007). Thus, jurisdiction again by decree would jointly fall under Judge Austin as was the King-Khalifah's terms. Once jurisdiction is acquired as it is now. It is exclusive essentially creating a remand which limits all court's jurisdiction under Foreign Law, defaulted on in this case subjudice, Brown v. Brown, F.Supp. 2d, 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); Harris v. hhgregg Inc., F.Supp. 2d, 2013 WL 1331166(N.C.2013); Karnalcheva v. J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., 871 F.Supp.2d 834(2012). We Object.

Further, the PLRA only speaks to inmates who are inmates in name only, because the PLRA speaks nothing to as to whether or not plaintiffs are prohibited from filing jointly if they are Foreign citizens and or a Foreign State. Decedent domicile issues attach to this case. We are dealing with an unprecedented event, a legal binding Contract, Covenant, Testament, between God and Adam and Eve, who was a King, creating a sole corporation. The Quran confirms the Biblical Text stating Adam was a "Vicegerant" , "King", whom King David and Christ trace their lineage back to, who were also Kings. Pursuant to this legal binding contract. Once the Heir appears, he automatically make every Christian, Jew, Muslim, African and its diaspora Kings and Priest, Khalifahs and Imams, with the same rights established by the F.S.I.A.. See King James Bible, Exodus 19:6; Isaiah 66:21; Revelations 5:10. A Sole Corporation is a series of persons holding office, a continuous legal personality that is attributed to successive holders of certain Monarchical or Ecclesiastical position, such as Kings, Bishops, High Priests and the like. This continuous personality is viewed by legal fiction as having the qualities of a Corporation C.I. Corporation aggregate. Contracts cannot be made or unmade by the courts. A Testament is defined as a legal document dispositing of a person's property after death which includes all rights and titles, tangible, intangible and intellectual. A Covenant is a contract which is not to be made broken by the courts. As The Fiduciary Heir, King, Jahjah has legal authority to defend and sue to protect the Contract/ Covenant, American Mut. Liberty Ins. Co. v. Plywood -Plastics Corp., 81 F.Supp. 157(DSC.1948).

A District Court shall not have jurisdiction of a Civil action in which any party, by assignment or otherwise, has been improperly or collusively made or joined to invoke the jurisdiction of such court, 28 U.S.C. § 1359 section 1441(d) consistently has been interpreted to allow Foreign States that are named as third-party plaintiffs in a state case already in progress to remove to federal court. The policies that led Congress to provide a Federal Forum to Foreign States is just as strong when those States acquire an interest in ongoing litigation, and when they voluntarily join such litigation, it is as if they are named originally as party. We hold that a Foreign State that acquires an interest in state court litigation by assignment may remove the case to Federal Court under The F.S.I.A., consoli-

date and be heard jointly, even if the Foreign State joins the litigation voluntarily. I, Jahjah Al Mahdi, give notice. I voluntarily join all plaintiffs involved cases to include those listed in case 2013-CP-400-2294; Reinstate that case and remove them, EIE Guam v. Long Term Credit Bank, Japan, 322 F3d 635(9th.Cir. 2003); Verlinden B.V. v. Central Bank Of Nigeria, 461 U.S. 480, 103 S.Ct. 1962, 76 L.Ed.2d 81(U.S.1983). It is Decreed.

Since there is nothing in the provisions of the PLRA that speaks to these concerns or gives any indication that Congress intended to render void clearly established Federal and International Probate statutes, laws or Treaties. Where the language of a Treaty is clear of ambiguity. There is no room for construction. The F.S.I.A. permits joint filing.

"TOUT CE QUE LA LOI NE DEFEND PAS EST PERMITS"---That which the law does not forbid is permitted. Congress did not intend The Act to deprive of F.S.I.A. rights established under Probate laws or Treaties, Rull v. Secretary Of Dept. Of Health And Human Services, Fed. Cl. 2004 WL 2958453(U.S.F.C.2004); Socierty For Propagation Of Gospel In Foreign Parts Of Town Of New Haven, 21 U.S. 464, 1823 WL 2477(U.S.1823).

Congress expressed no opinion as to whether or not PLRA applies to inmates who are beneficiaries of a Trust where exclusive jurisdiction would lie before a Trustee appointed by a Foreign State, City Of Columbia v. Ours Garage and Wrecker Services Inc., 536 U.S. 424, 122 S.Ct. 2226(U.S.2002). Consolidate these cases please, Oldland v. Gray, 179 F2d 408(10th.Cir.1950); Guino v. Goard, 380 F3d 670; Wilder v. Virginia, 46 F. 676(W.Va. 1891) Rosen v. Rozan, 179 F.Supp. 829. We motion for Declaratory Judgment and seek all the aforementioned by Mandamus.

Insomuch, there is a recent documentary done and aired on PBS called "13". The evidence gathered by Michelle Allexander is undisputable. The governor of Virginia is presently now making efforts to restore the voting rights of inmates. The question is clear. Do the PLRA and AEDPA provisions which are an intrinsic part of the Clinton War on Drugs Campaign, disproportionately target African Americans? We all know the answer is yes. Put it on the record. We motion for Declaratory Judgment. If the answer is yes, which of course it is. They run afoul of EX Parte Virginia and can no longer be used by the courts. We object.

Here attached the court will find:

(4) A copy of the [92] page default document dated May 2, 2014.

(5) A copy of the [95] page subsequent document exercising power via the default dated December 8, 2014 with [9] page attachment.

(6) The [152] page document dated September 14, 2015 explaining the legal terms the default is established.

(7) The [31] page document dated October 7, 2015 voiding their jurisdiction for Due Process violation and appoint-

ing Judge Lee as Trustee.

When the conspiring parties realized the magnitude of what took place by the submitting of these documents. They had to act in additional crimes of conspiracy and fraud to negate the facts, and to get around the facts, that by their conspiratorial efforts took place. The parties went beyond the time to "LEGALLY" (emphasis added) respond to the documents and defeat them. Thereby they FORFEIT challenge where none was timely made.

An additional act which demonstrates the fraud. Is that Austin in using the PLRA asserted we had to exhaust. So Austin essentially said "BUNK" the U.S. Supreme Court in Ross v. Blake, 136 S.Ct.1850(2016). I don't care that we with the state actors are engaging in fraud, machination, criminal conspiracy, misrepresentation and other outrageous acts including stealing inmate funds. They still must exhaust. We object and motion for Declaratory Judgment where they held these cases up in a deadend within the state courts for well over (10) years when you look at the fraud occurring in the Gentry case involving the S.C. Supreme Court. the highest court is a defendant and defaulted. There are no available state remedies and some relief they don't have the power to grant or refuse to grant. We motion for Declaratory Judgment and file Mandamus to correct this injustice.

Now what is the Trust to which the plaintiffs as Christians, Jews, Muslims, and Africans are the beneficiaries of? The answer in part lies within Black Law Dictionary, which reads, LE LEY EST LE PLUS HAUT ENHERITANCE QUE LE ROY AD, CAR PAR LE LEY, IL MESME ET TOUNTS SES SUJETS SONT RULES, ET SI LE LEY, NE FRUIT, NUL ROY NE NUL ENHERITANCE SERRA". This is law, Foreign Law, Theocratic Law, which is perspicuous because it is found in Black Law Dictionary. Thus, no one can assert this is a conclusory claim. It interprets for the purpose of this case.-- "THE LAWS OF GOD ARE THE HIGHEST INHERITANCE THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH POSSESSES (INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY); FOR BY THE LAWS OF GOD, THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ALL OF HIS SUBJECTS ARE RULED: AND

IF THERE WERE NO LAWS OF GOD, THERE WOULD BE NEITHER GOD APPOINTED KING-KHALIFAH, NOR INHERITANCE". This is defaulted on by the parties subjudice.

This is the heart of the matter and the source of the controversy related to most, if not all, the claims that are placed before the court. Christ confirmed this in the New Testament whenever he spoke his parables and said, "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS LIKE,...". The "KINGDOM", embodies the laws, rules ordinances, commands, prohibitions, rewards etc. that govern servanthood to demonstrate that you are party to the legal binding contract established by God with "MAN AND WOMAN" that makes one entitled by, to the eternal inheritance promised by God, to paradise, eternal life.

The (4) basic, essential pillars to the contract are "MILK", "HONEY", "JEALOUSY" and "SALT". These (4) pillars make Judaism, Islam and Christianity congruent, in harmony with each other. It makes them "ONE", demonstrating that all (3) of these legal binding Contracts, Wills, Testaments of inheritance are "ONE", and come from the same God. "MILK"---is obedience, servant hood. God milks us for all He Desires. He is an austere God. He has Dominion. "HONEY"---is for this obedience. We are given blessings, all the benefits of the contract(s) which include eternal life after the resurrection. "JEALOUSY"---which shows He is a jealous God and which also means "PROTECTION". He protects us; We protect, fight and stand for His Laws. This is why there are "cities of refuge" in the old testament and blasphemy laws in Israel and the Middle East. And for obedience to the first (3) pillars, conditions of the contract, we become "SALT". "SALT"---is a sweet savour in the mouth of our God. This is why Christ said, "THAT WHICH IS WRITTEN, CANNOT BE BROKEN", signifying that no one including the courts can unmake or dissolve the contracts made, Woods v. Woods, 2016 WL 4013754; United Dominion Realty Trust, Inc., 307 S.C. 102; C.A.N. Enters Inc. v. S.C. Health And Human Servs. Fin. Comm'n, 296 S.C. 373, 377; M & q Polymers U.S.A., LLC. v. Tackett, 135 S.Ct. 926(2015); Hardt v. Reliance Standard Life Ins. Co., 560 U.S. 242, 130

S.Ct. 2149, 176 L.Ed.2d 998(2010); Lacke v. Lacke, 362 S.C. 302, 608 S.E.2d 147(S.C.2005). Thus, the King-Khalifah and his subjects, the plaintiffs, are required by the terms of the contract to protect its terms and prevent any party, court or nation from violating the terms. ei"A Land Flowing With Milk and Honey".

Is the Contract a perpetual contract established by God and His Holy Prophets and Kings which set the foundation for the Sole Corporation? All one would have to do is look at the contract in part in Zechariah 6:12-13; Numbers 18:1-8; Exodus 40:12-15; 1Kings 8:25; 1Chronicles 17:7-14; Isaiah 14:29-32; Isaiah 61:1-3; Malachi 3:1-4; Malachi 4:5-6; Sunnah ibn. Majah Volume 5 pages 391-396 ISBN No. 81-7151-294-1 and the citing of law and references listed on pages (69) through (78) of the [92] page default document dated May 2, 2014, and the answer would obviously be yes. The Biblical and Islamic references refer to Jahjah, including the claim he would come out of prison betrayed by members of his own household. These are terms and conditions defined in the contract(s), which cannot be broken.

Are your nations' laws your laws, or are they ours? The United States Supreme Court addressed this in particularity in the case of Trustees of Darthmouth College. There can be property (ei Intellectual Property), that is owned by private individuals or corporations that is ubiquitously used in the Civil or Public arenas as a "CHARITY"(GRANT). But this do not negate the fact that the property used in the Civil or Public sphere is privately owned. See Trustees of Darthmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201. This includes intellectual Property (ei The Right To Marry).

If the court would take notice of Genesis 17:1-7, thousands of years before your existence as a nation. God decreed your existence through Abraham to include the establishing of the Sole Corporation in the form of Kings which is an everlasting contract. If your nations were decreed before you came, then so were your laws; for a nation cannot exist without laws to

govern. Thus, God is the original fountain of all law (ei."Thou shalt not steal, rob, defraud etc."). This is a "GRANT" given to you though its ownership rests within the Sole Corporation as private property by contract. It is a "GRANT" with conditions.

Genesis 18:17-19 proves the "GRANT" when it said,"ALL THE NATIONS SHALL BE BLESSED BY HIM", and the command is given perpetually as a Trust to protect the terms of the contract as shall command this Trust to your children and future Kings for Justice and Judgment (ei "LAWS"). Thus, your laws are the property of the King-Khalifah who can make or break them to ensure that the terms of the contract remain intact perpetually as "LAWGIVER" of the Sole Corporation and original fountain (ei "GOD"), remaining true to His law that "WE ARE THE SALT OF THE EARTH".

United States Art. 1 § 10 of The Constitution declare THAT NO STATE SHALL MAKE ANY LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS. The Charter(Covenant) was not dissolved by a break in the chain of successors or the revolution. Thus by God's special grace, knowledge and mere motion, for us, our heirs and successors will and have given, granted and appointed Kings, Khalifahs who are given the Trust and their appointed Trustee and successors shall forever hereafter be, in deed, act and name, a body corporate and politic, and that they, the said body corporate and politic, shall be known and distinguished, in all deeds, grants, bargains, sales, writings, evidences or otherwise howsoever, and in all courts forever now and hereafter, plea and be pleaded by the name of the King-Khalifah and or his appointed Trustee(s) Judge Austin, and that said Sole Corporation by the name aforesaid, shall be able, and in law capable for the use of The Global Theocratic State do whatever is needed or decreed by the King-Khalifah to maintain all terms of the contract between the Sole Corporation and The One True God. Thus, the King-Khalifah by these present, for us, our heirs and successors, bind without her consent as employee of The United States who is party to the default, create, make,

constitute and appoint Judge Austin to do among many things, discharge our debts. IT IS SO DECREED.

It can require no argument that the circumstances of this case constitute a perpetual Trust, a contract for which we are the beneficiaries and this private property has also been given as a "GRANT" to the nations, blessings, promised by God through Abraham, though now owned by Jahjah. Marriage is a religious contract which is an intrinsic part of our Covenant given by God to the Sole Corporation, which the world was to be blessed by it as are your laws. It is intellectual property privately owned, and restricted.

It is perspicuous that this element of the contract was given specifically to heterosexuals, because one specific term of the contract was "TO BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY" by natural conception (ei SEX BETWEEN MAN AND WOMAN). To give our intellectual property to Sodomites(homosexuals) and Gomorrahrites (lesbians) by your laws is a breach of the contract and violation of the "CHARITY"(GRANT) given under conditions to which Jahjah as the Sole Corporation and King-Khalifah can challenge in any open court. The Legislature and or courts were restrained from violating the rights of our property. To past any law impairing the obligation of contracts is repugnant to the Constitution and you add to this fact that we are dealing with Religion also protected under the 1st. Amendment. It violates the Establishment Clause.

The provisions of the Constition never has been understood to embrace other contracts than those which respect property, in this case intellectual property, or some object of value, and confer rights which may be asserted in a court of justice. When the state legislature and or courts shall pass an act or judgment annulling the prohibitions of the marriage contract set in place by God and the Sole Corporation, His Prophets and Kings, or allowing other parties to annul these prohibitions (ei Gays and Lesbians), without the consent of God or The Sole

Corporation, it will be time enough to inquire, whether such an act is constitutional.

This is the point on which the cause essentially depends. This is not a grant of political power unconditioned. Marriage created a religious institution that by "CHARITY"(GRANT) the Sole Corporation allowed others, with limits to partake, and is intellectual property of a Foreign government. Your laws all together, especially in light of the default, also by contract, are not solely in the hands of your governments. The donors in this case do not become public property and the rightful King-Khalifah by default has appeared to claim all rights of the crown and priesthood. The Trustee Judge Austin is permitted and required to execute the Trust uncontrolled by legislative or judicial authority that violates the contract by decree of the Sole Corporation. Let it be done.

The Sole Corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible and existing only in contemplation of God's Laws which are the original fountain of all nations' laws. Being a mere creation of God's Laws and contract, it possesses all properties which the intent of its creation confers upon it either expressly or as incidental to its very existence. These are such as are supposed best calculated to effect the object for which it was created, which among things is to worship, maintain the contracts, and protect God's Laws and prohibitions from those who would seek to water them down or do them harm.

This includes, most important are immortality, and if, the expression may be allowed, individuality---properties by which a perpetual succession of many persons are considered as the same and may act as a single individual. "HAERES EST EADEM PERSONA CUM ANTECESSORE"---THE HEIR IS THE SAME PERSON AS HIS ANCESTOR. This enables the Sole Corporation to manage its own affairs and to hold property without the perplexing intricacies, the hazards and endless necessity, of perpetual conveyances for the purpose of transmitting it from hand to hand acting as "ONE" immortal being. This Sole Corporation does not share in the Civil government, nor do the terms, provisions and objects of the contract unless that be the purpose for which it was created. Thus, it is not subject to be annulled, modified or changed in any manner without consent (ei. Giving marriage to gays and lesbians). The will of the donor becomes the law of the donation (1 Bl. Com. 471). There can be no reason for implying in the CONTRACT/COVENANT given for a valuable consideration a power which is not only not expressed, but is in direct contridiction to its expressed stipulations. The King-Khalifah's intellectual property, marriage, whose origin stems from the Sole Corporation can only be given to heterosexuals by the terms of the contract. The particular interest of giving these provisions to Gays and Lesbians as it pertains to God and the Sole Corporation, never entered into the minds of the donors. It was never constituted as a motive for their donation.

It is not public office nor is it a Civil institution by its original creation. It is a religious institution, a

"CHARITY"(GRANT) given to the nations when God told Abraham they would be blessed by him and this contract, and through Adam.

An artificial immortal being was created by God and the Crown, capable of receiving, distributing and protecting forever, according to the will of God, and the Sole Corporation, the terms of the donations and contract(s). This consideration for which is stipulated, even pursuant to your Global laws, which "[m]ust" be "JUST AND FAIR" to which you have miserably failed (ei. Slavery, Jim Crow laws, PLRA, AEDPA) is the perpetual application of this practice of contract in the mode prescribed by God and Sole Corporation.

The Sole Corporation is the assignee of the Trust and rights, the Fiduciary Heir in the form of Jahjah Al Mahdi stands in place and distributes the bounty and the appointed Trustee, Austin, must distribute it in accordance to his wishes, this chain being immortal. One of the main objects here is a New Heaven and Earth and restore God's house to its original position before Satan took 1/3 of the Angels establishing Hell. It is not about monetary gain or individual power, but God's purpose which do not give way to debauchery, Sodomy and Mr. & Mrs. "FREAKY, WANNA SLIDE DOWN THE STRIP POLE". It is a contract on the faith of which real and personal property and estate has been conveyed to the Sole Corporation. The language of the contract is unambiguous and explicit to exclude such practice.

The law in this case is the law of all. Austin as Trustee via decree of the Sole Corporation and Global Theocratic Court has all power and jurisdiction to act on behalf of the King-Khalifah and plaintiffs who are beneficiaries of the Trust where her powers derive from a regal source. She must partake in the spirit of their origin.

All rights and contracts respecting property, which include intellectual property, remain unchanged by and or due to religious revolution or national revolution or creating of independent states. Christ brought the conditions of the old contract forward and embellished them within the New Contract every time he said, "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS LIKE,...".; The old contract being a shadow of the new. The New Contract embellishing the old (ei. Christianity), and the 3rd. and final Contract (ISLAM) being components of "BOTH", making them "ONE", all falling under the care and authority of the Sole Corporation. The U.S. Constitution speaks with all clarity. "NO STATE, WHICH INCLUDES ITS JUDICIARY, SHALL PASS NO ACT, TO INCLUDE LAW, IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS". The Sole Corporation also via its appointed Trustee, as possessing the whole and legal, equitable interest and completely representing the donors and founders of the "CONTRACT/COVENANT" for the purpose of executing the Trust, has rights which are protected by the Constitution. Thus, the act of allowing the Sodomites and Gomorrahrites to marry and subjecting the King-Khalifah to your laws

via this false imprisonment to include his subjects as co-heirs and beneficiaries to the Trust is repugnant to the Constitution and are rendered to no effect by default and collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084. Thus, the Clause within the U.S. Constitution Article 1 sec. 10 declaring that "NO STATE SHALL PASS ANY BILL OF ATTAINDER, EX POST FACTO LAW, OR ANY LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS" bear on the claims made in this case, King v. Passmore, 3 T.R. 246; Phillip v. Bury, 1 Lord Raym 5 S.C. 2 T.R. 346.

The ingredients requisite to form a contract are parties, consent, and an obligation to be created or dissolved; these must all occur, because the regular effect of all contracts is, on one side, to acquire, and on the other, to part with, some property or rights, or to abridge or to restrain natural liberty, by binding the parties to do or restraining them from doing, something which before they might have done or omitted, Fletcher v. Peck, 6 Cranch 87, in which it was laid down that a contract is either executory or executed; by the former, a party binds himself to do or not to do a particular thing; the latter is one in which the object of the contract is performed, and this differs in nothing from a "GRANT"; but whether executed or executory, they both contain obligations binding on the parties, and both are equally within the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which forbid the states, governments, courts, to pass laws impairing the obligation of contracts.

Your nations' liberty was restrained in giving the right to marry to these people. Your nations were restrained from establishing laws like AEDPA and PLRA that disproportionately effect African Americans, institutionalizing slavery and Jim Crow, placing into effect indictments that take away the presumption of innocence and the other laws you promote which defy "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". Your nations are in violation of the contract and the rights of the beneficiaries of the Trust. Cause is established.

A contract is also a "GRANT" by meaning within the Constitution. A Corporation defined by Mr. Justice Blackstone (2 Bl. Com. 37) is to be a franchise with power to maintain perpetual succession, and to do corporate acts. To this "GRANT", "CONTRACT", "FRANCHISE" are God, the King, which in this case is Adam, his wife and co-heir Eve and the person for whom the benefit is created, or Trustee for them which is the Sole Corporation, and those they may for whatever reason appoint. The assent of both are necessary which we have in this case.

The subjects of the "GRANT" are not only privileges and immunities, but property, real and intellectual, or, which is the same thing, a capacity to acquire and hold property in perpetuity. Certain obligations are created binding both the grantor and grantees. On the part of the former, it amounts to an extinguishment of the King's prerogative to bestow the same identical franchise on another corporate body, because it would prejudice his prior "GRANT". You cannot grant the same rights of

the contract (ei. Marriage) on another corporate body (ei. Sodomites and Gomorrahrites), because it would prejudice the prior "GRANT" given to heterosexuals and violate the terms of the "Contract", "Covenant", "Grant", "Franchise", (2Bl. Com. 37).

You cannot make laws or subject people to laws that defy "JUSTICE, FAIRNESS" and the terms of the Contract, Covenant set in place by God, Adam and Eve who were your forefathers as well as mine, binding us all as mankind. "SEEING THAT ABRAHAM SHALL SURELY BECOME A GREAT AND MIGHTY NATION, AND ALL THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD SHALL BE BLESSED IN HIM? FOR I KNOW HIM, THAT HE WILL "COMMAND"(EMPHASIS ADDED) (NOT ASK) HIS CHILDREN AND HIS HOUSEHOLD "AFTER", "AFTER" HIM, AND THEY **"SHALL"** (MANDATORY) KEEP THE WAY(LAWS) OF THE LORD, AND DO JUSTICE AND JUDGMENT ****". And right after this very passage you have God's reference to Sodom and Gomorrah. Coincidence? Not on your life. The terms of the contract are unambiguous. Corrupt judges, crooked, racist, brutal cops, slavery, Jim Crow laws, PLRA, AEDPA, same sex marriage. Your nations speak blasphemies, and you violated the terms of the contract mankind, permitting Jahjah to legally intervene, abolish all unjust laws, indictments, marriages and restore all terms of the contract, to which Judge Austin is Trustee. Such is done and established by decree of Jahjah Al Mahdi.

This fulfills the Prophesy written in Mark 9:12 which state, "ELIJAH MUST FIRST COME AND RESTORE ALL THINGS". Every alteration of the Contract, Covenant, however unimportant, even though you claimed was in the interest of "Democracy", though objected to by the rightful heirs to the Kingdom Of God, impaired the obligation of the contract. For it is impossible that a new contract or construction should not violate the old contract, covenant, through Moses, Christ and Muhammad(PBUT), which are "ONE". The reason is obvious---A Covenant, Testament, is a contract, to the validity of which the consent of both parties is essential, and therefore it cannot be altered or added or

made or unmade by the courts without consent of the Sole Corporation which was never given in cases, and or is officially withdrawn. This includes any laws made by your global legislative bodies. Your nations have interpreted law or placed in effect laws that make the Sole Corporation question your sanity and intent, as though your nations were in a drunken stupor. My People, Christians, Muslims, Jews, Africans and its diaspora will have "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". You are in breach of the Trust, of the "GRANT", of Contract, allowing me and my people to jointly bring action as beneficiaries of the Trust and The Fiduciary Heir of The Sole Corporation. see King v. Passmore, 3 T.R. 246; Territt v. Taylor, 9 Cranch 43; 1 Bl. Com. 469, 475, 1 Kyd. on Corp., 13, 69, 189; 1 Wooddes, 471, & C.; Attorney General v. Whorwood, 1 Ves. 534; St. John's College v. Todington, 1 Bl. Rep. 84 S.C. 1 Burr. 200; Woods v. Woods, 2016 WL 4013754; M & G Polymers U.S.A., LLC v. Tachett, 135 S.Ct. 926(2015); Hardt v. Reliance Standard Life Ins. Co., 560 U.S. 242, 130 S.Ct. 2149, 176 L.ED.2d 998(U.S.2010); Trustees Of Darthmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201; Tonbar v. Bangs, 69 U.S. 728, 1864 WL 6590, 17 L.Ed. 768, 2 Wall 728(1864); Oparah v. The New York City Dept. Of Educ., F.Supp.3d, 2015 WL 4240733 (N.Y.D.C.2015); International Ass'n Of Machinist Lodge 1652 v. Internal Aircraft Service Inc(Charleston), 302 F2d 808, 49 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2976(4th.Cir.1962). We seek Declaratory Judgment.

As aforesaid. The Trustee's duty of loyalty prohibits both self dealing and conflicts of interest: Thus, the Trustee(s) must neither (1) deal with Trust property for the benefit of himself or third parties, (2) place herself in a position inconsistent with interest of the Trust. Austin must recuse and [redacted] vacate the separation order. Duty of prudence, under the common law of Trust, require the Trustee to adhere to the law. PLRA and AEDPA are unconstitutional by the litigation presented. She broke the law established in Ex Parte Virginia by making use of it in this case in furtherance of the conspiracy. We motion for sanctions and any initial review or time for submission of motion for Summary Judgment by the defendants be

forfeited, hearing be set, hearing be scheduled, legal counsel be appointed, discovery issue and case be set for trial. All relief sought in case 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294 be granted via sanctions sought for the fraud, for the monies stolen from us, evidence spoliated, physical assaults, corrupt Judges, fictitious homicides being established to frame the King-Khalifah and racial animus consistently displayed. This is outrageous! We seek full faith and credit given to the default and we seek immediate removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c) and all other relief sought by all the (4) Mandamus that were filed. Judge Austin must be made to stand up and fulfill her duty as Trustee, Fifth Third Bon Corp. v. Dudenhoefter, 134 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d. 457(U.S.2014). A Trustee shall invest and manage the Trust assets solely in the interest of the beneficiaries, Ws. 1977 & 4-10-905 Loyalty.

Under principles of equity, a Trustee bears an unwavering duty of complete loyalty to the beneficiaries of the Trust, to the exclusion of the interest of all others. To deter a Trustee from all temptation and to prevent any possible injury to the beneficiary, which occurred by her issuing this separation order, separating the plaintiffs from each other to cause harm to our proceedings. The Rule against the Trustee dividing her loyalties must be enforced with uncompromising rigidity. Self dealing by a Trustee or any Fiduciary is always suspect, and it is a universal Rule of equity that a Trustee shall not deal with Trust property to his or her own advantage without knowledge or consent of the Cestui Que Trust. She was given consent to establish the independent action, but not to separate us after that. She must be made to correct this injustice, Fobes v. Forbes, 341 P3d. 1041, 2015 Wy. 13 Jan. 23, 2015; N.L.R.B. v. Amex Coal Co.,...Div. Of Amax, Inc., 453 U.S. 322, 101 S.Ct. 2789(U.S.1981); Central States, Southeast and Southwest Arcas Pension Funds v. Central Transport, Inc., 472 U.S. 559, 105 S.Ct. 2833, 86 L.Ed.2d. 447(U.S.1985).

It is a general Rule of the common law (the reverse of that applied in ordinary cases) that a "GRANT", "CONTRACT",

"TESTAMENT" of a King-Khalifah at the suit of the grantee, is to be construed most beneficial for the King-Khalifah and most strictly against the grantee. Austin cannot be permitted to abuse the Trust. The laws which are connected to the convictions abuse the Trust and are called into account and are now given no effect being in egregious violation of the Contract. You are in forfeiture of all rights acquired under them by decree of The Global Theocratic King and Court whose power supersedes your global courts by the default and contract via such breach, emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084. Its time for prison reform and opportunity to fix this mess with these Sodomites your nations devised. It is perspicuous that any act of a legislature or court within your nations which take away any powers of franchise vested by the "COVENANT", "TESTAMENT", "CONTRACT" in the Sole Corporation, or its Trustee, or which restrains or controls the legitimate exercise of them, or transfer them to other persons without its assent is a violation of the obligations of that contract. If the Court and Legislature claim such an authority it must be written within the "WILL AND TESTAMENT", (3) HOLY BOOKS, to which it is not. Thus, the 4th. Circuit is bound to declare that the acts and injustices argued within the plaintiffs cases jointly and or separately do impair the obligations of the "COVENANT", "TESTAMENT", "CONTRACT" which in truth declare that there is no separation of church and state, which is obvious when your political candidates running for office consistently bring up their religious faith. The fact that the "CHARITY" (GRANT) given to you may be used in the public arenas don't make the Sole Corporation public. We are separate from you, a peculiar people, a chosen Kingdom and Priesthood designating limits placed on you via "CONTRACT" perpetually established restricted you giving this religious covenant to homosexuals and lesbians. As "SALT OF THE EARTH", by the (4) pillars we bring suit.

Insomuch, these claims can no longer be considered frivolous, or it be stated that we infringe upon rights that have

not been established. The claims of default and collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084 where the United States and other 192 Member States of the U.N. are parties to, make the claims true producing a preclusive effect preventing the courts from challenging these claims. Legal binding "CONTRACT" is placed before the courts.

It is perspicuous that the lower Federal and State Courts understood and know this to be true or they would have never engaged themselves in acts of machination, criminal conspiracy, obstruction and fraud, attempting to remand when there was no discretionary remand to allow the state actors to obtain the fraudulent, tainted protective orders to misrepresent the truth of this matter. Due to this dilatory, obstructive behavior, sanctions must be imposed and the claims of Sovereignty be given full faith and credit in all court(s) records, Robinson v. U.S., 2015 WL 1524406; U.S. v. Sterling, 724 F3d. 482 CA4(Va.2013); Turner v. U.S., 736 F3d. 274 CA4(N.C.2013); Loveless v. John Ford Inc., 232 Fed. Appx' 229, 2007 WL 1381597 CA4(Va.2007).

We motion for Declaratory Judgment on all issues and claims within this document and all those attached.

We motion to supplement the causes of action in all pending federal cases with the claims, issues and defenses argued within this document and seek this Mandamus to remedy all issues of concern.

We want the injunction sought and all relief in cases 16-1519, 16-1953, 16-2141 granted. We seek the recusal of Judge Austin and Harwell and Austin be required to stand in her position as Trustee and transferring all cases after consolidation to New Jersey where trial will commence. We seek that all plaintiffs in all the cases referred to be removed to the nicest federal pre-release camp this nation has pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c). We want our Master's, our God's intellectual property given to the King-Khalifah, the Sole Corporation by default and inheritance returned. Marriage by contract in its original conception is a religious covenant and practice. Not merely

a Civil act or public practice. It is restricted by contract which you violated. The Sole Corporation's right to challenge is established.

The right to issuance of the Writ is indisputable. Austin must exercise power as the King-Khalifah's Trustee. Recusal is sought and other crucial matters. The Writ issues in all cases where the party hath a right to have anything done and hath no other specific means of compelling its performance. Thereupon it must issue as a "WILDCARD" remedy. The primary purpose of a Writ Of Mandamus is to grant an established right and or enforce an imperative duty. By the documents continuously filed over the years, 10+, to include the claims of default and collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084 that they criminally, fraudulently conspired to negate and failed. We have established the rights with sufficient certainty and shown the imperative duty placed upon the conspiring State and Federal actors only to be defrauded, criminally delayed and unjustly denied. The Writ in the interest of "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" must issue, Porter v. Jedziniak, 334 S.C. 16, 18, 512 S.E.2d. 497, 498(1999) citing Williams v. City Of Greenville, 243 S.C. 82, 132 S.E.2d. 169(1963); Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct. 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d. 72(N.C.1977); Robinson v. Leahy, D.C.Ill. 1975, 401 F.Supp. 1027; Vistamar Inc. v. Vazquez, D.C. Puerto Rico, 1971, 337 F.Supp. 375; Wilwerding v. Swensen, 1971, 404 U.S. 249, 92 S.Ct. 407, 30 L.Ed.2d 418; Buise v. Hudkins, CA Ind. 1978, 584 F2d. 223; IN RE: Wainwright, CA5 (Fla.) 1975, 518 F2d. 173; Will v. United States, 389 U.S. 90, 95, 88 S.Ct. 269, 273, 19 L.Ed.2d. 305(1967); Kerr v. United States District Court For The Northern District Of California, 426 U.S. 394, 405, 96 S.Ct. 2119, 48 L.Ed.2d. 725 (1976); 3 Blackstone at * 110; IN RE: First Federal Savings & Loan Association Of Dorham, 860 F2d 135, 138 (4th.Cir.1988); 198 F3d. at 511; 695 F2d. 1179.

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATE

JAHJAH AL MAHDI

ANTHONY COOK

Anthony Cook

YAHYA MUQUIT

Yahya Muqit

November 2, 2016

Exhibit

Judge Lee #1

Julius W. McKay, II
Mark D. Cauthen
Daniel R. Settana, Jr.
M. Stephen Stubley
Janet Brooks Holmes
Peter P. Leventis

Kelli L. Sullivan*
Erin Farrell Farthing
Temus C. Miles, Jr.
David M. Bornemann
Brandon P. Jones
James E. L. Fickling

Law Offices
McKay, Cauthen, Settana & Stubley, P.A.

P.O. Box 7217
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-7217

1303 Blanding Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Douglas McKay, Jr.
(1917-2008)

Telephone
(803) 256-4645
Fax
(803) 765-1839
E-Mail
mms@mckayfirm.com
Web
www.mckayfirm.com

*S.C. Certified Mediator

June 17, 2014

Via Hand Delivery:
The Honorable L. Casey Manning
Chief Administrative Judge
Fifth Judicial Circuit
1201 Main St., Room 124
P.O. Box 192
Columbia, SC 29202-0192

Re: Anthony Cook v. Attorney General's Office et al.
Dominic Gallman v. Warden McKie, et al.
Case No: 13-CP-40-00084, 13-CP-40-02294
Claim Nos: 92579, 93510
Our File No: 9-384

Dear Judge Manning:

Thank you for speaking with me this morning regarding my request for continuance in this case. I represent SCDC and the Attorney General's Office in cases 2013-CP-40-2294 (which was #4 on the trial roster for the week of June 23, 2014), as well as the companion case -0084. We have several motions pending in both of these cases, each of which have repeatedly been continued at the request of Plaintiffs.

As I mentioned in our conversation this morning, you have previously recused yourself in these cases involving inmate Lawrence Crawford, a/k/a Jah Jah Tishbite, King of the North. He has named a litany of defendants and members of the judiciary, including yourself, in various complaints around the country. As part of our request for a continuance, we also respectfully requested that these cases be consolidated and placed on the Complex Case Roster. For the sake of judicial expediency, we believe that a singular Judge hearing all further matters in these cases would provide much needed continuity and clarity.

Thank you again for agreeing to take care of our request for a continuance in this matter. I have enclosed a proposed order for your signature, should it meet your approval. If I can provide anything further to the court, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Meghan Hall

Meghan Hazelwood Hall

cc: Anthony Cook #115157
Lawrence L. Crawford, #300839
Dominic Gallman #234627
Aerialle J. Crawford
Quinta D. Lee
Paul Gunter (via hand delivery)
Kristy Kohl (via hand delivery)

Meghan Hall

From: Manning, L. Casey Law Clerk (Eve Goodstein) <CManningLC@sccourts.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 4:07 PM
To: Meghan Hall
Cc: Paul Gunter (GUNTERP@rcgov.us); kohlk@rcgov.us
Subject: RE: Gallman v. SCAG; C/A No. 2013-CP-40-2294

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Meghan,

Judge Manning has signed your proposed order in this case.

Thank you,
Eve

From: Meghan Hall [mailto:mhall@mckayfirm.com]
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 12:26 PM
To: Manning, L. Casey Law Clerk (Eve Goodstein)
Cc: Paul Gunter (GUNTERP@rcgov.us); kohlk@rcgov.us; Manning, L. Casey Secretary (Ada H. James)
Subject: FW: Gallman v. SCAG; C/A No. 2013-CP-40-2294

Dear Eve,

I am following up again regarding our request for a continuance in the above-referenced matter. This case is presently #4 on the trial roster for the week of June 23, 2014. I failed to mention in my previous email that Judge Manning previously recused himself of matters involving one of the Plaintiffs in this case, inmate Lawrence Crawford, a/k/a Jah Jah Tishbite, as the Plaintiff claimed to have added him as a Defendant to another lawsuit. As such, we would seek a continuance on that additional ground, as well as the others I previously enumerated in my letters and emails to the Court. Finally, I am the associate handling this case, and I am scheduled to be out of town the week of June 23, 2014. I did not seek protection because this case was not ready for trial, and there are many outstanding motions in both 2013-CP-40-2994 and -0084, which require hearings before this case can be tried. We would respectfully request a continuance in this matter, and ask that these cases be consolidated and placed on the Complex Case Roster.

If I can provide any additional information to the court, or set up a status hearing, please let me know. I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,
Meghan Hall

Meghan Hazelwood Hall, Esq.
McKay, Cauthen, Settana & Stubley, PA
1303 Blanding Street (29201)
P.O. Drawer 7217
Columbia, SC 29202-7217
803-256-4645 ext. 132
803-765-1839 (fax)
mhall@mckayfirm.com

STATE OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

NOTICE OF MOTION SCHEDULING

Exhibit
Benjamin
No. 2

March 20, 2014

Motion "MMSTAY - Affidavit of Facts Seeking to File Objection to Defendants'" for Case: 2013CP4000084 - Anthony #115157 Cook , plaintiff, et al vs CPL Bouch , defendant, et al has been added to the following Motions Roster:

668 - MOTION ROSTER APRIL 3, 2014 COURTROOM 3-B

This hearing of this motion has been scheduled for 4/3/2014 at 9:30 AM.

The above referenced case is scheduled for a Motion Hearing before Judge Alison R. Lee. The Plaintiff's Attorney is to notify the Defendant in writing of the time and date of all Default and Damages Hearings. All requests for continuances must be in writing with a $25.00 filing fee and received by the Chief Administrative Judge prior to the hearing. A request for a continuance does not guarantee that a case will be continued. Please notify the Court in writing if the Motions are resolved prior to the hearing. Please file any briefs or memorandum the Wednesday before the week of the hearing. ALL ATTORNEYS MUST SEND A PROPOSED ORDER OR MEMORANDUM OF LAW BY Wednesday, March 26, 2014 FOR THE MOTION HEARING THAT IS BEING HEARD ON HARD COPY AND DISK: OR IT CAN BE SENT BY EMAIL TO ALeeLC@sccourts.org.

Mail Notice To:	Court Info:
Anthony #115157 Cook Lieber Correctional Instution P O Box 205 Ridgeville, SC 29472	Richland County Common Pleas Richland County Judicial Center 1701 Main Street Columbia, SC 29201-9201

Judge James R. Barber III
Chief Adminstrative Judge
Fifth Judicial Circuit

RICHLAND COUNTY
FILED
2014 APR -9 AM 10:01
JEANETTE W. GRAMBLE
C.C.P. & G.S.

STATE OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

NOTICE OF MOTION SCHEDULING

February 11, 2014

Motion "MMFDEF - Affidavit of Facts Seeking to File Objections to Counsel Sub" for Case: 2013CP4002294 - Dominic #234627 Gallman , plaintiff, et al vs Warden McKie , defendant, et al has been added to the following Motions Roster:

648 - MOTION ROSTER MARCH 6, 2014 COURTROOM

This hearing of this motion has been scheduled for 3/6/2014 at 2:00 PM.

The above referenced case is scheduled for a Motion Hearing before Judge Eugene C. Griffith, Jr. The Plaintiff's Attorney is to notify the Defendant in writing of the time and date of all Default and Damages Hearings. All requests for continuances must be in writing with a $25.00 filing fee and received by the Chief Administrative Judge prior to the hearing. A request for a continuance does not guarantee that a case will be continued. Please notify the Court in writing if the Motions are resolved prior to the hearing. Please file any briefs or memorandum the Wednesday before the week of the hearing. ALL ATTORNEYS MUST SEND A PROPOSED ORDER OR MEMORANDUM OF LAW BY Wednesday, February 26, 2014 FOR THE MOTION HEARING THAT IS BEING HEARD ON HARD COPY AND DISK: OR IT CAN BE SENT BY EMAIL TO EGriffithLC@sccourts.org.

Mail Notice To:	Court Info:
Lawrence L. # 300839 Crawford Lieber Correctional Inst. Po Box 205 Ridgeville, SC 29472	Richland County Common Pleas Richland County Judicial Center 1701 Main Street Columbia, SC 29201-9201

Judge L. Casey Manning
Chief Adminstrative Judge
Fifth Judicial Circuit

Exhibit

Judge Lee #3

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

COURT of APPEALS

FOR THE 2nd CIRCUIT

U.S DISTRICT COURTS

State of NEW YORK ET AL,

THE CRAWFORD AND OR SUTCLIFFE

APPEALS WITHIN THE 2nd 15-3907,

15-15414 AND WITH CIRCUITS ET AL, 15-14078

14078

ALSO RELATED TO U.S. DISTRICT COURT

CASES 9:15-CV-984 ; 9:15-CV-183;

9:14-CV-1501 ; 1:15-CV-2309 ; 1:15-CV-

2310 ; 15-1494 ; 15-1386 ; THE NEW

WRIT of ERROR in GEORGIA DISTRICT COURT

COOK ET AL, PETITIONERS

V.S.

The United States et al.,

defendants

Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Supplementing the Newly Filed Georgia Writ of Error, also the Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals of Cases 9:15-cv-183; 9:14-cv-150; 1:15-cv-2310 and all pending State and Federal cases; motions for Sanctions; motion to Strike; motion for Recusal; motion for En Banc Review, Evidentiary

Hearing, the Appointment of legal counsel, and to exceed any page limits, motion for an Extension of time, motion to Expand the scope and for Inclusion, motion for an official Independent Investigation by the U.S. ~~Department~~ of Justice

---

In re: Various State cases, The Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals, case 9:15-cv-904, The Writ of Error case in Georgia District Court "4005" to, The 2nd and 4th Circuit Courts of Appeals,

The Georgia and New York District Courts et al.,

The plaintiffs / petitioners in the above captioned matters have recently received conditional and or final orders in the Sutcliffe and Mitchell Pearls and Report and Recommendation in cases 1:15-cv-2309, 2310 and 4005 also New GA. Writ of Error.

Since Judge Batten in Nets of fraud upon the court adjudicated the motion for extension of time within a case (7) years closed when he had no jurisdiction not

owning the presiding Judge over this case conspiring with Evans and defendants. Also due to Judges in case 15-1386 in Acts of Fraud upon the court asserting there was no arguable bases in law to get ahead of us establishing that arguable bases in law within case 9:15-cv-804, and kill the Emergency stays on the state cases. We seek sanctions and the determinations must be made void for Due Process violation and Fraud upon the courts deeming this Response timely.

DUE to REMOVAL of the SUTCLIFFE and mitchell PURLS at the time the conditional orders and final orders was submitted. This tainted those documents rendering them void. The COURT WAS to PROCEED NO further and You conspired with the federal actors across multiple state and federal JURISDICTIONS to do so. We motion to strike those PCR orders in the Sutcliffe and mitchell PCR is ing sanctions sought for the sake of JUSTICE and fairness due to the parties resorting to unjust legal tactics, judicial chicanery and

Fraud upon the court see Hazel v. James The Law of Torts 1642-1643 L. (1956).

Any determination made in case 15-1386 is made void by fraud upon the court. First there was an independent Writ of Error filed that required a seperate case number. The 2nd Circuit asked for in forma pauperis documents to establish a seperate independent case then adjudicated under the closed case 15-1494. This is fraud. There was motion for Livingston's recusal being a defendant circumvented. She sat on the proceeding regarding additional

judges and fraud who are now defendants and whose recusal is sought, to place forth fraudulent adjudication to keep herself from being sued. Another act of fraud is that you conspire combine or consolidate cases 15-1494 and 15-1386 without first giving us notice and issuing an order stating such is being done. This is fraud and the damage is it prejudiced the hearing of the independent Writ of Error filed to address what Livingston did in case 15-1494. Th 2nd Circuit then files motions in - tended to be adjudicated in the

closed CASE 15-1494 to prevent ruling
in CASE 15-1386. They realized we
caught them, called them on it, which
is why they at the last minute
inappropriately consolidated without
order or notice. Yet the documents
still were circumvented being
ruled on or Judge Livingston would
not have been able to sit upon
these proceedings where recusal
was required, conspiring with Sharpe
and me away within the lower court.
They determined that we establish
an arguable basis in law within
CASE 9:15-cv-984 and wanted to

get ahead of that litigation and Unite the Stalker case(s). So they made a fraudulent Ruling in case 15-13866. Inasmuch, here the Georgia Court will find served upon you within this new Writ of Error which you received in prior proceedings:

(1) A copy of A motion to strike all magistrate report(s); motion for Recusal; motion for extension of time and En Banc Review, (4) pages dated July 16, 2015, with its (7) page attachment dated July 16, 2015.

COURT of APPEALS
FOR THE 2nd CIRCUIT
U.S DISTRICT COURTS
State of NEW YORK ET AL,

THE CRAWFORD AND OR SUTCLIFFE
APPEALS WITHIN THE 2nd 15-3807,
15-15414 AND WITH CIRCUITS ET AL, 15-14078
14078

ALSO RELATED TO U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CASES 9:15-CV-984 ; 9:15-CV-183 ;
9:14-CV-1501 ; 1:15-CV-2309 ; 1:15-CV-
2310 ; 15-1494 ; 15-1386 ; THE NEW
WRIT of ERROR in GEORGIA DISTRICT COURT

COOK ET AL, PETITIONERS

2015 OCT -1 PM 1
U.S.

V.S.

The United States et al.,

defendants

Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Supplementing The Newly Filed Georgia Writ of Error, Also The Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals of Cases 9:15-cv-183; 9:14-cv-150; 1:15-cv-2310 and all Pending State and Federal Cases; Motion for Sanctions; Motion to Strike; Motion for Recusal; Motion for En Banc Review, Evidentiary

Hearing, the Appointment of legal counsel, and to exceed any page limits, motion for an extension of time, motion to expand the scope and for Inclusion, motion for an official Independent Investigation by the U.S. ~~Department~~ of Justice

---

In re: various state cases, the Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals, case 9:15-cv-984, the Writ of Error case in Georgia District Court "4005" to, the 2nd and 4th Circuit Courts of Appeals,

The Georgia and New York District Courts et al.,

The plaintiffs / petitioners in the above captioned matters have recently received conditional and or final orders in the Sutcliffe and Mitchell cases and Report and Recommendation in cases 1:15-cv-2309, 2310 and 4005 also new GA Writ of Error.

Since Judge Batten in acts of fraud upon the court adjudicated the motion for extension of time within a case (7) years closed when he had no jurisdiction not

being the presiding Judge over this case conspiring with Evans and defendants. Also due to Judges in case 15-1386 in Acts of Fraud upon the court asserting there was no arguable bases in law to get ahead of us establishing that arguable bases in law within case 9:15-cv-804, and kill the emergency stays on the state cases. We seek sanctions and the determinations must be made void for Due Process violation and Fraud upon the courts deeming this Response timely.

DUE to REMOVAL of the Sutcliffe and mitchell PCRs at the time the conditional orders and final order was submitted. This tainted those documents rendering them void. The court was to proceed no further and you conspired with the federal actors across multiple state and federal jurisdictions to do so. We motion to strike those PCR orders in the Sutcliffe and mitchell PCRs via sanctions sought for the sake of justice and fairness due to the parties resorting to unjust legal tactics, judicial chicanery and

Fraud upon the court see Harper v James The Law of Torts 1642-1643 L. (1956).

Any determination made in case is-1386 is made void by fraud upon the court. First there was an independent writ of error filed that required a seperate case number. The 2nd circuit asked for informa pauperis documents to establish a seperate independent case then adjudicated under the closed case is-1484. This is fraud. There was motion for Livingstone's recusal being a defendant circumvented. She sat on the proceeding pending additional

judges in fraud who are now defendants and whose recusal is sought, to place forth fraudulent adjudication to keep herself from being sued. Another act of fraud is that you conspire combine or consolidate cases 15-1494 and 15-1886 without first giving us notice and issuing an order stating such is being done. This is fraud and the damage is it prevented the hearing of the independent Writ of Error filed to address what Livingston did in case 15-1494. The 2nd Circuit then files motions in - tended to be adjudicated in the

closed CASE 15-1484 to prevent RULING
in CASE 15-1386. They Realized WE
caught them, called them on it, which
is why they at the last minute
inappropriately consolidated without
ORDER OR NOTICE. Yet the documents
still WERE CIRCUMVENTED being
RULED ON OR JUDGE Livingston would
not have been able to sit upon
these PROCEEDINGS when RECUSAL
WAS REQUIRED, conspiring with SHARPE
and me Away within the lower Court;
They determined that WE established
an arguable basis in law within
CASE 9:15-cv-984 and wanted to

get ahead of that litigation and Unite the Stalker case(s). So they made a fraudulent Ruling in case 15-13886. Inasmuch, here the Georgia Court will find served upon you within this new Writ of Error which you received in prior proceedings:

(1) A copy of A motion to strike all magistrate report(s); motion for Recusal; motion for extension of time and En Banc Review, (4) pages dated July 16, 2015, with its (7) page attachment dated July 16, 2015.

(2) A copy of the (2) page certificate of service dated July 10, 2015 with its summons and affidavit of facts giving judicial notice; motion for reversal; motion for extension of time due to additional fraud upon the court(s); motion for sanctions; motion for emergency stays; supplementing all state and federal actions; motion for en banc hearing, (113) pages dated July 8, 2015.

Again we renew our previous filed motions to strike and motion for sanctions. We object to these

REPORTS OR CONDITIONAL AND OR FINAL ORDERS BEING ADMITTED INTO THE COURT RECORDS BECAUSE THEY ARE TAINTED BY ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT(S) WHERE THESE PARTIES CONSPIRED ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS TO SUBMIT THEM. IF THE ABOVE LISTED DOCUMENTS ARE NOT FILED IN CASES 2309, 2310 THEN YOU HAVE FURTHER ACTS OF SPOLIATION BY THE CONSPIRING PARTIES REQUIRING SANCTIONS AND THE REPORTS BE STRICKEN FROM THE COURT RECORD. THE CONDITIONAL AND FINAL ORDERS SUBMITTED IN

three sutcliffe and mitchell pleas were submitted via fraud upon the court at a time of removal requiring sanctions. the motion for such.

pursuant to Houston v Lack that (43) page document was deemed filed on July 10, 2015 (3) days prior to the issuing of the report where emergency stay was in place via the 2nd circuit. thus, no report should have been entered into the court record due to emergency stay and where the reports issued in both cases "2309" and "2310" are tainted by fraud. the orders

submitted in the sutcliffe and mitchell
PCRs were submitted during time
of removal. Add to this the aggravating
factors of the 2nd circuit filing the
documents in a closed case to pre-
vent adjudication and made a
fraudulent Ruling in case 15-1386
to get ahead of the fact that we
established an arguable bases in
law in case 915-cv-904. We object
and move to strike the Reports
and conditional or final orders
and Remember all orders in cases
15-1386 | 15-cv-2309 and 2310 void
on the bases of fraud upon the

COURT AND THE SPOLIATION WHERE JUDGE HARRINGTON DESTROYED OR PREVENTED FILING OF THE ORIGINAL SUTCLIFFE REMOVAL DOCUMENTS, CHRISTIANSON V M.B.N.A. AMERICAN BANK N.A. SE2d 2013 WL 8507850 (SC APP 2013); MILLER V COLUMBIA FOREST INC, SE2d 2014 WL 5390504 (SC APP 2014); CALDWELL V WIQUIST, 402 SC 595, 741 SE2d 583 (SC APP 2013); U.S. V STERLING, 724 F3d 482 CA4 (VA 2013); SUNOCO PRODUCTS CO V GULLEN, 2014 WL 5474633 (DSC 2014); HAWKINS V COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON, 2013 WL 6050324 (DSC 2013); TURNER V U.S., 736 F3d 274 CA4 (NC 2013);

NUCOR CORP v BELL, 251 F.R.D. 191, 194 (DSC 2008); EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 110 U.S. 339, 25 LED 676 (1872); 28 U.S.C §§ 2071, 2072.

WE RENEW OUR objections to apply (3) STRIKE CONCERN being levied at CRAWFORD. This is also what they are being sued for; to render all past adverse orders void. The arguable bases in law to do so is litigated in case 9:15-cv-980 and will now be litigated within this document to include the right CRAWFORD has to interject himself into his citizen members legal cases acting as Judge, legislator and attorney. Further,

the issue of threat of imminent danger pursuant to any (3) strikes in full related to these cases was already adjudicated within the 2nd Circuit Under case is-very. That higher court granted in forma pauperis review addressing these same claim(s) where the plaintiff, Jah-Jah Al Mahdi, survived at minimum (4) previous assassination attempts directly connected to these cases. Once the 2nd Circuit in case is-very granted in forma pauperis filing related to these

cases, which threat still exist
until this very date. The Georgia
District Court or any other subsequent
court is barred in challenging
such by collateral estoppel. To
deny such when the 2nd Circuit
granted it in case is very Unclear
same conditions and circumstances
would be fraud upon the court,
and abuse of discretion, a mis-
carriage of justice and a violation
of the equal protection of the laws
clause. The Georgia District Court
can provide no justifiable reason
for the disparity in treatment

where the 2nd Circuit is a higher court addressing the same issues under LS-1494. The threat of "imminent danger" is continuous and is directly connected to this case where Jahtah Al Mahdi, is now legally (emphasis added) established as the Global Theocratic King-Khalifah of the (4) Global Thrones by default and collateral estoppel where the United States and other 192 member states of the U.N. are parties, appeared and defaulted.

We object to any claim of "shot gun" pleading, or that the

case wreaks havoc on the judicial system, or that this case is frivolous or incomprehensible. You are dealing with the largest case in earth's judicial history which carves an exception to the concept of the "shot gun" pleading. If it were "shot gun" pleading everybody in the world would be named as defendants. Only specific parties are named who were involved directly to the facts and causes of action who are necessary to bring the suit. Furthermore, they defaulted at the state level in case 2013-CA-000-0084

now removed to these cases, making all claims true. By the default and collateral estopped the courts circumvented or failed to acknowledge, in acts of fraud upon the court, all claims are made true. Thus it would be and is an abuse of discretion to state the claims are frivolous or that there is no arguable bases in law. The default makes the claims true clearly establishing an arguable bases in law and fact. Inasmuch, via the default, we are dealing with "Acts of God", acts of God carries an exception to the "shotgun"

pleading analysis. Acts of God tend to wreak havoc when and wherever they manifest themselves. But by law they cannot be deemed to injure anyone. No one can be penalized by judicial determinations or otherwise for "Acts of God". The fulfilling of Religious prophesy is an "Act of God". Elijah must Restore "all "(Emphasis added) things. How can the Elijah, Al mahdi, Restore "all"(Emphasis added) things unless there was a case filed in this manner addressing all things God command to be addressed pursuant to Religious prophesy. See Mark 9:12

New Testament (Bible).

Additionally, you cannot legally call a case frivolous or incomprehensible, which is tangible proof of the Georgia District Court is fraud upon the court, where the case was pleaded within the state courts under 2013-CA-000-0084 and New Jersey A-05205-13 T4 and the 2nd Circuit in case 15-1386 and all Judges and Attorneys, State and Federal, comprehended the pleadings. Thereafter, in case 2013-CA-000-0084, the parties, which include all 193 member states of the United Nations

defaulted, making all claims TRUE and the case is merely being removed to the Federal Courts pursuant to Article III section 2 of the U.S Const., the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and FORE-most the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act of 28 USC § 1602-1612. The Courts are procedurally barred from calling this case frivolous or stating there is no arguable bases in law or fact by collateral estopped. We object, Blue Sky Trawl and Jours, Ucual Jayyar - Fed Appx - 2015 WL 1451636 (4th Cir 2015); 448 F3d 268; 772 F3d 1101; Slater v South Carolina Ry Co, 29 SC 96, 6 SE

936 S.C (1888); Smith v Georgia Power Co, 172 SC 142, 173 S.E 297 SC (1954); Mount Batten Surr Co. Inc v Town of Warrenshoales, FSupp 2d 2008 WL 2704921 (DSC 2008); Addys Harbor Dodge LLC v. Global Vehicles U.S.A. Inc, 2014 WL 4929335 (DSC 2014); Norfolk Southern Ry Co v. Baltimore and Annapolis R.R. Co, 2015 WL 685303 (DSC 2014); S.E.C. v. Jarkas, 557 Fed Appx 204 CA4 (Va 2014); U.S. Bank Nat. Ass'n v Zarabi, 560 Fed Appx 181 CA4 (Va 2014).

We object to the Report submitted in both cases "2309", "2310", the final order in case "183", the Georgia District Court cases, and case 15-1386, as

well as three orders submitted in the Sutcliffe and Mitchell cases, because you circumvented and did not address the claims of default and collateral estopped, ignored or spoliated emergency stay documents, crucial evidence filed or removal documents, adjudicated documents presently filed in closed cases, some closed for over (7) years, in egregious acts of fraud upon the court(s) warranting sanctions. The Reports, conditional and or final orders are tainted with fraud and must be stricken from the court record or rendered

void due to violations of the 6th, 7th, and with amended merits, 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 and DUE PROCESS LAW. Judges Wright, Cooper, Eubus, Harrington etc. collaborating with Sharpe and defendants did not merely abuse their discretion. They conspired with the Judges in spoliation within State and Federal cases to which they were void of all jurisdiction, stripping them of immunity and engaged in acts of fraud upon the courts. They never properly or sufficiently addressed or rebutted the acts of fraud or spoliation in the reports,

orders submitted or in their determinations. We object. We object also to the failure to rule on class action certification, the right to an evidentiary hearing, en banc review, the appointment of legal counsel to represent the class members and they bringing the now "legally" established foreign sovereigns before this court in violation of the terms they dictate. By their criminal, fraudulent assessment. They are asserting that the constitutional right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty by a jury of one's peers,

not OUR convictions being illegally adjudicated by the GRAND JURY via the language presented is frivolous and has no arguable bases in law? The Right of a legally established Sovereign not to have his property or liberty attached, arrested or executed without his consent is frivolous despite the default which makes the claims true by law and collateral estopped has no arguable base in law? They are asserting by actions that the evils and atrocities done during slavery and Jim Crow are frivolous and have no arguable bases in law or fact? They are asserting that the violating of essential jurisdictional prerequisites

and jurisdictional requisites are frivolous and have no arguable bases in law? What was done during slavery and Jim Crow by this nation with all of its atrocities committed thereby is frivolous and have no arguable bases in law? Do we really want to go down this road? These conspiring parties are recreant liars and white supremacist or black uncle Tom slave overseer types, fraudulent thieves deprived of sagacity, justice and fairness. Their judicial discretion have become egregiously compromised via overwhelming acts of fraud upon the court(s)

and ulterior motives creating a mis-carriage of justice. They have entered into a deliberate scheme to defraud the plaintiffs and inmates of this nation making a mockery and abuse of the judicial process involving themselves in crimes, spoliation, requiring their recusal by sanctions sought, U.S v Ray, 547 Fed Appx' 343 (4th Cir Va 2013); U.S. v Blondeau, 480 Fed Appx' 241 (4th Cir 2012); Wellon v Hall, 558 U.S. 220, 130 Sct 727 (U.S 2010); Ochoa Lizarbe v Rivera Rowdon, 402 Fed Appx' 834 (4th Cir 2010); Project Management Co. v Dyn Corp Intern LLC, 734 F3d 366 (4th Va 2013); Hawkins v College of Charleston, 2013 WL 6050

324 (DSC 2013) ; BRUNSON v U.S. 2014 WL 4402803 (DSC 2014) ; MASSI v WALGREEN Co, 2015 WL 3796507 (DSC 2015) ; GRAYSON Consulting Inc v GRATH CART, 2013 WL 3946203 (DSC 2013) ; EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339.

DUE to THESE continual injustices THE Injunction and PROTECTIVE ORDER ONES filed must be granted to get AT THE TRUTH and also to bring THE COURT transcripts from THE Judge LEE and Griffith hearings before THESE COURTS and make them A part of THE COURT RECORD. I WANT THE AUDIO PRESERVED AS EVIDENCE from both THOSE Judges hearings. We need to determine

What Judge Lee said about the affidavits of facts and how I need to file them where she determined if I detach the word "motion" from the affidavit of facts they legally stand, do not have to be ruled on unless by Rules of Court they are timely challenged when served upon the parties. We must establish that the pleadings were comprehensible to all judges and parties which will prove the fraud upon the court via the various federal judges in the Georgia District Court. Even the 2nd Circuit once they reviewed the pleading,

comprehended them wherein they made a fraudulent ruling stating that there was no arguable bases in law to inappropriately avoid recusal, and they consolidated cases without order or notice. I will deal with the issue as to whether there is an arguable bases in law later. Nevertheless, none of the state or federal parties who made appearance and whom were properly served, including the U.S., moved for an extension of time to answer before the default was filed. Nor did they timely challenge any subsequent related document.

They did not resist entry of the default document or rights claims to exercise power given by the default. They did not "timely" contest damages. They did not seek to appeal the filed default document nor those subsequently filed which sought to exercise sovereign power and authority or move to defeat them in a "timely" (emphasis added) manner making all claims, assertions of rights, titles, power and authority true. This bars all subsequent state and federal courts from

challenging these claims by default and collateral estopped. Thus it was an act of fraud and an abuse of discretion to claim there is no arguable bases in law. Hodges v State Farm Mut. Auto Ins Co, 488 FSupp. 1057 (DSC 1980); Standard Sewing Machine Co. v. Hedley 43 SC 17, 20 SE 790 SC (1895); White Oak Manor Inc v Lexington Ins Co, 407 SC 1, 753 SE 2d 537 (SC 2014); Ashcroft v Iqbal, 557 U.S. 662, 129 SCt 1937 (US 2009); Pyatt v Bypass, FSupp 2d, 2012 WL 7997262 (DSC 2012); Kuist v Lorick, 404 SC 649, 746 SE 2d 360 (SCApp 2013); In Re Jones, 396 SC 303, 721 SE 2d 437 (SC 2012); Walker v Brooks, 403 SC 212,

742 SE2d 869 (SCApp. 2013); Medford v US, FSupp 2d 2006 WL 2946187 (DSC 2006); Aughtry v Richland/Lexington Schools Dist. 5, FSupp 2d 2009 WL 2257615 (DSC 2009); State v Brockmeyer, 406 SC 324, 751 SE2d 645 (SC 2013); In Re Brunty, 411 SC 484, 769 SE 2d 426 (SC 2015); Taylor v Taylor, SE 2d 2013 WL 8541474 (SC 2013); In Re Lapham - SE2d - 2015 WL 3761501 (SC 2015).

Once the 2nd and 4th Circuits and other courts see that the parties were served, see that they made appearance or acknowledge receipt of complaint and summons but failed

to timely RESPOND, that is it. THE COURTS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR of LAW OR COLOR of AUTHORITY shall go NO FURTHER EXCEPT to ACKNOWLEDGE THIS TRUTH WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURT RECORD. THE COURTS CANNOT CALL THE CASE FRIVOLOUS OR claim THERE IS NO ARGUABLE BASES IN LAW OR FACT IN ACTS of FRAUD UPON THE COURT CONSPIRING WITH THE UNITED STATES AND DEFENDANTS to help THEM AVOID SUIT. THEY CANNOT DUE to COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL RELIEVE THE DEFENDANTS of THE DEFAULT acting AS THEIR LEGAL COUNSEL WHEN THEY FAILED to timely plead BEFORE THE

State court or challenge those subsequent documents in question, Shah v Palmetto Health Alliance, SE2d 2012 WL 10862486 (SC App. 2012); Burgess v Burgess, SE2d 2012 WL 10864559 (SC App. 2012); Sheppard v Higgins, SE2d 2014 WL 5771187 (SC App. 2014); In re Smith 401 SC 96, 736 SE2d 270 (SC 2012); Mims ex rel Mims v Babcock Center Inc, 399 SC 344, 732 SE2d 395 (SC 2012).

They past the (30) days permitted by Rules of Court to challenge the default document or subsequent filed and served documents exercising now established power and authority.

They did not properly seek leave but attempted further Acts of fraud and got caught requiring sanctions which were timely sought, Holmes v Haynes Worth, Sinkler & Boyd PA, 408 SC 620, 760 SE2d 399 (SC 2014); Kimlock v Pinkney, SE2d, 2014 WL 2589672 (SC App. 2014); McBride, SE2d, 2013 WL 8541576 (SC App. 2013).

By the default and collateral estoppel the claims in total are made true, not frivolous producing clear arguable bases in law, establishing rights and titles as King-Khaliffah, Imam, High Priest, Lawgiver

Who is legislator, Judge and Attorney combined, with the Right to REMOVE pursuant to the F.S.I.A which cannot be challenged, Stratten v Mecklenberg County Dept of Social Services, 521 Fed Appx 278, 2015 WL 2364587 (4th Cir 2013); 134 Sct 2250; Yousuf v Samantar, 699 F3d 763 (Va 2012); 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 — U.S. — 111 Sct 27, 111 L Ed 2d 840 (1990).

Judges Wright, Evans, the Court in Case 15-1386 failed to Rule on whether or not We meet the Criteria for

the commercial exception carved pursuant to the FSIA due to the default. We object. They failed to rule on the claim or acknowledge the default with all rights, titles and authority because in acknowledging such they could not make the fraudulent claim of frivolous or there being no arguable bases in law.

Is the punitive damages and or lien in the amount sought of "75 Trillion" exorbitant, outrageous or unreasonable? Lets look at it. The King Khalifah is bringing suit for the atrocities done during the

time of the U.S. and Global slave trade and the neo slavery period of Jim Crow here in America. Pursuant to 18 USC § 1116 Jah Jah do not have to be recognized by this government though the default establishes these rights. The U.S. and United Nations should have timely responded to prevent Jah Jah from obtaining power and authority of this magnitude. The F.B.I. who are employees of the United States supplied, trained and armed the Ku Klux Klan various institutes, in their raids and attacks upon African Americans here in the United States. This makes the U.S.

culpable. White slave traders and their governments, even the African nations they paid that sold their brethren to these white slave traders are culpable. Nations who remained silent benefitting from the commerce and trade Globally are culpable. All maritime operations, railroads, Banks, companies that engaged, supported, transferred funds and assets, purchased the products produced by the blood and torture of slaves. Global and U.S. companies directly tied to it. These global and U.S. companies are

businesses built in the future off of this wealth. The Saudi Oil Empire whose oil infrastructure and commerce was indeed established and built from revenue obtained via the slave trade. They now trade this oil until this present date, built off the blood and torture of slaves, with the global nations and their oil companies. All either directly or indirectly had a hand in it. This blood wealth is benefitted globally until this present date, especially by the top 2% via their ancestors. The hand of one is the hand of

All by the accomplice liability doctrine and Pinkerton doctrine of liability pursuant to conspiracy. All are culpable. These claims are not delusionable, but are clearly documented facts. My African heritage gives me standing even without any claims of sovereignty which are established by the default. This carves an exception to the "shotgun" pleading analysis producing exceptional circumstances because all or any one can be sued pursuant to 18 USC § 242, the C.A.T. Treaty, Rico Act and other provisions of law, as well as foreign law defaulted on by

the defendants in the State Court proceedings, Rule 44. Additionally, Foreign Law (via [3] Holy Books and Sunnah) make the claims true, also defaulted on, establishing Rights under International probate law, 18 U.S.C § 1116 (a)(b)(1); 18 U.S.C § 1116 (a)(b)(2)(3)(A); United States v. Dizdar, CA2 (N.Y.) 1978, 581 F.2d 1031; Wheeler v. United States, - U.S. - 106 S.Ct. 179, 88 L.Ed. 2d 148 (1985); English v. Gen. Elec. Co, 496 U.S. 72, 79, 100 S.Ct. 2270, 2275, 110 L.Ed.2d 65 (1990); Caruso v. Franklin Mint. Co. 24 F.Supp 2d 1013; 28 U.S.C §§ 2071, 2072.

Walther Edgar, the Great Histo-

Riggs who lives until this present date wrote in his Book entitled, "The History of The South", He stated that if you were to take the U.S. Cotton Trade for (30) years. It would take all the wealth from all gold mines from around the entire world for (500) years to equal the wealth obtained from the blood and torture of slaves within the (30) years of the U.S. Cotton Trade. Now do not be afraid to interject and correct me in my calculations. But lets do the math. Slavery in America

existed from 1619-1865. That comes to (246) years. So you take the (30) years of cotton trade and divide it into the (246) total years of slavery which comes to 8.6 (30) year periods. Then multiply the 8.6 (30) total year periods of cotton trade by the (500) years of the earths gold. This means it would take 4,300 years of all the gold on earth to equal the wealth obtained by slavery within these (246) years. Give or take a few dollars. Would this amount be more than the $75 trillion

When we speak to impose? Of course it would be, ... astronomically. This is just the cotton trade. You also had rice, sugar and tobacco trades. Now multiply these additional (3) square produced products by that 4,300 years of the world's gold if they are only where equivalent. This figure would equate to 13,200 years of all the gold on the face of the planet. Do the $75 trillion when and freeze touch or even come close to this amount? Of course it does not. Its not even a drop in the bucket.

Where not finished calculating.
Now you add in the aggravating
factors such as. Over 100 million
killed or dumped in oceans, fed
to the sharks during the middle
passage being forced to live in their
own blood, urine and feces packed
like sardines on top of each other.
Factor in the acts of torture, rape,
beatings, dismemberments, adult
and child sex slavery, sodomizing
males, females and children right
before each others eyes, the
crucifixions, the tearing apart
of families, children from their

fathers and mothers, husbands from their wives, the lack of homes, the beheadings, the robbing of land and property after re-construction, being burnt at the stake, flayed while hanged, the cutting of unborn fetus' from their mothers wombs'. And the depriving of education, job opportunities, unfair lending practices, discrimination, taxation without proper and fair representation that occurred during the neo slavery period of Jim Crow, the murdering of my people by klansmen,

government officials and others when they sought to vote or obtain other civil rights. are you bastards and dogs telling me that these crimes against humanity are delusional, frivolous and have no arguable bases in law? factor into this interest, the loss of wages and productivity due to loss of life and cost of living increases over the (246) years period until this present day, the debt not being paid. factor in the cost of pain, prison, suffering and mental anguish. add in the relief that was

obtained from the Saudi oil empire, OPEC, that was founded off the blood and torture of slaves. The amount owed would be staggering, blinding, leaving the human conscience in shock and awe, inconceivable, impossible to pay in over ten hundred thousand lifetimes. This is delusional to you rats and snakes? Are you trying to tell us that we, African Americans, do not have an established right to address what you've done to my ancestors during slavery and Jim Crow? You attacked and fragmented me now due to my

claim of being the Heir to the Ethiopian Throne and these people who suffered in the past. This produces cause of action now not applying CAT TREATY OR RICO Act RETROACTIVELY violations of the CAT TREATY OR RICO Act are not delusional and Rights are established thereby. We can give the defendants a choice. All the OPEC Oil Wealth since the time of slavery, coupled by the wealth gained by the Global Banks, along with 13,200 years of the earths gold plus punitive damages for the additional aggravating

factors mentioned and unmentioned?
or "75 trillion spreading the cost
over the 193 sovereign nations'
assets in lien and freeze? Which
is the more less, more responsible
more merciful, more forgiving amount?
Its not rocket science. "75 trillion
is a small insignificant figure
and drop in the bucket compared
to what is truly owed. You're telling
me this is delusional and not an
established right of African Americans?

The four horsemen of the
Apocalypse must be sent into
repose. How many more random

mass killing must occur within this nation before you come to realize that I spoke the truth all along. Those babies dying in Newtown should have been this nation's wake up call. How more have died!!! The anger of God is kindled. Same sex marriage globally must be annulled. Give them civil unions, not Gods intellectual property and religious covenant, my property as this appointed king. The raping killing, bombing, mayhem and global Jihad around the world must be brought to an end! The

only way to accomplish this task and bring the world a period of peace is to unite all contending factions under the banner. my people, Africans, its diaspora, Christians, Muslims and Jews do not need another hero. They need their King, Khalifah, Imam, Lawgiver and High Priest of Religious Prophesy. The one foretold who would purge them, lead them back to the old paths and Godly truths from the days of Yore, back to their "promised land", a land flowing with "milk and honey". I have come.

I am sent. I must be freed to go as God commands me. That $75 Trillion is written in the Book of Daniel chapter 11 verses 1-3. Thus, it too, is an "Act of God". Though they tend to wreak havoc, and "Act of God" injuries no one. All of this is established by the default making the claims true by law. That which is written cannot be broken. The courts and 2nd Circuit abuse their discretion in acts of fraud upon the court for calling clearly written religious doctrine of Christianity,

Judaism and Islam delusional where no man shall be called into question for the verity of his religious beliefs and the United States and U.N. members defaulted on all of this binding all by the SUPREMACY CLAUSE and KINGS DECREE!. This is where the 2nd CIRCUIT and COURTS ARE CONTROLLED by AN ERROR of LAW. They have construed the pleadings to believe that the Head SOVEREIGN opened the door to address these claims. This is the ERROR of law. The Head SOVEREIGN did not open the door on these Religious claims no matter how STRANGE OR fantastic

they may sound. The truth is that the State of South Carolina not only opened the door to the religious beliefs being argued before all courts, but they used these religious beliefs for the purpose of obtaining a murder conviction in violation of State and Federal Law. The claim, as ludicrous and false that it is. Is that the head sovereign beat his family member to death over A's microscope. If no witness the state produced ever stated that "God told me to do it". Then what the heck is my religious beliefs, no matter how strange, doing being brought up in that trial for murder

for the sake of establishing law when the beliefs, no matter how strangle have no relevance to the facts argued within the murder conviction? This creates an arguable bases in law and establishes and indisputable constitutional right of all citizens not to bee prosecuted for their religious beliefs if they are not relevant to the facts in a case or break any established laws. The state, not the head Sovereign, opened the door for all of this the day they used these beliefs to obtain that murder conviction violating the 1st, 5th, 6th

13th, 14th, and 15th amendments as attached to the structural error in the indictments where our presumption of innocence is clearly taken away. This taints and compromises the crafted criminal conviction, is clear reversible error requiring a new trial. This is addressed in the (240) page Kershaw County petition sought by discovery, Bank of St Matthew Baptist Church, 406 SC 156, 750 SE 2d 605 (SC 2013); McGowen v Maryland, 366 U.S. 420, 81 S.Ct 1153 (mem) (US 1961); U.S. v Poston, 312 F Supp 587 (DSC 1970), Valley Forge Christian College v Americans United for Separation of Church and State Inc 454 U.S. 464, 102 S.Ct 752, 70 L Ed 2d 700 (1982).

We REQUEST all previous filed motions, petitions etc for REHEARING REVIEW, EVIDENTIARY HEARING, appointment of legal COUNSEL in all Federal COURTS and Richland County State COURT, for EXTENSIONS of TIME to make additional RESPONSE in the NEW YORK and GEORGIA District Courts once the 2nd and 11th Circuits RULE establishing the Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals. We REQUEST all EMERGENCY stays and SEEK that the GEORGIA District COURT, not the 2nd Circuit, CONSOLIDATE all (3) Cook, Crawford, and Sutcliffe CASES. We

motion to expand the scope and for inclusion and that all documents filed in cases 9:15-cv-984; 9:15-cv-183; 9:14-cv-1501; 2013-cv-000-0084, 2294; 1:14-cv-3713; 1:15-cv-2309, 2310 and 4005; The Kentucky District Court cases and New Writ of Error processed in Georgia "4005", be deemed filed, added to the Record in each of these cases seeking that both the 2nd and 11th Circuit grant all relief sought within all cases collectively, including emergency stay on same sex marriage nationally until these matters are brought to trial, Middleton v Prissard

Motor Co Ltd, FSupp 2d 2012 WL 3612572 (DSC 2012); U.S. Ex Rel Knight v Relignt Hospice Inc, FSupp 2d 2011 WL 1321584 (DSC 2011); Harbison v Bell, 556 U.S. 180, 129 SCt 1481 (US 2009); U.S. v Athar, 92 F3d 1182 (4th Cir 1996). They blocked Crawford from exhausting by fraud.

To: Judges Harrington, Markley, Kuapis, McGuay, Joseph L. Yannotti, of Duke New Jersey Superior Court and Judge Hummell. We motion for your recusal and to strike any conditional orders, final order(s) Report and Recommendations issued in these cases. No one judge

Court sit on these cases until after en banc review is initially given without the relevant courts to prevent any further acts of fraud upon the court(s). This includes seeking recusal of the panel in cases 15-1494, 15-1386 and any judge in the 2nd Circuit that sat on any prior case involving Crawford. The participating judges must give en banc rulings. These names are officially supplied with pleaded as defendants in case 9:15-cv-984 and the Writ of Error being processed in the Georgia District Court. Wright, Eugene and

other Conspiring Judges in their legislative functions, acting as legislators changing law as they went, there violating the separation of powers provisions by implementing unsanctioned new law by these actions stripping them of immunity, conspiring to prevent these cases from moving forward until such time our right to be fairly heard before a jury which is impartial formed upon the court. Conduct of our Judges (Canon 3(C)(1)(d) mandates recusal of these judges implicated in total who conspired with Swarupe and the 2nd Circuit.

We supplement the appeal in both the 2nd and 4th Circuit and writ of mandamus also sought reinstatement to require this, Macauslo v Kingsman Energy, No. 05-CV-823, 2007 WL 1041602, at *14 (E.D.N.Y. 2007); and Altria v South Carolina, F.Supp 2d 2012 WL 3467298 (D.S.C. 2012); Kolon Industries Inc v E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co, 748 F3d 160 (4th Cir. 2014); Liteky v United States 510 U.S. 540, 114 S.Ct 1147 (U.S. CA. 1994).

We give the 2nd and 4th Circuits notice, Judge Ungaro in case No. 05-5205-BT-4 just transferred the case out of his jurisdiction in Feb

of Fraud upon the court by order dated July 27, 2015 Remanding case to lower court. this intent was to avoid being required to be subject to any pending Ruling that may come from the 2nd and 4th Circuits. Appeal of that order is sought within the Dist. Supreme Court Docket case number 076372. We motion to supplement to require that any determination by the 2nd and 4th Circuits Apply to any court the dist. case Resides in at the time of the 2nd and 4th Circuits Ruling. By the way. The court in case A-005205-

13TH and the lower court the case was transferred to via video conference understood the pleading and even ruled partially in the appellate court. This too, proves the fraud upon the court via the Georgia District Court when it asserted the claims were incomprehensible. Again we motion to exceed any page limits because we are dealing with multi-District and State and Federal jurisdiction litigation where response to report and recommendations, conditional and final orders is mandated and these issues must

be properly addressed. The head foreign sovereign is laboring under a disability to his hands placing him in pain arguing a case this complex and size. This format is needed pursuant to his rights under ADA. This includes any defect.

Addressing the conditional and or final orders in the Sutcliffe and mitchell cases. Attached the court will find a supplement per application that is to be filed in both cases 2015-CA-10-2153 and 3080.

The structural constitutional error in the indictments taking away the presumption of innocence etc.

is being argued in both cases. Since the conspiracy indictment was not pros in the Mitchell case. The murder indictment do not allege who Mitchell conspired with. The Sutcliffe indictment do not allege what Battery took place. In the supplement PCR is placed litigation arguing elements, even though it may refer to other elements. The same litigation applies to the elements deficient in these two cases. The (180) day ruling & judicial order is being argued in both cases. Sutcliffes judicial matters were supposed to have been concluded by July of

2011, not March of 2012. Mitchells case was suppose to be concluded by May of 2003, not November of 2004. You don't have a success in the PCR on Mitchell because its tainted by a similar judicial order requiring the PCR to be concluded within (365) days. All these are claims of subject matter jurisdiction and Gentry was adjudicated under fraud upon the court. Your use of it opens the door for attack. Violations of Anti Peonage Act is being argued. Claims of this can be waived, can be raised at any time and is not subject to limitations bars

which include lashes and successive constructive amendment of the indictments and Century Travel issue is being argued in both cases. A hearing is required and the appointing of legal counsel. You have foreign sovereign issues argued. This too is a challenge to jurisdiction requiring all parties, including Crawford be brought before any court together, not seperately. We move to consolidate all pending PCRs and seek class action certification arguing preemption under Rules (19) and (23) joinder of parties. Crawford is now party pursuant to preemption, Rule

19 UNDER FEDERAL RULES. WE MOVE CRAWFORD BE ADDED AS A PARTY IN ALL PENDING PCRS SINCE HE DISCOVERED THE HEAD ISSUE(S) PURSUANT TO SEEKING CLASS ACTION OR CONSOLIDATION. HE MUST BE PERMITTED UNDER FEDERAL LAW, RULE 19 TO PROTECT HIS INTEREST. WE MUST BE BROUGHT BEFORE ANY STATE OR FEDERAL COURT TOGETHER EVEN PURSUANT TO REMOVAL, 28 USC §§ 2011, 2012.

REFERRING BACK TO THE ISSUE of COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL. DOES IT ATTACH AND DID JAHIAH AL MAHDI, CRAWFORD, ESTABLISH ALL RIGHTS AND TITLES WITH

his ability of act as Lawgiver within the 193 member states of the United Nations borders which include the United States clearly binding all state and Federal courts due to the default via the Supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution and Kings decrees establishing and arguable bases in law exist for this claim. Legally all the plaintiffs have to do is prove the United States was served, made and appearance and produced no challenge to any claim submitted and a judg-

There are additional circumstances in this case that indisputably establishes the default and the attachment of collateral estoppel. That being that the default emanates from a judicial order adjudicated, determined and resolved by the SC Supreme Court under Article V § 4 of the South Carolina constitution where all administrative factors attached to the order have been rescinded. This it is not an administrative issue or determination. It

is a judicial order, mandatory, declaration, based upon SC Constitution DUE PROCESS law creating a 6th and 14th amendment claim, under fair and impartial hearing and EQUAL PROTECTION of LAWS.

FURTHER the ORDER has been attached to the SC constitution where under ARTICLE 1 § 23 of the SC Constitution, by the LANGUAGE of the ORDER it is not discretionary. It by this additional provision makes it mandatory, declaration, creating a "JURISDICTIONAL PREREQUISITE", UNLESS there

is something in the language of the order that states otherwise; to wit, there is not. This applies to the Sutcliffe and Mitchell cases also.

Once the state court fails to be in compliance to this essential "jurisdictional prerequisite" by the time demanded via the S.C. Supreme Court order (c) file a written order of continuance within the pending case within (365) days of its original filing to proceed with the case beyond the (365) days demanded via S.C. Supreme

COURT ORDER. This applies to the (180) day provision for trial courts as well.

Failure to be in compliance immediately voids the state courts jurisdiction. So once the party detects this "jurisdictional" flaw or defect and enters it into the court record by affidavit of facts, not a motion as was determined by Judge Lee. The affidavit of facts stands as true in the court record as a final determination on the issue, not being contested by the court or parties within (30) days of filing as is required by S.C.

law. The affidavit of facts is then made true on the court record by S.C. Supreme Court order, determination, resolution and adjudication even though Judge Lee made a similar oral determination to support this fact related to the affidavits standing. It becomes a final determination supported by the S.C. Supreme Court order in the pending case because the state court and parties, which include the United States, would be procedurally barred in challenging the affidavit being past the (30) days permitted to challenge by South Carolina Rules

of court, now also being divested of jurisdiction. Collateral estoppel would immediately attach preventing challenge from any subsequent court. The affidavit of facts laid clear claim on all titles, Rights, power, authority established by all documents filed in the case which include the memorandum of Law and Declaration of sovereignty as well as the (95) page document dated December 8, 2014 exercising all Rights as Lawgiver of God and as King-khalifah etc of the (4) Global Thrones. The affidavit of facts

claiming default with that (95) page subsequent document and those that followed them, now become binding on all courts, all appearing parties, all those served, who conspired to avoid service and who failed to timely respond or respond at all. This specifically include the United States. The other 192 member states were served at the U.N. and additional service was done on the United states via the U.S. Justice Dept., the US Congress, the U.S. Senate and various other Federal Attorneys; Ex Parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339, 25 Led 676 (1812).

THERE ARE (4) ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS to ESTABLISHING A CLAIM of COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL. (1) THE ISSUE of FACT IS IDENTICAL to THE ONE PREVIOUSLY LITIGATED. THE AFFIDAVIT of FACTS FILING DEFAULT PURSUANT to THE ARTICLE V § 4 S.C SUPREME COURT ORDER AND MANDATE WAS PREVIOUSLY LITIGATED in THE STATE COURT. THE CLOCK STAMP on THE DOCUMENT IS PROOF of ITS FILING. IT IS ARGUED in SUBSEQUENT PLEADING. (2) THE ISSUE of FACT WAS ACTUALLY RESOLVED in A PRIOR PROCEEDING. JUDGE LEE RESOLVED THE ISSUE of THE FILING of THE AFFIDAVITS in A PRIOR PRO-

ceeding by oral determination where she said the affidavits stand, do not have to be ruled on if the word "motion" is detached and no one timely rebuts them. The issue was also resolved by the S.C Supreme Court where via their Article V powers they detached any administrative factors so it could not be construed as an administrative proceeding. They resolved it as an order and jurisdictional requisite, being mandatory, draconian in nature further establishing it to be so by also attaching it to

the S.C. Constitution under Article 1§23. This placed double emphasis on it being mandatory. (3) The issue of facts is critical and necessary to the judgment in the prior proceeding. This issue is so critical and necessary to the judgment that failure to be in compliance to this jurisdictional requisite divest and or voids their jurisdictionary powers to proceed further or render any additional judgment. (4) The judgment in the prior proceeding is final and valid. Due to the divesting and or voiding of

jurisdiction. The judgment of Judge Lee on the court record related to the filing of the affidavit of facts, their claims being valid unless timely disputed, which the court or no party timely disputed, is final and valid. Additionally the finality and validity of the judgment becomes strengthened by the S.C Supreme Court order in that prior proceeding where the S.C Supreme Court's decision is final and valid being the states highest court. And (5) The party to be foreclosed by the prior Judge Lee and SC Supreme Court resolution of the issue of fact, the filing of the af-

fidquit of Jnets and Article V § 4 order, had full and fair opportunity to litigate the issue of fact in the prior proceeding. That default document with its subsequent (95) page document and those that followed exercising power by default was served on all parties since may of 2014 where they appeared. South Carolina law gives them (30) days to challenge any pleading filed. They never, all parties involved (emphasis added), timely challenged any of these facts. The United States instead of taking

advantage of the opportunity to litigate, conspired at points to avoid service, then concealed their appearance before the court and then got caught hiding, creeping like a bunch of back door ghost. The plaintiffs exposed them and moved for default. They engaged in fraud upon the court warranting sanctions which was sought. The aforementioned meets every element for establishing collateral estoppel. U.S Bank Nat. Assn v. Zarrabi, 560 Fed Appx 181 (4th Cir 2014); In Re Raguci, 433 B.R. 889, 895 Bankr (MD Tenn 2010).

Claim preclusion only requires a valid and final judgment. In these exceptional circumstances we have two. One from Judge Lee's determination on the filing of the affidavit of facts. The second further making that prior Lee judgment final and valid comes via the SC Supreme Court Article V § 4 order where all administrative factors have been rescinded where it could not be construed as an order emanating from an administrative proceeding, creating a jurisdictional requisite. The S.C.

SUPREME COURT THEN TIED IT TO THE SC CONSTITUTION TO EMPHASIZE THIS PROVISION WAS AND IS MANDATORY, DRACONIAN IN NATURE. STATE JURISDICTION IS VOIDED PREVENTING THE UNITED STATES AND DEFENDANTS FROM CHALLENGING THE AFFIDAVIT THAT ESTABLISHED THE DEFAULT BEING SO LATE IN THE GAME, SEC V JARKAS, 557 FED APPX 204 (4TH CIR 2014); DELTA APPAREL INC V JARKAS, 406 SC 257, 750 SE 2d 615 (SC APP. 2013); MOORE V BYARS, 2013 WL 6710273 (DSC 2013); IN RE ESTRAND, 529 B.R. 865 BKRPTCY (DSC 2015); PARKER V. ASBESTOS PROCESSING, LLC, 2015 WL

127930 (DSC 2015) | Jowley v La Salle Bank Nat Assn, 36 FSupp 3d 657 (DSC 2014) | Harper & James The Law of Torts 1642-1643 L. (1956).

When a party has substantially participated in an action in which he has had full opportunity to defend, like the state court proceedings and mandamus under 15-1494 where the United States appeared in both proceedings then engaged in acts of fraud upon the court(s) conspiring to defeat the mandamus and then concealed their appearance in case 2013-cp-400-00814, 2294 and got caught. They never disputed or challenged

the merits. The case was placed on the complex case docket demonstrating the pleadings were comprehended by all parties proving Georgia's fraud. It is not an abuse of discretion to apply collateral estoppel after default document was filed which void their jurisdiction for due process violation, and Judge Lee Resolved the issue of the Affidavit of Facts as a final determination on that issue, before jurisdiction was then void by order preventing any further challenge to the document. When substantial participation and same

tions were sought for dilatory or obstructive conduct. Such as the United States hiding its appearance to negate the requirement to respond to the pleadings, or avoiding service, conspiring in fraud upon the court, skirting procedural rules where they failed to timely respond. Or placing the case on the complex case docket after the fact to evade the voiding of their jurisdiction or circumvent their failure to timely be in compliance to the initial SC Supreme Court Article V § 4 orders because the complex

CASE docket has different time RULES. OR spoliating EVIDENCE and docu-MENTS in SUBSEQUENT CASES BE-CAUSE they did not WANT EVIDENCE of this default placed in SUBSEQUENT COURT RECORDS. SANCTIONS sought FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT(S), intimi-dation of plaintiffs, judges acting AS investigators conducting EX PARTE investigations subjecting us to official mental and physical TORTURE, RETALIATION FOR US SEEKING REDRESS and other MISCARRIAGES of justice producing AGGRAVATING factors. The "actual litigated" REQUIREMENT is

myet and collateral estopped Attaches, Institutform Tech Inc v Amerik Supplies Inc, 850 F Supp 2d 1336, 1362 (N.D GA. 2012); Eastern Associated Coal Co. v. Director Office of Workers Compensation Programs, 578 Fed Appx 165 (4th Cir (2014); Radmite v University of S.C, SE 2d 2015 WL 4275972 (SC App. 2015); Jillery v Jaguar / Land Rover Hilton Head, 2015 WL 3736216 (DSC 2015); In re Russo-Chestnut, 522 B.R. 148 (DSC 2014); White, 2014 WL 1513280 (DSC 2014).

This is the issue of controversy here. The defendants never rejected the plow "legally" (emphasis

added) established foreign sovereign king, khalifah and lawgiver of the one true God, to have knowledge of the SC supreme court order and jurisdictional requirement as well as how and when to make use of it. One rights of S.C constitutional due process law was played on the court record making all claims true by default. Thereupon permitting the plaintiffs to exercise now established foreign sovereign power and authority. It was an abuse of discretion for judge casey manning, who is a defen-

dgmt in these cases and who was not the presiding judge in these cases. In violation of the code of judicial conduct, to place these cases on the complex case docket, after the fact, as a means to circumvent the jurisdictional written order of continuance requirement. Done to conceal the fact that they "dropped the ball" and are in procedural error and default, creating a SC state constitutional jurisdictional defect voiding their jurisdiction to submit any further judgment, violating the

plaintiffs DUE PROCESS Rights Under the FSIA of 28 USC § 1602-1612 et seq., his 4th Amendment Rights pursuant to the illegal SEIZURE of a SOVEREIGN, his 6th Amendment Right to a fair and impartial hearing and his 14th Amendment Rights Under the Equal protection of the Law clause related to established rights via default clearly demonstrating an arguable basis in law. The United States is involved in this conspiracy concealing its appearance within the Richland Court. This satisfys the minimal adversity requirement permitting us to Remove

and disqualify pursuant to sanctions and 28 USC § 1602-1612 et seq of the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act, see Elie Guam v Long Term Credit Bank, Japan supra; currency, 9 FSupp3d 502 (2014)

Once the default and collateral estoppel attaches making all claims true, establishing all rights, titles and authority of the Global Theocratic King-Khalifah, which include his right to act as Lawgiver with superseding authority. It also automatically made the (3) Holy Books true as the last will and testament of Gods Holy Prophets

and Kings pursuant to International Probate law. This established the "Act of Marriage", as a Religious Covenant, one of Gods Laws and commands given to "Adam and Eve", Gods servants, not "Adam and Steve". "Adam and Steve" cannot "procreate" which is an essential requirement to be given and practiced by this Religious law and Covenant.

The laws of God are an intrinsic part of the intellectual property and portion of the inheritance given to His Global Theocratic King, Khaliph, High Priest, Imam and Prophet as it relates to the de-

scendants of Aaron and King David. This is clearly written in the Biblical text. Is the court calling the Holy Bible delusional? You acted as a theologian not a Judge stripping you of immunity. This property cannot now, legally by law, due to the default, be arrested, attached or executed without Gods Appointed Kings expressed consent which this state or any global nation have related to same sex marriage. "Elijah must first come and restore all things" (Mark 9:12). All of this is an intrinsic part of the default establishing the Right to secure my

And Goods property. Suit is being brought for this. Declaratory Judgment and injunctive Relief is sought as well. By the aforementioned these cases should have never been dismissed sua sponte or said frivolous without first serving the parties in the Federal Court to make them respond to the default that occurred in the State Court and all crimes, torts, spoliation connected to it. There exist genuine issues of dispute and arguable bases in law ei Foreign Law with rights and titles, Theocratic Law, Probate

law defaulted on by the defendants, specifically, the United States, made true by the existing default where they failed to respond, instead conceded their appearance. Travel upon the courts is established requiring en banc review, Jones v Sternheimer, 387 Fed Appx 366 2010 WL 2711305 (4th Cir 2010); US v Watson, — F3d — 2015 WL 4385697 (4th Cir 2015); Hanley v South Carolina Dept of Corrections, 2013 WL 5428585 (DSC 2013); People v Rogers, FSupp2d 2010 WL 4024201 (DSC 2010); Gentry Technology of S.C Llc v Baptist Health South

Florida Inc, 2015 WL 12192 51 (FSC 2013).

Referring back to the issue of subject matter jurisdiction and or voiding jurisdiction as it relates to the Article VI § 4 orders that is one of the sources of the default, as well as jurisdictional prerequisites and or jurisdictional requisites in total as they exist within State and Federal courts, which can be raised at anytime and cannot be waived. We bring the courts and parties attention to the following cases

State v Gentry, 365 SC 93, 610

SE 2d 494, 495 (SC 2005); United States v Cotton, 535 U.S. 625, 122 SCt 1781, 152 LEd 2d 860 (2002); State v Parkhurst, 845 S.W. 2d 31 (MO 1992); Russell v United States, 369 U.S. 749, 82 SCt 1038 (1962); Indictment sufficiency 70 Columb L Rev 876, 888 (1970); United States v Abrams, 539 FSupp. 378, 384 (SDNY 1982); Stirone v United States 361 U.S. 212 (1960); Gaither v United States, 413 F2d 1061 (DC Cir 1969). We are suing the State of South Carolina and the 4th Circuit for injunctive relief and the abuse of discretion and acts of fraud upon the Rule.

want courts for their deceptive, fraudulent, criminal adjudications they have done in and related to the State v Gentry case. This is further reason why we are suing to disqualify them, injunctive relief.

By the holdings made in the Gentry case. They purposely mis-interpreted the holdings made in U.S v Cotton and destroyed the true concept of OUR DUE PROCESS Rights as they relate to subject matter Jurisdiction and Indictments. They adopted the Federal laws and requirements of the indictment

via their states constitutions. They engaged in acts of fraud upon the courts for the purpose of essentially establishing modern day slavery in violation of the Anti Peonage Act where we can no longer be deemed "duly" (emphasis added) convicted making void their power and jurisdiction. We are suing them for this as well as Judge Sharpe and all Judges listed within these cases because they conspired during and after the fact to establish modern day slavery in violation of the C.A.T. Treaty and Rico

Act and to conceal this crime and miscarriage of justice. They conspired to conceal the fact that the legal issues affected the state of New York and all (50) states producing public juris claims and the minimum contact requirement pursuant to long arm statute provisions and conspiracy pursuant to the RICO Act and extra-territorial jurisdiction claims.

By the holdings made in the Gentry case. That court essentially took the position that courts powers of subject matter jurisdiction are absolute via state legislative or

CONGRESSIONAL STATUTES OR ENACTMENTS of LAW AND AT NO TIME CAN THAT POWER BE DIVESTED OR VOIDED. THE GENTRY COURT ESSENTIALLY CLAIMED THERE CAN BE NO SITUATIONS THAT CAN DEVELOPE DURING THE COURSE OF JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS THAT CAN DIVEST OR VOID JURISDICTION. WE OBJECT TO THIS. THIS IS A LUDICROUS AND CRIMINAL POSITION TO TAKE WHICH WILL BE PROVEN BY JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS MADE AFTER THE GENTRY CASE WAS ESTABLISHED.

THERE ARE ESSENTIALLY (2) PRONGS TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. ONE (1) IS WHERE THE COURTS LACK SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION (ie WHERE A

family court would attempt to try a criminal case, or a probate court would attempt to try a military tribunal case). Of course in these situations those courts would "lack subject matter jurisdiction".

This is essentially what the Cotton court was saying which is the reason why the litigant in that case did not prevail. By state and federal statutes or congressional enactments, specific courts have jurisdiction to hear cases of a general class (ei criminal courts have jurisdiction to hear criminal cases). (2) But there is

A second prong to subject matter jurisdiction where jurisdiction is made void because of due process violation despite any existing state statute or federal law. So the Cotton court was essentially saying is that the litigant, by the language he presented, he was arguing his case under the wrong prong. More specifically, the litigant should have asserted that jurisdiction is made void due to a particular due process violation. see cases

The Gentry court knew the Cotton court was vague on this issue and went on a "fishing ex-

predition" to find Cotton and Parkhurst so they could adjudicate the Gentry case under the same incorrect prong to defraud the inmates of this state. Like the Article V §4 orders leading to the claims of default and collateral estoppel in these cases. The sufficiency of an Indictment is a "[J]URISdictional [p]REREQUISITE" and DUE PROCESS claim that voids jurisdiction as opposed to the other prong where the Family Court would attempt to try a criminal case and would lack subject matter JURISdiction. The DUE PROCESS prong is what we

ARE ARGUING THE ARTICLE VI § 4 ORDERS default, and STRUCTURAL ERROR of RELIGIOUS PROPHESY PERTAINING to THE INDICTMENTS PREDETERMINING IN ADVANCE THE OUTCOMES of THE PROCEEDINGS, taking AWAY of PRESUMPTION of INNOCENCE, CONVICTING US BEFORE plea OR TRIAL UNDER. THUS THE DETERMINATION made by JUDGE LEE RELATED to THE filing of THE affidavit of facts BECOMES A final JUDGMENT WHERE EVERY ACT done AFTER BECOMES void UPON THE documents filing WHEN THEY WENT PAST THE (30) days to challenge it. THIS IS A CRUCIAL PART of THE FRAUD UPON THE COURT THEY PERPETRATED

Against the inmates of this state and plaintiffs, SHARPE conspired to aid them conceal this, either by acting as an investigator, a quasi-judicial act, with parties, these secretly GREP, scope etc, conducting EX PARTE SECRET investigations, and bringing that imputed knowledge back into court to initiate ruling in case "183", for the purpose of establishing modern day slavery in violation of the C.A.T. Treaty CARVING and exceptions to they being sued though they are judges. Congress confers upon no court, state or federal, the

power to establish modern day slavery, The Amistad, 40 U.S. 518, 15 Pet 518, 1841 WL 5024.

When the constitutionality of a ruling is in doubt (ei the Cotton and Guentry cases). The court has an obligation to interpret the Cotton case as it relates to Guentry, Abrams, Gaither, Stirone, Russell and the voiding of jurisdiction for due process violations under this prong, not the other. Stare Decisis et plen quient a movere". Once clearly decided the courts shall not move from it. Certain violations of due

PROCESS void jurisdiction, 9 FSupp3d 582.

If A CRIMINAL CASE IS APPEALED but NO TRIAL TRANSCRIPT IS PRODUCED, WHAT OCCURS? THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPT IS A JURISDICTIONAL REQUIREMENT IN THE APPEALS COURT. THE COURT MUST REMANDED FOR A NEW TRIAL. IF A CASE IS IN THE STATE COURT AND A PETITION TO REMOVE IS FILED, WHAT OCCURS? THE STATE COURT JURISDICTION IS DIVESTED AND THAT COURT CAN'T NOT PROCEED UNTIL REMANDED ORDER IS ISSUED, STATE V LADSON, 373 SC 320, 644 SE2d 271 (SC App 2007); LOVETT V. DEUTSCHE BANK NAT' TRUST CO, FSupp 2d, 2013 WL 841679 (DSC 2013). A CASE

is in lower court. A motion is filed where adverse ruling is given. The party appeals it, what occurs? The higher court cannot hear it without the jurisdictional prerequisite final order, Fortmill v Fitzgerald, SE 2d, 2014 WL 7339453 (SC App. 2014). In civil cases parties must be in compliance to all Rules of constructive service. Compliance is jurisdictional prerequisite. If a step is omitted (accordingly a sufficient indictment omitted) decree or ruling is void, Caldwell v Winquist, 402 SC 565, 741 SE 2d 583 (SC App 2013). Where case

filed in District Court but parties file a second case to subvert the District Courts jurisdiction in the state court. This act would void state courts jurisdiction. This jurisdiction is not absolute despite legislative statute of a state or federal law, Ackerman v Exxon Mobil Corp, 734 F3d 237 (4th (Md 2013). jurisdictional defects in tax cases void jurisdiction, Reeping v JEbbco, LLC, 402 SC 195, 740 SE2d 507 (SCApp 2013). Money amounts jurisdictional in wills, probate and estates Dickson v Alexander Hospital, 177 F2d 876 (4th (Va 1949) || Aladekcha 2010 WL 4054267 (2010)

When a conviction fails to comport with DUE PROCESS if the statute under which it is obtained, and we can add to this an indictment, fails to provide a person of ordi- to comport to Due Process and fair
nary intelligence "fair" notice or other essential requirements of DUE PROCESS (ei double jeopardy protection, presumption of innocence), jurisdiction is void. If the court fails to act in a manner consis- tent with DUE PROCESS and author- izes and or encourages arbitrary and discriminatory practices (ei deny us equal protection of the laws, constructively amended

indictments of essential elements, taking away our presumption of innocence predetermining in advance the outcome of the proceedings by indictment language, spoliating documents and evidence, illegally seizing evidence and foreign sovereigns, engaging in acts of fraud upon the courts, depriving us of proper notice in violation of the 4th, 5th, 6th, 13th, 14th, 15th Amendments. Jurisdiction is made void for violation of due process. Century Technology of SC Inc v. Baptist Health South Florida, ... 2015 WL 12192251 (DSC 2015); Yates Estate of

Yates, 2014 WL 2579917 (SC App 2014); Ware v Ware, 404 SC 1, 743 SE 2d 817 (SC App 2013); Orlando Residence Ltd v Hilton Head Hotel Investors, FSupp 2d, 2013 WL 1103027 (DSC 2013); Federal Land Bank Assn of Asheville, N.C. v C.I.R., 573 F2d 179 (4 (1978); Al Shimari v C.A.C.I. Int'l Inc, 679 F3d 205 (4 (Md 2012). The use of U.S. v Cotton, Parkhurst and Gwaltney must be deemed misplaced or overruled due to vagueness, Johnson v United States, — Sct — 2015, WL 2473450 (US 2015); U.S. v McKee, 506 F3d 225, 229-32 (3rd Cir 2007); U.S. v Resendez-Ponce, 549 U.S. 102, 127 Sct 782 (US 2007); U.S. v Hurt,

665 F3d 588 (3rd Cir 2008); Ingram v Phillips, 36 S.C. L. 200, 1850 WL 2857 SC App. Law 1850; Lewis-Murray v Murray, SE2d 2005 WL 7084812 (SC App 2005); Bankers v South Carolina, FSupp2d, 2010 WL 558580 (DSC 2010); Lamp mart v DeMoff Boberg & Associates, Inc, 319 Fed Appx 293 (4th Cir (SC 2009); United Student Aids Funds, Inc v Espinosa, 559 U.S. 260, 130 S.Ct 1367 (US 2010); Aranda v Village West Owners Assn Inc, SE2d 2011 WL 11735004 (SC App 2011); Elderberry of Weber City, LLC v. Living Centers-Southeast, Inc - F3d -, 2015 WL 4430836 (4th Cir (Va 2015). The Judgment in these cases (ei Country

15-1386 | 15-1494 | 11:15-CV-2309, 2310; 9:15-CV-183; 9:14-CV-1501 etc) is once affected by fundamental infirmities. There is arguable bases in law, established Rights and clear error. The state opened the door for the Religious matters to be argued, not Crawford, where they tried him only to obtain a murder conviction and it had no relevance to the facts in the case. You can not convict a man for the verity of his Religious beliefs when they had no bearing on the case. The claims are made true by default and anything occurring after is made void. Removal is permitted now under the J.S.I.A.

We meet the criterion for establishing class action. The legal issue(s) affects (50) states, 2.3 million inmates. No sua sponte dismissal should have occurred. Counsel should have been appointed to represent class. Evidentiary hearing and en banc review is required. You have fraud upon the courts, spoliation and the establishing of modern day slavery via the defective indictments and complaints we plot being "duty" convicted. You have judges conspiring in venues in which they are void of all jurisdiction doing non judicial acts stripping them of immunity in their effort to prevent this case

from going to trial. These infirmities may be raised after any judgment becomes final, United States Aids Funds, Inc v Espinoza supra; Moses v. Happyhaps, 10 Rich 465, 1857 WL 3239 S.C. Err. App. 1857; Norbrega v Hinkle, 576 Fed Appx 224 (4th Cir (Va 2014); Jones v. Sternheimer, 387 Fed Appx 366 2010 WL 2711305 (4th Cir (Va 2010); U.S. v. Watson -- F3d -- 2015 WL 4385697 (4th Cir (Va 2015); Harley v South Carolina Dept of Corrections, 2013 WL 5428585 (DSC 2013); People v Rogers, F Supp 2d 2010 WL 424 201 (DSC 2010); Gentry Technology of SC Inc v Baptist Health South Florida Inc, 2015 WL 12192 51 (DSC 2015).

There are essentially two

requirements that must be met before a case can be deemed frivolous or it be stated there is no arguable bases in law. One - is which it is clear that the defendants are immune from suit. The Writ of Error in Georgia being processed list all defendants as do case 9:15-cv-984. Many are not Judges. Some are individuals and companies. You have judges doing non judicial acts and acting in vesture where they are void of all jurisdiction. You have them creating law (legislative functions) and implementing them. You have Judges acting as investigators, destroying evidence and doing executive functions. So

it is obvious the courts have not met the first requirement for establishing there is no arguable bases in law, Baccus v Merchant, 2014 WL 13309 84 (DSC 2014); Forrester v. White, 484 U.S. 219, 108 SCt 538 (US 1988); Wise v U.S., FSupp 2d 2009 WL 3052608 (DSC 2009); King v Myers, 973 F2d 354 (4th Cir 1992); Abebe v Seymour, FSupp 2d 2012 WL 1130660 (DSC 2012); Ex Parte Virginia supra.

The second requirement is where claims infringement of a legal interest which clearly does not exist. The legal Sovereign did not first bring this seemingly strange Religious beliefs up. The state did

when they tried him in a murder case for these beliefs where they had no bearing on the case at all and did not break any law to believe such. The sovereign has a legal interest under the 1st, 6th, 14th amendments not to be tried for the verity of his religious beliefs. Furthermore, unless the 2nd, 11th circuits or any court address the issue of default and collateral estoppel. no court can legitimately claim that these claims infringement of a legal interest which clearly does not exist because they are made true by the default. The default and collateral estoppel must be addressed before any court

can claim the case is frivolous or has no arguable basis in law because the default makes the claims true and establishes all rights and titles, White v White, 886 F2d 721 (4th Cir. 1989); Ex parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339 (1872).

Where complaint has arguable bases in law (ei bringing my religion in the court for the purpose of establishing law or the default making all claims true). notice of any deficiency was required where the party was to be given opportunity to amend which was sought in C.A. the 2nd Circuit, via seeking extension of time to submit writ of error

which was not given by fraud. It would have allowed clarification to explain further the default that established the rights. numerous injuries were listed within the documents filed expanding over centuries. The case was required to be factually developed within the District Courts requiring service on the parties due to the existing state default. This created a miscarriage of justice and denial of meaningful access to the courts and proper Due Process of Law. King v Atiyeh, 814 F2d 565, 568 (9th Cir 1987); Procunier v Martinez 416 U.S. 396, 419, 94 S Ct 1800, 1814,

40 L.Ed.2d 224 (1974); Johnson v Avery, 393 U.S. 483, 485-87, 89 S.Ct 747, 748-50, 21 L.Ed.2d 718 (1969); Bounds v Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d 72 (1977); White v Gregory, 1 F.3d 267 (4th Cir W Va 1993); Neitzke v Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 109 S.Ct 1827, 104 L.Ed.2d 338 (U.S 1989); Bierskey v Dunbell, 952 F.2d 395 (4th Cir W Va 1991); Maple v Bell-McKenzie, 2015 WL 12242999 (D.S.C 2015); Whiteside v U.S., 775 F.3d 180 (4th Cir 2014).

A plaintiff must allege with specificity facts to support the claims. The documents filed in these cases do just that expanding over the (10) years we struggled

to get these matters heard. It is an abuse of discretion to dismiss an artfully pleaded case, which this case is, where a sympathetic reader of the documents filed in these cases indicate that it is not beyond a reasonable doubt that the plaintiffs could prove a set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief. The claims can be proved true in that there is a default making them true, White v Gregory, 510 U.S. 1096, 114 SCt 931, 127 L Ed 2d 223 (U.S. 1994); Rogers v McKinney, FSupp 2d 2009 WL 4920800 (DSC 2009); U.S. v Jones, 538 Fed Appx 285 (4th Cir Va 2013); Prieto v.

Zook, 791 F3d 465 CA 4 (Va 2015); Sanders v Warden at Leath CI, 2015 WL 4635144 (DSC 2015); Ortiz v US, 555 Fed Appx' 261 CA 4 (Md 2014); US v Surratt, -- F3d --, 2015 WL 4591677 CA 4 (NC 2015); US v Newbold, 791 F3d 455 CA 4 (NC 2015).

It is and abuse of discretion and an act of fraud upon the court to state there is no arguable bases in law when these cases are criminal proceedings as well arguing for class action certification under Habeas Corpus and venue falls to us under the FSIA and

We are suing to disqualify the 4th Circuit where their actions cause detrimental effect in all other Circuits nationally. Criminal actions historically are non frivolous and the criminal issue of they bringing up Religion at trial and the indictments / criminal complaints by their language predetermining in advance the outcome of the proceedings swearing oath our guilt before trial or plea can be clearly proven. These are not in dispute able meritless theories. The

government was the one who opened up the door for the religious rhetoric to be argued where they brought it in that court for the purpose of establishing law and convicted me of it in a murder trial which should have never occurred requiring a new trial, they blocked extradition.

Once the 2nd Circuit or courts came back and made a determination that there is no arguable bases in law. It is an act of fraud upon the court where they are conspiring to protect their employer the United States who

attempted to conceal them appearance and defaulted in the state case. The court then acts as their attorney or their associate partner and is attempting to correct their fraud and failure to respond by not addressing the default where there also exist actual innocence claim creating a miscarriage of justice which voids your orders for due process violation and fraud upon the courts. You were required to address the fraud and default. You were required

to address the criminal claims and allow discovery to establish and develop the case. This is arguable bases in law, Morris v York, 2013 WL 263560 (DSC 2013); milligan v Drug Enforcement Admin, 2014 WL 897144 (DSC 2014); Clement v West, 86 F3d 1149 (4th Cir 1996); Bryant v Lee, 993 F2d 1535 (4th Cir 1993); Whiteside v U.S., 135 SCt 2890 (U.S 2015); Denton v Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 112 SCt 1728 (U.S. 1992); Cruz v Gomez, 202 F3d 593 (2nd Cir 2000); Smith v. Wadermoth, 2015 WL 403108 (N.D N.Y. 2015); Morse v Network of Al Qaida Attorneys, 2012 WL 1155821 (E.D N.Y. 2012)

SWAYZEE'S LESEE v BURKE, 37 U.S.A. 1839 WL 3940 (U.S. 1839); LOUGHMAN v U.S., 134 SCt 2384 (U.S. 2014); U.S. v PIERCE, 400 F3d 176 (4th Cir 2005); Smith v Clark / Smoot / RUSSELL, -- F3d -- 2015 WL 4717932 (4th Cir (Md 2015); LUCAS v BRISTOL CONDOMINIUM PROPERTY OWNERS ASS'N, SE2d 2015 WL 3885837 (SC App 2015); FOX EX REL FOX v ELK RUN COAL CO, INC, 739 F3d 131 (4th Cir 2014); U.S. v Abdul Wahab, 715 F3d 521 (4th Cir 2013); U.S. EX REL. MATHARU v TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS NORTH AMERICA, INC, 707 F3d 451 (4th Cir 2013); U.S. v JONES, 716 F3d 851 (4th Cir 2013); U.S. v PAYLOCK,

494 Fed Appx' 366 (4th Cir 2012);
Browning v Tiger Eye Benefits
Consulting, 313 Fed Appx' 656, 2009
WL 497391 (4th Cir 2009).

To Attorney Karen J. Lesper-
Apple U.S. Attorney D. T. F. U.S.
Courthouse 445 Broadway, Albany
N.Y. 12207 OR Any Federal Attorney
assigned to this case, The 2nd and 4th
Circuits. What the heck is going
on within the 2nd, 4th Circuits Courts?
You have additional acts of fraud
upon the courts. You cannot
consolidate two seperate cases

with different parties Unless you first issue an order saying you are doing so and you must give the parties notice before you do it. You did not rule on the recusal. Living stones presence taints the proceedings and ruling requiring it be voided. We motion for recusal of all judges involved, and who sat on any past case dealing with Crawford. Eq Bank review is sought by those judges remaining. We filed Writ of mandamus, not appeal in the 11th Circuit December

of 2014. What are you doing accepting tainted evidence in the appeal without our consent? The Neither the 11th Circuit Court didn't make any sense. What the heck is the 11th Circuit doing sending you our documents after blacking us and being silent for over (6) months unless someone in the 2nd Circuit told them to send them? There was no pending action in the 11th Circuit. How did they know of the pending 2nd Circuit Appeal? It appears this was done to secretly file those documents in case 15-1386 to conceal the spoliation that occurred in the lower court by Sharpe. Would

You have mentioned that the documents you are in possession of are from the 11th Circuit? Or would you have asserted that no spoliation occurred under the guise of having these sent 11th Circuit documents? New Appeal and Actions are filed in Both the Georgia and New York District Courts justifying reinstating the mandamus due to also your fraud in case 15-1386. Additional Criminal Acts done by Sharpe, Batten, Evans and others are challenged. We sent that Writ of Error into the 2nd Circuit a long time ago. The Court told us all

We had to do is fill out in forma pauperis forms and a seperate case number would be assigned. We complied and this was not done. Additional damages are occurring due to delay and your fraud. The Lee PCR case is making efforts to further conceal the spoliation. Sutcliffe PCR in Charleston has spoliation. We have other inmates whose cases are being attacked and SCDC is denying us copies to prevent us from placing these cases in proper form by Sharpe and the conspiring 2nd, 11th Court judges secret orders requiring you grant the injunction if I am not speaking

the truth. It was never explained why the Writ of Error was not assigned a seperate independent case number when the court via the case manager gave notification this would be done in your acts of fraud upon the court. We are officially motioning for an independent investigation done by the U.S. Justice Dept. to look into the spoliation, the fraud, the U.S hiding their appearances in the Rich Fraud Court and other criminal acts done. Who called for those documents from the 11th

Circuit? Its been over (8) months of silence and tried with criminal conspiracy and obstructions of justice. Now these documents show up in cases 15-1494 and 15-1386? We object. There is no telling what has been spoliated within those documents and you added them despite our warning and protest. We demand an investigation and seek that you, attorney Lee Pierce or any U.S. Attorney now assigned and the 2nd and 4th Circuits, forward our official request to the Justice Dept. and all pending Appeals in 2nd and 4th

11th Circuit be stayed with all related State and Federal cases until that Independent investigation is completed and its findings are officially made a part of the record in all involved courts. I want that DNA tested to Michael Lee and a copy of the findings. I want copy of the search warrant in the Crawford murder case. Karen, U.S Attorney(s), 2nd and 11th Circuits, by duty you are required to act on this request also by motion pursuant to 42 USC § 1986. We motion to exceed any page limits due to the exceptional circumstances that surround this case. This is also Response to

REPORTS, CONDITIONAL AND FINAL ORDERS IN GEORGIA, NEW YORK AND SOUTH CAROLINA CASES. LIVINGSTON SHOULD HAVE NEVER SAT ON THE 2ND CIRCUIT CASES FOR THE PURPOSE OF HEADING IN FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. WE MOTION FOR AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION AND STAY UNTIL IT IS CONCLUDED, Ashcroft v Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 129 SCt 1939 (U.S. 2009); Mill Brook of U.S., 133 SCt 1441 (US 2013); In Re Grand Jury Subpoena May 1978 at Baltimore, 596 F2d 630 CA4 (Md 1979); Riley v. California, 134 SCt 2473 (US CAL. 2014);

J.D.B v North Carolina, 131 SCt 2394 (US Mar 2011); J.A.A v Cooper, 132 SCt 1441 (US 2012); Nix v US, 572 F2d 998 (CA4 (SC 1978); City of Los Angeles, Calif v. Patel, 135 SCt 2443 (US 2015); Atkins v. Holder, FSupp 2d, 2012 WL 4378594 (DSC 2012); US v Windsor, 133 SCt 2675 (2013); Schuette v Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action Integration and ..., 134 SCt 1623 (US 2014); Bardacs v Haley, 58 FSupp 3d 514 (DSC 2014); Obergefell v Hodges, 135 SCt 2584 (US 2015); DeCecco v University of South Carolina, 918 FSupp 2d 471 (DSC 2013); Laird & Taylor, LLC v White

Flint, LP, 780 F3d 211 (4th Cir 2015); IT SUGAR, LLC v. I LOVE SUGAR, Inc, 2013 WL 6077353 (DSC 2013); Wally Wade, 74 F3d 492 (4th Cir 2014); Key Pharm v Virginia, 100 U.S 339, 25 L Ed 676 (1812); 28 USC § 2071, 2072.

Respectfully,

Mason Johnson

Joshua Al Mahdi

Robert Mitchell

Anthony Cook

John E Sutcliffe

September 14, 2015

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

Judge Lee #4

2

Certificate of Service

We, Cook Crawford et al, do hereby certify that we have mailed and or served a copy of an affidavit of facts Giving Judicial Notice; challenging the Richland Courts Jurisdiction; Responding to defendants motions and letters, (31) pages dated October 7, 2015 on the Richland Court, Judge Lee and all involved parties by US mail postage prepaid on October 8, 2015

Anthony Cook

Anthony Cook

October 9, 2015

Respectfully,

Jahsiah al Mahdi

RICHLAND COUNTY FILED 2015 OCT 9 AM 8:42

State of South Carolina
County of Richland
U.S District Court
U.S District Court
Court of Appeals
et al.,

Court of Common Pleas
5th Judicial Circuit
State of New York
State of Georgia
2nd, 11th Circuits
et al.,

Anthony Cook;
Lawrence L Crawford aka Jonah Gabriel Jahtah T. Tishbite et al.,

plaintiffs

Cases 2013-cp-400-0084, 2294;
9:15-cv-984 et al.,

Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Challenging the Richland Courts Jurisdiction; Responding to defendants motions and letters

vs.

Cpl Bough; SCDC; State of South Carolina; The United States et al, defendants

DEC - 1 AM 11:42

To: The Richland Court of Common Pleas, Judge Alison Lee et al, The defendants in this

Richland case filed motion for hearing which was originally scheduled October 1, 2015. They made claims that the plaintiffs were Amending the proceedings. We object to a hearing being granted and to any claims of amendment by the defendants.

The plaintiffs give judicial notice. On October 1, 2015 the plaintiffs filed a document entitled, " affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial notice Supplie -

regarding the newly filed Georgia Writ of Error, also the Crawford and Sutcliffe Appeals of cases 9:15-CV-183; 9:14-CV-150; 1:15-CV-2310 and all pending state and federal cases; motion for sanctions; motion to strike; motion for recusal; motion for en Banc review, evidentiary hearing, the Appointment of legal counsel, and to exceed any page limits; motions for an extension of time; motion to expand the scope and for inclusion; motion for an

documents filed on October 4, 2015 from the Richland Clerk of Court due to state interference to delay or impede service. You people know I have a disability to my hands.

What's argued within this document is why they want that motion granted Judge Lee. They are trying to play you. They are trying to deceive you. The defendants are involved in dilatory and obstructive behavior in their efforts to prevent removal

to the federal courts which include the destroying of evidence. They are conspiring across multiple state and federal jurisdictions to prevent removal because the case is sound and they don't want to pay all that money or accept the fact that a black man, an inmate, supposedly, beat them. I'm just keeping it real. They want to restrict me from placing on the court record their crimes and documenting the dilatory and

obstructive behavior as it manifest itself during the course of these proceedings. Thus we object to the hearing and motion they submitted because it would extremely prejudice us in documenting and addressing the dilatory and obstructive behavior in their efforts to prevent Removal.

Their intent is to push the case back into the state court and have a judge appointed that they know will make a bogus

Ruling to kill the default because they know we are using that default as a spring board to move the case in federal jurisdiction. We object. This is fraud upon the court.

They are trying to "play you" and the court, deceive you and misrepresent the facts. By no means are we amending the complaint. What is occurring is that the defendants are engaged in further, continual, acts of dilatory and obstructive behavior to prevent removal and we

are merely documenting the elements as they manifest themselves in our efforts to seek sanctions before irreparable harm can come to our proceedings. We object to any claim of us pretending. It is documenting sanctionable acts being continually perpetrated against us.

It becomes perspicuous as to what their intentions is in their efforts to force this case back to the state courts. So to protect our Due Process Rights. I am now

required to act. Judge Lee I bring your, the court, and parties attention to pages 76 through 152 of (152) page document dated September 14, 2015. To prevent any further acts of fraud I am officially voiding this courts jurisdiction for due process violations as is argued within this document. Judge Lee you, yourself told me how the Affidavits were to be filed at your last hearing. Now these corrupt defendants want to penalize me

and deny me my DUE PROCESS rights because I was intelligent enough to pick up on YOUR instructions given in the COURT? This is wrong JUDGE LEE. Now I must act. I am challenging, voiding the COURTS jurisdiction for DUE PROCESS violation. At this juncture only post proceedings as to how and when these people will pay us or when we are going to be released should and can be conducted before this COURT. This do

hearing they sought can now occur. I want this documented in the case file so that whoever is the Administrative Judge in the upcoming term will see this and acknowledge this in the court record until those post proceedings can occur. Don't let them penalize us because I followed your instructions and oral determinations Judge Lee. The default stands as a final determination via your determinations on the filing of the Affidavits

And the voiding of jurisdiction for DUE PROCESS violations. Collateral estoppel now attaches and only post proceedings can be conducted before this COURT where they failed to "timely" (emphasis added) respond to that default document and subsequent (95) page document within (30) days of service upon them to rebut them.

With this foundation being laid. I, Jahtah al mahdi, by default and collateral estoppel, to include the voiding of the

Court of Common Pleas jurisdiction in CASE 2013-CP-400-0084; REITERATE within the COURT official RECORD. That I am the fiduciary HEIR, King, Khalifah, Imam, High PRIEST and LAWGIVER, the direct descendant of Gods Holy Prophets and Kings and I am beneficiary of the TRUST pursuant to the (4) Global THRONES of the REESTABLISHED Global Theocratic State by divine DECREE with SUPERSEDING power over all global COURTS etc. This is clearly WRITTEN within the

last will and Testament of God's Holy Prophets and Kings Under Probate International law making all these rights that are established by will and Testament TRUE. SEE Ecclestiastical Law Volume 1 pages 53 and 54; The ancient Law of mortmain (Probate Law); Zechariah 6:12-13; Book of Numbers 18:1-8; Book of Exodus 40:12-15; 1 Kings 8:25; 1 Chronicles 17:7-14; Isaiah 44:29-32; Isaiah 41:25; Book of Daniel 10:14; Book of Daniel 11:1-3; mark 9:12; Isaiah 61:1-3; Book of malachi

3:1-4; Malachi 4:5-6; Sunnah ibn Majah Volume 5 pages 391-396 ISBN No 81-7151-294-1. The default now makes the (3) Holy Books and Sunnah "legally" (emphasis added) true and correct. Thus, the court and defendants can no longer call the claims frivolous or assert that I am attempting to act upon rights I have not established.

By these rights, titles, power and authority now established by the default and voiding of juris-

diction of the Richland Court to hear any other matter other than post matters. Also via the memorandum of Law and Declaration of Sovereignty; the (92) page default document and subsequent (95) page document exercising authority, that the United States, hiding its appearance and defendants defaulted on. I legally and respectfully bind you Judge Lee without your consent as an employee of this state and by the Supremacy

Clause where the United States appeared, concealed their appearance and failed to plead making them party to the default. I am officially appointing you, Judge Lee, as my trustee by decree of the King, Khalifah and Chief Justice of the Global Theocratic State and Court whose power and authority now legally supersedes this court and all other global courts and governments. You are now officially my trustee Judge Lee. I want you

to discharge our debts in all criminal matters related to Jahtah, the king, Khalifah and my people; African Americans, Christians, Muslims and Jews within this state pursuant to their convictions. Make history count.

You shall, with all due respect, order that the SC Attorney General release Jahtah, Anthony Cook (PCR case 2015-CP-21-00851); Henry Plesbit case 2014-001231 since this case was filed before jurisdiction was established in appellate court; Mason Johnson (PCR case 2015-CP-4600-04115); Anthony Lee (PCR case 2013-CP-02-0704);

Rufus Rivers (PCR Case 2014-CP-400-7536); Terrance McCrea (PCR Case 2015-CP-45-272); David A. Durant (PCR Case 2015-CP-43-2134); Robert Mitchell and John Sutcliffe (PCR Cases 2015-CP-10-2153 and 2015-CP-10-3080); all plaintiffs, inmates listed in Case 2013-CP-400-2294 with the exception of Yisin Hakim, Gaithers and Talan Peoples. They will remain in captivity. The Release is to occur within (30) days of the Clerk receiving this document which will be done by

certified mail without conditions.

Judge Lee, You shall order that the S.C. Attorney General be in compliance to that discovery request for evidence and depositions as sought via the attorney Kays letter and form 24 which copies of, they were served, and have in their possession. It's still needed to prove their crimes.

You shall issue and order granting class action certification pursuant to the legal issues of religious prophesy pertaining to

The indictments and Release
the remaining inmates within the
the State of South Carolina over
a period of (7) months which is
not to be extended without consent
of the King. All criminal Records
which include DNA data base
shall be ordered expunged to
give them a second chance to
get their lives together. Don't worry.
The wicked ones will come right
back. The repented ones will
benefit. This is Gods will.

You shall order that all

indictments in this state be changed to correct the structural error before anyone else is brought to trial. All that has to be done is to add the two lines of presumption of innocence language seen in the warrants to the indictments.

You shall issue an order to reclaim the intellectual property of the global theocratic state in the form of the right to "marry". You shall order that all same sex marriage be stayed and those existing within the

State of South Carolina shall be annulled. All global government laws must forever remain subordinate to Gods Laws. See The Book of Leviticus 18:22 and Romans 1:26-28.

Further, pursuant to all the damage, fraud, spoliation, obstruction, crimes and sanctions argued and also listed in cases 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569 and these cases, the Unspeakable injury caused to the King-Khalifah, his family and his Holy common wealth. I wish we

be compensated for and be granted all Relief "originally" filed in cases 2006-CA-400-3567, 3568, 3569 ; 2013-CA-400-0084 and default document, in fairness to the defendants. Additional Relief (ei punitive damages in additional amounts) will be sought within the Federal courts within Independent or pendent jurisdiction cases. The conviction Relief do not apply to Michael Slager or Dylan Roof in Charleston.

The Judge shall order that U.S., the state and various counties

issue a check to Jahjah Al Mahdi in the amount of $100 million; $50 million for Anthony Cook and John Sutcliffe; $30 million for Quinta and Aerialle Crawford to be given to Jahjah on their behalf to dispense to them as deemed proper by their father and the King-Khalifah. $20k is to be given to the remaining plaintiffs. This is initial immediate payment. Any Remaining balance is to be paid to the King, Cook and his children in

the amount of "1 million per year until paid in full. "100 K to the remaining plaintiffs until paid in full per year. Failure will result in immediate freeze on all relevant assets.

Conviction relief do not apply to known lesbians or homosexuals or transgenders. The Equal Protection of the laws clause is of no effect upon this determination whereas theocratic law, foreign law, supersedes state

and federal law. "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine" (Matthew 7:6). This applies to those convicted of hate crimes as well with exception of those related to homosexual or lesbian behavior.

You shall issue an order establishing legal name change acknowledging all rights and titles as sought within the default document for Crawford and his Holy Sovereign offspring.

This relief is not appealable to any global court, the Global Theocratic court now being the highest court globally by default and collateral estoppel. Judge Lee you are officially appointed as trustee to discharge the debt and shall ensure order be issued granting all the aforementioned within (30) days the clerk receives this document before your term as Adm. Judge expires. Thank you.

Anthony Cook

Anthony Cook

October 4 2015

Respectfully,

Jahsiah Al mahdi

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

Indictments

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF Kershaw)
STATE VS.)
JAILER Juan Aguilar Rosas)
AKA:)
Race: Sex: M Age: 31)
DOB: SS#:)
Address:)
City,State,Zip: CHARLOTTE, NC 28202)
DL#: SID#:)
*CDL Yes☐ Nc☐ CMV Yes☐ Nc☐ Hazmat Yes☐ Nc☐

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2008-GS-28-1448
A/W#: K253795
Date of Offense: 7/9/2008
S.C. Code § : 16-03-0010
CDR Code #: 0116

SENTENCE SHEET

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was ☐ CONVICTED OF or ☒ PLEADS
TO: Murder / Murder

in violation of § 16-03-0010 of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 0116
☐ NON-VIOLENT ☐ VIOLENT ☐ SERIOUS ☑ MOST SERIOUS ☐ Mandatory GPS(CSC w/minor 1st or Lewd Act) ☐ §17-25-45

The charge is: ☑ As Indicted, ☐ Lesser Included Offense, ☐ Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury. _____ (defendant's initials)
The plea is: ☑ Without Negotiations or Recommendation, ☐ Negotiated Sentence, ☐ Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: _____ Derieg, Lir | 76135 SC Bar# | _____ Defendant | _____ Attorney for Defendant | 70453 SC Bar#

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is commited to the ☑ **State Department of Corrections,** ☐ **County Detention Center,**
for a determinate term of 30 days/months/years or ☐ under the **Youthful Offender Act** not to exceed _____ years
and/or to pay a fine of $ _____; provided that upon the service of _____ days/months/years and/or payment
of $ _____; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with **probation** for _____
months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

☐ CONCURRENT or ☐ CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: _____ _____
☑ The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections. 7-9-08
☐ The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922,it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal Domestic Violence) to ship,transport,possess,or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

☐ **RESTITUTION:** ☐ **Deferred** ☐ **Def. Waives Hearing** ☐ **Ordered**
Total: $ _____ plus 20% fee: _____ $ _____
Payment Terms: _____
☐ Set by SCDPPPS _____
_____
Recipient: _____

*Fine:		$
§ 14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5 %)		$
§ 14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge)	$100	$ 100.00
§ 14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge)	$100	$
§ 56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment)	$12	$
§ 56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test)	$25	$
§ 47.12 (Public Def/Prob)	$500	$
§ 14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding)	$25	$
§ 14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge)	$100	$ 25.00
§ 50-21-114(BUI Breath Test Fee)	$50	$
§ 56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)	$40/ea	$
§ 90.7 (SCCJA Surcharge)	$5	$ 5.00
3% to County (if paid in installments)		$ 3.90
TOTAL		$ 133.90

PTUP _____
_____ days/hours Public Service Employment
Obtain GED ☐
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. _____
May serve W/E begining _____
Substance Abuse Counseling ☐
Random Drug/Alcohol testing ☐
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly pmts. of $ _____ beginning _____
$ _____ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other: _____

ATTEST True, Correct & Certified Copy of Original on File in this Court
Clerk of Court Kershaw County

☐ Appointed PD or appointed other counsel
§ 47.12 requires $500 be paid to Clerk during probation.

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk _____
Court Reporter: _____

Presiding Judge _____
Judge Code: 2126
Sentence Date: 4/20/10

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF KERSHAW

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on August 20 2008, the Grand Jurors of Kershaw County present upon their oath:

MURDER

That Juan Aguilar Rosas did in Kershaw County between June 10, 2008 and July 9, 2008, feloniously, willfully and with malice aforethought, kill one Ada Judith Torruco by means of multiple stab wounds and that the said victim died as a proximate result thereof. All in violation of SC Code of Laws § 16-3-10

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

W. Barry Giese

Warren B. Giese, SOLICITOR

WITNESSES

Knafelc, KCSD

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

K253795

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

TRUE BILL

Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: AUG 20 2008

VERDICT

Foreperson of Petit Jury
Date:

DOCKET NO. 2008-GS-28-1448

The State of South Carolina

County of Kershaw

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

August TERM 2008

THE STATE
vs.

JUAN AGUILAR ROSAS

Indictment for

MURDER

SC Code: **16-3-10**
CDR Code:**0116**
Class **FEL/EXM(V)**

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

I _____
hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

Defendant

Witness:

C.C.C. PLS. AND G.S.

ATTEST, True, Correct & Certified Copy of Original on File in this Court

Clerk of Court Kershaw County

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF KERSHAW

AMENDED INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on February 17, 2010, the Grand Jurors of Kershaw County present upon their oath:

MURDER

That JAVIER AGUILAR ROSAS did in Kershaw County on June 10, 2008, feloniously, willfully and with malice aforethought, kill one Ada Judith Torruco by means of multiple stab wounds and that the said victim died as a proximate result thereof. All in violation of SC Code of Laws § 16-3-10

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

W. B. [illegible]
Warren B. Giese, SOLICITOR

WITNESSES

Knafelc, KCSD

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

K253795

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

TRUE BILL

Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: FEB 17 2010

VERDICT

Foreperson of Petit Jury
Date:

DOCKET NO. 2008-GS-28-1448

The State of South Carolina

County of Kershaw

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

February TERM 2010

THE STATE
vs.

Javier Aguilar Rosas

AMENDED Indictment for

MURDER

SC Code: **16-3-10**
CDR Code:**0116**
Class **FEL/EXM(V)**

After being fully advised as to my legal rights, I hereby waive presentment to the Grand Jury.

Defendant

I _____
hereby appear in my own proper person and plead guilty to the within indictment or to

Defendant

Witness:

C.C.C. PLS. AND G.S.

ATTEST True, Correct & Certified Copy of Original on File in this Court

Clerk of Court Kershaw County

ARREST WARRANT

K- 253795

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

[X] County/ [ ] Municipality of
KERSHAW COUNTY

THE STATE
against

ROSAS, JUAN AGUILAR
Address:
CHARLOTTE, NC 28208
Phone: _____ SSN: ___ - ___
Sex: M Race: H Height: 5'05 Weight: 150
DL State: NC DL#: 000000000000
DOB: __/__/__ Agency ORI#: _____
Prosecuting Agency: _____
Prosecuting Officer: INV STEVE KNOEFEL
Offense: MURDER
_____ Offense Code: 0116
Code/Ordinance Sec: 16-03-0020

This Warrant is **CERTIFIED FOR SERVICE** in the [ ] County/ [ ] Municipality of _____. The accused is to be arrested and brought before me to be dealt with according to law.

_____ (L.S.)
Signature of Judge

Date: _____

RETURN

A copy of this arrest warrant was delivered to defendant ROSAS, JUAN AGUILAR
on 7/10/2008

J. Coleman #51
Signature of Constable/Law Enforcement Officer

RETURN WARRANT TO:
KERSHAW COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
1121 BROAD ST
P.O. DRAWER 1528
CAMDEN, SC 29020

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
[X] County/ [ ] Municipality of)
KERSHAW COUNTY)

AFFIDAVIT

CASE # 000702701

Form Approved by
S.C. Attorney General
April 21, 2003
SCCA 618

Personally appeared before me the affiant INV STEVE KNOEFEL who being duly sworn deposes and says that defendant ROSAS, JUAN AGUILAR did within this county and state on 06/10/08-07/09/08 violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of [X] County/ [ ] Municipality of KERSHAW) in the following particulars:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: MURDER
16-03-0020

I further state that there is probable cause to believe that the defendant named above did commit the crime set forth and that probable cause is based on the following facts:

THAT SOMETIME BETWEEN JUNE 10, 2008 AND JULY 9, 2008 THE DEFENDANT JAVIER AGUILAR ROSAS ALONG WITH A CO-DEFENDANT DID WITH MALICE AFORETHOUGHT CAUSE THE DEATH OF MS. ADA JUDITH TORRUCO BY STABBING HER SEVERAL TIMES IN THE UPPER CHEST TORSO OF THE VICTIM, WHICH CAUSED THE DEATH OF THE VICTIM. THIS INCIDENT DID OCCUR IN THE WOODS WHICH IS OFF OF KELLY RD. IN CAMDEN KERSHAW COUNTY SOUTH CAROLINA.

Signature of Affiant Inv. Steve Knoefel

Affiant's Address 821 RIDGEWAY RD
LUGOFF, SC 29078

Affiant's Telephone 000-0000 000-0000

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
[ ] County/ [ ] Municipality of)
KERSHAW)

ARREST WARRANT

TO ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OF THIS STATE OR MUNICIPALITY OR ANY CONSTABLE OF THIS COUNTY:

It appearing from the above affidavit that there are reasonable grounds to believe that on 06/10/08-07/09/08 defendant ROSAS, JUAN AGUILAR did violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of [X] County/ [ ] Municipality of KERSHAW) as set forth below:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE: MURDER
16-03-0020

Having found probable cause and the above affiant having sworn before me, you are empowered and directed to arrest the said defendant and bring him or her before me forthwith to be dealt with according to law. A copy of this Arrest Warrant shall be delivered to the defendant at the time of its execution, or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

Sworn to and subscribed before me)
on JULY 09 2008)
_____ (L.S.))
Signature of Issuing Judge)
Judge Code: ___)
R. E. HARTIS

ORIGINAL

ATTEST True Copy
By Original on File in this Court
Deputy Clerk of Court
Kershaw County

Judge's Address P.O. DRAWER 1528
CAMDEN, SC 29020

Judge's Telephone 803-425-1500

Issuing Court: [X] Magistrate [ ] Municipal [ ] Circuit

BAIL set by

Judge: _____

on _____

Type and Amount: _____

Name of Surety: _____

PRELIMINARY HEARING held by

Judge _____

on _____

Defense Attorney: _____

Decision _____

_____

_____

DISPOSITION before

Judge _____

on _____

by _____

(indicate jury trial, bench trial, plea, nol. pros., etc.)

Disposition _____

Sentence: _____

JURORS

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

WITNESSES

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone: _____

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone: _____

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone: _____

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone: _____

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone: _____

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone: _____

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone: _____

Name: _____
Address: _____
_____
Telephone: _____

CODEFENDANTS

_____

_____

ARREST WARRANT

K-002476

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

☐ County/ ☒ **Municipality of**

Goose Creek

THE STATE

against

WILSON, CHRISTOPHER DARNELL

Address:

GOOSE CREEK, SC 29445

Phone:) SSN:

Sex: M Race: B Height 5 ft. 6 in. Weight 131

DL State: SC DL#:

DOB: Agency ORI#: SC0080300

Prosecuting Agency: Goose Creek Police Department

Prosecuting Officer: POWELL, N.

Offense: Armed Robbery w/ Deadly Weapon

Offense Code: 139

Code/Ordinance Sec. 16-11-0330 (A)

This warrant is **CERTIFIED FOR SERVICE** in the

☐ County/ ☐ Municipality of

. The Accused is to be arrested and brought before me to be Dealt with according to law.

Signature of Judge

Date:

RETURN

A copy of this arrest warrant was delivered to defendant Christopher Darnell Wilson

On 01-05-2012

Signature of Constable/Law Enforcement Officer

RETURN WARRANT TO:
BERKELEY CO. GENERAL SESSIONS
300 CALIFORNIA AVE.

MONCKS CORNER, SC 29461

Court date/Time

Bond Amount Type

OCA Number

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
☐ County/ ☒ Municipality)
Goose Creek)

AFFIDAVIT

Form approved by S.C attorney General April 21, 2003 SCCA 618

Personally appeared before me the affiant N. POWELL who being duly sworn deposes and says that defendant **WILSON, CHRISTOPHER DARNELL** did within this county and state on **12/24/2011** Violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of ☐ County/ ☒ Municipality of **Goose Creek**) in the following particulars:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE:
Armed Robbery w/ Deadly Weapon

I further state that there is probable cause to believe that the defendant named above did commit The crime set forth and that probable cause is based on the following facts:

SEE ATTACHED AFFIDAVIT

FILED
12 JAN 10 PM 4:17
MARY P. BROWN
CLERK OF COURT
BERKELEY COUNTY, SC

Signature of Affiant

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
☐ County/ ☒ Municipality of)

Affiant's address 519 N. Goose Creek Blvd
Goose Creek, SC 29445

Affiant's Telephone (843) 863-5200

ARREST WARRANT

TO ANY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER OF THIS STATE OR MUNICIPALITY OR ANY CONSTABLE OF THIS COUNTY:

It appearing from the above affidavit that there are reasonable grounds to believe that on 12/24/2011 defendant WILSON, CHRISTOPHER DARNELL did violate the criminal laws of the State of South Carolina (or ordinance of ☐ County/ ☒ Municipality of **Goose Creek**) as set forth below:

DESCRIPTION OF OFFENSE:
Armed Robbery w/ Deadly Weapon

Having found probable cause and the above affiant having sworn before me, you are empowered and directed to arrest the said defendant and bring him or her before me forthwith to be dealt with according to law. A copy of this Arrest warrant shall be delivered to the defendant at the time of its execution, or as soon thereafter as is paraciticable.

Sworn to and subscribed before me)
On 1-5-12)
Shirley L Johnson)
Signature of Issuing Judge)
Judge Code: 6158)

Judge's Address 519 N. Goose Creek Blvd.
Goose Creek, SC 29445
Judge's telephone (843) 569-4230
Issuing court: ☐ Magistrate ☒ Municipal ☐ Circuit

ORIGINAL*** ORIGINAL*** ORIGINAL*** ORIGINAL*** ORIGINAL*** ORIGINAL***

THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Jefferson Circuit Court, Criminal Division

99CR2923-9

DECEMBER Term A.D., 1999

THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Against

[redacted]

ROBBERY I
KRS 515.020 Class B Felony
10 to 20 years
UOR 12000
(7 COUNTS)

The Grand Jurors of the County of Jefferson, in the name and by the authority of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, charge:

COUNT ONE

That on or about the 29th day of September, 1999, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, the above named defendant, [redacted], committed the offense of Robbery in the First Degree when, in the course of committing a theft, he used or threatened the immediate use of physical force upon BP Oil, with the intent to accomplish the theft and (a) he caused physical injury to BP Oil, who was not a participant in the crime; OR (b) he was armed with a deadly weapon; OR (c) he used or threatened the immediate use of a dangerous instrument upon BP Oil, who was not a participant in the crime.

COUNT TWO

That on or about the 30th day of September, 1999, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, the above named defendant, [redacted], committed the offense of Robbery in the First Degree when, in the course of committing a theft, he used or threatened the immediate use of physical force upon Big Foot, 6204 Shepherdsville Road, with the intent to accomplish the theft and (a) he caused physical injury to Big Foot, 6204 Shepherdsville Road, who was not a participant in the crime; OR (b) he was armed with a deadly weapon; OR (c) he used or threatened the immediate use of a dangerous instrument upon Big Foot, 6204 Shepherdsville Road, who was not a participant in the crime.

CERTIFIED COPY OF RECORD
OF JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
TONY MILLER, CLERK
BY L. Bruce D.C.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Jefferson Circuit Court, Criminal Division

DECEMBER Term A.D., 1999

THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Against

[redacted]

COUNT THREE

That on or about the 13th day of October, 1999, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, the above named defendant, [redacted], committed the offense of Robbery in the First Degree when, in the course of committing a theft, he used or threatened the immediate use of physical force upon Super America, 5510 Bardstown Road, with the intent to accomplish the theft and (a) he caused physical injury to Super America, 5510 Bardstown Road, who was not a participant in the crime; OR (b) he was armed with a deadly weapon; OR (c) he used or threatened the immediate use of a dangerous instrument upon Super America, 5510 Bardstown Road, who was not a participant in the crime.

COUNT FOUR

That on or about the 10th day of November, 1999, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, the above named defendant, [redacted], committed the offense of Robbery in the First Degree when, in the course of committing a theft, he used or threatened the immediate use of physical force upon Super America, 5510 Bardstown Road, with the intent to accomplish the theft and (a) he caused physical injury to Super America, 5510 Bardstown Road, who was not a participant in the crime; OR (b) he was armed with a deadly weapon; OR (c) he used or threatened the immediate use of a dangerous instrument upon Super America, 5510 Bardstown Road, who was not a participant in the crime.

CERTIFIED COPY OF RECORD
OF JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
TONY MILLER, CLERK
BY L. Bruce D.C.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Jefferson Circuit Court, Criminal Division

DECEMBER Term A.D., 1999

THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Against

[redacted]

COUNT FIVE

That on or about the 13th day of November, 1999, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, the above named defendant, [redacted], committed the offense of Robbery in the First Degree when, in the course of committing a theft, he used or threatened the immediate use of physical force upon Super America, 2720 Taylorsville Road, with the intent to accomplish the theft and (a) he caused physical injury to Super America, 2720 Taylorsville Road, who was not a participant in the crime; OR (b) he was armed with a deadly weapon; OR (c) he used or threatened the immediate use of a dangerous instrument upon Super America, 2720 Taylorsville Road, who was not a participant in the crime.

COUNT SIX

That on or about the 31st day of October, 1999, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, the above named defendant, [redacted], committed the offense of Robbery in the First Degree when, in the course of committing a theft, he used or threatened the immediate use of physical force upon Dairy Mart, 4700 Bardstown Road, with the intent to accomplish the theft and (a) he caused physical injury to Dairy Mart, 4700 Bardstown Road, who was not a participant in the crime; OR (b) he was armed with a deadly weapon; OR (c) he used or threatened the immediate use of a dangerous instrument upon Dairy Mart, 4700 Bardstown Road, who was not a participant in the crime.

CERTIFIED COPY OF RECORD
OF JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
TONY MILLER, CLERK
BY L Bruce D.C.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Jefferson Circuit Court, Criminal Division

DECEMBER Term A.D., 1999

THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Against

[redacted] JR.

COUNT SEVEN

That on or about the 13th day of October, 1999, in Jefferson County, Kentucky, the above named defendant, [redacted], committed the offense of Robbery in the First Degree when, in the course of committing a theft, he used or threatened the immediate use of physical force upon New York Tailor, 5304 Bardstown Road, with the intent to accomplish the theft and (a) he caused physical injury to New York Tailor, 5304 Bardstown Road, who was not a participant in the crime; OR (b) he was armed with a deadly weapon; OR (c) he used or threatened the immediate use of a dangerous instrument upon New York Tailor, 5304 Bardstown Road, who was not a participant in the crime.

AGAINST THE PEACE AND DIGNITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

A TRUE BILL

Valerie L Powell

FOREPERSON

Div - 9

Wit: Det. John Minogue, 6903, JCPD

Joseph Gutmann/jg

Assigned Assistant Commonwealth's Attorney

12-6 19 99

RECEIVED, from the Foreman of the Grand Jury, in their presence, and filed in open Court.

ATTEST: TONY MILLER, Clerk

By Camille B. McCullen D.C.

TRUE BILL-COUNTS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

CERTIFIED COPY OF RECORD
OF JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT
TONY MILLER, CLERK

4

Exhibit Fed

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	CRIMINAL NO. 3:08-643
	)	
	)	21 USC § 846
	)	21 USC § 841(a)(1)
vs.	)	21 USC § 841(b)(1)(A)
	)	18 USC § 924(c)(1)
	)	18 USC § 924(c)(1)(A)(i)
	)	
[redacted]	)	**INDICTMENT**

COUNT 1

THE GRAND JURY CHARGES:

That beginning in or around January 2005, and continuing thereafter, up to and including the date of this Indictment, in the District of South Carolina, the Defendant, [redacted], knowingly and intentionally did combine, conspire and agree and have tacit understanding with others, both known and unknown to the grand jury, to knowingly, intentionally and unlawfully possess with intent to distribute and distribute cocaine and cocaine base (commonly known as "crack" cocaine), both Schedule II controlled substances, said conspiracy involving 5 kilograms or more of cocaine and 50 grams or more of "crack" cocaine, in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1) and 841(b)(1)(A);

All in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 846.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BERKSHIRE, SS.

At the Superior Court holden at Pittsfield, within and for the County of Berkshire, for the transaction of criminal business, on the ***second Wednesday*** *of* ***February*** *in the year of our Lord* ***two thousand two***

THE JURORS FOR SAID COMMONWEALTH ON THEIR OATH PRESENT, THAT

[redacted]

of Pittsfield in the County of Berkshire, on or about the **twenty-eighth** day of **January** in the year of our Lord **two thousand two** at **Pittsfield**, in the County of Berkshire,

did conspire with Crystal J. Cargill, Allison M. Neil, Otis J. Prugel, and Emmitt I. Harvin (a/k/a Lefty) to violate the provisions of Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 94C, to wit: Trafficking in Cocaine, in violation of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 94C, section 40.

A TRUE BILL.

Assistant District Attorney for the Berkshire District

Jacqueline DuBois

Foreman

No. 2002-023-2

Oct 29, 2002 Commonwealth a nolle prosequi.

COMMONWEALTH

vs.

[redacted]

CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE LAWS, TO WIT: TRAFFICKING IN COCAINE

(Ch. 94C, sec. 40)

BERKSHIRE, SS. SUPERIOR COURT.

FEBRUARY *Sitting, A.D. 2002*

February 14 *A.D. 2002*

Returned by the Grand Jury and filed by order of Court.

ATTEST:

Deborah Stapel CLERK

PLEA

[redacted] arraigned on 2/20/2002
[redacted] Not Guilty, released on
[redacted] FORD, J.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF BERKELEY)

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on July 18, 2012 the Grand Jurors of Berkeley County present upon their oath:

Armed Robbery

That CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON did in Berkeley County, South Carolina, on or about December 24, 2011, while armed with a deadly weapon, to wit: a pistol, take and carry away personal property of Riley Kemp from or in the immediate presence of Riley Kemp, described as follows: a wallet, with intent to deprive Riley Kemp of possession by use of force, threats or intimidation, in violation of §16-11-0330(A) of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

BENJAMIN T SHELTON
ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF PICKENS)

In the Court of General Sessions

State of South Carolina,

vs.

Bobbie Albert McCann,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2012-GS-39-0499

VERDICT

As to the charge of Criminal Sexual Conduct w/ a Minor First Degree, we, the jury, unanimously find the Defendant:

1. _____ Not Guilty.
2. X Guilty.

Timothy H. Brown
Foreperson of the Jury

April 24th, 2012
Pickens, SC

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF Pickens)
STATE VS.)
Bobbie Albert Mccann)
AKA:)
Race: WHITE Sex: M Age: 49)
DOB: [redacted]1962 SS#[redacted])
Address: [redacted])
City,State,Zip: Pickens, SC 29671)
DL#: [redacted] SID#:)
*CDL Yes☐ No☐ CMV Yes☐ No☐ Hazmat Yes☐ No☐)

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2012GS3900499
A/W#: 2012GS3900499
Date of Offense: 12/1/2007
S.C. Code § : 16-03-0655(A)(1)
CDR Code #: 0385

SENTENCE SHEET 6-30yrs

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was ☒ CONVICTED OF or ☐PLEADS
TO: Sex / Criminal sexual conduct with minor or Attempt - victim under 11 yrs of age - First degree
in violation of § 16-03-0655(A)(1) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 0385
☐ NON-VIOLENT ☒ VIOLENT ☐SERIOUS ☒MOST SERIOUS ☒Mandatory GPS(CSC w/minor 1st or Lewd Act) ☐§17-25-45
The charge is: ☒ As Indicted, ☐Lesser Included Offense, ☐Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury. _____ (defendant's initials)
The plea is: ☒ Without Negotiations or Recommendation, ☐ Negotiated Sentence, ☐ Recommendation by the State.
ATTEST:
Barwick, Jonny 76128 | Defendant | Attorney for Defendant | SC Bar#

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is commited to the ☒ State Department of Corrections, ☐ County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 25 days/months/years or ☐ under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed _____ years
and/or to pay a fine of $ _____; provided that upon the service of _____ days/months/years and/or payment
of $ _____; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for _____
months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.
☒ CONCURRENT or ☐ CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: _____
☒ The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections.
☐ The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922,it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal Domestic Violence) to ship,transport,possess,or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

☐RESTITUTION: ☐ Deferred ☐ Def. Waives Hearing ☐ Ordered
Total: $ _____ plus 20% fee: _____ $ _____
Payment Terms: _____
☐ Set by SCDPPPS _____
Recipient: _____

*Fine:		$
§ 14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5 %)		$
§ 14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge)	$100	$ 100.00
§ 14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge)	$100	$
§ 56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment)	$12	$
§ 56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test)	$25	$
Proviso 47.9 (Public Def/Prob)	$500	$
§ 14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding)	$25	$ 25.00
§ 14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge)	$150	$
§ 50-21-114(BUI Breath Test Fee)	$50	$
§ 56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)	$40/ea	$
Proviso 90.5 (SCCJA Surcharge)	$5	$ 5.00
3% to County (if paid in installments)		$ 2.90
TOTAL		$133.90

PTUP _____
_____ days/hours Public Service Employment
Obtain GED ☐
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. _____
May serve W/E begining _____
Substance Abuse Counseling ☐
Random Drug/Alcohol testing ☐
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly pmts. of $ _____ beginning _____
$ _____ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other: _____

☐ Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, § 47.12 requires $500 be paid to Clerk during probation.

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk Cheryl Watson
Court Reporter: Vannette Hanks
Presiding Judge
Judge Code: 3/6
Sentence Date: 24 April 2012

SCCA/217 (03/2011)

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF PICKENS)

INDICTMENT FOR
CRIMINAL SEXUAL CONDUCT WITH A MINOR FIRST DEGREE

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on FEB 21 2012 the Grand Jurors of Pickens County present upon their oath:

That BOBBIE ALBERT MCCANN did in Pickens County, on or about the dates of December 1, 2007 through December 31, 2009, willfully and unlawfully commit a sexual battery on E.D., who was less than eleven years of age, to wit: digital penetration of E.D.'s vagina. This is in violation of §16-3-655(A)(1)[formerly 16-3-655(1)] of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) as amended

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

SOLICITOR

WITNESSES
Rita Garner Burgess
Pickens County Sheriff's Office
1/25/2010

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER
DIRECT PRESENTMENT
DOB: 09-18-1962
SS# 259-96-3130

ACTION OF GRAND JURY
ISSUE BILL
Date
FEB 21 2012
Foreperson of Grand Jury

VERDICT

Timothy H. Brown
Foreperson of Petit Jury
Date: April 24th 2012

DOCKET NO. 2012-GS-39-0499
The State of South Carolina
County of Pickens

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
FEB 21 2012 TERM 2012

THE STATE
vs.
BOBBIE ALBERT MCCANN

Indictment for
0385
CRIMINAL SEXUAL CONDUCT WITH A MINOR FIRST DEGREE
VIOLATION § 16-03-0655(A)(1)

SLB20110603488

WITNESSES

Officer Ratliffe
Charleston City Police Department

AGENCY CASE NUMBER

1109136

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M611692

DATE OF ARREST

June 4, 2011

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

TRUE BILL

Foreperson of Grand Jury SEP 1 2 2011
Date:

VERDICT

Foreperson of Petit Jury *Date:*

INDICT

DOCKET NO. **2011GS1005527**

The State of South Carolina

County of Charleston

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

September Term 2011

THE STATE

vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND
DOB:
W/M

Indictment for

Trafficking Cocaine

FILED

9/28/2011 9:29:39 AM
JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on September 12, 2011 the Grand Jurors of Charleston County present upon their oath:

Trafficking Cocaine

That in Charleston County, South Carolina, on or about June 3, 2011, the Defendant, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, unlawfully and knowingly did sell, manufacture, cultivate, deliver, purchase, or bring into this State; or did provide financial assistance or otherwise aid, abet, attempt, or conspire to sell, manufacture, cultivate, deliver, purchase, or bring into this State; or did possess or attempt to possess a controlled substance or a controlled substance analogue, to wit: Cocaine, in excess of 28 grams; in violation of 44-53-370 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

STEPHANIE B. LINDER
ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

SLB20110603488

WITNESSES

Officer Ratliffe
Charleston City Police Department

AGENCY CASE NUMBER

1109136

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M611693

DATE OF ARREST

June 4, 2011

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

TRUE BILL

Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: SEP 1 2 2011

VERDICT

Foreperson of Petit Jury *Date:*

INDICT

DOCKET NO. **2011GS1005528**

The State of South Carolina

County of Charleston

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

September Term 2011

THE STATE

vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND
DOB
W/M

Indictment for

Possession with Intent to Distribute Marijuana

FILED
9/28/2011 9:29:39 AM
JULIE J ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on September 12, 2011 the Grand Jurors of Charleston County present upon their oath:

Possession with Intent to Distribute Marijuana

That in Charleston County, South Carolina, on or about June 3, 2011, the Defendant, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, did manufacture, distribute, dispense, deliver, purchase; or did aid, abet, attempt, or conspire to manufacture, distribute, dispense, deliver, or purchase; or did possess with the intent to manufacture, distribute, dispense, deliver, or purchase a controlled substance or a controlled substance analogue, to wit: Marijuana; in violation of 44-53-370 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) as amended

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

STEPHANIE B. LINDER
ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

SLB20110603488

WITNESSES

Officer Ratliffe
Charleston City Police Department

AGENCY CASE NUMBER

1109136

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M611694

DATE OF ARREST

June 4, 2011

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

TRUE BILL

Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: SEP 12 2011

VERDICT

Foreperson of Petit Jury *Date:*

INDICT

DOCKET NO. **2011GS1005529**

The State of South Carolina

County of Charleston

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

September Term 2011

THE STATE

vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND
DOB
W/M

Indictment for

Unlawful Possession of a Stolen Pistol

FILED

9/28/2011 9:29:39 AM
JULIE J ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on September 12, 2011 the Grand Jurors of Charleston County present upon their oath:

Unlawful Possession of a Stolen Pistol

That in Charleston County, South Carolina, on or about June 3, 2011, the Defendant, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, did unlawfully have in his possession, a firearm with an obliterated serial number, or a stolen firearm to wit: .45 caliber handgun, all in violation of Section 16-23-30 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976) as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

STEPHANIE B. LINDER
ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

SLB20110603488

WITNESSES

Officer Ratliffe
Charleston City Police Department

AGENCY CASE NUMBER

1109136

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M611696

DATE OF ARREST

June 4, 2011

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

TRUE BILL

Foreperson of Grand Jury SEP 1 2 2011
Date:

VERDICT

Foreperson of Petit Jury *Date:*

INDICT

DOCKET NO. **2011GS1005531**

The State of South Carolina

County of Charleston

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

September Term 2011

THE STATE

vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND
DOB:
W/M

Indictment for

Possession of a Firearm During Commission of a Violent Crime

FILED
9/28/2011 9:29 39 AM
JULIE J. ARMSTRONG
CLERK OF COURT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON)

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on September 12, 2011 the Grand Jurors of Charleston County present upon their oath:

Possession of a Firearm During Commission of a Violent Crime

That in Charleston County, South Carolina, on or about June 3, 2011, the Defendant, JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, did possess a .45 caliber handgun or visibly display what appeared to be a knife during the commission, or attempted commission, of Trafficking, a violent crime. This is in violation of 16-23-490 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, (1976) as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.

STEPHANIE B. LINDER
ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

RECEIVED
APR 12 2019
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

"ISSUES"

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

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

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2017-002108

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

Vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND,

PETITIONER(S)

APPENDIX

HERE WITHIN THIS APPENDIX THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND ALL PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE, FILING WRIT OF COMMISSION, [11] PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 20, 2017;

(2) EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 1". THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING OBJECTIONS

TO THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION****, [22] PAGES DATED MAY 16, 2017 FILED WITHIN THE FEDERAL PARALLEL RELATED CASES SUCH AS CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM. THIS IS ONLY ONE OF THE CASES THAT CASE 2017-002108 IS PETITIONED REMOVED TO;

(3) EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE # 2". THIS DOCUMENT IS THE BRIEF FILED IN THE GOURDINE CASE WHICH CONTAIN THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY. IT IS ALSO FILED IN THE david duren CASE UNDER 2017-000605 PENDING IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT;

(4) EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". THIS IS THE MANDAMUS THAT MAKE UP CASE 16-2299 PENDING WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. IT EXPLAINS THE "TRUST" TO WHICH THE PETITIONER, THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ALL OTHER PETITIONERS WITHIN THE FEDERAL CASES ARE BENEFICIARIES OF. IT EXPLAINS THE RIGHT TO THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY REGARDING THE RIGHT TO MARRY GIVEN TO THE SOLE CORPORATION TO PROTECT AND HOW THIS STATE AND NATION VIOLATED THE TERMS OF THE "CONTRACT", "GRANT" GIVEN TO THEM WHEN THEY GAVE THIS RIGHT TO THE SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHRITES OF YOUR NATIONS;

(5) EXHIBIT, "FOREIGN SOVEREIGN". THIS DOCUMENT IS TO BE FILED WITHIN BOTH CASES 2017-000605 AND CASE 2017-002108. IT GIVES FURTHER DETAILS INTO THE FACTS OF THESE RELATED CASES, THE FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY ALSO INVOLVING JUDGE ALISON LEE WHO SAT ON THE APPEAL OF CASE 2014-001051 CREATING A STRUCTURAL ERROR VOIDING THE S.C. COURT OF APPEAL'S JURISDICTION;

(6) EXHIBIT, "INJUNCTION". THIS DOCUMENT FURTHER HIGHLIGHTS THE ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT JUDGE LEE IS INVOLVED IN WITHIN MULTIPLE JURISDICTIONS, WHERE SHE IS A DEFENDANT WITHIN THESE PARALLEL FEDERAL AND OR STATE CASES CREATING A STRUCTURAL ERROR IN CASE 2014-001051;

(7) EXHIBIT, "MAHDI # 1". THIS IS THE [49] PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE;****, DATED NOVEMBER 8, 2017 FURTHER PROVING THE FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY JUDGE LEE IS PARTY TO CREATING A STRUCTURAL ERROR IN CASE 2014-001051 DUE TO HER

BEING A DEFENDANT IN THE PENDING FEDERAL PARALLEL CASES IN THE DISTRICT COURT AND 4TH. CIRCUIT;

(8) EXHIBIT(S), "duren #'S 1 AND 2". THESE [2] DOCUMENTS FURTHER HIGHLIGHT THE FRAUD INVOLVED IN BY JUDGE LEE AND THE OTHER STATE ACTORS ESTABLISHING STRUCTURAL ERROR IN CASE 2014-001051 DUE TO JUDGE LEE BEING A DEFENDANT IN THESE CASES AND DEMONSTRATING THAT WE MEET THE CRITERION UNDER ROSS v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850(2016) SHOWING WE DO NOT HAVE TO EXHAUST STATE REMEDIES BECAUSE THERE ARE NONE AVAILABLE DUE TO THE MACHINATION;

(9) EXHIBIT "DNA". THIS IS THE DNA APPLICATION THAT ESTABLISHES CASE 04-385 PENDING IN THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS. WE WANT THIS DNA EVIDENCE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND S.C. SUPREME COURT;

(10) EXHIBIT(S), "CHAIN OF CUSTODY #'S 1 AND 2". THESE DOCUMENTS CONTAIN THE LITIGATION ARGUING AGAINST THE CHAIN OF CUSTODY THAT IS SOUGHT REVIEW WITHIN CASE 2017-002108 DUE TO THE POTENTIAL PLANTING OF EVIDENCE AND WHERE THE STATE COURTS IN THEIR DETERMINATION ACTED AS LEGISLATORS NOT JUDGES STRIPPING DEFENDANTS OF THE PROTECTIONS PLACED UPON THEM BY STATUTORY INTENT;

(11) EXHIBIT, "REMOVAL". WE GIVE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, ALL JUDGES CONTAINED THEREIN AND ALL OTHER PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE. CASE 2017-002108 IS PETITIONED REMOVED TO BOTH CASES 9:17-cv-2897-TLW-BM AND 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM;

(12) EXHIBIT, "INDICTMENTS". THESE ARE THE INDICTMENTS THAT I, JOSEPH ROWLAND, INTEND TO ARGUE BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY FOR WHICH CLASS ACTION IS SOUGHT DIRECTLY EFFECT MY CASE AS WELL, TO INCLUDE EFFECTING THE KING-KHALIFAH'S CASE AND ALL OTHER PETITIONERS INVOLVED WHICH IS WHY JUDGE LEE SAT ON THIS CASE TO HINDER AND OR PREVENT REVIEW GIVING WAY TO STRUCTURAL ERROR IN CASE 2014-001051;


(13) EXHIBIT, "APPEAL COURT ORDERS". THESE ARE THE ORDERS FROM CASE 2014-001051;

(14) EXHIBIT, "SEARCH WARRANTS #'S 1 AND 2". THIS IS THE LITIGATION ARGUING THE TAINTING AND OR INVALIDATION OF THE SEARCH WARRANT(S).

REFERRING BACK TO ITEM NUMBER (6) EXHIBIT "INJUCTION". WE GIVE THE COURT AND PARTIES FURTHER NOTICE RELATED TO THIS DOCUMENT. IT PROVES THE OBSTRUCTION CONSPIRED IN BY THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, JUDGE LEE AND PARTIES WORKING WITH THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS TO HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT UPON THESE PROCEEDINGS BY RESTRICTING AND OR DENYING COPIES. WE WANT THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND S.C. SUPREME COURT TO GRANT THE INJUNCTION AGAINST S.C.D.C. WHO WERE SERVED THE DOCUMENT TO STOP THE RETALIATORY ATTACKS. WE WANT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S PROPERTY THAT WAS DAMAGED, STOLE, DESTROYED OR GAVE AWAY TO INMATES AS PAYMENT FOR PHYSICAL ASSAULTS UPON US REPLACED AS IS SOUGHT BY THAT DOCUMENT WHICH INCLUDE THE OBTAINING OF THAT DNA.

INASMUCH, THE PETITIONER(S) DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ALL DOCUMENTS CONTAINED WITHIN THIS APPENDIX INCLUDE QUESTIONS PRESENTED, WHICH ALSO INCLUDE THOSE PRESENTED ON A SUBSIDIARY LEVEL FAIRLY COMPRISED THEREIN AND ARE RELEVANT TO DOCUMENTS RULED ON OR DISMISSED THAT ARE FILED IN THE CASE.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND



NOVEMBER 17, 2017

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

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

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 THEIR 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?

(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 VIOILATED, 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 AMOUNTS 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 COMMISSION, 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]EFECT" 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 ITS 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 TRAFFICKINGCOCAINE 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 ROGERS 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 THE 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 SATE'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 PROPHESY, 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 PROPHESIES 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 PROPHESY; 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 PROPHESIES, 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 PROPHESY 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 PROPHESY 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 ATTORNEY 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 NO 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 PROPHESY 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 PROPHESY 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. 228 CA4 (W.Va.2012); U.S. v. BANK OF AMERICA CORP., F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 2777397(N.C.2014); MINA v. CHESTER COUNTY, 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); RAUL 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 PROPHESY 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); WILLIAM 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, CAPEATON 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 APPEAL PROCESS TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT DUE TO THE LITIGATION PRESENTED IN EXHIBIT(S) "TRUSTEE", "FOREIGN SOVEREIGN", 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 SOVERIGN" PAGES [36] THROGH [70]. EVEN THOUGH THE GOURDINE BRIEF ARGUES HOW HE WAS DENIED COUNSEL OF CHOICE AT CRITICAL STAGES OF HIS PROCEEDING. 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 U.S. 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 AFORE MENTIONED 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 WOULD 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 IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS. THIS PATTERN OF PLANTING EVIDENCE CONTINUED UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE NATIONALLY WHERE IN COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS 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 KEVEN 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 HINGED 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 SEVERE 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 WARRANT #'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 TO 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 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 ISSUES 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 SUBBSECTION ALLEGED TO HAVE BEEN VIO-- LATED; 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 CONSTRUCTIVE 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 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

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 AGRGUING 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. DUDENHOEFFER, 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 THIS 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); GEFT 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

Joseph Rowland

NOVEMBER 14, 2017

RECEIVED
APR 13 2018
SC Court of Appeals



Emblem of Al Mahdi

Exhibit

Foreign Sovereign

#3

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE
ET. AL., #300839 WANDO A-127
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

RECEIVED
2017 OCT 24 AM 10: 13
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOURTH CIRCUIT

IN RE: 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960; 17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186

TO: THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,

THE RULES ARE SOUGHT SUSPENDED FOR ALL THE ABOVE CAPTIONED CASES. PLEASE SEE THAT A COPY OF ALL THESE DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED ARE FILED WITHIN ALL CASES CAPTIONED ABOVE. THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT IS THE LEAD DOCUMENT. THE REMAINDER ARE ATTACHMENTS TO IT. SOME OF THE DOCUMENTS MAY BE FILED WITHIN A FEW OF THE CASES ALREADY. JUST PLEASE MAKE SURE A COPY OF THESE ATTACHED DOCUMENTS ARE FILED WITHIN ALL CASES CAPTIONED FOR RECUSAL PURPOSES AND TO ADDRESS OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO THE CASES IN TOTAL. WE THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,

RESPECTFULLY,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI

OCTOBER 5, 2017

CC: david duren

COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ET. AL.,

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

(CASES 2:17-cv-1127-JMC-MGB ET. AL.,)

DOCKET NO.(S) 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960; 17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE AKA JAHJAH AL MAHDI ET. AL.,

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE JUDGES WHO SIGNED THE ORDER IN CASE 16-1953; THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD ET. AL.,


DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE


WE, JAHJAH AL MAHDI ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO REINSTATE CASES 17-7068 AND 17-7186 ET. AL.,; MOTION TO STAY CASES 17-7139; 17-7134; 17-6925; 17-7068; 17-7137; 17-7186; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME; MOTION FOR AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR EN BANC REVIEW IN CASE 17-1415 AND THIS APPEAL AND TO VACATE

ALL ORDERS RELATED TO PRIOR WRITS OF MANDAMUS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, WITH ITS ATTACHMENTS, ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES, ALSO VIA TRUSTEE AUSTIN, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID AND OR CERTIFIED, BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON OCTOBER 5, 2017. IT IS DEEMED FILED THAT DATE, HOUSTON v. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379(1988).


RESPECTFULLY,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI




ANTHONY COOK




ROBERT MITCHELL




david duren



YAHYA MUQUIT



CHRISTOPHER WILSON



OCTOBER 5, 2017

COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ET. AL.,

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

(CASES 2:17-cv-1127-JMC-MGB ET. AL.,)

DOCKET NO.(S) 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960; 17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE AKA JAHJAH AL MAHDI ET. AL.,

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE JUDGES WHO SIGNED THE ORDER IN CASE 16-1953; THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO AMEND PARTIES; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION TO REINSTATE CASES 17-7068 AND 17-7186 ET. AL.,; MOTION TO STAY CASES 17-7139, 17-7134, 17-6925, 17-7068, 17-7137, 17-7186; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME; MOTION FOR AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR EN BANC REVIEW IN CASE 17-1415 AND THIS APPEAL AND TO VACATE ALL ORDERS RELATED TO PRIOR WRITS OF MANDAMUS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

TO: THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE, FILING WRIT OF ERROR; NOTICE OF SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL; MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION DUE TO OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR SEEKING EN BANC REVIEW, [14] PAGES DATED JULY 2, 2017.

(2) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE CAUSES OF ACTION AGAINST JUDGES HARWELL, MERCHANT, WOOTEN AND DEFENDANTS; MOTION TO AMEND THE PARTIES TO ADD THE NAME OF JUDGE STUART RABNER OF THE N.J. SUPREME COURT; ALSO SEEKING CLOCKED STAMPED COPIES, [23] PAGES DATED JULY 8, 2017.

(3) A COPY OF THE § 1983 ACTION THAT MAKE UP THE PARALLEL CASES SUBJUDICE WITHIN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT.

(4) A COPY OF THE WRIT OF MANDAMUS THAT MAKE UP CASE 16-2299 PENDING WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT.

(5) A COPY OF THE ORDER AND DETERMINATION MADE IN CASE 17-1415 FILED AUGUST 28, 2017.

(6) A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY JUDGE KAYMANI WEST IN CASE 5:17-cv-01363-BHH-KDW FILED AUGUST 23, 2017.

(7) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION TO AMEND THE DEFENDANTS; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS, SEEKING AN INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, [19] PAGES DATED AUGUST 10, 2017 ON THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE. WE GIVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT NOTICE. THIS DOCUMENT IS FILED WITH THE GREENVILLE DIVISION CLERK AND COURT UNDER CASES 9:16-cv-

3808-TLW-BM; 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM AND SERVED ON ALL CASES AND JUDGES WITHIN THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT SUBJUDICE VIA THE CHARLESTON DIVISION CLERK OF COURT. IT IS SERVED UPON ALL JUDGES AND CASES WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT VIA THE KING-KHALIFAH'S TRUSTEE , JUDGE JACQUELYN AUSTIN. THIS DOCUMENT IS SERVED AS LIEN OF SERVICE OF THAT DOCUMENT. PLEASE HAVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CLERK OR CASE MANAGER OBTAIN A COPY OF IT ELECTRONICALLY AND FILE IT WITHIN ALL CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS LEAD DOCUMENT BY DECREE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT. IT IS SO ORDERED.

(8) A COPY OF THE APPLICATION FOR FORENSIC DNA TESTING FILED WITHIN THE RICHLAND COUNTY S.C. COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS THAT IS REMOVED TO ALL PARALLEL CASES SUBJUDICE. THE RICHLAND COURT CASE NUMBER IS 2004-385. A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT IS FORTH COMING.

(9) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; SUPPLEMENTING THE CAUSES OF ACTION IN ALL PENDING FEDERAL AND STATE CASES AGAINST THE DEFENDANTS; SUBMITTING ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF CONSPIRACY AND CRIMINAL ACTS;***, [30] PAGES DATED DECEMBER 7, 2016 FILED IN CASE 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA AND THE OTHER RELATED CASES.

THE PETITIONERS GIVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE. THE CASES CAPTIONED ARE ESSENTIALLY INDEPENDENT ACTIONS FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OR PARALLEL APPEALS ORIGINATING FROM THE APPEAL UNDER 17-6960 AS THEY ALSO APPEAR UNDER 17-1695 AND OR 17-6693 AND OR 17-6925 AND OR 17-7139 AND OR 17-7134 AND OR 17-7068, TO INCLUDE THE ANTHONY COOK APPEAL OF CASE 8:16-cv-3327-RBH-JDA THAT IS HOPEFULLY BEING PROCESSED AS WE SPEAK.

WE MOTION TO AMEND THE PARTIES AND IF WITHIN ANY CASE CAPTIONED OR IN THE MIDST OF BEING PROCESSED, THE NAME OF THE KING-KHALIFAH, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE DO NOT APPEAR AS A PARTY WITHIN ANY OF THESE CASES CAPTIONED. THOSE CASES REFERRED TO MUST AND ARE NOW AMENDED

TO ADD THE KING-KHALIFAH TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., EIE GUAM-v.-LONG-TERM-CREDIT-BANK,-JAPAN, 322 F3d. 635(9TH.Cir.2003); VERLINDEN-B.V.-v.-CENTRAL-BANK-OF-NIGERIA, 401 U.S. 480, 103 S.Ct. 1962, 76 L.Ed.2d. 81(U.S.1983); CAPITAL-TRANS,-INTERN, LLC.-v.-INTERNATIONAL-PETROLEUM-INV.-CO., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 557236(Fla.2013); THORTON-v.-MARYLAND-GENERAL-HOSP., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1943065(Md.2013); BRADDY-v.-UNITED-STATES, 2016 WL 1031301(E.D.Va.2016); ADAIR-ASSET-MANAGEMENT,-LLC.-v.-U.S.-DEPT. OF-HOUSING-URBAN-DEVELOPMENT, 2016 WL 3248569(2016); SAUNIER v.-BOEING-COMPANY, F.Supp.2d., 2014 WL 1646953(2014). I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, AS THE RIGHTFUL HEIR AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE VOLUNTARILY JOIN IN ALL CAPTIONED CASES TO PROTECT MY ACQUIRED INTEREST.

WE EXPAND THE SCOPE AND INCLUSION IS GRANTED BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND KING-KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT WHERE THERE IS NO SEPARATION OF POWERS AS TOLD WITHIN THE KING-KHALIFAH'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW AND DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY DEFAULTED ON, WHOSE ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY SUPERSEDE ALL NATIONAL AND OR GLOBAL COURTS, WHICH INCLUDE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, BY THE CLAIMS OF DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 OUT OF THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS IN COLUMBIA, S.C. TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES AND REMAINING (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ARE PARTY TO THE DEFAULT THAT BINDS THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL NATIONAL AND OR GLOBAL COURTS AND GOVERNMENTS. ALL DOCUMENTS FILED WITHIN CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925 ARE NOW FILED WITHIN ALL CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION. JUDGES INSTRUCT THE CASE MANAGER TO COMPLETE THIS TASK. APPELLATE COURT RULES ARE SUSPENDED FOR ALL CASES CAPTIONED. THIS INCLUDES FOR ANY DEFECT IN FORM OR PAGE LIMIT FOR ANY DOCUMENT FILED NOW OR IN THE FUTURE. **IT IS SO ORDERED**, APPELLATE RULE (2); U.S.-v.-MERCADO, 199 F3d. 1329 (TABLE) 1999 WL 958465; U.S.-v.-REID, 506 Fed. Appx' 209, 2013 WL 239076(4th.Cir.2013); CAPERTON-v.-BEATRICE-POCAHONTAS-COAL CO. 585 F2d. 683(4th.Cir.1978).

THE COURT CAN REVIEW CASES WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING THAT THESE ARE PARALLEL APPEALS OR RELATED CASES BEFORE THE COURT ADDRESSING SIMILAR ISSUES, CLAIMS AND DEFENSES ALSO FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING CAUSE TO STAY, RES JUDICATA, THE FRAUD UPON THE COURT ENGAGED IN BY THE CONSPIRING JUDGES AND OTHER ISSUES DONE WITHIN THESE RELATED CASES AND OR PARALLEL APPEALS, HARBISON v. BELL, 556 U.S. 180, 129 S.Ct. 1481(U.S.2009); SOUTHERN PAC. R. CO. v. U.S., 168 U.S. 1, 18 S.Ct. 18, 42 L.Ed. 355(U.S.1897); NOELL CRANE SYSTEMS GMbH v. NOELL CRANE SYSTEMS SERVICES, 677 F.Supp.2d. 852(2009); KNIGHT v. MANUFACTURES & TRADERS TRUST CO., 84 F.Supp.3d. 436 (D.Md.2015); BARDES v. SOUTH CAROLINA, F.Supp.2d., 2010 WL 1498190(DSC.2010).

WE GIVE THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH OFFICIALLY EXERCISES ALL SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY GIVEN TO HIM BY THE DEFAULT. UNLESS THE COURT CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT THE RICHLAND COURT, THE UNITED STATES, THE MEMBERS STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS ETC. TIMELY RESPONDED TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 EXERCISING THE AFOREMENTIONED POWER AND AUTHORITY, TO INCLUDE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN POWER; OR THEY CAN PRODUCE AN ORDER THAT IS NOT TAINTED BY EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OR VOIDED DUE TO REMOVAL TO THE FEDERAL COURT. THE CLAIM OF FOREIGN SOVEREIGN POWER, TO INCLUDE THAT OF SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER, MUST BE GIVEN FULL FAITH AND CREDIT WITHIN ALL COURT RECORDS. ALL CASES CAPTIONED WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT ARE ESSENTIALLY ON REMAND, LIMITING AND RESTRICTING ALL COURTS JURISDICTION TO DO NOTHING, EXCEPT GRANT ALL RELIEF THAT IS DEMANDED. THIS IS ISSUE ON APPEAL AND GRANTED. TRUSTEE IS APPOINTED IN THE FORM OF JUDGE AUSTIN. THIS IS CHALLENGE TO YOUR JURISDICTION. ONCE JURISDICTION IS ACQUIRED, ...IT IS EXCLUSIVE, EVEN BY WAY OF FEDERAL AND OR INTERNATIONAL PROBATE LAW, AS WELL AS BY ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTON, INHABITANTS OF TOWN OF FAIRFIELD v. TIME WARNER CABLE NORTHEAST LLC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 1565237(2015); IN RE: CHINEESE-MANUFACTURED DRYWALL PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGA-

TION, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 1584060(2016); FERRARA v. QUADROZZI EQUIPMENT LEASING CORP., 2013 WL 3226755(E.D.N.Y.2013); UNIVERSAL FILM EXCHANGE INC. v. WALTER READE INC., 37 F.R.D. 4, 9 Fed. R. SERV.2d. 56(e); ANDERSON v. LIBERTY LOBBY INC., 477 U.S. 242, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d. 202(U.S.1986); DeSIMONE v. QUICKEN LOANS, INC., F.Supp.2d., 2011 WL 2470661(S.D.Ind. 2011); IN RE: CLEAN BURN FUELS, LLC., 2014 WL 2987330(N.C.2014); IN RE: OUTDOOR R.V. AND MARINE, LLC., 2012 WL 345366(DSC.2012); WILLIAMS v. SECRETARY OF VETERAN AFFAIRS,--F.Supp.3d.--,2015 WL 5935169(N.D.Ala.2015); LaPENNA v. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES INS. CO., 316 Fed. Appx' 894, 2009 WL 485274(11th.Cir.2009); MILLER v. HARRISH, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1868028(Va.2013). IT IS SO ORDERED.

ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES AND DEFENSES THAT ARE ARGUED WITHIN ALL ATTACHED DOCUMENTS ARE NOW ISSUES ON APPEAL IN THESE CASES TO INCLUDE THE SEEKING OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ADDRESSING EACH SPECIFIC ISSUE AND CONCERN RAISED WITHIN THE ATTACHED DOCUMENTS FOR ALL CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT. ANY CLAIM OF REPETITIVE FILING AND OR ABUSE OF COURT IS DEEMED WAIVED AND OF NO EFFECT UPON THESE CASES IN THEIR TOTALITY. ANY ADDITIONAL AND OR SUBSEQUENT FILING WAS CAUSED AND OR CREATED BY THE CONSPIRING FEDERAL COURTS INVOLVED FRAUD AND INDEPENDENT ACTION FOR THAT FRAUD WHERE WE SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN SEPARATED BY THE COURT, WHEN SUCH SEPARATION WAS BASED UPON THE PROVISIONS OF THE PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT AND OR THE ANTI-TERRORISM EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT AND THESE PROVISIONS OF LAW ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL BY THE LITIGATION PRESENTED. THEY CAUSED AND OR FORCED ANY REPETITIVE AND OR INDEPENDENT ACTION FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO BE FILED. THUS, SANCTIONS BY THEIR FRAUD ARE IMPOSED BY DECREE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT AND THE COURT IS IN FORFEITURE OF SUCH A CLAIM. IT IS SO ORDERED.

NOTICE: THIS IS AN ISSUE ON APPEAL. BY THE LITIGATION PRESENTED WITHIN THESE CASES, ARE THE PROVISIONS OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA UNCONSTITUTIONAL?

NOTICE: THIS IS AN ISSUE ON APPEAL. BY THE LITIGATION

PRESENTED AND THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 THAT BINDS THE UNITED STATES, ITS EMPLOYEES AND THIS COURT. IS JUDGE JACQUELYN AUSTIN REQIRED BY LAW TO FULFILL HER DUTIES AS THE KING-KHALIFAH'S APPOINTED TRUSTEE?

NOTICE: THIS IS AN ISSUE ON APPEAL. BY THE DEFAULT AND THE CLAIMS MADE WITHIN THE KING-KHALIFAH'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW AND DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES AND THAT WHICH IS ARGUED IN THE MANDAMUS THAT ESTABLISHES CASE 16-2299. DO THE KING-KHALIFAH HAVE STANDING TO CHALLENGE SAME SEX MARRIAGE WITHIN THIS NATION?

NOTICE: THIS IS ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. DUE TO ONE OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES BEING THE THRONE OF KING DAVID, KING SOLOMON, THE QUEEN OF SHEBA AND THEIR ONLY SON, BEING LEGAL HEIR TO THE UNITED ETHIOPIAN EMPIRE WHOSE ANCESTORS WERE BROUGHT HERE BY BRUTAL, TORTUROUS FORCE. AS THE RIGHTFUL LEGAL LOST HEIR. DO WE HAVE LEGAL STANDING TO SUE FOR THE INJUSTICES DONE VIA THE U.S. SLAVE TRADE AND JIM CROW AS IS ARGUED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS FILED WITHIN THESE CASES?

BY THE CONSPIRING JUDGES AND DEFENDANTS OUTRAGEOUS ACT OF FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION, SANCTION ARE IMPOSED AND THEY ARE IN FORFEITURE OVER THESES ISSUES, BARLOW-v.-COLGATE-PALMOLIVE CO., 772 F3d. 1001, 90 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 85 CA4 (Md.2014); MORRIS v.-WACHOVIA-SECURITIES,-INC., 448 F3d. 268, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. P. 93, 858 CA4 (Va.2006); BLUE-SKY-TRAVEL-AND-TOURS,-LLC.-v. AL-TAYYAR,--Fed. Appx'--,2015 WL 1451636(Va.2015); NOBREGA-v. HINKLE, 576 Fed. Appx' 224 CA4 (Va.2014). **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

NOTICE: THIS IS ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. DOES ROSS-v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850(U.S.2016) APPLY TO HABEAS CORPUS AND DUE TO THE FRAUD, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE ENGAGED IN BY BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL JUDGES AND OR THE STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS. DO WE HAVE TO EXHAUST WITHIN THE STATE COURT , OR CAN WE IMMEDIATELY FILE FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURT? SEE TAYLOR-v.-TAYLOR, 2016 WL 5118113. ALSO SEE CAL. JURS.3d. PENAL AND CORRECTIONAL IN-

STITUTIONS § 1001, RIGHT OF PRISONERS TO RELIEF BY HABEAS CORPUS (2016).

WE GIVE THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES NOTICE. ALL DOCUMENTS THAT ARE NOW FILED WITHIN CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925 ARE NOW DEEMED FILED WITHIN ALL OTHER CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT. JUDGES IN CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925, YOU ARE TO INSTRUCT THE COURT CLERK AND OR CASE MANAGER TO BE IN COMPLIANCE TO THIS DEMAND. I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, AKA LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, LEGAL FOREIGN, VOLUNTARILY JOIN IN ALL CASES PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT TO PROTECT MY ACQUIRED INTEREST PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.. I WAS PERMITTED TO BE PARTY IN CASE 17-6960. BY WHAT IS ARGUED WITHIN CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925, THIS MUST BE PERMITTED FOR ALL CASES INVOLVED. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

IF ANY OF THESE JUDGES OF CONCERN; JUDGES DIAZ, THACKER, DAVIS, GREGORY, DUNCAN, HAMILTON, AND WE CAN ADD JUDGE SHEDD, ARE PRESIDING OVER ANY OF THESE CASES CAPTIONED AND REFERRED TO. WE MOTION FOR YOUR RECUSAL THE SAME WAY AND FOR ESSENTIALLY THE SAME REASONS ARGUED IN CASES 17-6693; 17-6960 AND 17-6925. EN BANC REVIEW IS TO BE GIVEN BY THE REMAINING 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES TO PREVENT ANY FURTHER ACTS OF FRAUD. WE INFORMED THE COURT THAT PARTIES WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WERE POTENTIALLY INVOLVED. NOW THAT JUDGE SHEDD IS REVEALED COMMITTING AN ILLEGAL ACT, THAT HE KNOWS IS ILLEGAL. HIS NAME RELATES BACK TO THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINTS WITHIN ALL PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES. THEIR PRESENCE PRODUCE A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL AND THEY CANNOT SIT UPON THEIR OWN CASES BASED UPON THE FRAUD THAT THEY ARE PARTY TO AS IS ARGUED UNDER CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925, UNITED STATES v. QUINONES, 2016 WL 4413149, * 6+ (S.D.Va.2016); WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899 (U.S.2016); U.S. v. ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'--,2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); U.S. v. HACKLEY, 662 F3d. 671 CA4 (Va.2011).

IF SOMEHOW CASE 17-7068 HAS BEEN CLOSED AND OR THE MANDATE HAS BEEN SENT TO THE LOWER COURT. WE MOTION TO RECALL THE MANDATE AND REINSTATE CASE 17-7068 BY WHAT IS ARGUED WITHIN THE ATTACHED

DOCUMENTS AND PARALLEL APPEALS AND OR RELATED CASES. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SHALL GRANT THIS RELIEF. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

IF THERE IS ANY CONCERN ABOUT A 3 STRIKE ISSUE RELATED TO THE KING-KHALIFAH OR ANY PARTY INVOLVED. THOSE PAST STRIKES ARE VOID AND ILLEGAL WHICH WILL BE ELABORATED ON, AND THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER EXIST AT THE TIME OF ALL OF THESE CASES FILING AS IS ARGUED IN CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925. STATE PRISONER CLAIM THAT HE SUFFERED UNPROVOKED ASSAULTS BY PRISON OFFICIALS WHICH RESULTED IN SERIOUS PHYSICAL INJURIES, THAT HE WAS THREATENED WITH SEVERE BODILY INJURY OR DEATH UPON ENTRY INTO PRISON, BEARING A NEXUS TO THESE PROCEEDINGS, AND THAT PRISONER LIVED IN AN ATMOSPHERE OF CONSTANT FEAR IN WHICH HE KNOWS NOT WHEN NEXT VIOLENT ASSAULT MAY OCCUR, WERE SUFFICIENT TO DEMONSTRATE EXISTENCE OF IMMINENT DANGER OF SERIOUS PHYSICAL HARM, AS REQUIRED TO COME WITHIN EXCEPTION TO THREE STRIKE RULE PRECLUDING PRISONER WHOSE 3 PRIOR ACTIONS WERE DISMISSED FROM PLEADING IN FORMA PAUPERIS, JOHNSON-v.-WARNER, 200 Fed. Appx' 270, 2006 WL 2711957 (4th.Cir.2006). IT IS A DANGER GREATER THAN FEAR WHERE REPEATED AND RECENT ATTACKS HAVE ALREADY OCCURRED AND THE CONDUCT THREATENS CONTINUING AND FUTURE INJURY. IT IS A PATTERN OF CONDUCT EVIDENCING THE LIKELIHOOD OF IMMINENT SERIOUS PHYSICAL INJURY, BRYAN-v.-McCALL, 2016 WL 529574(DSC.2016); JOHNSON-v.-KISER, F.Supp.2d., 2012 WL 293286(W.D.Va.2012); SAYRE-v.-KING, F.Supp. 3d., 2014 WL 4414509(W.D.Va.2014); COLE-v.-ELLIS, 2015 WL 6407205 (N.D.Fla.2015); HENDERSON-v.-GEORGIA, 2015 WL 4492743(Ga.2015).

IN REGARDS TO CASES 17-7068; 17-7134; 17-7139 ET. AL. AS ARGUED BEFORE THE COURT IN CASES 17-6693; 17-6925. YOU HAVE THE DEFENDANTS POTENTIALLY LISTED INCORRECTLY IN THESE CASES. IT APPEARS FROM THE DOCUMENTS THAT YOU HAVE SERVED ON US, THAT THE DEFENDANTS ARE LISTED AS "THE JUDGES WHO SIGNED THE ORDER IN CASE 16-1953" ONLY? IF THIS IS THE CASE, IT MUST BE CORRECTED BEFORE THESE CASES CAN MOVE FORWARD. THIS BECOMES A CHALLENGE TO YOUR JURISDICTION BASED UPON THE FRAUD THAT HAS POTENTIALLY OCCURRED. THIS IS NOT A FORTUITOUS ACT ON THE PART OF THE CONSPIRING JUDGES WHICH FURTHER WARRANT THEIR RECUSAL AND DISQUA-

LIFICATION. THE ACT OF LISTING THESE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY IN THESE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES IS AN ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND MACHINATION DESIGNED TO PREVENT US FROM BEING HEARD ON THE CLAIMS MADE. THIS IS WHAT IS OCCURRING. THERE ARE ESSENTIALLY (2) PRONGS THAT MUST BE MET BEFORE THE COURT CAN DEEM A CASE AS BEING FRIVOLOUS. THEY ARE:

(1) THE PLAINTIFF(S) MUST BE IN A POSITION WHERE HE IS MAKING EFFORTS TO SUE A PERSON WHO UNDER THE ALLEGATIONS MADE WITHIN THE COMPLAINT CANNOT BE SUED.

(2) IS WHERE THE PLAINTIFF(S) INFRINGES UPON A RIGHT THAT IS NOT ESTABLISHED.

THE JUDGES AND CONSPIRING PARTIES KNEW THAT LEGALLY THE DEFAULT AND CLAIMS OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 DEMONSTRATES THAT WE ARE NOT INFRINGING UPON RIGHTS THAT WE DID NOT LEGALLY ESTABLISH BECAUSE THE ACTION UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IS REMOVED TO THESE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES AND BECAUSE THE CLAIMS OF DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ESTABLISHES THE RIGHTS SOUGHT TO BE EXERCISED AND OR INVOKED, BARRING ANY FURTHER CHALLENGE IN THIS REGARD. SO THEIR INTENT WAS TO SHOW THAT WE DID NOT MEET THE FIRST PRONG. THAT BEING THAT WE WERE SUING PEOPLE WHO COULD NOT BE SUED FOR THE CLAIMS MADE. FOR EXAMPLE, WE ARE SUING THE UNITED STATES FOR ESTABLISHING THE PROVISIONS OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA. YET, THE UNITED STATES IS NOT LISTED AS A DEFENDANT. WE ARE SUING THE UNITED STATES AND THE OTHER (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR THEIR ARRESTING, ATTACHING AND OR EXECUTING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE RE-ESTABLISHED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE WHERE THEY ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE CONTRACT, THE GRANT, GIVEN TO THE NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION, IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT BY GIVING THE RIGHT TO MARRY TO GAYS AND LESBIANS. WE CAN'T SUE THESE JUDGES FOR THIS. THIS IS WHY THEY FAILED TO LIST THE DEFENDANTS PROPERLY. WE ARE SUING THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS AND THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR

CONSPIRING WITH THE JUDGES AND FOR OTHER ACTS THEY'VE DONE. YET, THEY ARE NOT LISTED AS PARTY. WE ARE SUING THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND ITS JUDGES, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AND ITS JUDGES ALL THESE COURTS' JUDGES BY BY NAME INDIVIDUALLY FOR THE STATE v. GENTRY FRAUD. YET, THEY ARE NOT LISTED. WE ARE SUING FOR REPARATIONS FOR THE U.S. SLAVE TRADE AND JIM CROW LAWS IN THIS NATION. YET, THE PARTIES FOR THIS CLAIM ARE NOT LISTED. WE ARE SUING FOR THE INJUSTICES THAT OCCURRED UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 TO WHICH IS REMOVED TO THESE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES. YET, THESE DEFENDANTS ARE NOT LISTED BY THE JUDGES CONSPIRING TO AID THEM AVOID SUIT. LOOK AT THE § 1983 THAT ESTABLISHES THE PARALLEL CASES, AS IT WAS FOR THE WRIT OF ERROR THAT ESTABLISHES APPEAL OF CASES 8:16-cv-3327, 3328, 3194-RBH-JDA. ON PAGE (2) OF THE [44] PAGE COMPLAINT ATTACHED WHERE IT ASKED FOR DEFENDANT NO.(1). IT IS LISTED "SEE ATTACHED SHEETS AND THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE SERVED ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT". THIS IS A HAND WRITTEN DOCUMENT. IT WAS THEN TYPED DOWN AND NOW EXIST AS THE (14) PAGE DOCUMENT IN QUESTION THAT THE JUDGES CALLED S.C.D.C. AND TOLD THEM TO BLOCK COPIES TO PREVENT ITS FILING SO THEY COULD IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE LIST THESE DEFENDANTS AS THEY PRESENTLY HAVE THEM LISTED AND FRAUDULENTLY SAY THAT WE ARE SUING PEOPLE WHO CAN'T BE SUED FOR THE CLAIMS MADE WITHIN THE COMPLAINTS AND OR WRITS OF ERROR IN ACTS OF MACHINATION. WE OBJECT AND DEMAND THAT THE NAMES OF ALL THE DEFENDANTS SOUGHT TO BE LISTED WITHIN ALL OF THESE PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES BE NOW AMENDED AND ADDED TO THE RECORD. THE HAND WRITTEN (34) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE, WHICH IS NOW TYPED AND EXIST AS THE (14) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE IS SUPPOSE TO BE FILED IN THE (3) CASES REFERRED TO AND FILED IN CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND david duren CASE, WAS BLOCKED BEING FILED AND OR IGNORED IN THE OTHER PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES BY THE CONSPIRING JUDGES AND IS NOW ATTACHED TO THE FACE OF ALL COMPLAINTS AND OR WRITS OF ERROR FOR ALL PURPOSES WHICH INCLUDE INFORMING THE COURT OF WHO THE DEFENDANTS ARE WITHIN THESE CASES. WE WANT ALL DEFENDANTS NAMES LISTED INDIVIDUALLY AS REQUIRED.

FROM ON PAGE (7) OF THE COMPLAINT, THE "LEES" AND "ABRAMS"

WERE OMITTED IN THEIR FRAUD. ON THAT PAGE WE AGAIN INFORMED THE COURT THAT THE REMAINDER OF THE DEFENDANTS ARE LISTED WITHIN THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE. ON PAGE (15) IT IS CLEARLY STATED WE ARE SUING THE UNITED STATES. NONE OF THESE DEFENDANTS ARE LISTED IN THE ACTUAL RECORD IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS AND MACHINATION SO THEY COULD CRIMINALLY, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW AND OR AUTHORITY, ALSO IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS AND CLAIM THAT WE ARE TRYING TO SUE JUDGES FOR ALL OF THESE CLAIMS ONLY, WHEN IT IS OVERWHELMINGLY CONSPICUOUS THAT THE JUDGES CANNOT BE SUED FOR ANY OF THESE CLAIMS PREVIOUSLY MADE, EXCEPT FOR THEY BEING PARTY TO THE CONSPIRACY WHERE THE LAW REQUIRES THAT WHOM THEY CONSPIRED WITH BY NAME MUST BE LISTED AS DEFENDANTS. IT BECOMES PERSPICUOUS THAT THE JUDGES PRESENCE IN THESE PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES IS OF SUCH A DETRIMENTAL AND PREJUDICIAL MAGNITUDE, THAT THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL WARRANTING SANCTIONS, RECUSAL, DISQUALIFICATION AND THAT OUR REQUEST AND MOTION FOR A CHANGE OF VENUE TO NEW JERSEY BE GRANTED. WE WANT THE DEFENDANTS AMENDED IN ALL OF THESE PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES, ALL THAT ARE CAPTIONED, TO REFLECT THE PARTIES AS THEY WERE ORIGINALLY INTENDED FOR THEM TO BE FILED AND CHANGE OF VENUE TO NEW JERSEY AND WE WANT INJUNCTION TO REQUIRE THIS. **NOTICE:** ALL THE AFOREMENTIONED ARE ISSUES ON APPEAL. WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT FROM THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016); KOLON INDUSTRIES INC. v. E.I. DUPONT De NEMOURS & CO., 748 F3d. 160 CA4 (Va.2014); CATAWBA INDIAN NATION v. STATE, 407 S.C. 526, 756 S.E.2d. 900(S.C.2014); ARATA v. VILLAGE WEST OWNERS ASS'N INC., 2011 WL 11735004, * 2+, S.C. App.; WILSON v. GMAC MORTG. LLC, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5244967(DSC.2015); U.S. v. LAWRENCE, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 856866(S.D.Va.2015); GREAT AMERICAN INC. CO. v. NEXTDAY NETWORK HARDWARE CORP., 73 F.Supp. 3d. 636(2014); BLUE SKY TRAVEL AND TOURS, LLC v. AL TAYYAR, --Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636(Va.2015); NUCAR CORP. v. BELL, 251 F.R.D. 191, 194(DSC.2008); UNITED STATES v. QUINONES, 2016 WL 4413149, * 6+ (S.D.Va.2016); FORRESTER v. WHITE, 484 U.S. 219, 108 S.Ct. 538(U.S.1988); ULUSE v. U.S., F.Supp.2d., 2009

WL 3052608(DSC.2009); ABEBE-v.-SEYMOUR, F.Supp.2d., 2012 WL 1130660; JOHNSON-v.-UNITED-STATES-DEPT.-OF-JUSTICE, 2016 WL 4593467(D.Md.2016); HALLAL-v.-MARDEL, 2016 WL 6494411; BRAZELL v.-WINDSOR, 384 S.C. 502, 682 S.E.2d. 824(S.C.App.2009); BELLE-GRAIN-v.-BERTHELSEN, F.Supp.2d., 2012 WL 10847(DSC.2012); CARTER v.-SOUTH-CAROLINA, 2014 WL 5325234(DSC.2014); ERSTEIN-v.-WORLD ACCEPTANCE-CORP., 2015 WL 2365701(DSC.2015); BENTON-v.-BURNS, 11 Fed. Appx' 328, 2011 WL 640248 CA4 (2011); BACCUS-v.-MARCHANT, 2014 WL 1330984(DSC.2014); PULLIAM-v.-ALLEN, 466 U.S. 522, 104 S.Ct. 1970(U.S.1984); EX-PARTE-VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339(1880).

THE JUDGES BLOCKED THESE DEFENDANTS AS BEING LISTED ALSO AS A MEANS TO AVOID RECUSAL IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS. WE OBJECT. THE PARTIES WERE ALREADY GIVEN NOTICE BY THE ACTIONS PENDING THROUGH THE WRITS OF MANDAMUS UNDER CASES 16-2299; 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415 AND OTHER PLEADINGS RELATED TO THE PENDING PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES AND THE KING-KHALIFAH PERSONALLY WROTE THE S.C. FEDERAL ATTORNEY AND U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE INFORMING THEM OF ALL CASES ADMONISHING THEM THAT IT WOULD BE IN THEIR BEST INTEREST TO MAKE AN APPEARANCE SINCE THEY APPEARED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 NOW REMOVED TO THESE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES. YOU HAVE ALL THE DEFENDANTS NAMES UNDER CASES 8:16-cv-3327, 3328, 3194-RBH-JDA VIA THE (34) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE. THUS, THEIR NAMES RELATE BACK TO THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT AND OR WRIT OF ERROR IN ALL OF THESE PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES. ALL NAMES MUST BE LISTED INDIVIDUALLY NOT MERELY BY REFERRING TO A CASE OR AFFIDAVIT, GOODMAN-v.-PRAXAIR-INC., 494 Fed. Appx' 458, 68 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 850(4th.Cir.2007); JOHNSON-v.-MARRIOTT INTERNATIONAL-INC., 2017 WL 1957071(2017); RUSSELL-v.-S.N.-SERVICING-CORPORATION, 2017 WL 1449211(N.D.Va.2017); GREEN-v.-BRADLEY COMPANY, 194 F.Supp.3d. 479 (DSC.2016).

THE DEFENDANTS THAT ARE TO BE PROPERLY LISTED TO CORRECT THIS FRAUD IN THE PREVIOUS CASES AS WELL AS CASES 17-7134; 17-7068; 17-7139 ET. AL.,; THE ANTHONY COOK CASE UNDER 8:16-cv-3327-RBH HOPEFULLY BEING PROCESSED, MUST BE LISTED IN A SIMILAR FASHION WITH A SLIGHT VARIATION DUE TO INDEPENDENT ACTION ISSUES SUBSEQUENTLY RAISED. YOUR JURISDICTION IS LIMITED AND OR RE-

STRICTED TO ADDRESSING THE FRAUD IF ALL OF THE DEFENDANTS ARE NOT PROPERLY LISTED, AND BY THIS FRAUD THE COURT MUST REMAND TO ALLOW THIS INJUSTICE TO BE CORRECTED, U.S. v. PIERCE, 400 F3d. 176 CA4 (Va.2005); COLE v. BLANKENSHIP, 30 F2d. 211 CA4 (1929); LOUGHAN v. U.S., 134 S.Ct. 2384(U.S.2014); SMITH v. CLARK/-SMOOT/-RUSSELL,--F3d.--, 2015 WL 4717932 CA4 (Md.2015); LUCAS v. BRISTOL-CONDOMINIUMS-PROPERTY-OWNERS-ASS'N, S.E.2d., 2015 WL 3885837(S.C.App.2015); FOX-EX-REL-FOX v. ELK-RUN-COAL CO. INC., 739 F3d. 131 CA4 (2014); NELSON v. U.S. BANK N.A., 2015 WL 6852712(DSC.2015); STRATTEN v. MECKLENBERG-COUNTY-DEPT. OF-SOCIAL-SERVICES, 521 Fed. Appx' 278, 2013 WL 2364587 CA4 (N.C.2013).

NOTICE: THIS IS ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. BY THE LEGAL ISSUES SUBMITTED UNDER CASE 17-6693 THAT ARE ALSO FILED FOR ALL PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES AND BY THE LITIGATION SUBMITTED THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL, DO WE HAVE A RIGHT TO CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION, ALSO BY THE ATTORNEY POWERS GIVEN TO THE KING-KHALIFAH BY THE DEFAULT.

INASMUCH, THE COURT IN CASES 17-7139; 17-7134 AND 17-7068 REQUIRED WE FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS AND SUBMIT INFORMAL BRIEF. EVEN THOUGH THIS ISSUE IS ADDRESSED IN CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925 WHICH APPLIES TO ALL OF THESE CASES OF CONCERN. WE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME UNTIL OCTOBER 16, 2017 BECAUSE THE 6 MONTH STATEMENTS MUST BE SENT TO S.C.D.C. HEAD QUARTERS AND THE TURN AROUND TIME CAN TAKE UP UNTIL A MONTH BEFORE WE RECEIVE THEM BACK. THEREFORE, WE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME UNTIL THEN TO FILE THE DOCUMENT AND ANY POTENTIAL INFORMAL BRIEF OR BRIEF OF ANY KIND. NEVERTHELESS, BY ALL DOCUMENTS FILED IN CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925, TO INCLUDE THOSE HERE WITH ATTACHED. WE MOTION TO WAIVE THE FILING FEES FOR ALL APPELLANTS IN THESE CASES DUE TO ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONVERSION DONE BY JUDGE SEYMOUR AND THE CLAIMS ARGUED WITHIN THOSE CASES WHICH ARE NOW FOR ALL CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT.

TO ESTABLISH CAUSE OF ACTION TO RECOVER DAMAGES FOR CONVERSION, WHERE JUDGE SEYMOUR STOLE MONEY FROM ROBERT MITCHELL'S

COOPER TRUST FUND ACCOUNT, WHICH WAS MONEY OWED TO THE KING-KHALIFAH, GIVING HIM THE RIGHT OF CLAIM. A PLAINTIFF MUST SHOW LEGAL OWNERSHIP OR AN IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR RIGHT OF POSSESSION TO A SPECIFIC IDENTIFIABLE THING AND MUST SHOW THAT THE DEFENDANT(S) EXERCISED AN UNAUTHORIZED DOMINION OVER THE THING IN QUESTION TO THE EXCLUSION OF THE PLAINTIFF(S) RIGHTS. ROBERT MITCHELL OWED THAT MONEY TO THE KING-KHALIFAH GIVING US BOTH STANDING TO CHALLENGE AND SEEK SANCTION FOR THIS INJUSTICE WHICH ARE GRANTED BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT. ALL FILING FEES FOR ALL PARTIES ARE WAIVED. THE UNITED STATES IS IN DEFAULT IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. YOUR GLOBAL NATIONS VIA THE DEFAULT HAD NO RIGHT TO ATTACH, ARREST OR EXECUTE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY "GRANT", "FRANCHISE", "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" ORIGINATING FROM THE SOLE CORPORATION WHICH HAD RESTRICTIONS WHICH YOU VIOLATED WHICH IS PROTECTED UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10. YOU HAD NO AUTHORIZATION TO GIVE THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY TO THE SODOMITES AND GOMMORAHRITES OF YOUR NATIONS. CAUSE IS ESTABLISHED. WE MOTION FOR AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION BY SOMEONE NOT ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION, KINGJUX I.P.-W.-I.R.P.-INTERNATIONAL-INC., 2016 WL 5936875(N.Y.2016); NAT'L-CTR.-FOR-CRISIS-MGMT.,-INC.-V.-LERNER, 91 A.D.3d. 920, 920-21, 938 N.Y.S.2d. 138, 138-39(2nd.DEPT.2012).

JUDGE KAYMANI WEST IN ONE OF THE PARALLEL APPEALS ISSUED AN ORDER ON AUGUST 23, 2017 CLAIMING SHE COULD NOT READ SOME OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS FILED. THE ATTACHED REFERRED TO ORDER IS NOW SOUGHT LEAVE TO APPEAL. WE INFORMED THE COURT IN CASES 17-6969; 17-6693 AND 17-6925 ALSO ARGUED IN THE (19) PAGE INJUNCTION THAT WE ARE BORROWING A TYPEWRITER TO WHICH WE DO NOT ALWAYS HAVE ACCESS TO DUE TO STATE INTERFERENCE. JUDGE WEST ABUSED HER DISCRETION. THIS ORDER IS VACATED AND ON REMAND BY DECREE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT. IT IS CONSPICUOUS BY WHAT IS ARGUED IN THE (19) PAGE INJUNCTION THAT THE STATE INTERFERENCE DO INDEED RISE TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL WHERE THE DEFENDANTS IN THESE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES DESTROYED THE KING-KHALIFAH'S TYPEWRITER, SUBJECTING HIM TO

PHYSICAL ASSAULTS AND OTHER OUTRAGEOUS ACTS OF RETALIATION BECAUSE THEY KNOW HE SUFFERS FROM A LIFE LONG DISABILITY TO HIS HANDS WHICH IS WHY HE TRACES HIS LETTERS IN EFFORTS TO MAKE HIS WRITING MORE LEGIBLE. THE DISABILITY TO HIS HANDS CREATED BY THE ACTS OF OFFICIAL MENTAL TORTURE HE WAS SUBJECTED TO BY THESE DEFENDANTS, ALONG WITH THE DESTRUCTION OF HIS PROPERTY THEY KNEW HE DID NEED TO AID IN ACCESS TO THE COURT, WAS DONE TO IMPEDED HIS ACCESS TO THE COURTS AND OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND SUBJECT HIM TO INTENSE PHYSICAL PAIN THEY KNEW HE WOULD SUFFER IN WRITING BY HAND IN HOPES OF DETERRING HIM FROM FREELY EXERCISING THE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHT OF ACCESS TO THE COURTS. THIS ALSO IS TANTAMOUNT TO ACTS OF PHYSICAL TORTURE IN VIOATION OF THE C.A.T. TREATY FOR WHICH THEY ARE BEING SUED FOR. THE DAMAGE TO THE KING-KHALIFAH'S HANDS IS IRREPARABLE AS THE DOCTORS HAVE REPEATEDLY SAID. JUDGE KAYMANI WEST, CONSPIRING WITH THE DEFENDANTS UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW AND OR AUTHORITY, ISSUES THIS ATTACHED ORDER WITHIN THE DISTRICT COURT WHERE IN THIS ACT OF MACHINATION SHE HAS ESSENTIALLY PENALIZED THE KING-KHALIFAH IN ACTS OF RETALIATION FOR HIS DISABILITY WHERE THIS ORDER SERVES AS A MEANS, AN OBSTACLE TO BAR OR RESTRICT HIS ACCESS TO THE COURT IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 12203 (a)b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT. SINCE THE KING-KHALIFAH BY WAY OF HIS DISABILITY CANNOT MAKE HIS LEGAL DOCUMENTS ANY MORE LEGIBLE THAN HE HAS, SPECIFICALLY AT TIMES WHEN HE DOES NOT HAVE ACCESS TO A TYPEWRITER. DAMAGES ARE NOW CLEARLY SHOWN AND THE INJUNCTION THAT IS NOW SERVED ON THE LOWER COURT "MUST" BE GRANTED. THE ORDER PRODUCED BY JUDGE WEST PRODUCES EVIDENCE OF DAMAGES VIA THE DISABILITY AND BY THE STATE INTERFERENCE ARGUED IN THE INJUNCTION, IT DEMONSTRATES INDEED THAT THE STATE INTERFERENCE DOES RISE TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. THEREFORE, BY THE KING-KHALIFAH'S RIGHTS UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, THE INJUNCTION MUST AND IS GRANTED. WE MOTION THAT THE COURT INSTRUCT JUDGE WEST TO SIGN THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER. DUE TO ADA RIGHTS AND THE COMPLEXITY OF THE CASE IT MUST BE GRANTED.

JUDGE WEST, BY THE ISSUING OF SUCH AN ORDER SUBJUDICE ON AUGUST 23, 2017; THIS HAS GOT TO BE THE MOST STUPID, IGNORANT, UNREASONABLE ORDER I HAVE EVER SEEN IN MY ENTIRE LIFE. BY SUCH AN ORDER JUDGE WEST HAS ESSENTIALLY ORDERED A "BLIND MAN" TO STOP BEING BLIND. SHE HAS ORDERED A "PARALYZED MAN" TO STOP BEING PARALYZED. SHE ORDERED A "LAME MAN" WITH NO LEGS TO GET UP AND DANCE THE TENNESSEE WALTZ AND DANCE THE "CHARLESTON" , THEN DANCE A BALLET, BREAK DANCE THEN JUMP UP AND DO (20) JUMPING JACKS. JUDGE WEST IN AN EGREGIOUS MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE HAS ORDERED A DISABLED PLAINTIFF, THE KING-KHALIFAH, TO STOP BEING DISABLED IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, WHICH IS LUDICROUS, UNREASONABLE AND CRIMINAL IN ACTS OF RETALIATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. BY SUCH ACTION, LEGAL COUNSEL MUST BE APPOINTED TO REPRESENT THE CLASS MEMBERS TO PREVENT ANY FURTHER INJUSTICES FROM OCCURRING. WE MOTION FOR SUCH, BUT THE KING-KHALIFAH DO NOT WAIVE HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF SELF REPRESENTATION. LET COUNSEL ACT AS STAND-BY TO ASSIST THE KING-KHALIFAH WITH SUCH MATTERS AS FILING, TYPING OR ANY OTHER MATTER THAT MAY STAND AS AN OBSTACLE DUE TO THE DISABILITY IN HIS HANDS CAUSED BY THESE DEFENDANTS. THE KING-KHALIFAH SHALL RETAIN HIS RIGHT OF SELF REPRESENTATION WHILE LEGAL COUNSEL BE APPOINTED IN FULLNESS FOR THE OTHER CLASS MEMBERS. BY THE DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, THE KING REMAIN AS LEAD PLAINTIFF. THE APPOINTING OF LEGAL COUNSEL AND THE GRANTING OF THE INJUNCTION NOW BECOMES MANDATORY. **IT IS SO ORDERED,** LASKY v. MORRISTOWN T.P., 425 N.J. SUPER. 530, 42 A.3d. 202 (N.J.2012); RULE 23(g) Fed. RULES OF PRO.; ROYSTERS v. NEW JERSEY STATE POLICE, 439 N.J. SUPER. 554, 110 A.3d. 934(N.J.2015); CATTUNA v. SARA LEE CORP., A.2d., 2010 WL 3418354 (2010); BARTLETT v. NEW YORK STATE BD. OF LAW EXAMINERS, 970 F.Supp. 1094 (S.D.N.Y.1997); KIMEL, 528 U.S. at 86, 120 S.Ct. 631; FERRELL V. ESTELLE, 568 F2d. 1128, 1132-1133 CA5 (1978); PEOPLE v. RIVERA , 125 MISC.2d. 516, 528, 480 N.Y.S.2d. 426, 434 (Sup.Ct.1984); TENNESSEE v. LANE, 541 U.S. 509, 124 S.Ct. 1978, 158 L.Ed.2d. 820(2004); BABY NEAL FOR AND BY KANTER v. CASEY, 43 F3d. 48 (3rd.Cir.1994); LACKY v. GREENTREE, 330 S.C. 388, 498 S.E.2d.

898 (S.C.1998).

NOTICE: THIS IS ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. DUE TO THE TOTALITY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES. DO WE MEET THE CRITERION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF LEGAL COUNSEL UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, THE COMPLEXITY OF THE CASE, AND DUE TO THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE?

42 U.S.C.A. § 12203 PROVIDES:

* 4 CHAPTER 126 OF TITLE 42 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE IS COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) SECTION 42 U.S.C. § 12101 ET. SEQ. SECTION 12203 OF THE ADA, WHICH AIMS TO PROHBIT **RETALIATION AND COERCION"** PROVIDES:

(a) **RETALIATION;**

NO PERSON SHALL DISCRIMINATE AGAINST ANY INDIVIDUAL BECAUSE SUCH INDIVIDUAL HAS OPPOSED ANY ACT OF PRACTICE MADE LAWFUL BY THIS CHAPTER (WHICH INCLUDE ACCESS TO THE COURTS) OR BECAUSE SUCH INDIVIDUAL MADE A CHARGE, TESTIFIED (AS WE DO AGAINST THESE DEFENDANTS SEEKING SANCTIONS), ASSERTED OR PARTICIPATED IN ANY MANNER IN AN INVESTIGATION (SUCH AS THE ONE WE PRESENTLY SEEK BEFORE THE COURT), OR PROCEEDING, OR HEARING UNDER THIS CHAPTER.

(b) **INTERFERENCE, COERCION OR INTIMIDATION:** IT SHALL BE UNLAWFUL TO COERCE, INTIMIDATE, THREATEN, OR INTERFERE WITH ANY INDIVIDUAL IN THE EXERCISE OR ENJOYMENT OF, OR ON ACCOUNT OF HIS OR HER HAVING ENJOYED, OR ON ACCOUNT OF HIS OR HER HAVING AIDED OR ENCOURAGED ANY OTHER INDIVIDUAL IN THE EXERCISE OR ENJOYMENT OF, ANY RIGHT GRANTED OR PROTECTED (RELIGION AND ACCESS TO THE COURTS) BY THIS CHAPTER. THE PLAINTIFFS IN THESE PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES WERE AIDING THE KING-KHALIFAH IN THE EXERCISE AND ENJOYMENT OF HIS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHT OF FREEDOM OF RELIGION, ACCESS TO THE COURTS AND BY THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES VIA THE DEFAULT, FOREIGN SOVEREIGN RIGHTS UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT.

THE REMEDIES AND PROCEDURES AVAILABLE UNDER SECTION 12117, 12133 AND 12188 OF THE TITLE SHALL BE AVAILABLE TO AGGRIEVED PERSONS FOR VIOLATION OF SUBSECTION (a) AND (b) OF THIS SECTION WITH RESPECT TO SUBCHAPTER 1, SUBCHAPTER 11 AND SUBCHAPTER 14 OF THIS CHAPTER. THE KING REMAINS PROPRIA PERSONA. WE RENEW THE DEMAND FOR CRIMINAL CHARGES AND A FULL INVESTIGATION BY AN INDEPENDENT AGENT NOT ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION . THE PARTIES ARE CONSPIRING TO AVOID PROSECUTION, SUIT, AND THE CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS. THEY ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE RICO ACT. **NOTICE:** THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT IS ON APPEAL, WALKER v.-BEAUMONT-INDERENDENT-SCHOOL-DISTRICT, 2016 WL 6666833; CABI v.-BOSTON-CHILDREN'S-HOSPITAL, 161 F.Supp.3d. 136(2016). FOR THE COURT TO NOT INSTRUCT THE JUDGES TO SIGN THE INJUNCTION WOULD DEMONSTRATE A CONSCIOUSNESS OF GUILT, EARLY-v.-STATE, S.E.2d.,--2016 WL 6092514(Sup.Ct.2016); STATE-v.-TONEY, S.E.2d., 2014 WL 2575415(2014); STATE-v.-INMAN, 395 S.C. 539, 720 S.E.2d. 31(2011).

INSOMUCH, THE LAW FIRMS AND OR ATTORNEYS THAT WE'VE SPOKEN TO THAT WOULD BE WILLING TO TAKE THESE CASES UPON THE ISSUING OF AN ORDER FROM THE COURT ARE:

(1) EVANS, MOORE LLC (843) 995-5000;

(2) DAVIDSON AND LINDERMANN P.A. (803) 806-8222;

(3) NELSON, MULLINS WHO ALSO HAVE A PRO BONO COMMITTEE , JAMES ROLLINS (617) 573-4722 OR NORAH ROGERS (803) 255-9546 THEIR "800" NUMBER IS 1-800-237-2000.

ANY OF THESE ATTORNEYS CAN BE APPOINTED TO REPRESENT THE CLASS MEMBERS AND OR ACT AS STAND-BY FOR THE KING-KHALIFAH AS HE PARTAKES IN HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF SELF REPRESENTATION . THE STATE AND OR FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN THIS INSTANCE RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL WHERE THESE JUDGES ARE TRYING TO RESTRICT THE KING-KHALIFAH'S ACCESS TO THE COURT ESSENTIALLY PENALIZING HIM IN ACTS OF RETALIATION DUE TO HIS DISABILITY IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF ADA. WE SEEK SANC-

TIONS. WE ALSO MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT FROM THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, CHANEY v. LEWIS, 801 F2d. 1191, 1196 (9th.Cir.1986); KNAUBERT v. GOLDSMITH, 791 F2d. 722(9th.Cir. 1986); TOWNSEND v. SAIN, 372 U.S. at 313, 83 S.Ct. 757; ANDERSON v. HEIZE, 358 F2d. 479, 481 (9th.Cir.) CERT. DENIED 358 U.S. 889, 79 S.Ct. 131, 3 L.Ed.2d. 116 (1958); RASQUA v. COUNCIL, 186 N.J. 127, 142 (2008); MONROE v. PAPE, 365 U.S. 167, 183, 81 S.Ct. 473, 482, 5 L.Ed.2d. 492(1961); RATSY v. BOARD OF REGENTS OF STATE OF FLORIDA, 457 U.S. 500, 102 S.Ct. 2557 (1962); ALTMAN, 541 U.S. 677(U.S.2004).

WE MOTION FOR A REHEARING EN BANC IN CASE 17-1415 WHICH SHALL BE GRANTED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT THESE CASES NOW BEING OFFICIALLY ON REMAND FROM THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT. ALL ORDERS ISSUED IN CASES 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415 DUE TO STRUCTURAL ERROR ARE VOID AND VACATED. ALL OF THESE CASES ARE ESSENTIALLY ON REMAND BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT, RESTRICTING, LIMITING YOUR JURISDICTION TO DO NOTHING EXCEPT GRANT THE RELIEF THAT IS DEMANDED WITHIN THESE CASES FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

(1) JUDGE GREGORY AND DIAZ ACTED IN RETALIATION BECAUSE WE PEEPED THE MOVE THEY INTENDED TO DO IN CASE 17-6960 SO WE MOTIONED FOR THEIR RECUSAL. IN RETALIATION IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) THEY COMPROMISED SHEDD AND MADE A FRAUDULENT RULING TO GET AHEAD OF US MOTIONING FOR THEIR RECUSAL IN THIS CASE.

(2) THEIR JUDGMENT CONFLICTS WITH A RECENT DECISION MADE BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359 (U.S.2016).

WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE CASES THE 4th. CIRCUIT JUDGES CITED RELATED TO RECUSAL SUCH AS 811 F2d. 818. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE CASES MARCHANT AND AUSTIN CITED RELATED TO RECUSAL SUCH AS: 384 U.S. 563; 988 F2d. 1335; 581 F2d. 1114; 946 F2d. 335; 15 F3d. 319; 2012 WL 2805717 WHERE THESE JUDGES CONSPIRED IN COURTS

TO WHICH THEY HAD NO JURISDICTION TO MAKE THE CLAIMS APPEAR FRIVOLOUS WHEN THEY WERE NOT VIA THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE CASES JUDGES WEST AND BAKER CITED RELATED TO RECUSAL- 882 F2d. 913; 733 F2d. 304; 691 F2d. 666; 726 F2d. 158; 581 F2d. 1114; 510 U.S. 540; 330 F3d. 658. ALL THESE, INCLUDING THE GRISMORE CASE THAT WAS OVER RULED BY THAT SAME CIRCUIT. ALL OF THESE CASES THE JUDGES IN TOTAL CITED AT BEST, THE LATEST CITED CASE IS FROM 2012. THE REMAINDER OF THEM ARE FROM THE 80'S THROUGH 2003. THE JUDGES ARE ATTEMPTING TO NULLIFY U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT ESTABLISHED IN 2016 WITH LOWER COURT CASES OVER (20) YEARS OLD AND THAT ARE NOT FROM THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT; ATTEMPTING TO GIVE THE LOWER, LESSER COURTS, POWER OVER THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ITSELF. WE OBJECT. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN WIILIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899(U.S.2016) GAVE CLARITY TO THESE EARLIER CITED CASES. THE LOWER COURTS CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO OVER RIDE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WITH OLD CASES TO RENDER VOID OR WATER DOWN THEIR RULINGS MADE IN 2016. I, WE OBJECT. THE CRITERION ESTABLISHED BY THE WILLIAMS CASE IS (3) PRONG TO WHICH IF ONLY ONE OF THESE EXIST, RECUSAL BECOMES MANDATORY. THEY ARE: (1) A JUDGE CANNOT SIT UPON HIS OWN CASE; (2) HE CANNOT SIT IF HE HAS AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME; (3) HE CANNOT SIT IF THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. EXTRA-JUDICIAL SOURCE FOR BIAS IS NOT THE STANDARD FOR RECUSAL AS WAS DETERMINED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. THE AFOREMENTIONED ARE THE (3) PRONG STANDARD AND CRITERION. ALL (3) OF THESE EXIST IN THESE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES TO WHICH THESE JUDGES ARE DEFENDANTS, TO INCLUDE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY WARRANTING SANCTIONS AND RECUSAL, BENTON-v.-BURNS, 2017 WL 491251(D.C.Md. 2017); PEGG-v.-HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112(4th.Cir.2017); JOHNSON v.-BYRD, 2016 WL 6839410(N.C.2016); GRAHAM-v.-GAYRON, 831 F3d. 176 (4th.Cir.2016); BERGER-v. U.S., 255 U.S. 22, 41 S.Ct. 230, 65 L.Ed. 481(U.S.1921); CANADA v.-MILLER, F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 1512245(2014); BOOTH v.-BALLARD, 2016 WL 1275054(2016)(DEMONSTRATING THAT A HEARING MUST OCCUR IN THE DISTRICT COURT); UNITED STATES v. QUINONES,--F.Supp.3d.--,2016 WL 4413149(2016).

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 VOID'S THE COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. JUDGES DIAZ AND GREGORY WERE REQUIRED TO RECUSE THEMSELVES AS WERE THE LOWER COURT JUDGES WITHIN THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT.

WATCH THE LANGUAGE USED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. "ON THE QUESTION OF RECUSAL, THE COURT ASKS "[N]OT" WHETHER A JUDGE HARBORS AN ACTUAL BIAS (FOR EXAMPLE, JUDICIAL BIAS AS IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION THE CONSPIRING JUDGES ASSERTED), 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 CONSPICUOUS THAT SUCH AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL DOES EXIST IN THESE PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES AS IS EVIDENCED BY WHAT OCCURRED INVOLVING THESE JUDGES OF CONCERN, CAPEATON-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).

(3) EVERY WRIT OF MANDAMUS RULING IS VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION BY THE STRUCTURAL ERROR WHERE EVERY MANDAMUS RULING WAS RENDERED BY INVOKING THE PROVISIONS OF THE PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT WHICH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DEMANDED AS A PRE-REQUISITE FOR ENTRY INTO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. EVEN THE CASES JUDGES GREGORY, DIAZ AND SHEDD CITED VIOLATE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER EX-PARTE-VIRGINIA AND THE-SLAUGHTER-HOUSE-CASES, INCLUDING IN-RE:-BEARD, 811 F2d. 818 IS TAINTED AS WELL WHICH VOID THE ORDER IN CASE 17-1415. THE CASES ARE ILLEGAL AS IS ANY ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415, AS WELL AS ANY ORDER ISSUED WITHIN ALL OF THESE CASES LISTED

WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT FOR THESE PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES JUST AS IS ARGUED WITHIN CASES 17-6693 AND 17-6925. THIS WILL BE ELABORATED ON LATER WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT.

REFERRING BACK TO THE ISSUE OF THE JUDGES. THE JUDGES BLOCKED THE DEFENDANTS FROM BEING LISTED PROPERLY AS A MEANS TO AVOID RECUSAL. PER THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S ENTRY NUMBER (16) FILED AUGUST 8, 2017 IN CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM. WE GAVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND ALL PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE OF SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL WITHIN (14) DAYS OF RECEIPT OF THAT ORDER ONLY TO BE SUBJECTED TO FRAUD UPON THE COURTS INVOLVING ZANCHELLI AND THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT. A SIMILAR SITUATION OCCURRED IN CASE 1:17-cv-1468-HMH-SVH TO WHICH WE OBJECT. THE ORDER ISSUED BY MARCHANT ACTED AS A FINAL ORDER ON THEIR FAILURE TO RECUSE AND TRANSFER VENUE; ADDING ANTHONY COOK AS PARTY DUE TO REMOVAL OF CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1)(WHERE WE ARE DEFENDANTS RELATED TO CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS), 2679, 1602-1612 ET SEQ.(WHICH IS WHY MARCHANT IN THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PREVENTED REMOVAL TO PREVENT THE EVIDENCE IN THAT CASE FROM ENTERING THE COURT WHICH WE OBJECT TO); CONSOLIDATION (WHICH IS ANOTHER REASON THEY LISTED THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY TO DENY CONSOLIDATION WHICH WE OBJECT TO); THE JUDGES SEPARATING US; THEY MAKING USE OF THE PLRA AND OR THE AEDPA; DENIAL OF CHANGE OF VENUE AND CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION. THUS, WE IMMEDIATELY SOUGHT LEAVE TO APPEAL THE ORDERS IN BOTH CASES 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM AND 1:17-1468-HMH-SVH OR IT WOULD HAVE CAUSED IRREPARABLE DAMAGE TO THE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THEY BEGAN. THIS DIVESTED BOTH COURTS OF JURISDICTION PENDING THAT REVIEW.

THE JUDGES ARE THE ONES WHO IN ACTS OF MACHINATION SEPARATED US IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THIS IS WHY THE PARALLEL CASES EXIST AND WHY THE KING-KHALIFAH, CRAWFORD, HAD TO HAVE HIMSELF ADDED AS A PARTY IN EACH OF THESE PARALLEL AND OR RELATED CASES TO PROTECT HIS INTEREST PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ. WHICH IS PERMITTED UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES ALSO BEING THE FIDUCIARY HEIR. SEPARATE

FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS WERE FILED TO ADDRESS ANY CONCERN IN THIS AREA. WE MOTION TO AMEND THE PARTIES IN BOTH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT TO REFLECT THAT CRAWFORD IS PARTY IN EACH INDIVIDUAL CASE AND THE NAMES OF THE DEFENDANTS BE LISTED AS THOSE CONTAINED IN THE (14) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE IN QUESTION. THIS IS PARALLEL LITGATION WHERE RES JUDICATA ATTACHES.

WE WANT THE COURTS TO PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE (23) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 8, 2017 AND THE (14) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED JULY 2, 2017 SERVED ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT AND FILED IN CASES 9:17-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 8:16-cv-3327, 3328, 3194-RBH-JDA. WE EXPAND THE SCOPE AND INCLUDE THESE DOCUMENTS THAT ARE TO BE FILED IN ALL CASES LISTED IN THE CAPTION TO ADDRESS ISSUES OF COMITY, PARALLEL LITIGATION, RES JUDICATA, CHANGE OF VENUE AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE JUDGES INVOLVED. SEE U.S. EX REL. KNIGHT v. RELIANT HOSPICE INC., F.Supp.2d., 2011 WL 1321584(DSC. 2011); HARBISON v. BELL, 556 U.S. 180, 129 S.Ct. 1481(U.S.2009); MIDDLETON v. NISSAN MOTOR CO. LTD., F.Supp.2d., 2012 WL 3612572 (DSC.2012); SOUTHERN PAC. R. CO. v. U.S., 168 U.S. 1, 18 S.Ct. 18, 42 L.Ed. 355(U.S.1897); NOELL CRANE SYSTEMS GMbH v. NOELL CRANE SYSTEMS SERVICES, 667 F.Supp.2d. 852(2009); KNIGHT v. MANUFACTURERS & TRADERS TRUST CO., F.Supp.3d. 436(D.Md.2015); BARDES v. SOUTH CAROLINA, F.Supp.2d., 2010 WL 1498190(DSC.2010).

NOTICE: THIS IS AN ISSUE ON APPEAL. YOU HAVE FRAUD UPON THE COURT INVOLVING PARTIES IN BOTH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT. WE OBJECT. PURSUANT TO FEDERAL APPELLATE COURT RULE, RULE 4(d). ZANCHELLI OR ANY OTHER 4TH. CIRCUIT CLERK SHOULD HAVE NEVER IN ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, HELD UP THE NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM TO ALLOW JUDGE MARCHANT TO PRODUCE A FRAUDULENTly OBTAINED REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF HAVING A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT ON THE MATTERS RELATED TO THESE APPEALS. A SIMILAR SITUATION OCCURRED UNDER CASE 1:17-cv-1468-HMH-SVH WHERE THE CONSPIRING JUDGES IGNORED THE FIRST NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL TO CONCEAL THEIR CRIMES, THEREUPON CLOSING THE CASE WHEN THEIR JURISDICTION WAS DIVESTED. THEREAFTER,

THEY SENT UP THE APPEAL BASED UPON A SUBSEQUENT LETTER AND OR DOCUMENT, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT HOLDING THEIR NOTICE, TO ALLOW THE DISTRICT COURT TO CLOSE THAT CASE BEFORE IT WAS SENT UP FOR APPEAL WHEN THEIR JURISDICTION WAS DIVESTED BY THE FIRST NOTICE. WE OBJECT.

WE RENEW THE PREVIOUS FILED MOTIONS AND SEEK ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS TO REMEDY THIS EGREGIOUS INJUSTICE AND ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS. WE WANT CASE 1:17-cv-1468-HMH-SVH REINSTATED, OPENED, AND WE WANT THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ISSUED BY MARCHANT RENDERED VOID FOR FRAUD AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. EVIDENCE BY THE ACTIONS OF THE CLERKS WOULD SERVE TO SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES WHOM RECUSAL IS SOUGHT FOR ARE INVOLVED. WE RENEW THE MOTION FOR THE JUDGES RECUSAL AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGES, TO INCLUDE RENEWING THE MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE ALL CASES INVOLVING THE KING-KHALIFAH AND PLAINTIFFS AND VENUE BE TRANSFERRED TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY. WE SEEK BY SANCTION THAT NOT ONLY THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT, BUT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AS WELL BE IN FORFEITURE OF PRESENTING IN ANY MANNER THE LEGAL STANCE, POSITION OR ADJUDICATION THAT WAS PRODUCED IN BOTH CASES SUBJUDICE AND OR IS CONTAINED WITHIN THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ISSUED BY MARCHANT IN ANY FORM. EVEN IF THE COURTS ATTEMPT TO MODIFY THE LANGUAGE IN ANY MANNER TO MAKE THOSE SAME CLAIMS CONTAINED THEREIN. THEIR JURISDICTION WAS DIVESTED AND THE FRAUD TAINTS THE ACTIONS RENDERING THEM VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, ALSO FOR VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, U.S. v. LAWRENCE SUPRA.; IN RE: WALLACE, 649 Fed. Appx' 298(MEM)(4th.Cir.2016); IN RE: WHOLESALE GROCERY PRODUCTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION, 849 F3d. 761, 96 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 1207(8th.Cir.2017); IN RE: DUROSER, 2015 WL 4068243(N.D.N.Y.2015); BROWN v. ELI LILLY AND CO., 654 F3d. 347(2nd.Cir.2011); SHANKLIN v. SEALS, 461 Fed. Appx' 313, 2012 WL 29186(4th.Cir.2012); RUSS v. HEWITT, 69 Fed. Appx' 185, 2003 WL 21546021(4th.Cir.2003); KAMP v. WARDEN OF GRAHAM C.I., 2014 WL 6809522(DSC.2014); ASHCROFT v. IQBAL, 556 U.S. 662, 129 S.Ct. 1937(U.S.2009); UNITED STATES v. ROGERS, 101 F3d. 247(2nd.Cir.1996). WE MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT FROM THE

4TH. CIRCUIT.

THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PRODUCE CONCRETE EVIDENCE, THAT OUR CLAIM AS TO WHY THEY INCORRECTLY LISTED THE DEFENDANTS IN THE CIVIL ACTIONS THE WAY THEY HAD THEM LISTED WAS TRUE AND NOT A CONCLUSORY CLAIM, SO WE OBJECT TO THIS STATEMENT MADE BY MARCHANT IN THAT REPORT. WE WARNED THE 4TH. CIRCUIT OF THEIR INTENTIONS BEFORE THEY ACTED WHICH ARE NOW CLEARLY MANIFESTED REQUIRING SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURTS AND VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW. THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PRODUCED BY MARCHANT AND THE ACTS OF HODGES ETC. IN CASE 1:17-cv-1468 PROVES WE WERE CORRECT AND THE PRESENCE OF THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGES ESTABLISH THAT THERE IS A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL CREATING A STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS THEIR JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. WE OBJECT, IANNELLI v. U.S., 420 U.S. 770, 95 S.Ct. 1284, 43 L.Ed.2d. 616; BLUE SKY TRAVEL AND TOURS, LLC v. AL TAYYAR, --Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); U.S. v. STERLING, 724 F3d. 482 CA4 (Va.2013); WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899(2016); BENTON v. BURNS, 2017 WL 491251(D.C.Md. 2017); CHRISTIANSON v. M.B.N.A. AMERICAN BANK N.A., S.E.2d., 2013 WL 8507850(S.C.App.2013); CALDWELL v. WINQUIST, 402 S.C. 595, 741 S.E.2d. 583(S.C.App.2013); LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19(2014); WHITE v. MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280(DSC. 2014); GRUPO SUPRA, 124 S.Ct.1920(U.S.2004).

REFERRING BACK TO THE ISSUE OF BIAS REGARDING THE JUDGES. THE (14) PAGE AND (23) PAGE DOCUMENTS THEMSELVES, ALONE, EVEN THOUGH THERE ARE MANY OTHERS TO INCLUDE THOSE IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 MARCHANT IS CONSPIRING TO PREVENT FROM BEING REVEALED, AND OTHERS TO WHICH THE STATE AND FEDERAL JUDGES ALONG WITH THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORR. ARE CONSPIRING TO BLOCK FILING, ARE MORE THAN SUFFICIENT TO NOT ONLY PROVE REMOVAL UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.. THEY ALSO PROVE BOTH OVER-WHELMING "PERSONAL" AS WELL AS "JUDICIAL" BIAS. WHEN YOU HAVE THE JUDGES GOING OUT OF THEIR WAY TO CALL US "RACIST", "VULGAR" AND "SEXIST"? THIS PROVES JUDGE MARCHANT LIED IN FRAUD WHEN

HE SAID IN THE REPORT THAT THE ACTION WAS "INCOMPREHENSIBLE", BECAUSE THE COURT IN CASE 5:17-cv-0105-BHH-KDW DID NOT MAKE THIS CLAIM AND FURTHER AFFIRMED THAT THE PLEADING CONSTITUTE AN "AFFIDAVIT". SUCH ASSESSMENT COULD NOT HAVE BEEN DONE IF THE PLEADINGS WERE "INCOMPREHENSIBLE". WE OBJECT. RES JUDICATA ATTACHES FROM JUDGE KAYMANI WEST. WHAT MORE DO YOU NEED TO ESTABLISH "PERSONAL" BIAS. "PERSONAL" IS DEFINED AS---PERTAINING TO, OR CONCERNING A PARTICULAR PERSON; REFERRING OR DIRECTED TO A PARTICULAR PERSON IN AN OFFENSIVE MANNER; PERTAINING TO THE BODY, CLOTHING OR APPEARANCE (PHYSICALLY OR CHARACTERISTICALLY). WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE MOTION TO REINSTATE CASE 5:17-cv-0105-BHH-KDW, THE ORDER PRODUCED FROM IT; THE REPORT AND WHAT MARCHANT AND WOOTEN DID IN BOTH CASES 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM; WHAT JUDGES HARWELL AND AUSTIN DID IN CASES 8:16-cv-3327, 3328, 3194-RBH-JDA; WHAT THE JUDGES DID IN CASE 1:17-cv-01468-HMH-SVH, IGNORING THE INITIAL NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL AND CLOSING THAT CASE; WHAT THEY DID TO david duren IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CONSPIRING WITH THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL; ALSO WHAT JUDGE BAKER DID IN CASE 2:17-cv-1127-JMC-MGB AND THE PLEADINGS IN THEIR TOTALITY. IT IS CONSPICUOUS THAT IT HAS GOTTEN SERIOUSLY PERSONAL BETWEEN THE JUDGES AND PLAINTIFFS, SO MUCH THAT THE JUDGES ARE ENGAGING IN CONSTANT ACTS OF FRAUD, MACHINATION, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY. WE OBJECT TO JUDGE MARCHANT'S CLAIMS THAT THE STATE CASE, 2013-CP-400-0084 DO NOT BEAR ON OR HAVE ANY CONNECTION TO THE CLAIMS BEING MADE OR THAT IT DOESN'T WARRANT REMOVAL TO ESTABLISHED THE FACTS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1)(DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL CASE/ CONVICTION ISSUES), 2679 (PROPERTY INFRINGMENT BY THE UNITED STATES), 1602-1612 (FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT CLAIMS) WHICH IS WHY HE DO NOT WANT THIS EVIDENCE TO ENTER THE COURT. IT WILL INDISPUTABLY PROVE THE FACTS. LETS SEE. ORDER THE ISSUING OF THE INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER. ALONG WITH THE (23) AND (14) PAGE DOCUMENTS RECENTLY FILED. THEY HIGHLIGHT THE REPEATED, CONTINUOUS ACTS OF FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY WHICH IS WHY JUDGE MARCHANT IS CONSPIRING TO PREVENT THE REMOVAL OF THE STATE CASE. WE OBJECT. WE MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF THE JUDGES AND

CHANGE OF VENUE TO BE GRANTED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT VIA THESE PARALLEL APPEALS AND OR RELATED CASES. WE WANT CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION FOR THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY, IN RE: NAT. FOOTBALL LEAGUE PLAYERS CONCUSSION INJURY LITIGATION, 775 F3d. 570, 90 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 563(3rd.Cir.2014); IN RE: WHOLESALE GROCERY PRODUCTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION SUPRA.; ALILA KATITA v. U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, 2016 WL 4992464(N.D. Cal.2016); FLEISCHMAN v. ALBANY MEDICAL CENTER, 639 F3d. 28, 79 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 494(2nd.Cir.2011); SCOTT v. CLARKE, 61 F.Supp.3d. 569(W.D.Va.2014); BUMGARNER v. N.C.D.C., 276 F.R.D. 452(N.C.2011); BURNETT v. TAHEY, 699 F3d. 804(MEM)(4th.Cir. 2012); KARSJENS v. PIPER,--F3d.--, 2017 WL 24613(8th Cir. 2017).

EVEN THOUGH THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION SUBMITTED BY JUDGE MARCHANT IS TAINTED BY FRAUD AND CAN'T BE USED. WE OBJECT TO MARCHANT IN THE REPORT STATING THAT THE DOCUMENT CONTAINS DISPARAGING AND INFLAMMATORY LANGUAGE; THAT THE CASE CAN BE CHARACTERIZED AS "BUSSWORDS" OR "LEGAL GIBBERISH", CITING ROCHESTER v. McKIE, 2011 WL 2671228(DSC.2011) AND YOCUM v. SUMMER , 1991 WL 171389 (N.D.Ill.1991). FIRST, THESE CASES ARE VOID DUE TO THEIR USE OF THE PLRA AND OR AEDPA WHICH ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THIS RENDERS HIS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION VOID FOR MAKING USE OF SUCH CITINGS OF LAW. SECONDLY, THE USE OF THESE CASES IS MISPLACED AND IS LIKE COMPARING "APPLES TO ORANGES". THERE IS NOTHING IN THE CASES CITING BY THE JUDGE THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT THOSE CASES INVOLVED PUBLIC JURIS CLAIMS, OR CLAIMS INVOLVING MATTERS OF PUBLIC, SOCIAL, RELIGIOUS OR POLITICAL INTEREST TO THE COMMUNITY WHERE BY THOSE CASES DO NOT INVOLVE PROTECTED SPEECH. SINCE THIS IS THE CASE FOR THE PLAINTIFFS FILINGS; THUS, THE LANGUAGE CONTAINED THEREIN IS "PROTECTED SPEECH" AND CANNOT BE CHARACTERIZED AS "BUSSWORDS" OR "LEGAL GIBBERISH". "GIBBERISH", IS DEFINED AS---CONFUSING, UNITELLIGIBLE OR MEANINGLESS SPEECH OR LANGUAGE. OUR PLEADINGS CANNOT BE CHARACTERIZED AS SUCH. JUDGE MARCHANT ABUSED HIS DISCRETION IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT IN HIS EFFORTS TO KEEP THE EVIDENCE FOUND UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 FROM COMING INTO THE COURT AND BEING MADE A PART OF THE COURT RECORD.

FUTHERMORE, WE TAKE YOU TO ISAIAH 14:29 (THE AUTHORIZED KING JAMES BIBLE), THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT", ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION. IT READS: "REJOICE NOT THOU, WHOLE PALESTINA, BECAUSE THE ROD OF HIM THAT SMOTE THEE IS BROKEN (MEANING THIS MAN WILL COME AT A TIME WHEN THE PALESTINIANS ARE SUBJECT TO APARTHEID AS THEY ARE NOW. ISRAEL, IS THE "ROD". IT IS BROKEN [STOPPED] BECAUSE I AM BOTH THEIR KING-KHALIFAH, THE FIDUCIARY HEIR.); FOR OUT OF THE "SERPENT'S ROOT" (SATAN'S ATTACK UPON MY LIFE. "ROOT"---MEANING SOURCE, ORIGIN OR CAUSE. "CAUSE" IS FURTHER DEFINED AS---"CAUSE FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW", "PRISON".) . SHALL COME A "COCKATRICE"--MEANING A BOLD, ARDENT, STOCKY, "PERNICIOUS" (EMPHASIS ADDED) FELLOW.); AND HIS "FRUIT" (THAT WHICH COMES FORTH FROM HIM, THAT 7 TIMES THE SPIRIT OF ELIJAH THING FORETOLD BY PROPHESY TO COME), SHALL BE THAT OF A "FIERY FLYING SERPENT". MY PERSONALITY, WHICH INCLUDES MY SPEECH, IS ESTABLISHED AND PROTECTED BY LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT TEN THOUSAND YEARS BEFORE I WAS BORN. IT IS AN "ACT OF GOD" ORDAINED UNDER CONTRACT PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10. THE DETERMINATION MADE BY JUDGE MARCHANT MUST BE REJECTED WHERE SUCH ACCEPTANCE WOULD BURDEN THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT AND PENALIZE THE KING-KHALIFAH FOR AN "ACT OF GOD" WHICH IS IMPERMISSIBLE BY LAW. THE COURTS CANNOT MAKE OR UNMAKE THE CONTRACT AFTER THE FACT WITH EX POST FACTO LAW. SUCH WOULD BE A MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE, REUGH-v.-U.S., 133 S.Ct. 2072, 186 L.Ed.2d. 84, 81 U.S.L.W. 4372(2013); U.S.-v.-WELLS, 578 Fed. Appx' 234 CA4 (Va.2014); GRAHAM-v.-McFADDEN, 2015 WL 505536 (DSC.2015); OGDEN-v.-SANDERS, 25 U.S. 213 (1827); TRUSTEES-OF CONCINNATI-SOUTHERN-RY-v.-PORTER, 21 OHIO N.P. (N3) 441, 1918 WL 96530.

IN FURTHER ADDRESSING THIS MATTER, AND THE OUTRAGEOUS ACTS, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, FRAUD UPON THE COURTS IN JURISDICTIONS WHERE THEY HAD NO POWER OR AUTHORITY ESTABLISHING EXTRA-TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION CLAIMS. PART OF THE REASON THE JUDGES INVOLVED DID WHAT THEY DID, WAS BECAUSE THEY DID NOT LIKE THE WAY THEY WERE TALKED TO, DEMONSTRATING "PERSONAL" AS WELL AS "JUDICIAL" BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTI-

TUTIONAL LEVEL, WHICH IS EVIDENT BY WHAT MARCHANT SAID IN THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION. THE JUDGES INVOLVED DID THE ACTS IN RETALIATION AGAINST US IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) ; 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 AND IN VIOLATION OF ARTICLE III SECTION 1 AND 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. JUST LIKE THE DEFINITION OF PERSONAL BIAS DICTATES. THE JUDGES RETALIATED AGAINST US, INCLUDING MARCHANT, WOOTEN, WEST AND AUSTIN, FOR THE PURPOSE OF REGULATING AND RESTRICTING OUR SPEECH, BECAUSE THEY FOUND IT PERSONAL, INFLAMMATORY, DISPARAGING, AND OFFENSIVE. THEIR ACTIONS WOULD CHILL A PERSON OF ORDINARY FIRMNESS FROM CONTINUING TO ENGAGE IN THE PROTECTED SPEECH. LOOSE, FIGURATIVE OR HYPERBOLIC LANGUAGE IS PROTECTED WHERE THESE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES INVOLVE MATTERS OF PUBLIC, SOCIAL, RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL INTEREST TO THE COMMUNITY PRODUCING PUBLIC JURIS CLAIMS. THE USE OF ROCHESTER AND YOCUM ARE MISPLACED. THERE WAS NO PHYSICAL THREAT MADE AGAINST ANY OF THESE JUDGES. THE JUDGES SHOULD HAVE NEVER DONE THE ACTS THEY'VE DONE IN THESE CASES IN RETALIATION WARRANTING RECUSAL AND SANCTIONS, SABATINI v. REINSTEIN, --F.Supp. 3d.--, 2016 WL 8716594(E.D.Pa.2016); HALE v. EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY, 2016 WL 3277264(D.Kan.2016); LAROCHELLE v. WILMAC CORPORATION, 210 F.Supp.3d. 658(E.D.Pa.2016); DOE v. RECTOR AND VISITORS OF GEORGIA MASON UNIVERSITY, 149 F.Supp.3d. 602(E.D.Va. 2016); SNYDER v. PHELPS, 580 F3d. 206(4th.Cir2009); BALTIMORE SPORTS & SOCIAL CLUB, INC. v. SPORT & SOCIAL, LLC, 2017 WL 526499, * 3+, D.Md.; SCIRIO v. BLACK CAT BAIL BONDS, 2010 WL 1463470, * 4 (DSC.2010); MORRIS v. DORMA AUTOMATIC S. INC, 537 Fed. Appx' 254, 255 (4th.Cir.[S.C.] 2013); JOHNSON v. BYRD, 2016 WL 6839410(N.C.2016); BERGER v. U.S, 255 U.S. 22, 41 S.Ct. 230, 65 L.Ed. 481(U.S.1921); CANADA v. MILLER, F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 1512245(2014); BOOTH v. BALLARD, 2016 WL 1275054(2016)(DEMONSTRATING EVIDENTIARY HEARING MUST OCCUR).

NOTICE: THESE ISSUES ARE ON APPEAL. CAN THE KING-KHALIFAH ACT AS ATTORNEY FOR OTHER INMATES WHO ARE SUBJECTS UNDER THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES? WHAT IS "JAHJAH AL MAHDI, CRAWFORD'S" STATUS AT THE TIME OF FILING THESE CASES? DID JUDGE MARCHANT ABUSE HIS DISCRETION IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHEN HE ASSERTED

THAT THERE WAS NO RELIEF AVAILABLE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ. IN HIS EFFORTS TO PREVENT THE EVIDENCE FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 FROM ENTERING THE FEDERAL COURT?

FIRST, YOU ARE DEALING WITH THE FRAMING OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN. THE KING-KHALIFAH IS A DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL CASE WHERE HIS DUE PROCESS MATTERS WERE COMPROMISED ON DIRECT APPEAL GIVING WAY TO HABEAS CORPUS WHICH PRESENTLY EXIST UNDER CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM SOUGHT CONSOLIDATED TO THE EXISTING PARALLEL § 1983 CASES ARGUING THAT PROCESS WAS CORRUPTED BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED. THUS THE PROVISIONS OF 28 U.S.C. § 1443(1) DO ATTACH AS A DEFENDANT WHICH IS ALSO PRESENTED UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 REMOVED TO THESE PARALLEL CASES.

SECONDLY, WE TAKE YOU TO THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT", ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION UNDER ISAIAH 11:1-5. IT READS: "AND THERE SHALL COME FORTH A "ROD" (A KING/ SOVEREIGN) OUT OF THE STEM OF JESSE (KING DAVID'S FATHER) AND A "BRANCH" (A DESCENDENT) SHALL GROW OUT OF HIS ROOTS (THE KING-KHALIFAH IS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR). AND THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD SHALL REST UPON HIM, THE SPIRIT OF WISDOM AND UNDERSTANDING, THE SPIRIT OF COUNSEL (JAHJAH AL MAHDI POSSESSES ATTORNEY POWERS) AND MIGHT, THE SPIRIT OF KNOWLEDGE AND OF THE FEAR OF THE LORD; AND SHALL MAKE HIM OF QUICK UNDERSTANDING IN THE FEAR OF THE LORD: AND HE SHALL NOT JUDGE (JAHJAH AL MAHDI IS A JUDGE) AFTER THE SIGHT OF HIS EYES, NEITHER REPROVE AFTER THE HEARING OF HIS EARS: BUT WITH RIGHTEOUSNESS SHALL HE JUDGE THE POOR, AND REPROVE WITH EQUITY (JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS) FOR THE MEEK OF THE EARTH: AND HE SHALL SMITE THE EARTH (MEANING MY POWER AND AUTHORITY IS GLOBAL) WITH THE ROD OF HIS MOUTH AND WITH THE BREATH OF HIS LIPS SHALL HE SLAY THE WICKED". (AGAIN PROVING THE KING-KHALIFAH'S SPEECH IS PROTECTED SPEECH UNDER THE 1st. AMENDMENT AND VIA CONTRACT UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONST.).

ISAIAH 16:5 READS: "AND IN MERCY SHALL THE THRONE BE ESTABLISHED: AND HE SHALL SIT UPON IT IN TRUTH IN THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID (I AM KING AND HIGH PRIEST), JUDGING AND SEEKING JUDG-

MENT (I AM JUDGE, ATTORNEY AND LEGISLATOR WITH SUPERSEDING GLOBAL AUTHORITY), AND HASTING RIGHTEOUSNESS".

ISAIAH 42:18-22 READS: "HEAR YE DEAF; AND LOOK YE BLIND, THAT YE MAY SEE. WHO IS BLIND, BUT MY SERVANT: (I WILL NOT SEE THE WORLD'S POINT OF VIEW), OR DEAF AS MY MESSENGER (I AM SENT, THE VOICE OF GOD IN THE FORM OF A MAN, A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. I WILL ACCEPT NO ARGUMENT WHEN IT COMES TO THE LAWS OF GOD.) THAT I [GOD] SENT? (I AM HIS ADVOCATE, ATTORNEY), WHO IS BLIND AS HE WHO IS PERFECT, AND BLIND AS THE LORD'S SERVANT (ALL I SEE IS WHAT MY GOD DESIRES). SEEING MANY THINGS, BUT THOU OBSERVEST NOT (I SHALL TEACH MANY, BUT I SHALL NOT BE MOVED). THE LORD IS WELL PLEASED FOR HIS RIGHTEOUSNESS SAKE; HE (THE KING) WILL MAGNIFY THE LAW". I AM KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, HIGH PRIEST, LAWGIVER, ATTORNEY, JUDGE, LEGISLATOR WITH GLOBAL SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY BY MY ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH OVER TEN THOUSAND YEARS BEFORE YOUR NATION WAS FORMED VIA CONTRACT FROM THE SOLE CORPORATION WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION THAT WAS DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH IS WHY THE FEDERAL JUDGES ARE CONSPIRING TO PREVENT REMOVAL OF THAT STATE CASE TO THE FEDERAL COURTS.

WE TAKE TO TO THE CONTRACT UNDER LUKE 11:52. IT READS: "WOE UNTO YOU [LAWYERS!] FOR YE HAVE TAKEN AWAY THE KEY OF KNOWLEDGE: YE ENTER NOT IN YOURSELVES, AND THEM THAT WERE ENTERING YE HINDERED". YOU THINK YOU CAN LEGALLY HINDER ME? YOUR LAWS ARE NOT SOLELY YOUR OWN. THEY ARE OURS. OWNERSHIP LIES WITH US, THE SOLE CORPORATION, UNDER FOREIGN LAW. THE SOLE CORPORATION UNDER GOD IS THE "ORIGINAL FOUNTAIN" OF ALL LAW. THE "TERM" OR "CONCEPT" OF "ATTORNEY" DID NOT COME FROM ENGLISH LAW. IT DID NOT COME FROM THIS NATION GIVING YOU THE LEGAL RIGHT TO RESTRICT IT TO REQUIREMENT OF ENTRY TO THE STATE OR FEDERAL BAR ABSENT OF THE RIGHTS OR PREROGATIVES OF THE SOLE CORPORATION WHO ESTABLISHED IT AND WHERE FULL OWNERSHIP LIES. IT COMES FROM US, THE SOLE CORPORATION. THESE LAWS ARE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS. I HAVE FULL OWNERSHIP VIA CONTRACT PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND CAN ABUSE OR ACT IN THEM AS I PLEASE. THEREFORE, THE CLAIMS MADE BY MARCHANT ARE WITHOUT MERIT. THE COURTS CANNOT MAKE OR UNMAKE THE CONTRACT.

NOW WHAT'S INSIDE CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 THAT JUDGE MARCHANT AND THE FEDERAL JUDGES ARE WILLING TO LIE, RISK THEIR JOBS, ENGAGE IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY TO PREVENT FROM BEING SUBMITTED AS EVIDENCE TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES AND U.N. MEMBER STATES DEFAULTED ON? ONE DOCUMENT IS ENTITLED, "MEMORANDUM OF LAW WITH POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ON 'SOVEREIGNTY' OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, PROPHET AND HIGH PRIEST SUPPLEMENTED TO PREVIOUS SENT UNITED NATIONS DOCUMENTS IN RELATO GOD'S THEOCRATIC GOVERMENT OF THE SEVERAL GLOBAL NATIONS AND THEIR RESPECTIVE NATIONAL AND OR FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS AND NOTICE OF LIEN". IT READS IN RELEVANT PART:

TO: THE GLOBAL GOVERNMENTS, S.C.D.C., RELEVANT CORPORATIONS, BANKING ENTITIES, ETC. VIA THE UNITED NATIONS ETC., U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE, U.S. STATE DEPT., S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL ET. AL., FIRST AVENUE AT 46th. STREET NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017,

TO WHOM JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, THE KING OF THE NORTH, AL MAHDI, APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, PROPHET AND HIGH PRIEST, TRUE FIDUCIARY HEIR TO THE THEOCRATIC THRONE OF THE AFRICANS, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWISH WORLD, BY WILL AND TESTAMENT OF THE ONE TRUE GOD AND HIS PROPHETS PRESENTS SHALL COME. IN THE NAME OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, THE MOST MERCIFUL, THE MOST GREAT. SHALOM. AS SALAMU ALAYKUM WA RAMATULLAH WA BARAKATU. MAY THE BLESSING OF CHRIST JESUS BE UPON YOU. TAKE NOTICE THAT:

IT IS A WELL UNDERSTOOD FACT OF WORLD HISTORY THAT THE MOST DYNAMIC DOCUMENTS AND OR BOOKS THAT SET THE COURSE OF WORLD EVENTS AND WORLD HISTORY ARE THE TORAH, BIBLE, QURAN AND THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH). IT WAS WITHIN THE SACRED PAGES OF THESE HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH THAT DISCLOSED THE FUTILITY

, TYRANNY, WICKEDNESS, EVIL AND DEPRAVITY OF WORLD GOVERNMENTS AND FALSE RELIGIONS. THEY EXPRESSED THE ELEMENTS OF GOD'S LAWS AND THE RIGHTS OF THE SERVANTS OF THE MOST HIGH GOD WITHIN ANY SOCIETY WORLDWIDE ESTABLISHING THAT THE BELIEVING MEN AND WOMEN, SERVANTS AND WILLFUL SLAVES OF GOD, ARE CO-HEIRS TO GOD'S ETERNAL KINGDOM PROMISES. THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH), BY WILL AND TESTAMENT OF GOD AND HIS HOLY PROPHETS STIPULATED THE CHAIN OF AUTHORITY BY HOLY PROGENY AND GODLY AUTHORITY GIVEN TO HIS ANOINTED AND APPOINTED KINGS, KHALIFAHS, IMAMS AND HIGH PRIESTS WITHIN THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC GOVERNMENT, LEADING TO THE ETERNAL EARTHLY REIGN OF CHRIST, JESUS OF NAZARETH, TO INCLUDE HIS FORERUNNER AND HIS FORERUNNER'S DECLARATION OF SOVEREIGNTY AS ALSO SEEN BY THE ATTACHED UNITED NATIONS DOCUMENT DATED JULY 1, 2009 AND THE (21) PAGE SUMMONS AND LETTER DATED DECEMBER 25, 2009, AND THE OBVIOUS FACT THAT THE ONE TRUE GOD, HAVING NO PARTNERS, CREATES KINGS, KHALIFAHS AND HEIRS. THAT IT WAS THE ONE TRUE GOD WHO INSTITUTED , ORDAINED OR PERMITTED WORLD GOVERNMENTS AND IN DOING SO GOD SECURED THE RIGHTS OF ALL GOVERNMENTS AND OR CAN TAKE AWAY THESE RIGHTS AS HE SO WILLS, AND THAT WORLD GOVERNMENTS, AT EVERY LEVEL, DERIVE THEIR 'JUST POWERS' BY THE DECREE AND MERCY OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, FOR ALL MANKIND, JINN AND ANGELS ARE CREATED TO WORSHIP HIM.

IT IS WELL ESTABLISHED THAT THE SERVANTS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD MUST BE WILLING TO LOSE THEIR LIVES TO FIND THEIR LIVES, IN ALTRUISM, SUBJUGATION, PLACING ONESELF LAST IN ORDER TO BECOME FIRST IN THE RECEIPT OF GOD'S KINGDOM PROMISES, NOT LOVING THEIR LIVES UNTO DEATH! EVEN IF THEY MUST BE IMPRISONED OR DIE TO BE IN COMPLIANCE, PROTECT AND SERVE THE LAWS, DECREES AND WILL OF THE ONE TRUE GOD AS GIVEN BY HIS (3) HOLY BOOKS, SUNNAH AND HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI. THIS DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE CREATES AND RE-ESTABLISHES BEFORE ALL MANKIND THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD HAVING NO PARTNERS, TO INCLUDE THE SOVEREIGNTY OF HIS ANOINTED, APPOINTED KING OF THE NORTH, AL MAHDI, JONAH THE TISHBITE, FIDUCIARY HEIR TO THE EARTHLY THRONE OF

THE AFRICANS, ITS DIASPORA, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS WORLD-WIDE, WHICH IS NOT TO BE PLACED IN A DEMOCRACY OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE OR FOR THE PEOPLE OR OTHER GLOBAL NATIONAL INTEREST . THEREFORE, GOD AND HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH THE TISHBITE AND THE CREATURES THEY CREATE AND OR RULE BY DIVINE POWER ei. GOVERNMENTS OF THE WORLD, THEIR INHABITANTS, AND THOSE WHO WORK FOR/ IN GOVERNMENT(S) ARE PUBLIC SERVANTS AND OR GOD'S SERVANTS AND BY GODLY DECREE, FAITH, IMAN,HAVE PLACED THEMSELVES IN A SUBSERVIENT POSITION, TO SERVE THE ONE TRUE GOD AND HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH WITHIN THEIR OFFICE/ FUNCTION/ POSITION/ STATUS VIA THEIR RELIGIOUS COVENANTS AND OATHS PURSUANT TO THE LAWS OF GOD'S (3) HOLY BOOKS AND THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MU-HAMMAD(PBUH).

IN REGARD TO THE PRINCIPLES ESTABLISHED BY THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD PURSUANT TO THIS DECLA-RATION OF INDEPENDENCE, ANY PRESENT LAWS AND ANY SUBSEQUENT LAWS WRITTEN OR CREATED AFTER IT, AND OF THE TRUE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, ANY WRITTEN OR SPOKEN CUSTOMED LAW IS NOT ONLY THE DIRECT EXPRESSION OF THE SOVEREIGN WILL OF GOD, HIS PROPHETS AND APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, AL MAHDI, THE KING OF THE NORTH, IT IS ALSO THE ABSOLUTE RULE OF ACTION AND DECISION OF ALL DEPARTMENTS AND OFFICES OF GOD'S GLOBAL THEOCRATIC GOVERN-MENT WITH RESPECT TO ALL MATTERS COVERED BY IT, AND THEY MUST CONTROL AS THEY ARE WRITTEN OR STATED, INTERPRETED BY AL MAHDI, UNTIL IT IS CHANGED BY THE AUTHORITY WHICH ESTABLISHED IT, GOD, HIS PROPHETS AND THE KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE NORTH, AL MAHDI, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE. FOR REFERENCES SEE **STATE-EX REL-CRENSHAW-v.-JOSEPH,** 175 Ala. 579, 57 So. 942; **SCHMITT-v. F.W.-COOK-BREWING-CO.,** 187 Md. 623, 120 N.E. 19, 3 A.L.R. 270; **COLLINS-v.-MARTIN,** 209 Pa. 388, 139 A. 122, 55 A.L.R. 311; **TRA-VELER'S-INSURANCE-CO.-v.-MARSHALL,** 124 Tex. 45, 76 S.W.2d. 1007, 96 A.L.R. 802; **STATE-EX-REL-LEMON-v.-LANGLIE,** 45 WASH.2d. 82, 273 P.2d. 464; **EIE-GUAM-v.-LONG-TERM-CREDIT-BANK,-JAPAN,** 322 F3d. 652(9th.Cir.2003); **WANG-v.-ASHCROFT,** 320 F3d. 130(2nd.Cir. 2003); **ENGLISH-v.-THORN,** 676 F.Supp. 761(S.D.Miss.1987); **IN**

RE:-GREEN, 980 F2d. 590(9th.Cir.1992).

...AND TAKE NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING CASES AND POINTS:

(1) "BEFORE AND WHEN THE REVOLUTION BY GOD'S DECREE AND WAR IN THE FORM OF THIS LITIGATION BEFORE THE COURTS TOOK PLACE, THE KING OF THE NORTH, THE 12th. AND FINAL OF THE RIGHTLY GUIDED KHALIFAHS OF ISLAM WAS SOVEREIGN BY WAY OF HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SOVEREIGN AS IS WRITTEN IN THE HOLY BOOKS OF THE (3) TRUE RELIGIONS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) BEING A SECURED PERSON BY THAT WHICH IS WRITTEN AND CONTAINED THEREIN BEFORE THE UNJUST CAPTIVITY OF HIS HOLY ANCESTORS OR THE PRESENT NATIONS OF THE WORLD WERE FORMED AND BEFORE ANY SLAVE NAME OR NUMBER WAS ASSIGNED TO HIM BY BIRTH CERTIFICATE, SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER OR ANY OTHER RELEVANT LEGAL OR OTHERWISE DOCUMENT IN THE UNITED STATES WAS PRODUCED. BY SUCH HIS SUBJECTS ARE ALSO SECURED PERSONS BEING A KINGDOM OF PRIEST, A KHALIFATE OF IMAMS AS REDEEMED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD'S HIGH PRIEST OF THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD, CHRIST AND LINE OF AARON", MARTIN-ET.-AL.,-v.-THE LESSEE-OF-WADDELL, (1342) 41 U.S. (6 Pet.) 367, 410, 10 L.Ed. 997, 1013; ENGLISH-v.-THORN, 676 F.Supp. 761(S.D.Miss.1987); IN-RE:-GREEN, 980 F2d. 590(9th.Cir.1992); THE (3) HOLY BOOKS.

(2) "THE THEOCRATIC STATE, THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) ARE THE SUPREME LAW OVER ALL MANKIND, WRITTEN BY THE SUPREME POWER, THE ONE TRUE GOD HAVING NO PARTNERS AND HIS PROPHETS AS THEY WERE MOVED BY THE RUH OF ALLAH, THE HOLY SPIRIT, AS HE WRITES UPON THE HEARTS OF MAN WITH THE PEN THAT THOU KNOWETH NOT", RE-GORHAM--FAYETTE LOCAL-SCHOOL-DIST., 20 OHIO MISC. 222, 49 OHIO OPS.2d. 143, 250 N.E.2d. 104; STATE-EX-REL-WEINBERGER-v.-MILLER, 87 OHIO ST.-12, 99 N.E. 1078; IN-RE:-GREEN, 980 F2d. 590(9th.Cir.1992).

(3) "THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) ARE THE VOICE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, HIS PROPHETS, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, SPEAKING IN THEIR SOVEREIGN CAPACITY UNDER THEOCRATIC LAW AS WELL AS FOREIGN LAW,

AND THEY ARE CONGRUENT TO EACH OTHER, IN HARMONY WITH EACH OTHER, THEY ARE ONE AND MUST BE HEEDED; WHEN THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) SPEAK WITH REFERENCE TO A PARTICULAR MATTER, THEY MUST BE GIVEN EFFECT AS INTERPRETED BY AL MAHDI AS THE PARAMOUNT LAW OF THE LAND AND GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE", PEOPLE-v.-PARKS, 58 Cal. 624; (3) HOLY BOOKS; ENGLISH-v.-THORN-SUPRA.

(4) "GOD'S APPOINTED KING AL MAHDI, JONAH THE TISHBITE HIMSELF, OF COURSE IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW, FOR HE IS NOT ONLY KING/ KHALIFAH, BUT ALSO PROPHET OF GOD BEING THE VOICE OF GOD IN THE FORM OF A MAN, LAWGIVER OF GOD, THE AUTHOR AND SOURCE OF THE RESTORE LAW, BUT HE IS ALWAYS SUBJECT TO THE COMMANDS GIVEN HIM BY THE ONE TRUE GOD AS HIS SLAVE AND SERVANT. IN OUR GLOBAL THEOCRATIC SYSTEM, WHILE SOVEREIGN POWERS ARE DELEGATED TO VARIOUS AGENTS AND OR AGENCIES OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC GOVERNMENT, SOVEREIGNTY ITSELF REMAINS WITH GOD AND HIS APPOINTED, ANOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, UNTIL TAKEN OVER BY CHRIST, JESUS OF NAZARETH, BY WHOM AND FOR WHOM ALL EARTHLY GOVERNMENTS EXIST AND ACTS. AND THE LAW AS WRITTEN IN THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF MUHAMMAD(PBUH) ARE THE DEFINITION AND LIMITATION OF POWER AND GOD'S DIVINE LAWS", YICKS-WO-v.-HOPKINS, 118 U.S. 356; ENGLISH-v.-HORN-SUPRA.

(5) "UNDER OUR GLOBAL THEOCRATIC SYSTEM THE PEOPLE, WHO BY THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH) ARE CALLED SERVANTS AND SLAVES OF THE ONE TRUE GOD BEING SUBJUGATED TO GOD AND HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH THE TISHBITE, ARE HERE AND WORLDWIDE A KINGDOM OF PRIEST, A KHALIFATE OF IMAMS, WHETHER COLLECTIVE OR INDIVIDUAL, BEING SUBJECT TO THE LAWS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE ABOVE ANY OTHER LAW WITHIN ANY NATION AND ARE IMMUNE FROM PARALLEL OR SECONDARY STATE ACTION BEING THEMSELVES KINGS AND KHALIFAHS WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SOVEREIGN KING OF KINGS, KHALIFAH OF KHALIFAHS JONAH IBN YAQUB, AL MAHDI, OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, FROM THE LEAST OF THEM TO THE GREATEST OF THEM BY BEING A HOLY COMMONWEALTH AND KINGDOM. THEY ARE BOUND TO GIVE WAY TO THE SENTIMENT OF LOYALTY, THE BAYT, TO THE PERSON OF JONAH GABRIAL JAHJAH

T. TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, THE TRUE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH TO THE HOLY THRONE OF THE AFRICANS, THEIR DIASPORA, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS WORLDWIDE. THE CITIZENRY OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE KNOW HIM AS SUCH PERSON, DECREED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD, HOWEVER IN YEARS TO THOSE IN POWER, A KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, AND HIGH PRIEST OF STRENGTH AND POWER THEY NEED TO YIELD RIGHTS WHICH THE LAW AND COMMANDMENT OF THE ONE TRUE GOD SECURE HIM", SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF MUHAMMAD(PBUH); UNITED-STATES v.-LEE, 106 U.S. 196 at 208.

(6) "IN THE THEOCRATIC STATE WORLDWIDE SOVEREIGNTY RESTS WITH THE ONE TRUE GOD, HAVING NO PARTNERS OR ASSOCIATIONS, HE IS ONE GOD NOT A TRINITY, IN HIS APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, PROPHET AND HIGH PRIEST, JONAH THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI", SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF MUHAMMAD(PBUH); CHISOLM-EX'R-v.-GEORGIA, 1 L.Ed. (2 DALL) 415, 472; ENGLISH v.-TRHORN, 676 F.Supp. 761.

(7) "KNOW IT TRUE THAT UNDER GLOBAL THEOCRATIC LAW THE DUTY OF ANY ATTORNEY GENERAL, GENERAL, OR OFFICER OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE IS TO REPRESENT, SERVE AND PROTECT THE TRUTH, LAWS, RIGHTS AND OR LIFE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, HIS APPOINTED, ANOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH BEING THE EMBODIMENT OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AS GOD PROTECTS THE KING/ KHALIFAH AS THE KING/ KHALIFAH PROTECTS AND SECURES THE RIGHTS OF THE SERVANTS AND SLAVES OF GOD.(I CAN LEGALLY ACT AS ATTORNEY, JUDGE AND LEGISLATOR WITH SUPERSEDING POWERS). ANY FORM OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT OR OTHERWISE, OR ITS LAWS, WHETHER NATIONALLY OR INTERNATIONALLY THAT STAND IN OPPOSITION TO THE DECREES OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING OR THE LAWS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE ARE NOT PREVAILING AND THEY ARE TO BE RENDERED VOID. YOU WANT TO PLACE INTO EFFECT LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PREVENT THE GUANTANOMO DETAINEES FROM RECEIVING JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS IN AMERICAN COURTS? THEN SET THEM FREE. I HAVE REDEEMED THEM AS HIGH PRIEST, KING AND KHALIFAH. AS I AM SOVEREIGN THEY ARE SOVEREIGNS UNDER A SOVEREIGN BEFORE ANY OF YOUR NATIONS WERE FORMED BY LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT PURSUANT TO THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) NOT SUBJECT TO THIS UNJUST CAPTIVITY

OR YOUR GLOBAL LAWS. YOU WANT TO PLACE INTO EFFECT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION BY LAW OR U.N. COUNCIL PROTECTING THE WORSHIP OF FALSE GODS, THESE SODOMITE AND LESBIAN DOGS AROUND THE WORLD? I MAKE VOID ANY EFFECT YOUR NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL LAWS HAVE UPON MY PEOPLE THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND CLAIM THE LIMITATIONS PLACED UPON OUR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN THE FORM OF THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY REGARDING SAME SEX MARRIAGES. THE ANTI-CHRIST, AD DAJJAL, WILL BE A ONE EYED CLOSET FAGOT SODOMITE DOG AND PIG. BEHIND THE SCENES OF YOUR GLOBAL GOVERNMENTS HE IS PREPARING FOR HIS RULE. BEHIND THE WALL OF YOUR CORRUPT BROKEN PRISON SYSTEM I AM PREPARING FOR MY RULE OVER GOD'S PEOPLE. NEITHER TIME NOR PLACE HINDERS THE POWER OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH. YOU WILL NOT SUBJECT GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OR THE CITIZENS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE TO THESE STUPID, IGNORANT, VILLAGE IDIOT LAWS, INJUSTICES OR OPPRESSIONS. I WILL DROP A HOUSE ON YOUR WICKED, STUPID, DEPRAVED, PERVERTED, SODOMITE PROTECTING TAILS. PUSH MY BUTTON IF YOU WANT TO. YOU GOT THE RIGHT-WRONG ONE. I WILL CLEAN YOUR PUTRID CLOCKS. THE PROPHET OF GOD IS ABOVE ALL WORLDLY GOVERNMENTS TO INCLUDE THE PEOPLE HE IS COMMANDED TO PROTECT. THE GOD APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE IS SOVEREIGN BEING SUBJECT TO GOD, SO ALL OFFICERS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE DUTIES ARE TO THAT SOVEREIGN AS THAT SOVEREIGN PROTECTS THE RIGHTS OF THE THEOCRATIC PEOPLE BY HIS GODLY WISDOM AND DISCRETIONARY ACTS RATHER THAN TO THE MACHINERY OF ANY GLOBAL GOVERNMENT", HANCOCK-v.-CARRY-ALCORN-MINING-CO.-INC.,-KY., 503 S.W.2d. 710; KENTUCKY-CONSTITUTION-SECTION-4;-COMMONWEALTH EX REL-HANCOCK-v.-PAXTON-KENTUCKY, 516 S.W.2d. PAGE 867(2) CLAUSE 3; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); ENGLISH-v.-THORN-SUPRA..

(8) "LOCAL LAWS AND ORDINANCES ENACTED BY CITY, STATE OR NATION(S) MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH AND CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO OVERRIDE OR OVERRULE THE LAWS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE. YET CONCESSIONS CAN BE MADE BY GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH AS HE IS MOVED BY THE RUH, THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD IN LIGHT OF GOD'S MERCIES AND THE CIRCUMSTANCES PRESENTED, BELL-v.-VAUGH, 155 Fla. 551, 21 So.2d. 31; EVANS-v.-BERRY, 262 N.Y. 61, 186 N.E. 203, 89 A.L.R. 387.

(9)"IT IS THE DUTY OF ALL OFFICIALS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, WHETHER LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, EXECUTIVE OR BY CHOICE MONARCHY/ KHALIFATE, ADMINISTRATIVE OR MINISTERIAL, TO PERFORM EVERY OFFICIAL ACT AS NOT TO JUST VIOLATE THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) AS INTERPRETED BY AL MAHDI, BUT EVERY WORD THAT PROCEEDETH OUT OF THE MOUTH OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, WHICH GIVES LICENSE BY GOD'S DISCRETION VIA HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH TO FUFILL ANY ACT GOD COMMANDS EVEN IF IT SEEMS TO CONTRADICT HIS WRITTEN LAWS OR THE LAWS OF ANY SOVEREIGN NATION, SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) ei. JUNCTURE OF THE TWO SEAS AL KIDR AND MUSA; MONTGOMERY v. STATE, 55 Fla. 97, 45 So. 879; DANIEL 11:1-3.

(10) "THE PROVISIONS OF THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) AS RESTORED AND INTERPRETED BY JONAH AL MAHDI AND THE DECREES OF GOD'S PROPHET AND APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE MUST BE GIVEN EFFECT EVEN IF DOING SO A STATUTE OR LAW OF ADJACENT OR OTHERWISE SOVEREIGN NATIONS UPON THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND ITS CITIZENRY ARE HELD TO BE INOPERATIVE". SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); STATE EX REL. WEST v. BUTLER, 70 Fla. 102, 69 So. 771; ENGLISH v. THORN, 676 F.Supp. 761.

(11) "THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) AS RESTORED AND INTERPRETED BY JONAH IBN YAQUB, AL MAHDI, ARE NOT MADE TO ACT UPON THE LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT ALONE, BUT UPON EVERY DEPARTMENT OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE", WAY v. HILLIER, 16 OHIO 105; (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH; ENGLISH v. THORN, 676 F.Supp. 761; IN RE: GREEN SUPRA.

(12) "COURTS SHOULD NOT TOLERATE OR CONDONE DISREGARD OF THE DECREES OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE NOR ARBITRARY USURPATION OF POWER OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH ON THE PART OF ANY OFFICER OR THE PEOPLE [AND NEITHER SHOULD THE KING/

KHALIFAH] AND THE PEOPLE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE MUST BE GIVEN ACCESS TO THEIR KING/ KHALIFAH IN SOME FORM TO SEEK REDRESS OF THEIR GRIEVANCES IF SOMEHOW THE COURTS FAIL IN THEIR DUTIES", EX-PARTE-OWENS, 10 OKLA. CRIM. REP. 284, 136 P. 197, Ann. Cas. 1916 A. 522; KING'S DECREE--COURTS NO.(1); ENGLISH v.-THORN-SUPRA.; VERLINDEN-B.V.-v.-CENTRAL-BANK-OF-NIGERIA, 401 U.S. 480, 103 S.Ct. 1962, 76 L.Ed.2d. 81(U.S.1983).

(13) "THE OFFICERS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC LAW, IN THE EXECUTION OF PROCESS, ARE OBLIGED TO KNOW THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEOCRATIC LAW, AND IF THEY MISTAKE THEM, WHETHER THROUGH IGNORANCE OR DESIGN, OR IF THEY SEEK TO ROB OR PILLAGE THE KING OR ANY OTHER CITIZEN OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND ANY ONE IS HARMED BY THE ERROR OR INJUSTICE, **THEY MUST RESPOND IN DAMAGES AND ARE SUBJECT BY FINAL JUDGMENT TO THE KING/ KHALIFAH**", SEE 28 U.S.C. § 2679; CAPITAL-TRANS,-INTERN,-LLC.-v.-INTERNATIONAL-PETROLEUM-INV.-CO., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 557236(Fla.2013); THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF MUHAMMAD(PBUH); ROSTERS v. MARSHALL, (UNITED STATES USE OF ROGERS-v.-CONKLIN) 1 WALL (U.S.) 644, 17 L.Ed. 714 (EMPHASIS ADDED); ENGLISH-v.-THORN-SUPRA.; THORTON-v.-MARYLAND-GENERAL-HOSP., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1943065 (Md.2013).

(14) "IT IS A GENERAL RULE THAT AN OFFICER-EXECUTIVE, ADMINISTRATIVE, QUASI-JUDICIAL, MINISTERIAL, OR OTHERWISE--WHO ACTS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF HIS JURISDICTION AND WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION OF THE KING/ KHALIFAH AND THE PROVISIONS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC LAW MAY THEREBY RENDER HIM AMENABLE TO PERSONAL LIABILITY AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING/ KHALIFAH AS HE IS GUIDED BY THE RUH OF ALLAH, THE HOLY SPIRIT", SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); COOPER v.-O'CONNER, 69 App. D.C. 100, 99 F2d. 135, 118 A.L.R. 1440; CHAMBERLAIN-v.-CLAYTON, 56 IOWA 331, 9 N.W. 237, 41 Am. Rep. 101.

(15) "IN OUR GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, GOD AND HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, ARE SOVEREIGN,...AND THE GOVERNMENT AND OR PEOPLE

CANNOT SEVER ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE ONE TRUE GOD OR HIS APPOINTED GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING/ KHALIFAH,...", AEROYIM, 387 U.S. at 257, 87 S.Ct. at 1662.

(17) "IN THE COMMON USAGE, THE TERM 'KING/ KHALIFAH' THOUGH HE BE A SERVANT OF GOD DESIGNATED TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE, DOES NOT INCLUDE THE PEOPLE, AND STATUTES AND THEOCRATIC LEGISLATION EMPLOYING IT WILL ORDINARILY NOT BE CONSTRUED TO DO SO", UNITED-STATES-v.-UNITED-MINE-WORKERS, 330 U.S. 258(1947), 91 L.Ed. 884, 67 S.Ct. 677.

(18) "SINCE IN COMMON USAGE, THE TERM 'KING/ KHALIFAH' , THOUGH THE PEOPLE BE A KINGDOM OF PRIEST, A KHALIFATE OF IMAMS, DOES NOT INCLUDE THE PEOPLE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE UNLESS SPECIFIED, STATUTES OR LAWS NOT IMPLYING THE PHRASES ARE ORDINARILY CONSTRUED TO EXCLUDE IT", 1 U.S.C.S. 1 n. 12; 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.,; BRADDY-v.-UNITED-STATES, 2016 WL 1031301 (E.D.Va.2016), (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH); UNITED-STATES-v.-EX, 94 U.S. 315.

(19) "WHERE THE RIGHTS, DUTIES, AND OBLIGATIONS SECURED BY THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH) AS RESTORED AND INTERPRETED BY JONAH IBN. YAQUB, THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE DECREES ARE INVOLVED, THERE CAN BE NO RULE MAKING OF LEGISLATION PAST, PRESENT OR FUTURE, OTHER THAN CHRIST, JESUS OF NAZARETH HIMSELF, WHICH WOULD ABROGATE THEM WITHIN ANY NATION", SEETHE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); MIRANDA-v.-ARIZONA.

(20) "....THE CONGRESS, PARLIAMENT NOR ANY OTHER GLOBAL LAW MAKING BODY CANNOT OVERRIDE THE DECREES OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, GOD'S PROPHET AND APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH IBN. YAQUB, THE LAWS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, NOR CAN THEY REVOKE THE SOVEREIGN POWER OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING/ KHALIFAH, NOR THE POWER OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE", SEE THE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); PERRY-v.-UNITED-STATES, 294 U.S. 330, 353(1935); ENGLISH-v.-THORN-SUPRA; ADAIR-ASSET-MANAGEMENT,-LLC.-v.-U.S.

DEPT.-OF-HOUSING-DEVELOPMENT, 2016 WL 3248569(2016).

(21) "INHERENT 'SOVEREIGNTY' IS ONE OF THE FOUNDATIONAL STRUCTURES OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC GOVERNMENT AS IS DECREED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD AND IS DESIGNED TO EXIST BY AND THROUGH THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH) BEING A GOVERNMENT OF GOD, BY GOD AND FOR GOD. IN THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE SOVEREIGNTY RESIDES IN THE ONE TRUE GOD AND HIS SERVANT AND SLAVE, HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH IBN. YAQUB, THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, AND NO GLOBAL CONGRESS, PARLIAMENT OR ANY OTHER LEGISLATIVE BODY CAN EXERCISE ANY POWER WHICH THEY HAVE, IN CONTRADICTION OR OPPOSITION TO THEOCRATIC LAW AND THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, BY THEIR CONSTITUTIONS OR OTHERWISE ENTRUSTED TO THEM: ALL ELSE IS WITHHELD", (YOU CANNOT GIVE GAYS AND LESBIANS OUR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WHICH IS GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS UNDER "CONTRACT", "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS), SEE THE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); JULLIARD-V.-GREENMAN, 110 U.S. 421; ENGLISH-V.-THORN-SURRA.; SAUNIER-V.-BOEING-COMPANY, F.Supp. 2d., 2014 WL 1646953(2014).

(22) "ALL THAT THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI AND THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE DOES AND PROVIDES LEGITIMATELY BY THE COMMAND OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) ARE IN PURSUIT OF ITS DUTY TO PURGE THE INNER-SANCTUM OF AFRICANS, ITS DIASPORA, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS, BELIEVERS, SERVANTS OF GOD WORLDWIDE, PURIFY THE PLACES OF WORSHIP AND HOLY TEACHINGS, ALL THAT ARE PERMITTED TO WORSHIP AND LEARN THEREIN, AND PREPARE THEM FOR THE RULE OF THEIR ETERNAL EARTHLY KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, PROPHET AND HIGH PRIEST, CHRIST JESUS OF NAZARETH(PBUH), AND PROTECT THEIR RIGHTS AS HOLY HEIRS, KINGS, KHALIFAHS OF THE ETERNAL PROMISES OF GOD AS THEY REMAIN OBEDIENT, IN COVENANT TO GOD'S LAWS AND THE DECREES OF HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, AL MAHDI (WYNHAMMER-V.-PEOPLE, 13 N.Y. 378; (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD[PBUH]) WHICH DUTY THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING/ KHALIFAH AND THE GLOBAL

THEOCRATIC STATE WITH ITS COMMONWEALTH OWE TO THEIR CREATOR WHO IS ONE, HAVING NO PARTNERS. THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A "TRINITY". I, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL-MAHDI AND THE SERVANTS AND SLAVES OF THE ONE TRUE GOD; WHICH DEBT AND DUTY TO THEIR GOD IS NEVER EXTINGUISHED NOR DISCHARGED, BEING PERPETUAL, BY WAY OF GOD'S APPOINTED HIGH PRIEST OF THE LINE OF AARON, CHRIST(PBUT) AND THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD, REDEEMS THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COMMONWEALTH OF AFRICA, ITS DIASPORA, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS, HEREBY NULLIFY AND OR SUPERCEDE ANY DEBT OR DUTY OWED BY THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING/ KHALIFAH AND THEOCRATIC COMMONWEALTH, EXTINGUISHING AND DISCHARGING SUCH THAT EXIST WITHIN ANY GLOBAL NATION AS DETERMINED AND DECREED BY GOD'S HIGH PRIEST, IMAM, PROPHET, KING AND KHALIFAH. NO MATTER WHAT ANY GLOBAL GOVERNMENT OR NATION PROVIDES FOR US IN ANY MANNER OF CONVENIENCE, CONSCIENCE OR SAFETY, THE SERVANTS, SLAVES OR KING/ KHALIFAH OWES NOTHING TO THE GLOBAL GOVERNMENTS", SEE THE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); HALE v. HENKEL, 201 U.S. 43 at 74; LANSING v. SMITH, 4 WEND 9, 20 (1829); THE PARLIAMENT BELGE, 5 Prob. Div. 197; EXCHANGE, 7 CRANCH 116; VAVASSEUR v. KRUPP, 9 CH. DIV. 351.

(23) "UNDER THE FORM OF THE KING/ KHALIFAH'S GLOBAL THEOCRATIC GOVERNMENT, THE LEGISLATURE OR JUDICIARY IS NOT SUPREME. THEY ARE ONLY ORGANS OF THAT ABSOLUTE SOVEREIGNTY WHICH RESIDES WITH THE ONE TRUE GOD AND HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI. LIKE OTHER BODIES OF THE GOVERNMENT, IT CAN ONLY EXERCISE SUCH POWERS AS HAS BEEN DELEGATED TO IT, AND WHEN IT STEPS BEYOND THAT BOUNDARY OR THE DECREES OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING/ KHALIFAH, THEIR ACTS...ARE UTTERLY RENDERED VOID", SEE THE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); BILLINGS v. HALL, 7 CA. 1 (COURT OF APPEALS, U.S.); 6 PET. 729, 730; 7 CRANCH, 42 & C. 1 PET. 340; 2 PET. 163; 3 PET. 203; 10 PET. 472 & C. 12 PET. 611.

(24) I, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SOVEREIGN KING, KHALIFAH

AND FIDUCIARY HEIR, BY WAY OF HIMSELF SECURED PERSON PURSUANT TO THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH, LEGAL BINDING CONTRANTS UNDER FEDERAL AND INTERNATIONAL PROBATE LAW, ALSO REGARDING THE CITIZENS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, AS HIGH PRIEST AND DIRECT DESCENDANT OF AARON, OF MOSES, OF CHRIST THROUGH HIS BROTHER JAMES, OF THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD, OF KING DAVID, OF KING SOLOMAN AND THE QUEEN OF SHEBA OF THE ETHIOPIAN THRONE(PBUT), HEREBY REDEEMS HIMSELF BY THE HOLY DECREE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD AND BY HOLY INHERITANCE, TO INCLUDE THE SERVANTS, SLAVES, CITIZENS OF GOD OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND DISCHARGES ANY DEBT WHICH MAY BE SAID TO EXIST OR BE OWED TO THE STATE OR GOVERNMENT OF ALL GLOBAL NATIONS BY HIMSELF OR THE THEOCRATIC COMMONWEALTH. THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE WORLD ARE, HOWEVER, INDEBTED CONTINUALLY TO THE ONE TRUE GOD AND GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH AND THE CITIZENRY OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE BECAUSE THE ONE TRUE; HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH AL MAHDI AND THE CITIZENRY OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE OF THE MOST HIGH GOD WHO ARE SANCTIONED AND BLESSED BY HIM CREATING ALSO A GLOBAL THEOCRATIC CORPORATION IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE SOLE CORPORATION SUFFER THEIR CONTINUAL SODOMITE PROTECTING, FALSE GOD WORSHIPPING , OVER CARNAL INDULGING, CAPITALISTIC DOG EAT DOG IDEOLOGY, BLASPHEMING RUMPS EXISTENCE. THE CONTINUAL DEBT OF THE GLOBAL DEMOCRATIC AND WORLDLY NATIONS AND OR GOVERNMENTS OWE TO THE ONE TRUE GOD, THE GLOBAL APPOINTED THOCRATIC KING/ KHALFAH OF THE THEOCRATIC STATE AND ITS COMMONWEALTH WHO ARE IN THEMSELVES KINGS AND KHALIFAHS IS DISCHARGED UPON SETTLEMENT OF THE $100 TRILLION, DOLLAR AMOUNT WHICH IS ALSO TO BE ESTABLISHED BY LIEN UPON THE GLOBAL ASSETS OF THE (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER RELIEF SOUGHT BEFORE THE VARIOUS COURTS BY WAY OF THE DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 4:10-cv-4625-SBA, ALSO IN THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, AND OR BY DECREE OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, AND IS CONTINUED DISCHARGED UPON SUCH SETTLEMENT ONLY AS IF THEY DO NOT VIOLATE THE SOVEREIGNTY, LAWS AND RIGHTS OF THE KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE INCLUDING ITS CITIZENS, AND WHEN THE GLOBAL WORLDLY GOVERNMENTS FALL AND

OR FAIL IN THEIR DUTY TO PROVIDE PROTECTION--DISCHARGE ITS DEBT TO THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, IT IS AN ABANDONMENT **(AN INJURY)** OF ANY AND ALL POWER, AUTHORITY OR VESTIGE OF "SOVEREIGNTY" WHICH POSSESSED AND THE LAWS REMAIN THE SAME UNTIL CHANGED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD, HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH IBN. YAQUB, THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, THE SOVEREIGNTY OF ALL GLOBAL NATIONS REVERT BACK TO GOD, HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH AL MAHDI AND THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE FROM WHENCE IT CAME." SEE THE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH); DOWN-v.-BIDWELL, 182 U.S. 277; UNITED-STATES v.-JOHNSON,--Fed. Appx'--2014 WL 6764682 CA4 (N.C.2014); I.N.S. v.-CYR, 533 U.S. 289, 121 S.Ct. 2271(U.S.2001); DECATUR-v. RAULDING, 39 U.S. 599, 1840 WL 6277 (MEM) U.S. 1840; HORNS-v. WHALEN, 922 F2d. 835 CA4 (Va.1991); ALSO SEE SOURCES: BEFORE THE MAYFLOWER, A HISTORY OF BLACK AMERICA BY LERONE BENNETT; SUNA IBN MAJAH VOLUME # 5 ISBN. No. 81-7152-294-1 PAGES 391-395; SIGNS BEFORE THE DAY OF JUDGMENT, BY IBN KATHIR ISBN No. 1-870582-039 PAGES 18-24; ISAIAH 14:29-32; 41:25; WORLD'S GREATEST MEN OF COLOR, VOLUME 1 BY J.A. ROGERS ISBN No. 978-0- 684- 81581-7; THE KEBAR NAGAST OR "GLORY OF THE KINGS" A CHRONICLE OF THE RULERS OF ETHIOPIA; BUDGE E.A.W., THE QUEEN OF SHEBA AND HER ONLY SON MENYELEK, LONDON 1923; ORMONDE, CZENZI, SOLOMON AND THE QUEEN OF SHEBA, NEW YORK, FARRA STRAUS AND YOUNG 1954; ZECHARIAH 6:12-13; NATION,-COX-v.-SHALALA, 112 F3d. 151; ENGLISH-v.-GEN.-ELEC.-CO., 496 U.S. 72, 79, 100 S.Ct. 2270, 2275, 110 L.Ed.2d. 65(1990); O'BRIEN-v.-MOORE, 395 F3d. 499 CA4 (N.C.2005); BELL-v.-WOLFISH, 441 U.S. 520, 99 S.Ct. 1861(U.S. 1978); UNITED-STATES-v.-BANNISTER, 467 Fed. Appx' 175 CA4 (S.C. 2012).

(25) "THE INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE MAY STAND UPON HIS RIGHTS OUTLINED BY THE (3) HOLY BOOKS, THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) AND THE DECREES OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH AS SERVANTS AND SLAVES OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, AS A KINGDOM OF PRIESTS, AS A KHALIFATE OF IMAMS. HE IS ENTITLED TO CARRY ON HIS OWN PRIVATE BUSINESS IN HIS OWN WAY AS LONG AS SUCH BUSINESS OR WAY DO NOT VIOLATE THE LAWS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD PURSUANT TO THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH

OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) OR THE DECREES OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH IBN. YAQUB. HIS POWER TO CONTRACT IS UNLIMITED AS LONG AS HE IS IN COMPLIANCE TO THE PRIOR CONDITIONS. HE OWES A DUTY TO THE ONE TRUE GOD, THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING AND THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE TO CONDUCT SUCH BUSINESS IN THE FEAR AND LOVE OF GOD, THE KING'S DECREES AND THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE WITH JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS AND UPON VIOLATION OF ANY OF THE PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS, SUCH INJUSTICE OR ACTS THAT STAND IN VIOLATION OF THE LAWS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, THE KING'S DECREES AND THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, BY THE NATURE OF THIS BUSINESS OR ACTS WILL BE DIVULGED AND OPEN TO INVESTIGATION,... HE OWES ALMANAH, DUTY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO THE ONE TRUE GOD, FORSAKING ALL OTHER GODS SINCE ALL HE OWNS AND THE KNOWLEDGE HE POSSESSES IS GIVEN HIM BY THE ONE TRUE GOD. HE WILL PAY ZAKAT AND OR TITHE. HE WILL ESTABLISH PRAYER BY WAY OF HIS RELIGIOUS COVENANT. HE WILL PURIFY HIS LIFE WALKING IN HOLINESS POSSESSING TAWQA OF ALLAH. THE MARRIAGE IS UNDEFILED, AS LONG AS IT IS NOT SAME SEX MARRIAGE. HE WILL GO UNTO HIS TILT AS HE WISHES. THE FATHERS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE WILL TAKE THE LEAD RESPONSIBILITY FOR RAISING THE CHILDREN OF LIGHT, THE GODLY SEED, WHILE THE WOMEN ASSIST HIM. HIS HONOR , BLOOD AND PROPERTY ARE SACRED TO BE PROTECTED BY GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH AND HIS FELLOW SERVANTS OF GOD, THE UMMAH OF THE "I AM", "ALLAH", "JEHOVAH", THE BODY OF CHRIST(PBUH) BEING MEMBERS OF EACH OTHER. HIS RIGHTS ARE SUCH AS EXISTED BY THE (3) HOLY BOOKS, THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) AND THE DECREES OF THE KING/ KHALIFAH, AL MAHDI, THROUGHOUT THE LAND WITHIN ALL PROVINCES OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC SOVEREIGNTY, LONG ANTECEDENT TO THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND WORLDLY NATIONS, AND CAN ONLY BE TAKEN AWAY FROM HIM IF HE APOSTATE, WORSHIP FALSE GODS, BY DUE PROCESS LAW IN ACCORDANCE TO THE DECREES OF GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND THE SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH). HE OWES ALL. HIS BEST, HIS FIRST FRUITS, TO THE ONE TRUE GOD, MUST WANT FOR HIS BROTHER WHAT HE WANTS FOR HIMSELF AND SHALL NOT TRESPASS UPON THE RIGHTS OF THE KING/ KHALIFAH OR HIS FELLOW SERVANTS OF GOD, THE CITIZENS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE." SEE THE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND

SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH).

(26) "JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, IS NOT BOUND BY/GENERAL WORDS IN STATUTES OR GLOBAL LAWS, RESTRICTIVE OF PREROGATIVE RIGHTS, TITLES OR INTEREST, UNLESS EXPRESSLY NAMED AND CONSENTED TO. ACTS OF LIMITATIONS DO NOT BIND AT THE KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE NOR THE PEOPLE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE WHEN IT COMES TO THEIR DUTIES OR RELIGIOUS REQUIREMENTS OF BEING OBEDIENT TO THE LAWS AND DECREES OF THE ONE TRUE GODS. THE KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, IS THE VOICE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD BEING HIS MESSENGER IN THE FORM OF A MAN. THE KING/ KHALIFAH IS THE FINAL WORD ON ALL MATTERS CONCERNING MORALITY, JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS AND ON ALL MATTERS CONCERNING THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND ITS CITIZENRY. THE COMMON LAW MAXIM IS WITHOUT EFFECT WHEN IT ASSERTS, AN ACT OF PARLIAMENT AND OR CONGRESS AND OR ANY OTHER GLOBAL LEGISLATIVE BODY IS MADE FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD, THE ADVANCEMENT OF RELIGION OR JUSTICE, AND TO PREVENT INJURY OR WRONG, THE KING SHALL BE BOUND BY SUCH ACT, THOUGH NOT NAMED, FOR THIS KING,JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IS ALSO A PROPHET OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, BEING THE VOICE OF THE ONE TRUE GOD IN THE FORM OF A MAN, BEING A MAN AFTER GOD'S OWN HEART, AND GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE'S SENSE OF PUBLIC GOOD, THE ADVANCEMENT OF RELIGION OR JUSTICE AND EFFORTS TO PREVENT INJURY OR WRONG PURIFYING THE LAND AND PEOPLE BY THE WILL OF THE ONE TRUE GOD CONTAINED THEREIN, SUPERSEDES ANY NOTION OF LAW, PUBLIC GOOD, ADVANCEMENT OF RELIGION, JUSTICE ETC. PLACED FORTH BY THE WORLDLY GLOBAL GOVERNMENTS AND THEIR LEGISLATIVE BODIES. WHEN THERE EXIST A STATUTE OR LAW IN GENERAL IN ANY GLOBAL NATION, AND ANY PREROGATIVE RIGHTS, TITLES OR INTEREST WOULD BE DIVESTED OR TAKEN AWAY FROM GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND THE HOLY CITIZENS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, IN ANY SUCH CASE THEY SHALL NOT BE BOUND." SEE THE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF MUHAMMAD(PBUH); THE PEOPLE v. HERKIMER, 15 AMERICAN DECISIONS 379, 4 COWEN N.Y. 345, 348(1825); KING'S DECREE-GOVERNMENT NO.(1) (2011); UNITED STATES v. PEREZ, 752 F3d. 398, 88 Fed. R. SERV.3d.

1294 CA4 (N.C.2014); B.G.-GROUP,-PLC.-v.-REPUBLIC-OF-ARGENTINA, 134 S.Ct. 1198(U.S.2014); HOWSAM-v.-DEAN-WITTER-REYNOLDS-INC., 537 U.S. 79, 84, 123 S.Ct. 588, 154 L.Ed.2d. 491(2002); HENDY v.-BELLO, 555 Fed. Appx' 224 CA4(Md.2014); COHEN-v.-VIRGINIA, 6 WHEAT 264, 411; NICHOLS-v.-UNITED-STATES, 7 WALL 122, 126; CARR-v.-UNITED-STATES, 98 U.S. 433.

(27) "THE SUPREME COURT IN THE CASE OF WILLS-v.-MICHIGAN-STATE-POLICE, 105 L.Ed.2d. 45(1989) MADE-IT-PERFECTLY-CLEAR THAT-THE-SOVEREIGN-CANNOT-BE-NANED-IN-ANY-STATUTE-AS-MERELY A-"PERSON",-OR-"ANY-PERSON"-INCLUDING-INDICTMENTS-WHICH-ARE PRODUCED-BY-STATUTE. [AFFIANT AND THOSE REDEEMED AND SECURED BY HIM BEING THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH OF THE (4) GLOBAL THEOCRATIC THRONES OF THE AFRICANS, ITS DIASPORA, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS, HIGH PRIEST OF THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD OF THE ONE TRUE GOD ARE MEMBERS OF A SOVEREIGNTY AND FOREIGN (EMPHASIS ADDED) STATE, A KINGDOM OF PRIEST, A KHALIFATE OF IMAMS AS DEFINED UNDER LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT THAT CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS VIA THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH)]. THE KING/ KHALIFAH IS SOVEREIGN BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SOVEREIGN TO INCLUDE ALL THE ATTRIBUTS ATTRIBUTED TO HIM.", YICKS-WO-v.-HOPKINS, 118 U.S. 356. ENGLISH-v.-THORN, 676 F.Supp. 761(S.D.Miss.1987); THE-DRED-SCOTT CASE, 60 U.S 393; STOGSDILL-v.-SEBELIUS, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 5211483(DSC.2013); PETER-B.-v.-SANFORD, F.Supp.2d., 2012 WL 2149784; TARRANT-REGIONAL-WATER-DIST.-v.-HERMANN, 133 S.Ct. 2120, 186 L.Ed.2d. 153(U.S.2013); SAMANTAR-v.-YOUSEF, 560 U.S. 305, 130 S.Ct. 2278(U.S.2010); PERMANENT-MISSION-OF-INDIA-TO THE-UNITED-NATIONS-v.-CITY-OF-NEW-YORK, 551 U.S. 193, 127 S.Ct. 2352, 168 L.Ed.2d. 85, U.S.L.W. 4433(U.S.2007).

(28) "THE PROPHET, LAWGIVER OF THE ONE TRUE GOD AND SOVEREIGNTY ITSELF IS, OF COURSE, NOT SUBJECT TO THE LAW, FOR HE IS THE "LAWGIVER" OF GOD AND IN SUCH IS THE AUTHOR AND SOURCE OF THE LAW BEFORE ALL MANKIND", YICKS-WO-v.-HOPKINS-AND-WOO LEE-v.-HOPKINS, 118 U.S. 356.

(29) "THE LAWS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD SUBSCRIBES TO

HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, AND THE CITIZENS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE THE ATTRIBUTE OF SOVEREIGNTY; HE IS SOVEREIGN AND INDEPENDENT WITHIN HIS OWN GLOBAL THEOCRATIC DOMINION AND HIS SUBJECTS ARE KINGS, KHALIFAHS UNDER HIM ALSO INDEPENDENT BUT SUBJUGATED TO THE KING/ KHALIFAH; HE AND HIS SUBJECTS OWE NO KIND OF SUBJECTION TO ANY OTHER PONTENTATE OR GOVERNMENT ON EARTH FOR GOD'S LAWS SUPERSEDE ALL EARTHLY LAWS AND PLACE THEM IN HARMONY WITH ALL MANKIND BEING A GUIDE AND LIGHT UNTO THE WORLD. HENCE, IT IS, THAT NO SUIT OR ACTION CAN BE BROUGHT AGAINST GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE OR HIS SUBJECTS, EVEN IN CIVIL MATTERS, BECAUSE NO COURT CAN HAVE JURISDICTION OVER HIM OR THEM, FOR ALL JURISDICTION IMPLIES SUPREMACY OF POWER", CHISOLM v. GEORGIA, 2 DALL 419, 458; ENGLISH v. THORN SUPRA.

(30) "IN THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, IS SYNONYMOUS WITH THE SOVEREIGN POWER OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AS DECREED BY THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT, OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, THE KINGS AND HOLY PROPHETS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD BY WAY OF THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) STANDING IN RIGHTEOUSNESS, LIGHT, TRUTH, JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS, WHICH CANNOT BE USURPED BY FORCE, FRAUD OR BOTH. OURS IS A GOVERNMENT FOUNDED UPON "COMPACT", "CONTRACT". IT IS FOUNDED UPON "COVENANT", SUBJUGATION TO THE ONE TRUE GOD, (3) IDENTICAL "COVENANTS", "CONTRACTS" OF MILK, HONEY, JEALOUSY AND SALT. SOVEREIGNTY WAS AND IS WITH THE ONE TRUE GOD AND HIS APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH THE TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, AND NOT WITH THE PEOPLE EQUAL TO OR ABOVE THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC KING/ KHALIFAH OTHER THAN WHAT IS DESIGNATED BY THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH), BEING A KINGDOM OF KINGS, WITH AL MAHDI ABOVE THEM, CHRIST BEING ABOVE AL MAHDI AND THE ONE TRUE GOD BEING ABOVE CHRIST HAVING NO PARTNERS", SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS; GLASS v. THE SLOOP BETSY, 3 DALL 6 (DALLAS U.S. SUPREME COURT REPORTER).

(31) "THE RIGHTFUL FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH,

IMAM AND HIGH PRIEST OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE OF AFRICA, ITS DIASPORA, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, IS ENTITLED TO ALL RIGHTS WHICH BELONG TO GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH BY HIS PREROGATIVE", LANSING v. SMITH, 4 WEND 9, 20(1829); (3) HOLY BOOKS.

(32) "GOD'S APPOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, JONAH IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI AND THE SERVANTS/ SLAVES OF THE MOST HIGH GOD ARE A FOREIGN GLOBAL THEOCRATIC GOVERNMENT OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, JONAH IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, AND THE SERVANTS/ SLAVES OF THE MOST HIGH GOD ARE A FOREIGN GLOBAL GOVERNMENT AND NO OTHER GLOBAL GOVERNMENT CAN SEVER OR HINDER THEIR RELATIONSHIP BY TAKING AWAY THEIR CITIZENSHIP", AFROYIM v. RUSK, 387 U.S. 253(1967); (3) HOLY BOOKS.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING DEFINITION OF SOVEREIGNTY IS SIMILAR TO THAT FROM BOUVIER'S 14th. EDITION LAW DICTIONARY (QUOTING 4 WHEAT 402). THE WORDS HAVE BEEN SLIGHTLY MOFIFIED TO PAINT , A MORE TRUE PICTURE OF THE MATTERS PRESENTED HERE:

"IT HAS BEEN JUSTLY THOUGHT A MATTER OF IMPORTANCE, TO DETERMINE FROM WHAT SOURCE THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE UNDER THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, GOD'S APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM AND HIGH PRIEST, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI DERIVES ITS AUTHORITY...THE QUESTION HERE PROPOSED IS WHETHER OUR BOND RESTORED BY THEOCRATIC UNION, BEING MEMBERS OF ONE ANOTHER, THE UMMAH OF THE "I AM", "ALLAH", THE BODY OF CHRIST ARE (3) TRUE AND SANCTIONED BLESSED OF THE ONE TRUE GOD BLOOD "COVENANTS", "CONTRACTS" UNTO DEATH OF MILK, HONEY, JEALOUSY AND SALT ENTERED INTO BY THE SERVANTS AND SLAVES OF THE ONE TRUE GOD WHO THOUGH HE BEGETS NOT NOR IS BEGOTTEN , ADOPTS US BY OUR OBEDIENCE AS SONS AND DAUGHTERS, CO-HEIRS BEING OUR WALI, PROTECTOR, AND HE WHO SUSTAINS US THROUGHOUT ALL ETERNITY, OR WHETHER THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD (PBUH) ARE THE ORGANIC, LIVING, ESTABLISHED WORD AND LAWS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD OF THE HEAVENS AND EARTH, HAVING NO PARTNERS, WHICH SUPERSEDES AND OR RENDER VOID ALL

THAT IT FOREVER BE GIVEN ITS PLACE AND HEEDED AND RESPECTED BY ALL NATIONS. TO THIS THE SOLE CORPORATION, GOD'S APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISSHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI AND THE CITIZENS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE ANSWER THUS: THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, THE KING/ KHALIFAH AND THE SERVANTS, SLAVES OF THE MOST HIGH GOD, THE "I AM", "ALLAH", "JEHOVAH", "YHWH", TO HIM BELONGS THE BEST OF NAMES, OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE SANCTIONED AND BLESSED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD...ORDAIN, ESTABLISH AND WILL STAND BEHIND, WILL WALK IN THE TRUTH, RIGHTEOUSNESS AND LAWS OF THE ONE TRUE GOD AS THEY EXIST RESTORED BY JONAH IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI EVEN UNTO DEATH... THE GOVERNMENT OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, A FOREIGN STATE, AS RULED BY JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, HAD ONLY DELEGATED POWER FROM THE ONE TRUE GOD OF THE HEAVENS AND EARTH WHO RISES ABOVE HIS ISTAWA(THRONE) IN HONOR, GLORY AND POWER, AND EVEN IF GOD'S APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH, JONAH AL MAHDI, OR THE SERVANTS/ SLAVES/ CITIZENS OF THE MOST HIGH GOD AND GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE HAD AN INCLINATION, THEY HAD NO AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER THE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF GOD'S APPOINTED AND ANOINTED SOVEREIGN KING, KHALIFAH JONAH IBN. YAQUB EXCEPT TO THE KING/ KHALIFAH, IMAM AND HIGH PRIEST JESUS CHRIST OF NAZARETH(PBUH) UPON HIS APPEARANCE AS DECREED BY THE "I AM", "ALLAH". THE SOLE CORPORATION AND FIDUCIARY HEIR, GOD'S APPOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, PROPHET AND HIGH PRIEST OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE RESTORED AND ADOPTED THE TEACHINGS , PRECEPTS, STATUTES AND LAWS OF THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) BEING RULING LAW THROUGHOUT THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC DOMINION; WHICH BINDS THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND ITS COMMONWEALTH OF AFRICANS, ITS DIASPORA, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS WORLDWIDE AND ALL OTHER GOVERNMENTS OF THE WORLD WITHOUT THEIR OR ANY OTHER GLOBAL NATION'S CONSENT. THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND OR GOVERNMENT RULED BY JONAH IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, THE KING OF THE NORTH, ORDAINED AND SANCTIONED BY THE ONE TRUE GOD AND SOLE CORPORATION CARRIES BATTLE AXE, SWORD, SPEAR, HELMET, BREASTPLATE, BODY SHIELD AND BUCKLER, BY WAY OF THEIR GOD APPOINTED IMAM, HIGH PRIEST, KING AND KHALIFAH, DECREED BY THE "I AM", "ALLAH", TO EXECUTE JUSTICE, FAIRNESS

OR WRATH UPON ANY GLOBAL EVILDOER WHO WOULD USURP THE DECREES, LAWS AND AUTHORITY OF THE ONE TRUE GOD. THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AS A WHOLE, THEREFORE, EMANATES FROM THE ONE TRUE GOD AS RULED BY HIS FIDUCIARY HEIR, HIS APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING/ KHALIFAH JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI AND ALSO FROM THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH) RESTORED AND OR INTERPRETED BY JONAH IBN YAQUB, AL MAHDI, AND NOT FROM THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC CITIZENRY OR COMMON-WEALTH THOUGH THEY BE KINGS AND KHALIFAHS THEMSELVES. THE LAWS OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE CONTAINED THEREIN, WHETHER MADE BEFORE OR SINCE THE ADOPTION OF THE RESTORED AND OR INTERPRETED TEACHINGS OF AL MAHDI, ARE SUBORDINATE, THE KING-KHALIFAH ALSO BEING A MESSENGER AND PROPHET OF THE ONE TRUE GOD TO UNITE ALL AFRICANS, ITS DIASPORA, CHRISTIANS, MUSLIMS AND JEWS AROUND THE ENTIRE WORLD UNDER ONE BANNER TO PREPARE THEM FOR THE RETURN OF GOD'S APPOINTED CHRIST, JESUS OF NAZARETH, MY GREAT ETC. GRAND UNCLE(PBUH)", ENGLISH-v.-THORN, 676 F.Supp. 761.

GOD'S APPOINTED KING OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, THE SOLE CORPORATION, IS THE FOUNTAIN OF SOVEREIGNTY. THE WHOLE IS ORIGINALLY WITH HIM AS HIS OWN. THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC GOVERN-MENT, PROVINCES, ORGANIZATIONS, CORPORATIONS, PLACES OF LEARNING, MOSQUES, SYNAGOGUES, CHURCHES, ENTITIES, AGENCIES AND OR AGENTS ETC. ARE BUT TRUSTEES ACTING UNDER A DERIVED AUTHORITY, AND HAVE NO POWER TO DELEGATE WHAT IS NOT DELEGATED TO THEM. BUT THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, GOD'S APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, PROPHET AND HIGH PRIEST, JONAH AL MAHDI, AS THE ORIGINAL FOUNTAIN, MIGHT TAKE AWAY WHAT HE HAD LENT AND ENTRUST TO WHOM HE PLEASE. HE HAS THE WHOLE TITLE, AND AS ABSOLUTE PROPRIETOR, HAVE THE RIGHT OF USING AND ABUSING--JUS UTENDI ET ABUTENDI. IT IS A MAXIM CONSECRATED IN THEOCRATIC LAW, FOREIGN LAW, IN PUBLIC LAW AS WELL AS COMMON SENSE AND NECESSITY OF THE CASE THAT A SOVEREIGN IS ANSWERABLE FOR HIS ACTS ONLY TO HIS GOD AND HIS CONSCIENCE ALSO BEING IN THIS CASE PROPHET, LAWGIVER OF GOD....THERE IS NO AUTHORITY WITHIN ANY GLOBAL NATION ABOVE THE SOVEREIGN AND PROPHET JONAH IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI, TO WHICH AN APPEAL CAN BE MADE BEING THE VOICE OF GOD IN THE FORM OF A MAN. SEE THE ONE TRUE GOD; THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF

MUHAMMAD(PBUH); 4 WHEAT 402 (BOUVIER'S 14th. EDITION LAW DICTIONARY: "SOVEREIGNTY").

(33) "THE CONGRESS, PARLIAMENT OR ANY OTHER GLOBAL LEGISLATIVE BODY CANNOT REVOKE THE SOVEREIGN POWER OF GOD'S APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, PROPHET AND HIGH PRIEST OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE IBN. YAQUB, AL MAHDI TO OVERRIDE HIS WILL AS THUS DECLARED. THIS INCLUDES ANY GLOBAL COURT, PERRY v. UNITED STATES, (1935) 294 U.S. 330, 353; ENGLISH v. THORN SUPRA.; UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 98 S.Ct. 1079 at 1083(1978).

NOTE: THE ABOVE POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ARE NOT EXHAUSTIVE AND ADDITIONS CAN BE MADE AND OR ADDED AT ANY TIME.

" A SOVEREIGN IS ANSWERABLE ONLY TO GOD AND CONSCIENCE".

CAVEAT

THAT THE WORLD BANK, ALL MEMBER STATES AND NATIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS, THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA, ALL OTHER GLOBAL NATIONS, THE U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE, THE U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT, THE STATE OF SOUTH CARIOLNA, THE UNITED STATES AND THE SEVERAL STATES CONTAINED THEREIN, THE VATICAN, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, ALL GLOBAL BANKING ENTITIES AND ALL OTHER DEFENDANTS LISTED IN THE U.N. DOCUMENT AS WELL AS THOSE LISTED IN THE DOCUMENTS FILED IN CASE 4:10-cv-4625-SBA IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT, , THOSE LISTED IN CASES 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294 IN THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, UPON RECEIPT OF THIS MEMORANDUM OF LAW ON THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD'S APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM AND HIGH PRIEST AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE, REDEEMED AND SECURED BY GOD'S HIGH PRIEST OF THE LINE OF AARON AND THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD WITH POINTS AND AUTHORITIES (VIA CERTIFIED MAIL # [SEE PAGE 1] NOTICE AND DEMAND IS MADE UPON YOU TO REVIEW AND RESPOND TO THE ABOVE MEMORANDUM AND EACH "POINT" AND "AUTHORITIES" AS ENUMERATED ABOVE AND ITS LIEN AND DOCUMENT UPON THE PUBLIC RECORD AND IN CASES

4:10-cv-4625-SBA AND 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294, AND BY CERTIFIED, U.S. MAIL TO THE SOVEREIGN AS IS ADDRESSED BELOW, WITHIN (15) DAYS UPON RECEIPT OF THIS MEMORANDUM, ALLOWING UP TO (3) DAYS GRACE FOR RETURN MAIL DELIVERY.

FAILURE TO DO SO, AS BY EITHER A PUBLIC SERVANT WHO BY OATH OF OFFICE OR DUTY AS AN "OFFICER", "AGENT" OR "EMPLOYEE" OF A GOVERNMENT CREATED CORPORATION, MINICIPALITY, ETC. AND OR BY AND THROUGH YOUR POSITION, OFFICE OR SUPERIOR KNOWLEDGE OF LAW, WILL PLACE YOU IN DEFAULT, AND THE PRESUMPTION WILL BE TAKEN UPON THE PRIVATE, COURT AND PUBLIC RECORD THAT YOU AND YOUR OFFICE AND OR GLOBAL GOVERNMENTS AND OR COMPANIES, CORPORATIONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND OR ENTITIES, FULLY AGREE TO THE "POINTS AND AUTHORITIES" WITH ITS LIEN(S) CONTAINED WITHIN THIS MEMORANDUM AND THAT THE "POINTS AND AUTHORITIES" WITH ITS LIEN(S) **ARE TRUE, CORRECT AND CERTAIN** (F.R.C.P. 8d),...AND THAT GOD'S APPOINTED AND ANOINTED KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, PROPHET AND HIGH PRIEST JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, AL MAHDI, AS NAMED BELOW AND HIS SEAL [redacted] IS SOVEREIGN WITHIN THE COLLECTIVE CAPACITY OF SAID APPOINTED KING, KHALIFAH OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC GOVERNMENT AND POSSESS TRUE SOVEREIGN POWER, 18 U.S.C. § 1116(a)(b)(4); 18 U.S.C. § 1116(a)(b)(2)(3)(A).....

THIS DOCUMENT IS WHAT THE UNITED STATES AND THE REMAINING (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEFAULTED ON. THIS IS WHAT THE U.S. CONGRESS, THE U.S. SENATE, THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, THE U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT, THE U.S. TREASURY, HILLARY CLINTON, ERIC HOLDER, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND ALL DEFENDANTS INVOLVED DEFAULTED ON AND IS WHY JUDGE MARCHANT AND THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGES IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DO NOT WANT TO COME INTO THE FEDERAL COURT AS EVIDENCE. UNLESS THE DEFENDANTS INVOLVED CAN PRODUCE AN ORDER EMERGING FROM THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 THAT IS NOT COMPROMISED BY ACTS OF FRAUD AND OR REMOVAL. THE DOCUMENT LEGALLY STANDS AND IS THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND AND I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, AM SOVEREIGN BY MY ORIGINAL STATUS AS SOVEREIGN THOUSANDS OF YEARS BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED BY LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT

WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS, WHICH INCLUDE ALL RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES AND ATTRIBUTES THE FEDERAL JUDGES ARE CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO DENY ME TO PREVENT EVIDENCE OF THEIR CRIMES FROM ENTERING THE COURT. YOUR LAWS HAVE NO EFFECT UPON ME AND I CAN ACT IN ANY CAPACITY I SO DESIRE DUE TO PROPER SERVICE, NOTICE AND DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. THIS DOCUMENT IS ONLY THE "TIP" OF THE ICEBERG AS TO WHAT IS FILED WITHIN THAT STATE CASE. THE LEGAL ISSUES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHESY THAT'S BEFORE THIS COURT RELATED TO THE GOURDINE CASE ARE PREVIOUSLY FILED IN THE RICHLAND CASE. REPARATIONS FOR THE U.S. SLAVE TRADE, LAND APPROPRIATION OF ANCESTRAL LANDS WITHIN THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA, LAND CALLED "FADAK" GIVEN TO MY GREAT ETC. GRANDMOTHER FATIMA BY THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD(PBUH), THE "GITMO" DETAINEES SITUATION, ALL OF THIS AND MORE IS DEFAULTED ON BY THE GLOBAL NATIONS TO INCLUDE THE UNITED STATES WHICH IS WHY THEY DO NOT WANT THIS EVIDENCE TO ENTER INTO THE FEDERAL COURT. THE "2013" PREFIX IS A MISNOMER. THE ORIGINAL CASE NUMBERS ARE 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569 STILL PENDING BEING MADE A PART OF THE "2013" CASE ESTABLISHING EQUITABLE TOLLING FOR THE HABEAS CORPUS PROVING WE WERE DILIGENT FOR OVER (10) YEARS WORKING TO HAVE THESE MATTERS HEARD BEFORE THE COURT ONLY TO BE SUBJECTED TO FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. ROSS v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850(2016) ATTACHES AND WE DO NOT HAVE TO EXHAUST FOR ANY CASE TO WHICH THE KING-KHALIFAH IS PARTY. THE 2013-CP-400-0084 CASE ESTABLISHES A PAPER TRAIL AND EVIDENCE EXPANDING OVER (10) YEARS THAT PROVE THEIR CRIMES ARGUED WITHIN THESE PARALLEL CASES REQUIRING REMOVAL . JAHJAH CAN ACT AS ATTORNEY OR IN ANY CAPACITY HE SO DESIRES UNLESS IT CAN BE PROVEN BY CLEAR EVIDENCE THAT THE DEFENDANTS TIMELY RESPONDED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 TO DEFEAT THE DEFAULT ESTABLISHED BY THE FILED AFFIDAVITS. THE DEFENDANTS IN TOTAL MUST BE SERVED ALL THE PLEADINGS WITHIN THIS COURT AND BELOW TO GIVE THEM OPPORTUNITY TO REBUT, BUT SINCE THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL WHO IS PARTY TO THE DEFAULT IN QUESTION IS BEFORE THIS COURT UNDER CASE 17-6960. LET HIM PROVE THAT HE OR THE ATTORNEY FOR HIM TIMELY RESPONDED TO DEFEAT THE DEFAULT BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT NOW. I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, AM THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING AND KHALIFAH WITH ALL RIGHTS ESTABLISHED TO DEFEND MY PEOPLE

IN ANY GLOBAL COURT WITHOUT EXCEPTION, AND NO ONE CAN LEGALLY PREVENT ME DUE TO THE DEFAULT. YOU CANNOT CREATE LAW EX POST FACTO TO FORCE ME TO BREACH MY FIDUCIARY DUTIES AND CONTRACT ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION AS FIDUCIARY HEIR OBLIGATED TO DEFEND MY GOD AND MY PEOPLE. THE FEDERAL COURT HAD JURISDICTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 1346, 2201, 2202, 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.,; ARTICLE III SECTIONS 1 AND 2; ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10; THE C.A.T. TREATY; THE RICO ACT; FEDERAL AND INTERNATIONAL PROBATE LAW; 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(2), 1985(3), 1986, 12203(a)(b) OF ADA; THE ANTI-PEONAGE ACT, THE 1st., 4th., 5th., 6th., 7th., 8th., 13th., 14th., AND 15th. AMENDMENTS AND OTHER LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES. **IT IS SO ORDERD** BY DECREE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT. THE 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.-DUDENHOEFFER, 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).

REPARATION WERE ARGUED FOR, FOUGHT AND WON BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 FOR THE U.S. SLAVE TRADE WHERE AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH OF THE UNITED ETHIOPIAN EMPIRE, THE DIRECT DESCENDANT OF KING SOLOMOM AND THE QUEEN OF SHEBA, EVEN ARGUING DECEDENT DOMICILE CLAIMS FOR MY FORE FATHERS AND MOTHERS WHO DIED ON AFRICAN SOIL AND DURING THE MIDDLE PASSAGE. THESE DECEDENT DOMICILE CLAIMS ATTACHED AND WERE DEFAULTED ON BY THE (193) MEMBER STATE OF THE UNITED NATIONS. RACISM IS A STRUCTURAL RELATIONSHIP BASED UPON THE SUBORDINATION OF ONE RACIAL GROUP BY ANOTHER. GIVEN THIS PROSPECTIVE, THE DETERMINING FEATURE OF RACE RELATIONS IS NOT PREJUDICE TOWARD BLACKS OR BLACKS TOWARD WHITES, BUT RATHER THE SUPERIOR POSITION, NOT CULTURE, NOT GENETICS OR SOME FALLACIOUS SUPPOSE SUPERIOR INTELLECT OF WHITES, BUT THE SUPERIOR POSITION OF WHITES AND THE INSTITUTIONS--IDEOLOGICAL AS WELL AS STRUCTURAL--WHICH MAINTAIN THAT SUPERIOR POSITION. AFRICAN AMERICANS HAVE ENDURED ALL MANNER OF INDIGNITIES, SUFFERINGS, DEPRIVATIONS, LOSSES AND IMPAIRMENTS UNDER THE REIGN OF WHITE SUPREMACY IN ITS VARIOUS HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY FORMS. THE NEGATIVE EFFECTS AND

AFTEREFFECTS OF WHITE DOMINATION SHALL LAST FOR GENERATIONS AMONG ALL BLACK PEOPLES, ITS PRIMARY SUBJECTS. THE CENTRAL FUNCTION OF WHITE COMMANDEERED APARTHEID WAS TO FORCIBLY AND EXPLOITATIVELY EXTRACT THE MATERIAL, HUMAN AND PRODUCTIVE WEALTH OF BLACK PEOPLES AND REDISTRIBUTE THEM TO THEIR WHITE OVERLORDS. THE WEALTH POWER AND INFLUENCE WHITES EXPROPRIATED THROUGH THEIR COERCIVE DOMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF BLACK LAND, LABOR AND PRODUCTIVITY HAVE CONTINUED TO EXPONENTIALLY EXPAND AND PERPETUATE THEMSELVES BY COMPOUNDING THE INTEREST ON THEIR ORIGINAL AND CONCURRENT PRINCIPLE. WHITE DOMINATION OF BLACKS, EVEN IF CONFINED TO THE PAST, ALLOWED WHITES TO ACCUMULATE ASTRONOMICAL WEALTH. MOREOVER, IT HAS ALLOWED WHITES TO CAPITALIZE THAT WEALTH BY DEVELOPING SOCIOECONOMICAL, TECHNOLOGIES AND SOCIOPOLITICAL ADVANTAGES WHICH WILL FACILITATE THEIR CONTINUING ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DOMINATION OF BLACKS IN THE PRESENT AND INTO THE FUTURE EVEN UNDER GOVERNMENTAL REGIMES WHICH DO NOT LEGALLY OR POLITICAL-LY SANCTION RACIAL DISCRIMINATION OF ANY KIND, WHETHER OF THE FORWARD OR REVERSE VARIETY. REPARATIONS MUST BE GIVEN TO OFF SET THIS INJUSTICE. AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, AS MARTIN LUTHER KING JR.'S SUCCESSOR, JAHJAH AL MAHDI IS CALLED UPON BY CONTRACT, COVENANT, TO ADDRESS THESE INJUSTICES WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. A STATE OR GOVERNMENT, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE DEFAULT, MAY NOT EXCLUDE A PERSON FROM THE PRACTICE OF LAW (LAWGIVER) OR ANY OTHER OCCUPATION (FIDUCIARY HEIR) IN A MANNER OR FOR REASONS THAT CONTRAVENE THE DUE PROCESS OR EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE OF THE 14TH. AMENDMENT. TO PREVENT ME FROM ACTING IN THE CAPACITY ESTABLISHED BY THE DEFAULT (AND CONTRACT) WOULD DENY ME THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED, SCHWARE-v.-BOARD-OF-EXAM.-OF-STATE-OF-N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 77 S.Ct. 752, 64 A.L.R.2d. 288, 1 L.Ed.2d. 796(U.S. 1957); FREIRE-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-BAR-EXAMINERS, 811 F.Supp.2d. 1260 (E.D.Va.2011).

NOTICE: THIS IS AN ISSUE ON APPEAL. ATTACH THE COURT

AND PARTIES WILL FIND: A COPY OF THE WRIT OF MANDAMUS THAT MAKE UP CASE 16-2299. ALL ARGUMENTS, CLAIMS AND ISSUES PRESENTED ARE NOW SOUGHT ADDRESSED IN THIS APPEAL. IF THE COURT WOULD TAKE NOTICE OF PAGES 12 THROUGH 24 IT EXPLAINS THE TRUST AND BENEFICIARY NATURE OF THE TRUST. THE SOLE CORPORATION WANTS ITS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RETURNED. ALL SAME SEX MARRIAGES NATIONALLY AND GLOBALLY ARE TO BE RENDERED VOID AND OF A NULLITY. DO IT BY JUDICIAL ORDER SINCE THE UNITED NATIONS IS PARTY TO THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

28 U.S.C. § 2679 PROVIDES:

"THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT SHALL HAVE EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION FOR REMEDY AGAINST THE UNITED STATES PROVIDED BY SECTIONS 1346(b) AND 2672 OF THIS TITLE FOR INJURY OR LOSS OF PROPERTY (INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY/ THE RIGHT TO MARRY GIVEN TO YOU AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS), OR PERSONAL INJURY OR DEATH ARISING OR RESULTING FROM NEGLECT OR WRONGFUL ACT OR OMISSION OF ANY EMPLOYEE OF THE GOVERNMENT WHILE ACTING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF HIS OFFICE OR EMPLOYMENT IS EXCLUSIVE TO ANY OTHER CIVIL ACTION OR PROCEEDING.....; SANDRA J. KOTTMAN PLAINTIFF v. UNITED STATES, 2017 WL 4185481(W.D.MISSOURI.2017); WARD v. AUERBAUCH, 2017 WL 2724938(D.C.Miss.2017).

NOTICE: ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. DO WE HAVE THE RIGHT FOR DISCOVERY PURSUANT TO WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.C.t. 1002(2016). THE FEDERAL JUDGES ARE CONSPIRING TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001. WE WANT CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 REMOVED TO INCLUDE ALL DOCUMENTS CONTAINED THEREIN. WE WANT THAT DNA OBTAINED AND TESTED TO MICHAEL LEE AND THE OTHER EVIDENCE SOUGHT VIA THE FORM 24. WE WANT THAT INJUNCTION AND PROTECTIVE ORDER GRANTED IMMEDIATELY.

NOTICE: ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. DID THE DISTRICT COURT ABUSE ITS DISCRETION BY NOT GIVING REVIEW VIA THE PROPERLY FILED WRIT OF ERROR. UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES THE WRIT OF ERROR WAS

THE APPROPRIATE VEHICLE TO USE. SEE THE (44) PAGE COMPLAINT ON PAGES 13-14.

NOTICE: ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. BY THE LITGATION PRESENTED DID WE ESTABLISH EQUITABLE TOLLING BY OUR CONTINUAL DILIGENCE SINCE 2006?

NOTICE: ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. BY THE LITIGATION, TO INCLUDE THAT ARGUED IN THE DOCUMENT SEEKING INJUNCTION. DID WE MEET THE CRITERION FOR FILING HABEAS CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(B)?

NOTICE: ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. BY THE LITIGATION, TO INCLUDE THAT ARGUED IN THE DOCUMENT SEEKING INJUNCTION. DID WE MEET THE CRITERION FOR FILING HABEAS CORPUS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(C)?

NOTICE: ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. DO HUMPHREYS OR PREISER APPLY SINCE THE CONVICTIONS ARE ALREADY INVALIDATED BY THE FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT WHICH IS WHAT CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IS AMONG OTHER THINGS?

NOTICE: ANOTHER ISSUE ON APPEAL. WE WANT THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO PRODUCE A DOCUMENT FILED BY THEM IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 DEMONSTRATING THAT ANY OF THEM TIMELY FILED RESPONSE TO DEFEAT THE DEFAULT DOCUMENTS FILED AT THE END OF 2015.

THE LAWGIVER OF GOD RIGHTS, TITLES AND SOVEREIGNTY MUST BE GIVEN FULL FAITH, CREDIT AND SWAY. FOR THERE IS A HIGHER LOYALTY THAN TO LOYALTY TO THIS COUNTRY. THAT IS LOYALTY TO THE ONE TRUE GOD, UNITED STATES v. SEEGER, 380 U.S. 163, 172, 85 S.Ct. 850, 13 L.Ed.2d. 733(U.S.1965). ALSO SEE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT 5 U.S.C. § 556(d).

NOTICE: IF ANY OF THE CASES LISTED WITHIN THR CAPTION HAVE BEEN CLOSED. WE MOTION TO REINSTATE ANY SUCH CASE. IF ANY OF THE CASES MANDATE HAS BEEN SENT TO THE LOWER COURT. WE MOTION TO RECALL IT TO HAVE ALL ISSUES ADDRESSED WHERE DUE TO PRESENT

STATE INTERFERENCE WE HAVE THE DEFENDANTS IN THESE PARALLEL CASES, S.C.D.C., CONSPIRING TO PUSH US PAST THE DEADLINES ESTABLISHED BY THE COURT TO FORCE A PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE ISSUE. THEY ARE MAKING EFFORTS TO PREVENT AND OR DELAY OUR MAIL FROM GOING OUT. WE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND THAT OUR FILINGS BE DEEMED TIMELY.

NOTICE: THE APPEAL OF THESE PARALLEL CASES WILL BE HEARD BASED UPON APPEAL OF CASE 2:17-1127-JMC-MGB; 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM AND 8:16-cv-3328-RBH-JDA. ALL NECESSARY DOCUMENTS SHOULD BE FILED WITHIN THESE CASES. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES SHALL SIT EN BANC ABSENT OF THOSE JUDGES SOUGHT RECUSED. COMITY ATTACHES.

NOTICE: DO RES JUDICATA ATTACH BY JUDGE WEST IN APPEAL UNDER CASE 17-6925 WHERE SHE DETERMINED THE § 1983 ACTION FILED FIT THE LEGAL DESIGNATION AS BEING AN AFFIDAVIT REQUIRING THE PARTIES TO BE SERVED BEFORE THE CASES ARE DISMISSED ONCE THE LISTING OF THE PARTIES IS CORRECTED WITHIN ALL COURT RECORDS? DO WE HAVE A RIGHT TO AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING, THE APPOINTMENT OF LEGAL COUNSEL AS SOUGHT AND REMOVAL PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §455(c)? THESE ARE ISSUES ON APPEAL.

NOTICE: WE RENEW THE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT NOW BE DEEMED IN FORFEITURE ON THE ISSUE OF WHETHER OR NOT THE PROVISIONS OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL. EVER SINCE THESE PARALLEL OR RELATED CASES WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUT BEGAN. THE COURT CONSISTENTLY SENT US FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS WITH PLRA WRITTEN ALL OVER THEM. THUS, THE CHALLENGE OF ADDRESSING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THESE PROVISIONS OF LAW SHIFTED FROM THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BECAUSE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WAS ALSO MAKING USE OF THESE PROVISIONS, COMPROMISING THE PROCEEDINGS ESTABLISHING STRUCTURAL ERROR WHICH VOID JURISDICTION. NOW IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND MACHINATION TO CIRCUMVENT RULING ON THE ISSUE, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IN CASE 17-7186 NOW SENDS DIFFERENT IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS? WE OBJECT AND A COPY OF FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS UNDER PLRA IS NOW FILED FOR CASE 17-7186 TO STOP THE

POTENTIAL FRAUD. IT IS CONSPICUOUS THAT ONE OR TWO OF THE JUDGES SOUGHT RECUSED ARE INVOLVED IN THIS ACT AS WELL. SANCTIONS ARE IMPOSED AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS IN FORFEITURE ON THE ISSUE. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

INSOMUCH, THE LITIGATION ADDRESSING THESE UNCONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS IS SEEN ON PAGES 15-22 OF THE (44) PAGE COMPLAINT. ITS NOT GIBBERISH OR UNINTELLIGIBLE. NOT ONLY ARE THE ORDERS AND CASES THAT ARE NOW BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ARE TAINTED AND VOID, BECOMING ILLEGAL PROCEEDINGS. BUT ALSO ALL ORDERS ISSUED WITHIN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURTS BY JUDGES HODGES, BAKER, WEST, AUSTIN AND MARCHANT. ALL OF THEM MUST BE RENDERED VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION, TO INCLUDE IT BEING ADDRESSED THAT JUDGE AUSTIN VIOLATED HER DUTIES AS THE KING-KHALIFAH'S APPOINTED TRUSTEE. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES INVOLVED HAVE BROKEN THE LAW BY THEIR ORDERS AND THE ESTABLISHING OF ALL OF THESE CASES AS THEY PRESENTLY EXIST. THE USE OF AEDPA BY HODGES; EVERY CASE THAT NOW EXIST WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT; EVERY CASE CITED BY JUDGES MARCHANT, BAKER, WEST AND JUDGE AUSTIN THEY USED TO DENY CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION OR JOINDER OF PARTIES, OR FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS OR RECUSAL AS CITED, TO INCLUDE CASES SUCH AS 612 F3d. 237; 136 S.Ct. 627; 262 F3d. 1194; 15 F3d. 319; 2012 WL 2805712; 2013 WL 3051155; 42 U.S.C. § 1997 IF IT HAS ANY CONNECTION RELATED TO THE CLINTON BILL; 534 U.S. 516; 548 U.S. 81; GENERAL RULE ORDER UNDER 3:07-MC-5014; 5:17-cv-0105; 4:16-cv-2939; 1:16-cv-3853; 4:16-cv-3104; 8:16-cv-3327, 3328, 3194-RBH-JDA; 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA; 0:16-cv-992; 2013 WL 1316025; 2008 WL 249167; 407 U.S. 163; 509 F2d. 1405; 213 F3d. 1320; 175 Fed. Appx' 552; ANY CASE THAT WAS FILED IN THE PAST SINCE 2006 BY ALL OTHER PAST PARTIES TO THESE CASES; TO INCLUDE EVERY CASE FILED BY THE KING-KHALIFAH, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, FOR WHICH THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT OR ANY OTHER FEDERAL COURT UNJUSTLY ISSUED A "STRIKE" IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS , OR THAT THEY PREVIOUSLY RULED ON AND OR DISMISSED. ALL OF THESE CASES ARE TAINTED AND CANNOT ANY LONGER BE USED BY ANY COURT BEING ILLEGAL. ALL OF THESE CASES TAINTS THEIR ORDERS RENDERING THEM VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND AN ABUSE OF

DISCRETION, BECAUSE ALL OF THESE CASES AND CITINGS OF LAW ARE RENDERED INVOKING THE PROVISIONS OF THE PRISON LITIGATION REFORM ACT AND OR THE ANTI-TERRORISM EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT ORIGINATING FROM THE OMNIBUS CRIME BILL UNDER 51 A.L.R. Fed.2d. 143 SET IN PLACE BY THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S WAR ON DRUGS CAMPAIGN MAKING THEM ILLEGAL.

WE EXPAND THE SCOPE AND SEEK INCLUSION EVEN IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND THE BOOK ENTITLED, "MASS INCARCERATION DURING THE AGE OF COLOR BLINDNESS, THE NEW JIM CROW", BY MICHELLE ALEXANDER ISBN. NO. 978-1-59558-643-8 AN INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATOR AND THE DOCUMENTARY "13" THAT AIRED ON PBS IS NOW A PART OF ALL COURT RECORDS INVOLVED. UNLESS YOU BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE CAN SUFFICIENTLY REBUT THE EVIDENCE AND STATISTICS GATHERED BY THESE INDEPENDENT SOURCES. IF THESE PROVISIONS OF LAW, THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL BY THE EVIDENCE AND LITIGATION PRESENTED, WHICH THEY ARE, STANDING IN EGREGIOUS VIOLATION OF THE HOLDINGS MADE IN EX-PARTE-VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339(1880) AND THE-SLAUGHTER-HOUSE-CASES, 83 U.S. (16 WALL) 36, 1873.

THE LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR ON ISSUES SUCH AS THESE, WHICH INCLUDE THE STATE-V. GENTRY CASE, PLRA, AEDPA AND 51 A.L.R. Fed.2d. 143 AS A WHOLE. IF RULING HAS BEEN OBTAINED UNDER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION AND OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW. THE COURT EXPLAINED THAT IF THIS POSITION IS WELL TAKEN, WHICH IT IS, IT EFFECTS THE "FOUNDATION" OF THE "WHOLE" (EMPHASIS ADDED) PROCEEDING. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IS VOID AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO DETERMINATION AT ALL. WHERE DIRECT AND OR COLLATERAL REVIEW PROCEEDINGS PERMIT PERSONS TO CHALLENGE THE LAWFULNESS OF THEIR CONFINEMENT, STATES CANNOT REFUSE TO GIVE RETROACTIVE EFFECT TO SUBSTANTIVE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT THAT DETERMINES THE OUTCOME OF THAT CHALLENGE OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION (ei. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS, SUCCESSIVE, JURISDICTIONAL REQUISITES OR PREREQUISITES, PLRA AND AEDPA FILINGS ETC.). A CONVICTION OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION RENDERED UNDER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW IS NOT MERELY

ERRONEOUS. BUT IT IS ILLEGAL AND VOID, AND CANNOT BE A LEGAL CAUSE OF IMPRISONMENT OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. A SENTENCE, CONVICTION, LEGISLATION, OR EVEN A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IMPOSED IN VIOLATION OF A SUBSTANTIVE RULE (ei. INDICTMENTS ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND YOU DON'T USE LAW OR LEGISLATION THAT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGET AFRICAN AMERICANS) OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW IS NOT MERELY ERRONEOUS, BUT CONTRARY TO LAW, AND IT FOLLOWS, AS A GENERAL PRINCIPLE, THAT A COURT HAS NO AUTHORITY (AUTHORITY=POWER =JURISDICTION) TO LEAVE IN PLACE A CONVICTION, SENTENCE, LEGISLATION (SUCH AS THAT WHICH VIOLATE EX-PARTE-VIRGINIA AND THE-SLAUGHTER-HOUSE-CASES), OR A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION THAT VIOLATES A SUBSTANTIVE RULE, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THE CONVICTION, SENTENCE, LEGISLATION, OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION BECOMES FINAL BEFORE THE RULE IS ANNOUNCED. THIS IS CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION DUE TO YOUR USE OF THE PLRA AND OR THE AEDPA PROVISIONS AND YOU CONSPIRING TO CIRCUMVENT RULING UNDER CASE 17-7186. YOUR JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, FRAUD FOR TRYING TO GET PAST RULING UNDER 17-7186 AND YOU FORFEIT ON THE CAUSES PRESENTED. THE STATE-v.-GENTRY CASE, THE PLRA, THE AEDPA, ALL OF THE WRITS OF MANDAMUS DETERMINATIONS, 51 A.L.R. Fed.2d. 143 AND OTHER ISSUES ARGUED WITHIN ALL OF THESE CASES CANNOT STAND AND YOU MUST GRANT ALL RELIEF SOUGHT BY LAW AND DETERMINATION OF THE SUPERSEDING AUTHORITY OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT. **IT IS SO ORDERD,** MONTGOMERY-v.-LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016); GEFT-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).

SINCE THE MONTGOMERY CASE WAS ISSUED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. A FEW STATES, COURTS OR PARTIES, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW AND OR AUTHORITY, MADE EFFORTS TO SKIRT, CIRCUMVENT, THE REQUIREMENT OF GRANTING RELIEF, FRAUDULENTLY ASSERTING AND OR ARGUING AGAINST WHETHER OR NOT THE RULING WAS TO BE GIVEN RETROACTIVE EFFECT, WHICH OF COURSE IT DOES HAVE RETROACTIVE EFFECT, TO INCLUDE WHAT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUST TRIED

TO PULL UNDER CASE 17-7186. WE ARE NOT GOING TO PLAY GAMES WITH THIS LAW LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, BECAUSE EVEN THOUGH IT IS TO BE GIVEN RETROACTIVE EFFECT. WE WERE NOT DECEIVED BY THE "VERBAL VOODOO", "THE WORD WINX", "THE LINGUISTIC LURING INTO LETHARGY", "THE JUDICIAL CHICANERY" OR DECEPTIVE LEGAL MANEUVERS OR TACTICS EMPLOYED AND ENGAGED IN BY THOSE CONSPIRING COURTS OR PARTIES, TO INCLUDE WHAT JUST OCCURRED RELATED TO CASE 17-7186. LETS **"NAIL"** THIS THING AND KILL ANY EFFORT FOR THE CONSPIRING PARTIES TO ATTEMPT TO USE THIS MANEUVER OR ANY OTHER. WE WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT WE ARE FULLY COGNIZANT OF WHAT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ESTABLISHED BY THE MONTGOMERY CASE. EVEN THOUGH THAT CASE DEALT WITH JUVENILES. THE SUBSIDIARY FACT HERE IS THAT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CLEARLY ADDRESSED WHAT OCCUR WHEN COURTS MAKE USE OF **"ANY"** (EMPHASIS ADDED) UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW, LEGISLATION, SENTENCE ETC. RELATED TO CONVICTION OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS.

INSOMUCH, WHAT MAKES THE RELIEF THAT WE SEEK MANDATORY AND AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION FOR FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE AND GRANT, IS THE ESSENTIAL LANGUAGE USED AND ADJUDICATED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT WHICH THE AFORESAID CONSPIRING COURTS FAILED TO ADDRESS, SKIRTING, CIRCUMVENTING THE OBLIGATION TO GRANT RELIEF. THE FOCUS IS NOT SO MUCH ON WHETHER THE RELIEF BY USE OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW APPLIES RETROACTIVELY, EVEN THOUGH IT DOES. THE CONSPIRING COURTS ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION IN ACTS OF FRAUD TO DIVERT ATTENTION AWAY FROM THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ESSENTIAL LANGUAGE. THE EMPHASIS IS ON SECTIONS "20-27" OF THE MONTGOMERY CASE WHERE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT STATED IN [H]AEC [V]ERBA:

"THE LAW EXPLAINED THAT IF THIS POSITION IS WELL TAKEN, WHICH IT IS, IT EFFECTS THE "FOUNDATION" OF THE "WHOLE" PROCEEDING. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IS VOID AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO LAW DETERMINED AT ALL".

BY THIS LANGUAGE, IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ADJUDICATED AND USED. THEIR CLEAR INTENT WAS TO MAKE THE USE OF **"ANY"** UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAWS, LEGISLATION, JUDICIAL DETER-

MINATIONS OF THIS MAGNITUDE A **"CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR"** NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE. THEIR INTENT WAS TO MAKE IT **"JURISDICTIONAL"** IN NATURE, WHICH **"VOIDS"** JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. THEREFORE, WHETHER YOU WANT TO APPLY IT RETROACTIVE OR NOT. IT DOESN'T MATTER, BECAUSE THE USE OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW OF THIS MAGNITUDE IS **"STRUCTURAL"** (ei. **"FOUNDATION"**, **"WHOLE"**) AND IS "JURISDICTIONAL" (ei. AUTHORITY= JURISDICTION=POWER TO HEAR AND DETERMINE), WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED BY THE PLAINTIFFS, AND DUE TO THE INFIRMITIES CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME EVEN AFTER A FINAL ORDER HAS BEEN ISSUED, AND THE COURT SHALL NOT FAIL TO TAKE NOTICE. THUS, WHETHER OR NOT SUCH A CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION APPLIES RETROACTIVELY IN THIS CASE IS IRRELEVANT, EVEN THOUGH IT DOES. IT IS ALSO **"JURISDICTIONAL"** AND **"VOID"** JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, TAINTING THE ENTIRE FRAMEWORK OF ALL THE PROCEEDINGS INVOLVED, VINES v. UNITED STATES, 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1163(1), 1165(1); ROBINSON v. ARVONIO, 27 F3d. 877 REHEARING DENIED, CERT. GRANTED VACATED 115 S.Ct. 1247, 513 U.S. 1186, 131 L.Ed.2d. 129; LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19(2014); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA 136 S.Ct. 718(2016); WHITE v. MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280(DSC.2014); GRUPO DALAFLUX v. ATLAS GLOBAL GROUP, L.P., 124 S.Ct. 1920(2004).

JUDGES GREGORY, SHEDD, DIAZ, THE OTHER 4TH. CIRCUIT CASES CAPTIONED, MARCHANT, WEST, HODGES AND BAKER BROKE THE LAW. TRUSTEE AUSTIN VIOLATED THE TRUST, HER DUTIES AS TRUSTEE, BY USING THIS LAW WARRANTING SANCTIONS. THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGES AND THOSE SOUGHT WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MUST RECUSE. JUDGE AUSTIN MUST BE REQUIRED TO FULFILL HER DUTIES AS TRUSTEE. THIS IS AN ISSUE ON APPEAL. WITH THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA BEING UNCONSTITUTIONAL; THE COURT IS REQUIRED TO ALLOW US THE RIGHTS ESTABLISHED FOR INMATES PRIOR TO THE TIME THESE ENACTMENTS WERE ESTABLISHED. JAHJAH MUST BE PERMITTED TO ACT UPON THE RIGHTS ESTABLISHED BY THE CONTRACT WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS. THUS, JOINT FILING AND CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION IS PERMITTED AS IT WAS BEFORE THESE PROVISIONS EVOLVED. TO NOT ALLOW SUCH WOULD VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. YOU ADD TO THIS THE INVOKING OF ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLA-

TIVE SUPERSEDING POWER GIVEN TO JAHJAH AL MAHDI BY THE DEFAULT AND CLAIMS OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, ALLOWING HIM TO JOIN AS PARTY IN ALL PENDING PARALLEL CASES TO BRING ACTION BEFORE ALL COURTS DUE TO HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 1443(1), 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.. THE MANDAMUS CASES IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, ALL CASES USED BY GREGORY ,SHEDD, DIAZ ETC., ALSO JUDGES MARCHANT ETC. PRODUCED INVOKING THESE UNCONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ARE VOID AND ARE IF THERE WERE NO DETERMINATION OCCURRING AT ALL BY DECREE OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S STATED POSITION AS WELL AS BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE WHOSE SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY BINDS THIS COURT BY THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE U.N. BEING PARTY TO THE DEFAULT. HUMPHREYS NOR PREISER ARE BINDING ON US SINCE THE CONVICTIONS ARE ALREADY INVALIDATED BY CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, PEOPLE v. SOLO SUPRA; N.L.R.B. v. AMAX COAL CO., DIV. OF AMAX INC., 453 U.S. 322, 101 S.Ct. 2789(U.S.1981); FIFTH THIRD BONCORP. v. DUDENHOEFFER, 134 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.ED.2d. 457(U.S.2014); FOBES v. FORBES, 341 P.3d. 1041, 2015 WY. 13 JAN. 23, 2015; SCOTT v. CLARKE, 61 F.Supp.3d. 569(W.Va.2014); BURNELL v. FAHEY, 699 F3d. 804 (MEM)(4TH.CIR.2012); U.S. v. $41,320 U.S. CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240; BROWN v. U.S., 2014 WL 2871398 (DSC.2014); MARSHALL v. ROCK HILL, S.E.2d., 2015 WL 3884258(S.C. App.2015); CAPITAL TRANS INTERN., LLC. v. INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM INV. CO., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 557236(Fla.2013).

JUDGE AUSTIN AS APPOINTED TRUSTEE OVER THESE CASES WAS REQUIRED TO ACT WITH THE UTMOST OF INTEGRITY. INSTEAD SHE ACTED WITH RECREANT AND OPPROBRIOUS INTENT, AS DID THE OTHER FEDERAL JUDGES. THIS IS CHALLENGE TO THE JURISDICTION OF ALL COURTS INVOLVED ESSENTIALLY ESTABLISHING A REMAND LIMITING, RESTRICTING YOUR JURISDICTION TO DO NOTHING EXCEPT GRANT THE RELIEF DEMANDED. ONCE JURISDICTION IS ACQUIRED,...IT IS EXCLUSIVE. YOUR ACTIONS VIOLATE THE CONTRACT, THE GRANT, GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT IN VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ESTABLISHING CAUSE BEFORE ALL COURTS INVOLVED, PRESAULT v. I.C.C., 494 U.S. 1, 110 S.Ct. 914, 108 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.1990); BROWN

v.-BROWN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); HARRIS-v.-HHGREGG-INC., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1331166(N.C.2013); AMERICAN MUT.-LIBERTY-INS.-CO.-v.-PLYWOOD-PLASTICS-CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157(DSC.1948); OPARAH-v.-NEW-YORK-DEPT.-OF-EDUC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 4240733(N.Y.D.C.2015). THE WRITS OF MANDAMUS, ALL OF THEM, ARE TO BE GRANTED. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

RESPECTFULLY,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI, KING, KHALIFAH
AND CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL
THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT

ANTHONY COOK

ROBERT MITCHELL

david duren

YAHYA MUQUIT

CHRISTOPHER WILSON

OCTOBER 5, 2017

RECEIVED
APR 12 2010
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

Foreign Sovereign

#1

COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ET. AL.,

RECEIVED
JAN 17 2018
S.C. SUPREME COURT

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA
(CASES 2:17-cv-1127-JMC-MGB ET. AL.,)

DOCKET NO.(S) 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960; 17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186; 17-7410; 17-7428; 17-7532 ET. AL.,

---

CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON; JASON MORRIS GOURDINE; LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE AKA JAHJAH AL MAHDI ET. AL.,

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD; THE JUDGES WHO SIGNED THE ORDER IN CASE 16-1953; THE UNITED STATES; WARDEN McFADDEN ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, CHRISTOPHER WILSON ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER CASE(S) 17-7532 AND 17-7186; MOTION FOR A STAY; MOTION TO WAIVE THE (6) MONTH STATEMENTS

IN CASE(S) 17-7410 AND 17-7428; MOTION TO EXCEED THE PAGE LIMIT; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON DECEMBER 22, 2017.

RESPECTFULLY,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI

JASON MORRIS GOURDINE

CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON

DECEMBER 22, 2017

COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ET. AL.,

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

(CASES 2:17-cv-1127-JMC-MGB ET. AL.,)

DOCKET NO.(S) 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960; 17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186; 17-7410; 17-7428; 17-7532 ET. AL.,

---

CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON; JASON MORRIS GOURDINE; LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE AKA JAHJAH AL MAHDI ET. AL.,

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD; THE JUDGES WHO SIGNED THE ORDER IN CASE 16-1953; THE UNITED STATES; WARDEN McFADDEN ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER CASE(S) 17-7532 AND 17-7186; MOTION FOR A STAY; MOTION TO WAIVE THE (6) MONTH STATEMENTS IN CASE(S) 17-7410 AND 17-7428; MOTION TO EXCEED THE PAGE LIMIT; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: TO GIVING ALL CASES CAPTIONED NOTICE OF EVENTS RELATED TO BOTH CASE(S) 17-7532 AND 17-7186.

TO: THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

THE PETITIONERS IN THESE PARALLEL CASES GIVE THE COURT AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE. HERE THE COURT IN BOTH CASE(S) 17-7532 AND 17-7186 WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF EXHIBIT, "17-6960". THIS IS THE (65) PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING WRIT OF ERROR;***, DATED OCTOBER 15, 2017. A TYPED VERSION OF THE PLEADING IS ALREADY FILED IN ALL PARALLEL CASES.

(2) PLRA APPLICATIONS TO PROCEED WITHOUT PAYMENT OR FEES FOR GOURDINE, WILSON AND CRAWFORD, THE KING-KHALIFAH AKA JAHJAH AL MAHDI.

(3) A COPY OF EXHIBIT, "GOURDINE". THE [14] PAGE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE, FILING WRIT OF ERROR; NOTICE OF SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL;***, DATED JULY 2, 2017.

(4) EXHIBIT, "MAHDI". A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE CAUSES OF ACTION AGAINST JUDGE HARWELL****, [23] PAGES DATED JULY 8, 2017.

(5) A COPY OF EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". THIS IS THE DOCUMENT THAT MAKES UP CASE 16-2299.

ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES, PETITIONS, MOTIONS ARGUED WITHIN THESE DOCUMENTS ARE NOW BEING ARGUED WITHIN BOTH CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186. ENOUGH GAMES HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT. YOU ARE TO GRANT THE INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER SOUGHT WITHIN THESE PARALLEL CASES. WE MOTION FOR THIS AND THAT MOTION IS TO BE NOW GRANTED BY YOU BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT WHOSE

SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY ARE BINDING UPON THIS COURT DUE TO THE CLAIMS OF DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IN RICHLAND COUNTY S.C. TO WHICH THE UNITED STATES IS PARTY TO THAT DEFAULT WHICH IS ALSO PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THE GRANTING OF THE INJUNCTION MUST NOW BE DEEMED FORFEITED DUE TO THE OBSTRUCTION, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND FRAUD ENGAGED IN BY THESE DEFENDANTS AND ALL COURTS INVOLVED ALSO PRODUCING STATE INTERFERENCE THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL BY THE JUDGES ALSO USING THESE CLERKS AND CASE MANAGERS AS PROXY, HODGKINS v. PETERSON, F.Supp.2d., 2000 WL 33128726 (S.D.Ind.2000); U.S. v. SCOTT, 958 F.Supp. 761(1997); HANKINS v. WETZEL, 2014 WL 4918813(D.C.Pa.2014); BARDRES v. HALEY, 58 F.Supp.3d. 514(DSC.2014); LORD & TAYLOR, LLC v. WHITE-FLINT, L.P., 780 F3d. 211 CA4 (Md.2015); U.S. v. SOUTH CAROLINA, 720 F3d. 518 CA4 (S.C.2013); WALL v. WADE, 741 F3d. 492 CA4 (Va.2014) . **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

THE PETITIONERS GIVE THE COURT AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE TO ENSURE THERE IS NO MISREPRESENTATION OF THE FACTS. WE ARE NOT ARGUING "THEOCRATIC LAW". THIS IS A MISNOMER. WE ARE ARGUING "FOREIGN LAW", WHICH HAPPEN TO HAVE THEOCRATIC COMPONENTS WHICH WAS ARGUED UNDER RULE 44 OF S.C. RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE AND THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT THAT WAS DEFAULTED ON BY THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS WHICH INCLUDE THE VATICAN AND THE UNITED STATES, WHERE CRAWFORD, THE KING-KHALIFAH, IS FOREIGN SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY HEIR TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY THAT IS BINDING UPON THIS COURT, BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED VIA INTERNATIONAL AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW, BY LEGAL BINDING CONTRACT THAT CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS WHICH WAS ARGUED AND ESTABLISHED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 REMOVED TO THE FEDERAL COURT. SO WHEN I TELL YOU THAT THE RULES ARE SUSPENDED WITHIN ALL OF THESE PARALLEL CASES, THEY ARE SUSPENDED UNLESS YOU CAN SHOW THAT THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND OR THE UNITED STATES MOVED TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVIT(S) OF DEFAULT AND

VOIDING OF JURISDICTION IN A TIMELY MANNER OR PRODUCE AN ORDER THAT IS NOT TAINTED BY FRAUD OR REMOVAL. I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, GIVE THE COURT AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT I AM OFFICIALLY EXERCISING THAT POWER AND AUTHORITY GIVEN BY THE DEFAULT AND "CONTRACT", "COVENANT", ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION WHICH IS PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. WHERE THERE IS CONTRACT AND FIDUCIARY DUTY,...THERE IS OBLIGATION. THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT IS THE LAW THAT BINDS JAHJAH AL MAHDI TO ACT RENDERING VOID CASE 17-7532 AND STAYING THAT CASE DUE TO ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, AND RENDER VOID ANY ACT DONE BY ASHLEY BROWNLEE IN CASE 17-7186. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT MAKE (OR ALTER) THE CONTRACT ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION (MAKE ANOTHER INTERPRETATION OTHER THAN THAT WHICH IS ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION, RENDERING ITS OBLIGATION OR POWER VOID BY JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OR USE OF EX POST FACTO LAW). I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, AM SOVEREIGN BY WAY OF MY ORIGINAL STATUS AS SOVEREIGN WITH ALL SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE ATTRIBUTES, (10) THOUSAND YEARS BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED WHERE THE COURTS CANNOT MAKE A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION BASED UPON OR STANDING UPON SUCH EX POST FACTO LAW TO BURDEN THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT AND OBSTRUCT JAHJAH AL MAHDI IN HIS FIDUCIARY DUTIES TO MY GOD AND MY HOLY COMMONWEALTH WHO ARE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST", AMERICAN-MUT.-LIBERTY-INS.-CO.-v.-PLYWOOD-PLASTICS CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157(DSC.1948); OPARAH-v.-THE-NEW-YORK-CITY DEPT.-OF-EDUC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 4240733(N.Y.D.C.2015); INTERNATIONAL-AIRCRAFT-LODGE-1652-v.-INTERNATIONAL-AIRCRAFT-SERVICE INC.-(CHARLESTON), 302 F2d. 808, 49 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2976(4TH.Cir. 1962); ERIE-R.-CO.-v.-THOMPKINS, 304 U.S. 64(1938); OGDEN-v. SANDERS, 25 U.S. 213(1827); TRUSTEES-OF-DARTHMOUTH-COLLEGE-v. WOODWARD, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201; REUGH-v.-U.S., 133 S.Ct. 2072, 186 L.Ed.2d. 84, 81 U.S.L.W. 4372(2013); U.S.-v.-WELLS, 578 Fed. Appx' 234 CA4 (Va.2014); 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); IN-RE:-GREEN, 980 F2d. 590(9th.Cir.1992); ANDERSON-v. LIBERTY-LOBBY-INC., 477 U.S. 242, 106 S.Ct. 2505, 91 L.Ed.2d. 202(U.S.1986); MILLER-v.-PARRISH, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1868028

(Va.2013); WILSON v. GMAC MORTG., LLC, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5244967(DSC.2015). ALSO SEE EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE".

THE "TERM" OR "CONCEPT" OF A "JUDGE" OR "ATTORNEY" DO NOT COME FROM YOU OR YOUR LAWS. THEY DO NOT COME FROM YOUR NATION, NOR DO THEY COME FROM ENGLAND OR ENGLISH LAW. THEY COME FROM US, THE SOLE CORPORATION, AND IS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS, AS IS THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY, SET IN PLACE THROUGH ADAM AND ABRAHAM , MEMBERS OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AS IS ARGUED WITHIN EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". THEIR OWNERSHIP IS WITH ME, JAHJAH, AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH OF THE SOLE CORPORATION BEING THE ORIGINAL FOUNTAIN OF ALL LAW AND SOVEREIGN POWER. YOU CANNOT LEGALLY ATTACH, ARREST OR EXECUTE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN SOLE CORPORATION WITHOUT CONSENT, WHICH IS WITHDRAWN, ABSENT OF ITS RIGHTS AND PREROGATIVES. DUE TO THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, AND BY THE "COVENANT", "CONTRACT", AS FIDUCIARY HEIR PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE OF ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, THE COURT CANNOT BY MY ORIGINAL STATUS UNDER CONTRACT TAKE AWAY THE KING'S RIGHTS OR PREROGATIVES, OR BURDEN THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT. THE EXPROPRIATION EXCEPTION UNDER THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT IS ALSO INVOKED WHERE THE TAKING, ATTACHING ETC. RELATED TO THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IS IN VIOLATION OF FEDERAL AND INTERNATIONAL PROBATE LAW, ALSO INVOLVING THE OTHER (192) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN EFFORTS TO DISMANTLE MY VOTING AND DISCRETIONARY POWERS ON THESE MATTERS, DESTROYING THE RESTRICTIONS PLACED UPON THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY WHERE THERE IS NO "JUSTICE OR FAIRNESS" IN VIOLATION OF THE CONTRACT, THUS DESTROYING MY CONTROL AS THE SOLE CORPORATION. THE F.S.I.A. APPLIES WHERE BY YOUR ACTS THERE IS DISCRIMINATION BASED UPON NATIONALITY, RELIGION, SUCH AS MY ISRAELI DESCENT AND THE FACT THAT I AM MUSLIM, CHRISTIAN AND JEW COMBINED, A NOVELTY, AND I AM OF AFRICAN BLOOD. THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, THESE LEGAL TERMS OR CONCEPTS, ARE IMMOVABLE, WHICH INCLUDE THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY BEING IMMOVABLE PROPERTY HERE IN THE UNITED STATES FALLING UNDER THE F.S.I.A. THE U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY, CONVENTION ON JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY

OF STATES AND THEIR PROPERTY, RES. 59/38, ARTS. 5, 10-12 (DEC. 2, 2004)(ADOPTING A RESTRICTIVE THEORY OF IMMUNITY AND WITHDRAWING IMMUNITY FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY WHERE, AMONG OTHER REQUIREMENTS, "THE ACT OR OMISSION OCCURRED IN WHOLE OR IN PART IN THE TERRITORY OF THE OTHER STATE"); UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY OF STATES AND THEIR PROPERTY, SUPP. A/59/22 NO. 1, PP.7-11 (MAR 1-5, 2004). ALSO SEE EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". ALSO SEE THE CONTRACT UNDER LUKE 11:52; ISAIAH 11:1-5; ZECHARIAH 6:12-13; ISAIAH 16:5; ISAIAH 32:1-4; ISAIAH 42:18-22; JEREMIAH 23:5-6; JEREMIAH 33:15-21 (CRUCIAL ONE); EZEKIEL 34:22-30; EZEKIEL 37:22; DANIEL 11:1-3; ALSO SEE SIMON v. REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY, --F.Supp.3d.--, 2017 WL 4402293(D.D.C.2017); BOLIVIA REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA v. HELMERICH & PAYNE INTERN. DRILLING CO., 137 S.Ct. 1312, 197 L.Ed.2d. 663, 85 U.S.L.W. 4221(U.S.2017).

STATE AND OR FEDERAL REGULATION IN THIS CASE, OF DESCENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DECEDENT'S ESTATE MUST GIVE WAY IF SUCH REGULATION IMPAIRS THE FIDUCIARY DUTY AND SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL, LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE POWER OF THE CROWN, IMPAIRING EFFECTIVE EXERCISE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY RELATED TO OUR FOREIGN LEGAL SYSTEM TO INCLUDE THE SUPERSEDING AUTHORITY AND POWER OF THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DECREES, ZSCHERNIG v. MILLER, 389 U.S. 429, 88 S.Ct. 664, 19 L.Ed.2d. 683(U.S.1968); DOE v. FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6 (D.D.C.2016); ARMIDILLO DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISES INC. v. HAIYUN MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS MANUFACTURE CO. LTD., F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 2815943(D.C.Fla. 2014); CASSIER v. THYSSEN BORNEMISZA COLLECTION FOUNDATION, 737 F3d. 613(9th.Cir.2013); AL SHIMARI v. C.A.C.I. INTERN, INC., 679 F3d. 205(4th.Cir.2012).

IN THE GLOBAL NATIONS CONSPIRING TO ATTACH, EXECUTE OR ARREST THE KING-KHALIFAH'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN GIVING SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHRITES THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY BY JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. SUCH ACTION PRODUCES VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT WHICH SET FORTH PROHIBITION AGAINST CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH COMMERCE BY ROBBING, ATTACHING, EXECUTING OR ARRESTING THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IS VALID UNDER COMMERCE CLAUSE ON

ITS FACE AND IS APPLIED TO THESE DEFENDANTS WHO HAVE ESSENTIALLY ROBBED AND HIGH-JACKED THE KING-KHALIFAH'S INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, REMOVING THE RESTRICTIONS PLACED UPON IT BY THE "GRANT" UNDER "CONTRACT", WHERE CATERING AND WEDDING SERVICES, HOTEL AND HONEY-MOON ACCOMMODATIONS, FINANCIAL VENTURES SUCH AS CREDIT CARD AND OTHER BANKING USAGES NATIONALLY AND GLOBALLY PRODUCE COMMERCE ACTIVITIES AND ARE DONE AND MADE ACROSS STATE AND INTERNATIONAL BORDERS. THE APPLICATION OF YOUR STATE AND OR FEDERAL, EVEN INTERNATIONAL LAWS COULD BE BASED ON DE MINIMUS NEXUS TO INTER-STATE COMMERCE, SO LONG AS STATUTE OR LAW REGULATED ACTIVITY WHICH, THROUGH REPETITION, IN AGGREGATE HAD SUBSTANTIAL EFFECT ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE, WHERE MANY OF THESE WEDDING SERVICES ARE EVEN DONE ON THE INTERNET, WHICH INCLUDE WEDDING GIFTS SUCH AS THOSE MATTERS THAT ARE PRESENTLY BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN THE MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COM-MISSION...ADDRESSING FREE SPEECH, RELIGIOUS RIGHTS AND PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION PRODUCING INTERSTATE COMMERCE CLAIM. YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT, CUSTO v. U.S., 523 U.S. 1011, 118 S.Ct. 1201 (MEM) 140 L.Ed.2d. 329(U.S.1998); U.S. v. MILES, 122 F3d. 235(5th.Cir.1997); U.S.C.A. CONST. ART. 1, § 8 Cl. 3; 18 U.S.C.A. § 1951; UNITED STATES v. HENDERSON, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6084637(S.D.Tex.2016); UNITED STATES v. RUE, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5007930(S.D.Tex.2015); SIBLEY v. HERGENROEDER, F.Supp.2d., 2006 WL 3354137(D.C.Md.2006).

DUE TO THE AIDS THAT'S PRODUCED BY SUCH ACTIVITY, THE DEBAUCHERY AND VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS ASSOCIATED WITH SUCH PRACTICES, THAT STAND IN BLATANT DEFIANCE TO THE TERMS OF THE "CONTRACT" WHICH CLEARLY STATE, "THOU SHALT NOT LAY WITH A MAN AS THOU LAYETH WITH A WOMAN", "THE WOMAN SHALL NOT WEAR THAT WHICH PERTAINETH TO A MAN AND A MAN SHALL NOT WEAR THAT WHICH PERTAINETH TO A WOMAN FOR ALL THAT DO SO ARE AN ABOMINATION UNTO THE LORD THY GOD", "THERE SHALL BE NO WHORE OF THE BELIEVERS NOR A SODOMITE OF THE BELIEVERS". SEE DEUTERONOMY 22:5 AND 23:17. THIS IS CLEAR VIOLATION OF THE "GRANT" GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS WITH RESTRICTIONS AS THUS STATED IN PART. THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN POWER WHOSE AUTHORITY OVER THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY EXISTING VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION HAS THE PARAMOUNT RIGHT TO PROTECT

THE LIVES, HEALTH, MORALS, COMFORT AND GENERAL WELFARE OF THE PEOPLE WHICH INCLUDE HIS HOLY COMMONWEALTH WHO RESIDE WITHIN ALL GLOBAL AND OR NATIONAL BORDERS, HOME-BLDG.-&-LOAN-ASS'N v.-BAISDELL, 290 U.S. 398, 54 S.Ct. 231, 88 A.L.R. 1481, 78 L.Ed. 413(U.S.1934); ELLIOTT-v.-BOARD-OF-SCHOOL-TRUSTEES-OF MADISON-CONSOLIDATED-SCHOOLS,--F3d.--, 2017 WL 5988226(7th.Cir. 2017); NORTH-CAROLINA-ASS'N-OF-EDUCATORS,-INC.-v.-STATE, 368 N.C. 777, 786 S.E.2d. 255(N.C.2016). SINCE THE KING-KHALIFAH WAS NOT PARTY TO ANY OF THESE ILLEGAL PROCEEDINGS IN QUESTION DEALING WITH THIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND YOUR COURTS HAD NO CONSENT, THE RULINGS ARE VOID FOR FRAUD AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, GORDON-v.-T.B.C.-RETAIL-GROUP,-INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 4247738(DSC.2016); REED-v.-BIG-WATER-RESORT,-LLC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 2935891(DSC.2016); DAN-RYAN-BUILDERS,-INC.-v.-CRYTAL RIDGE-DEVELOPEMENT,-INC., 783 F3d. 976, 91 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 625(4th.Cir.2015); WEAVER-v.-MASSACHUSETTS, 137 S.Ct. 1899, 198 L.Ed.2d. 420, 85 U.S.L.W. 4433(U.S.2017); PIRELA-v.-HORN, --Fed. Appx'--, 2017 WL 4176224(3rd.Cir.2017).

THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL MUST RESPOND, NOT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES OR YOUR CLERKS OR CASE MANAGERS ACTING AS PROXY FOR THE JUDGES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW OR AUTHORITY IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO ABSTAIN FROM ADDRESSING SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL QUESTIONS TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 RENDERING ILLEGAL THESE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS. THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL OR THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS MUST RESPOND AND DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY TIMELY SOUGHT TO DEFEAT THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION DONE BY AFFIDAVIT(S) IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 OR ALL RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, TITLES AND IMMUNITIES STAND. IN SUCH, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, NOR YOUR CLERKS OR CASE MANAGERS ACTING AS PROXY FOR THE JUDGES CONSPIRING TO CREATE AN INCOMPLETE RECORD AND CIRCUMVENT RULING, ABSTAINING FROM ANSWERING FEDERAL QUESTION, NOR THE STATE MAY EXCLUDE A PERSON, NAMELY, THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED, TO PRACTICE LAW (LAWGIVER OF GOD, ATTORNEY, JUDGE, LEGISLATOR), OR ANY OTHER OCCUPATION GIVEN TO HIM BY "COVENANT",

"CONTRACT" (FIDUCIARY-KING-KHALIFAH), IN A MANNER OR FOR REASONS THAT CONTRAVENE THE DUE PROCESS POWER AND AUTHORITY GIVEN TO HIM OR IN A MANNER THAT VIOLATES THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE OR ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OR ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, SCHWARE v. BOARD OF EXAMS OF THE STATE OF N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 77 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 BAR EXAMINERS, 811 F.Supp.2d. 1260 (E.D.Va.2011); PEREZ v. CHIMES DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6124679(D.C.Md.2016); IN RE: GREEN, 980 F2d. 590(9th.Cir.1992). WE MOTION TO EXCEED THE PAGE LIMIT. IT IS GRANTED.

I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, FULFILLED MY DUTY BY YOUR NATION'S DUE PROCESS LAWS AND PEACEFULLY, AS A NON-COMBATANT, FILED LEGAL ACTION TO ESTABLISH ALL RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES . I GAVE PROPER NOTICE AND PROPERLY SERVED ALL PARTIES INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES AND BROUGHT THE MATTERS TO THEM UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHERE WE WERE SUBJECTED TO OUTRAGEOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, WHERE THEY DEFAULTED AND JURISDICTION WAS MADE VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND OTHER UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, THEREUPON THAT CASE WAS REMOVED TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT WITHIN THESE PARALLEL CASES SUB-JUDICE. THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE PROTECTS RIGHTS OF CITIZENS, TO INCLUDE OUT OF STATE AND OR EVEN FOREIGN STATE CITIZENS IN THIS INSTANCE VIA THE F.S.I.A. CONNECTIONS, TO PLY THEIR TRADE, PRACTICE THEIR OCCUPATION AND PURSUE A COMMON CALLING. IN THIS INSTANCE THE COMMON CALLING OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE SOLE CORPORATION IS THAT OF PROPHET , KING, KHALIFAH, IMAM, LAWGIVER AND HIGH PRIEST WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY AND THE COURTS CANNOT IMPAIR THE KING-KHALIFAH ON ACCOUNT OF HIS OUT OF STATE CITIZENSHIP ACTING FOR PROTECTORATE PURPOSES, McBURNEY v. YOUNG, 569 U.S. 221, 133 S.Ct. 1709, 185 L.Ed.2d. 758(U.S. 2013); HENRY v. VERMONT, 2017 WL 2167123(2017); SCHOENEFELD v. SCHNELDERMAN, 821 F3d. 273(2nd.Cir.2016).

NOW LETS WITH THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT PRODUCED IN THE FORM OF CASE 17-7532 AS THEY DID IN CASE 17-6960 RENDERING THIS CASE VOID AND IN FORFEITURE FOR FRAUD AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, WHICH INCLUDE ALL ORDERS PRODUCED THEREIN MAKING THIS CASE ILLEGAL AND A CRIMINAL ACT TO PROCEED WITH IT AS FILED. THIS INCLUDE WHAT ASHLEY BROWNLEE DID IN CASE 17-7186. THIS IS CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION. JURISDICTION LIES WITH TRUSTEE JUDGE AUSTIN WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION IS LIMITED AND RESTRICTED. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IS RAISED IN BOTH CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186 AS IT WAS IN CASE 17-6960 AND THIS CASE AND ALL PARALLEL CASES SHALL NOT FAIL TO TAKE NOTICE. SEE EXHIBIT, "17-6960".

WHEN DETERMINING WHETHER A PERSON HAS STANDING TO SUE, THE COURT MUST FOCUS ON THE STATUS OF THE PARTY WHO HAS FILED THE COMPLAINT. BY THE PLEADINGS WITHIN THESE CASES TO INCLUDE THOSE UNDER CASE 16-2299, EXHIBIT, "TRUSTEE". I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, AM FOREIGN SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH BY "CONTRACT" WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY WHICH CANNOT BE MADE OR UNMADE BY THE COURTS PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE UNDER ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, WHERE ALL ACTS WHERE DONE SPECIFICALLY TO THE KING AND THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS WHO ARE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST", WHO SOUGHT TO AID THE KING-KHALIFAH EXERCISE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C.A. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT. WHAT AND WHO I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI AM, AS WELL AS MY HOLY COMMONWEALTH IS, THE PETITIONERS IN THESE PARALLEL APPEALS, WAS ESTABLISHED BY "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" BY MY, OUR, ORIGINAL STATUS BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED WHICH CANNOT BE UNMADE BY THE COURTS WITH EX POST FACTO LAW. THE 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. DUDENHOEFFER, 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); SCOTT v. SOUTH-CAROLINA 2017 WL 875858(DSC.2017); MILLER v. SCATURO, 2016 WL 3951668 (DSC.2016); GRUPO-DALAFLUX v. ATLAS-GLOBAL-GROUP-L.P., 541 U.S.

567, 124 S.Ct. 1920, 158 L.Ed.2d. 866(U.S.2004); LOUMIET-v. UNITED-STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19 (2014); U.S.-v.-TISDALE, F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 2156666(DSC.2007); SEBELIUS-v.-AUBURN-REGIONAL-MEDICAL-CENTER, 133 S.Ct. 817, 184 L.Ed.2d. 627, 81 U.S.L.W. 4053(U.S.2013); SIZWARD-v.-RIDDLE, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 707018(DSC.2013).

THE CASE 17-7532, AS DID CASE 17-6960, POSSESS SEVERAL FATAL STRUCTURAL DEFICIENCIES THAT ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE RENDERING CASE 17-7532 AND 17-7186 VOID FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION ESTABLISHING FORFEITURE BY SANCTIONS SOUGHT AND GRANTED BY DECREE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT. FIRST, WE MOTION FOR THE RECUSAL OF JUDGES DIAZ, THACKER, DAVIS, HAMILTON, GREGORY, DUNCAN AND SHEDD IN BOTH CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186. AS LONG AS ANY OF THESE JUDGES SIT UPON THESE AND THE OTHER PARALLEL APPEALS YOU HAVE A STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION. UNTIL THE ISSUE OF RECUSAL IS RULED ON, ON THE COURT RECORD, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF § 1983, NOT A MANDAMUS OR § 2254, WHICH YOU IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT FILED THE APPEAL OF CASE 17-7532 UNDER. THE PROCEEDINGS ARE ILLEGAL DUE TO THE FRAUD AND BECAUSE CASE 17-7532 POSSESSING THIS STRUCTURAL ERROR AS DO CASE 17-7186 IF THESE JUDGES SIT. THE LANGUAGE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT USED IN WILLIAMS-v.-PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016) IS CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL GIVING CLARITY TO ALL PREVIOUSLY ADJUDICATED CASES ON THE SUBJECT. THERE ARE (3) PRONGS. IF ONE EXIST RECUSAL IS MANDATORY. WATCH THE LANGUAGE USED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. NO MAN SHALL SIT UPON HIS OWN CASE NOR CAN A MAN TRY A CASE TO WHICH HE HAS AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME NOR SHALL HE SIT IF THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. 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 VIOILATION. IN CASE 9:17-cv-1803-TMC SUBJUDICE

AS WELL AS IN THE PARALLEL APPEALS IS A COPY OF THE (44) PAGE COMPLAINT. BY THIS DOCUMENT, THE JUDGES SOUGHT WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MUST RECUSE THEMSELVES. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS REQUIRED BY DUE PROCESS LAW IN CASE 17-6960, ALL PARALLEL CASES, AS WELL AS IN CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186 TO RULE ON THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL NOT UNDER MANDAMUS, NOT UNDER SOME FRAUDULENTLY PRODUCED § 2254 APPEAL, BUT UNDER § 1983 TO WHICH THEY ARE PARTY TO THESE PROCEEDINGS EVEN VIA THE WRIT OF ERROR WHICH MUST BE ADJUDICATED UNDER § 1983. THUS, ANY SUBSEQUENT ACTION UNTIL THIS IS DONE CREATES A DUE PROCESS CLAIM THAT VOIDS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION BY THESE ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO DENY US APPEALABLE ISSUES FOR WRIT OF CERT., POTENTIALLY ORDERING US TO BE PARTY TO AN ILLEGAL PROCEEDING WITHOUT FIRST RULING ON THE SUBMITTED MOTION FOR RECUSAL. FURTHER, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IN ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO ABSTAIN FROM ANSWERING FEDERAL QUESTION, GETS JENNIFER RICE TO ISSUE A RULE 40(d) NOTICE IN CASES 16-1953 AND 16-2141 WHEN THOSE PROCEEDINGS ARE ILLEGAL AND NO SUCH NOTICE CAN ATTACH BY LAW. THE CONSPIRING JUDGES THEN UNDER CASE 17-7186 USING ASHLEY BROWNLEE AS A JUDGE/PROXY, TO ABSTAIN FROM ANSWERING FEDERAL QUESTIONS IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, BLOCKS THE FILING OF THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 WHICH IS SUBSTITUTED AS THE INFORMAL BRIEF TO AGAIN DENY US APPEALABLE ISSUES AND OBSTRUCT JUSTICE USING THESE CLERKS AS PROXY TO PREVENT FULL AND PROPER JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE ISSUES WITHIN THESE CASES IN VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. WE OBJECT TO THIS CONTINUAL FRAUD BY THESE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES AND ACTS OF MACHINATION REQUIRING THEIR RECUSAL AND FORFEITURE OF THE ISSUES SOUGHT DUE TO SANCTIONS WHICH ARE SOUGHT AND GRANTED BY DECREE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC JUDGE, JAHJAH AL MAHDI. SEE LETTER DATED DECEMBER 5, 2017 FILED IN CASE 17-7186. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT ABSTAIN FROM DECIDING FEDERAL QUESTIONS BEFORE CASE 17-7532 OR 17-7186 PROCEED CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO DENY US ISSUES ON APPEAL WHICH VOID YOUR JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND FOR VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. STOP USING

THESE CLERKS AND CASE MANAGERS AS PROXY, AS JUDGES TO SKIRT RULING, TO HIDE YOUR ABUSES OF DISCRETION AND ARBITRARY JUDICIAL ACTION IN VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE. STOP RULING ON ISSUES OF APPEAL SUBSTITUTING MANDAMUS FOR APPEAL. A MANDAMUS CANNOT SUBSTITUTE FOR AN APPEAL AND THE CLERKS OR CASE MANAGERS CANNOT SUBSTITUTE FOR A JUDGE IN ACTS OF MACHINATION TO CREATE AN INCOMPLETE RECORD AND DENY US APPEALABLE ISSUES, ABSTAINING FROM RULING ON CRUCIAL FEDERAL QUESTIONS IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW. WE MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES IN QUESTION RECUSAL. YOU ARE IN VIOLATION OF CLEARLY ESTABLISHED STATUTES, ARTICLE III SECTION 1, AS WELL AS YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE MAKING YOUR ACTIONS CRIMINAL IN DEFIANCE TO CLEARLY ESTABLISHED LEGISLATIVE INTENT AND THAT OATH OF OFFICE HAVING THESE CLERKS ACTING AS JUDGES TO BLOCK, HINDER AND IMPEDE FULL REVIEW IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983, 1985(2), 1985(3) AND 1986 AS WELL AS 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, U.S. v. RON PAIR ENTERPRISES INC., 489 U.S. 235, 119 S.Ct. 1027, 103 L.Ed.2d. 290(U.S.1989); IN RE: ARGO CREDIT, LLC., --B.R.--, 2017 WL 4404269(2017); LAKE CARRIER ASS'N v. MacMILLIAN, 406 U.S. 498, 92 S.Ct. 1749(U.S. 1972); U.S. v. $41,320 U.S. CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240; 1997 WL 10291 U.S. (APPELLATE BRIEF) BRIEF OF SENATORS ORIN G. HATCH, STROM THURMOND ET. AL.; FORRESTER v. WHITE, 484 U.S. 219, 108 S.Ct. 538(U.S.1988); PULLIAM v. ALLEN, 466 U.S. 522, 536-543, 104 S.Ct. 1970, 1971-1982, 80 L.Ed.2d. 565 (1984); EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339, 348-349, 25 L.Ed. 676 (1880); ROCHE v. EVAPORATED MILK ASS'N, 391 U.S. 21, 63 S.Ct. 938, 87 L.Ed. 1185(U.S.1943); IN RE: WILLIAMS, 381 Fed. Appx' 284, 2010 WL 2231958(4th.Cir.2010); WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES, 2015 WL 11109497, * 1, E.D.Va..

INASMUCH, ON THE QUESTION OF RECUSAL AS DETERMINED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. "THE COURT ASKS '[N]OT' WHETHER A JUDGE HARBORS AN ACTUAL BIAS (FOR EXAMPLE EXTRA JUDICIAL OR PERSONAL BIAS AS IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION THE CONSPIRING JUDGES ASSERTED IN THEIR ACTS OF FRAUD), 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 CONSPICUOUS THAT SUCH AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

OF BIAS DOES EXIST IN THESE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES AS IS EVIDENCED BY WHAT OCCURRED INVOLVING THESE JUDGES OF CONCERN, WHICH INCLUDE HOW THIS CASE IS FRAUDULENTLY FILED UNDER 17-7532 AND THE JUDGES USING ASHLEY BROWNLEE IN CASE 17-7186, ATTEMPTING TO FRAUDULENTLY MANIPULATE CHRISTOPHER WILSON TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS THAT DO NOT HAVE THE PLRA LANGUAGE ON THEM TO CIRCUMVENT THE STRUCTURAL ERROR, ACTING AS LEGISLATORS, NOT JUDGES, WHERE THE LEGISLATORS CLEARLY DETERMINED THAT FILING BEFORE THIS COURT MUST BE DONE PURSUANT TO THE PLRA, TO ABSTAIN FROM RULING ON THE SPECIFIC ISSUE OF THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THESE PROVISIONS, THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA, BEFORE THESE CASES PROCEED. THIS IS REQUIRED BY DUE PROCESS LAW OR THE CASES ARE ILLEGAL AND THE JUDGES, CLERKS AND CASE MANAGERS ARE IN CLEAR VIOLATION OF THEIR OATH OF OFFICE. FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND STRUCTURAL ERROR EXIST. WRIT OF ERROR IS NOW FILED TO ADDRESS IT. RULE ON THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL UNDER § 1983 BEFORE ANY SUB-SEQUENT MATTER OCCURS OR ALL PROCEEDINGS ARE ILLEGAL AND VOID UNDER 17-7186, 17-7532 AND ALL OTHER PENDING PARALLEL APPEALS, CAPEATON-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 6788852, * 11+ (Md.2016); DACRES-v.-ATTORNEY-GENERAL-U.S., 615 Fed. Appx' 79 (3rd.Cir.2015); IN RE:-SYNTAX-BRILLIAN-CORPORATION, 2016 WL 7177615(D.Md.2016); IN-RE:-LUNDY, 2016 WL 6108524(D.OHIO.2016).

LETS FINISH DRIVING THE "STAKE" IN THESE RAT, STINKING, VAMPIRES HEARTS. WHAT'S GOING ON HERE CORRUPT JUDGES OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT? THIS IS THE SAME STUPID CRIMINAL MESS AND STUNT YOU JUDGES PULLED UNDER CASE 17-6960. THE ENTIRE CASE UNDER 17-7532 IS CORRUPTED BY FRAUD RENDERING IT VOID. WHERE IS THE FILING FEE PAID FOR CASE 17-7532? WHERE ARE THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS? AS IN CASE 17-6960, YOU DID NOT REQUIRE SUCH FOR CASE 17-7532. IF YOU DID, WHICH WE HAVE NOT SEEN, THE SAME STRUCTURAL ERROR EXIST IN CASE 17-7532 AS IT DOES IN CASES 17-6960, 17-6693, 17-6925 AND THE OTHER PARALLEL APPEALS PENDING BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT. ITS PERSPICUOUS IN YOUR FRAUD THAT YOU MADE A MISTAKE. SO WE ATTACHED THE PLRA IN FORMA PAUPERIS

DOCUMENTS FOR THIS CASE TO HELP YOU OUT A LITTLE BIT. WE DON'T WANT YOU TO FALL AND BUMP YOUR HEAD. WATCH THAT FIRST STEP, ITS A "DOOSEY". NOW RULE ON THE DOGGON' ISSUES!!! STOP THE FRAUD AND FOOLISHNESS. **IT IS SO ORDERED.** THE COURT UNDER CASE 17-7532 AS IN CASE 17-6960 DID NOT ISSUE ANY ORDER STATING THAT THE FILING FEES WERE WAIVED. THIS IS CLEAR ERROR AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE. THIS CONSTITUTES AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION AND PLAIN ERROR BY YOUR FRAUD AND MACHINATION. UNLESS THE COURT RULES THAT SUCH A FILING FEE OR FORMS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL, WHICH THE COURT DID NOT DO. THE COURT CANNOT ACT AS A LEGISLATOR IN VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND UNDO A CLEAR LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENT REQUIRED FOR FILING WITHIN THIS COURT. THE JUDGES ARE NOT LEGISLATORS WHICH VOID YOUR JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. WE OBJECT, BANK-MARKAZI-v.-PETERSON, 136 S.Ct. 1310, 194 L.Ed.2d. 463, 84 U.S.L.W. 4222(U.S.2016); U.S.-v.-BASTON, 818 F3d. 651(11th.Cir.2016).

IT IS NOT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S OR ANY COURT'S PLACE TO CHANGE THE MEANING OF A CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS STATUTE; WHERE STATUTE'S LANGUAGE IS PLAIN AND UNAMBIGUOUS, AND CONVEYS A CLEAR AND DEFINITE MEANING, RULES OF STATUTORY INTERPRETATION ARE NOT NEEDED AND THE COURT HAS NO RIGHT TO IMPOSE ANOTHER MEANING. WHAT THE LEGISLATORS SAY IN THE TEXT OF THE STATUTE IS CONSIDERED THE BEST EVIDENCE OF THE LEGISLATIVE INTENT AND WILL, STATE v.-MILES,--S.E.2d.--, 2017 WL 3611694(S.C.2017); SIGNOR-v.-KEEL, S.E.2d, 2017 WL 117711(S.C.2017); SMITH-v.-TIFFANY, 419 S.C. 548, 799 S.E.2d. 479(S.C.2017); STAR-ATHELETICA,-LLC.-v.-VARSITY BRANDS,-INC., 137 S.Ct. 1002, 197 L.Ed.2d. 354, 85 U.S.L.W. 4139(U.S.2017); ENCINO-MOTOR-CARS,-LLC.-v.-NAVARRO, 136 S.Ct. 2117, 195 L.Ed.2d. 382, 84 U.S.L.W. 4424.

BY THAT WHICH WAS SET IN PLACE BY THE LEGISLATURE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT RULES AND DUE REQUIRE THAT A FEE OF $505.00 BE PAID OR 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1) REQUIRES AN AFFIDAVIT TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE ANY MATTER CAN PROCEED. THIS IS JURISDICTIONAL, SO WE DECIDED TO HELP YOU OUT BY SENDING THE ONES ATTACHED. JUST LIKE THE COURT UNDER 17-6960; THE COURT UNDER CASE 17-7532 IS PROHIBITED FROM SAYING ANYTHING ABOUT

THIS CASE. THE RULES ARE SUSPENDED FOR CASE 17-7532 AS IT IS ALSO FOR CASE 17-7186. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

THE COURT DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION UNDER CASE 17-7532 UNLESS YOU HAVE ENTERED AND SERVED UPON US AN ORDER WAIVING THE FILING FEES EXPLAINING WHY (EMPHASIS ADDED) SUCH FEES WERE WAIVED. WE GIVE YOU JUDICIAL NOTICE. SINCE THE DOCUMENTS FOR FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS ARE NOW ATTACHED FOR BOTH CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186, THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA MUST BE ADDRESSED ON THE COURT RECORD BEFORE THESE CASES CAN PROCEED OR THE PROCEEDINGS BECOME ILLEGAL. BY THIS FAILURE THE COURT ACTED AS A LEGISLATOR, NOT A JUDGE, OVERRULING CONGRESS WITHOUT A PROPER JUDICIAL DETERMINATION EXPLAINING "WHY", WHICH VOIDS YOUR JURISDICTION FOR FRAUD AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. THIS IS A JURISDICTIONAL DEFECT, U.S. v. RON PAIR ENTERPRISES INC., 489 U.S. 235, 119 S.Ct. 1027, 103 L.Ed.2d. 290(U.S.1989); IN RE: ARGO CREDIT, LLC, --B.R.--, 2017 WL 4404269(2017); UNITED STATES v. STE BRI ENTERPRISES INC., 2017 WL 4226873(D.C.OHIO. 2017); THOMPSON v. FINN, 2016 WL 5724369(2016); DAHER v. OWENS, 2014 WL 1159629; IN RE: DUROSER, 2015 WL 4068243(N.D.2015); STONE v. BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON N.A., 2014 WL 61480; RORICK v. COMMISSION OF SOCIAL SEC., 32 F.Supp.3d. 157; ENCANNATION v. BRANDT, 2015 WL 7078682(N.D.N.Y.2015); WEST v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 5375782(2016); MOCHE v. GEORGIA PACIFIC CORPORATION, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 9307307(2015); IN RE: GJEADE, 535 B.R. 329 (2015); BLAKELY v. WARD, 738 F3d. 607(4th.Cir.2013). WE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT BRIEF AND THE COURT RULE ON THESE ISSUES UNDER CASE 17-7532 BEFORE ANY INFORMAL BRIEF BE REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT ABSTAIN FROM ANSWERING FEDERAL QUESTIONS OR ORDER US TO BE PARTY IN AN ILLEGAL PROCEEDING, LAKE CARRIER ASS'N v. MacMILLIAN, 406 U.S. 498, 92 S.Ct. 1749(U.S.1972); U.S. v. $41,320 U.S. CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240; BROWN v. U.S., 2014 WL 2871398 (DSC.2014); 1997 WL 10291 U.S.(APPELLATE BRIEF) BRIEF OF U.S. SENATORS ORIN G. HATCH, STROM THURMONG ET. AL.; FORRESTER v. WHITE, 484 U.S. 219, 108 S.Ct. 538(U.S.1988); PULLIAM v. ALLEN, 466 U.S. 522, 536-543, 104 S.Ct. 1970, 1977-1982, 80 L.Ed.2d. 565(1984); BACCUS v. MARCHANT, 2014 WL 1330984(DSC.2014); EX

EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339, 348-349, 25 L.Ed. 676(1880).

LETS GO FURTHER. I WANT YOU TO LOOK AT THE APPEAL UNDER CASES 17-7186, 17-6960 AND 17-7532. WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE IN THESE (3) APPEALS BESIDES THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES IN ACTS OF FRAUD USING ASHLEY BROWNLEE AS PROXY TO BLOCK THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 AND CONSPIRING TO MANIPULATE WILSON INTO FILLING OUT DIFFERENT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS TO CIRCUMVENT RULING ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA? THE ANSWER,...IS NOTHING. THE STRUCTURE OF THE CASES SUB-JUDICE ARE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME. SO THEN WHAT THE HECK DO THESE CORRUPT JUDGES UNDER CASES 17-6960 AND 17-7532 DOING HAVING THESE CASES FILED AS HABEAS CORPUS AND CASE 17-7186 IS ESSENTIALLY FILED AS A § 1983 ACTION? AND IF CASE 17-7532 IS A HABEAS CORPUS WHICH IS WHY McFADDEN IS LISTED AS RESPONDENT. WHY IS IT NOT LISTED WITHIN THE RECORD UNDER CASE 17-7532 THAT THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL IS MAKING AN APPEARANCE AS IN CASE 17-6960? IF THEY ARE REQUIRED TO APPEAR IN CASE 17-6960, THEN THEY ARE REQUIRED TO APPEAR UNDER CASE 17-7532 DUE TO YOUR FRAUD. **IT IS SO ORDERED**, BY DECREE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT.

NONETHELESS, THE ANSWER FOR CASE 17-7532 IS THE SAME FOR CASE 17-6960. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, SINCE THEY FAILED IN THEIR ACTS OF MACHINATION IN CASE 17-6960 THEIR PLAN IS TO USE CASE 17-7532 AND THE ACTIONS DONE BY ASHLEY BROWNLEE UNDER CASE 17-7186 TO DEFRAUD US BY FILING THE CASE(S) INCORRECTLY AND BLOCK THE FILING OF THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 FROM BEING FILED AND CIRCUMVENT RULING ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PLRA BY FRAUDULENTLY MANIPULATING WILSON INTO FILLING OUT DIFFERENT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS TO ABSTAIN FROM RULING ON THE ISSUE. THEY NEVER EXPECTED US TO ENTER THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WITH THE DELUGE OF SUBSEQUENT CASES THAT FOLLOWED WHICH CAN NOW ACT AS A "MARKER" TO HIGHLIGHT AND PROVE THE FRAUD AND CRIMINAL INTENT CONSPIRED IN BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT PARTIES, CLERKS, CASE MANAGERS AND JUDGES SOUGHT RECUSED IN THEIR EFFORTS TO PROTECT THE DEFENDANTS IN THESE CASES AVOID SUIT. THEY KNEW WE SOUGHT RECUSAL OF JUDGES. SUCH IS NOT WARRANTED UNDER § 2254,

BUT IT WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED UNDER § 1983 AND THEY WANTED TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY WERE SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASES IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 MAKING CASE 17-7532 ILLEGAL LIKE THE OTHERS AFOREMENTIONED. WE ARE SEEKING REPARATIONS FOR SLAVERY AND JIM CROW AS RULER OF THE UNITED ETHIOPIAN EMPIRE, ONE OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES; WE ARE SEEKING RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND ARTICLE IV § 2 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION; VIOLATIONS OF THE HOBBS ACT, 28 U.S.C. § 2679, THE F.S.I.A., THE C.A.T. TREATY, THE RICO ACT AND OATH OF OFFICE AND OTHER § 1983 ISSUES WHICH COULD NOT HAVE BEEN GRANTED UNDER § 2254. SO IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND MACHINATION, JUST LIKE YOU DID UNDER CASE 17-6960, THEY ESTABLISHED THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 17-7532 TO DEFRAUD US AND PREVENT FAIR, PROPER AND FULL REVIEW OF THE ESSENTIAL ISSUES BEFORE THE COURT BY FILING THE APPEAL, NOT JUST UNDER CASE 17-6969, BUT ALSO UNDER CASE 17-7532 AS A § 2254 ACTION AS OPPOSED TO A § 1983 WHILE ASHLEY BROWNLEE IN CASE 17-7186 CONSPIRED TO BLOCK THE FILING OF THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017. WE OBJECT.

WE OBJECT TO CASE 17-7532'S USAGE FOR ANYTHING. STAY THESE CASES AS WE SOUGHT. **IT IS SO ORDERED.** THE ENTIRE CASE UNDER BOTH CASE 17-7532 AND 17-7186, DUE TO ASHLEY BROWNLEE'S RECENT ACTIONS INVOLVING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES ARE CORRUPTED BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND THE CASES STAND IN EGREGIOUS VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 PRODUCED TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH AND JASON M. GOURDINE DID NOT ENTER THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT UNDER § 2254 AND BROWNLEE, ACTING AS PROXY FOR THESE JUDGES IS BLOCKING THE FILING OF THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 AND TRYING TO MANIPULATE WILSON INTO FILLING OUT DIFFERENT IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS TO CIRCUMVENT OR ABSTAIN RULING ON FEDERAL QUESTION. THE CASE SUB-JUDICE UNDER 17-7532 WAS ENTERED IN THE DISTRICT COURT PURSUANT TO WRIT OF ERROR WHICH BY THE MANDATES OF THE ALL WRITS ACT OF 28 U.S.C. § 1651 MUST BE HEARD UNDER § 1983 NOT § 2254, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO DENY US THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS FOR PROTECTORATE PURPOSES AND BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED, RAUL-ADAMS-v.-CALIFORNIA-INSTITUTION

, 2016 WL 6464444; DONATONI v. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, --F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 1755871; U.S. v. HARE, 820 F3d. 93 (4th. Cir.2016). THIS VOIDS BOTH CASE(S) 17-7532 AND 17-7186'S JURISDICTION FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION PLACING YOU IN FORFEITURE FOR ALL RELIEF SOUGHT. **IT IS SO ORDERED,** WHITE v. MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280(DSC.2014); U.S. v. ALEDEKCHA, 2010 WL 4054267(D.C.Md.2010); HUNT v. U.S., F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 5131716(DSC.2007).

ONCE THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGES, EVEN CONSPIRING WITH PARTIES WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, ENGAGED IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MACHINATION, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, VIOLATIONS OF THEIR OATH OF OFFICE, VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE III SECTIONS 1 AND 2 OF THE U.S. CONST., VIOLATIONS OF THE RICO ACT, THE C.A.T. TREATY, THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT, THE A.D.A. AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW CITED, BY ESTABLISHING CASES IN A MANNER THAT WE DID NOT ORIGINALLY FILE THEM, ALTERING OUR INTENDED PROCEEDINGS, SITTING UPON CASES TO WHICH THEY ARE DEFENDANTS OR TO WHICH THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL IN VIOLATION OF U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT, SPOLIATING WRITS OF ERROR, PROPERTY AND EVIDENCE ALSO TO PREVENT OUR RIGHT TO TIMELY REINSTATE CASE 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-MBS-TER WITHIN (10) DAYS OF ORDER, CONSPIRING WITH THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS TO NOT PICK UP AND TRANSPORT THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ANTHONY COOK TO THE STATE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING FRAUDULENT PROTECTIVE ORDERS SO THEY CAN MAKE USE OF THEM WITHIN THESE FEDERAL PROCEEDINGS, INSTRUCTING ASHLEY BROWNLEE TO OBSTRUCT FILING OF THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 IN CASE 17-7186 AND ATTEMPTING TO MANIPULATE HIM INTO FILLING OUT DIFFERENT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS TO CIRCUMVENT RULING ON ESSENTIAL ISSUES AND GET AROUND THE STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT EXIST BY USE OF PLRA, JENNIFER RICE CONSPIRING TO ATTACH A RULE 40(d) NOTICE TO ILLEGAL PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASES 16-1953 AND 16-2141, INSTRUCTING S.C.D.C. IN PHYSICAL ATTACKS UPON US, DESTROYING PROPERTY NEEDED TO ACCESS THE COURTS AND TELLING S.C.D.C. NOT TO MAKE COPIES OF EVIDENCE AND LEGAL DOCUMENTS OR DENY INJUNCTIONS TO PREVENT THIS EVIDENCE AND DOCU-

MENTS SUBMISSION SO THE FEDERAL COURTS COULD PRODUCE FRAUDULENT REPORTS, ORDERS, RECOMMENDATIONS OR DETERMINATIONS, IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 AS WELL AS IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT. THE PROCEEDINGS IN THEIR TOTALITY BECAME IRREGULAR AND INVALID WARRANTING THE WRIT OF ERROR. WHERE CIVIL DISABILITY IN THIS CASE EXIST SUCH AS THE ILLEGAL DEPRIVING OF PARENTAL RIGHTS OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH, WHERE ALL COURTS WERE REPEATEDLY TOLD THAT I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, THE KING-KHALIFAH DENOUNCE HIS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP AND ADOPT THE CITIZENSHIP OF HIS ISRAELI FOREFATHER KING DAVID OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR TO THE THRONE OF ISRAEL AND THE OTHER (3) GLOBAL THRONES, THE DEPRIVING OF SOVEREIGN RIGHTS IN VIOLATION OF THE F.S.I.A. DECLARED BY DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, TO INCLUDE THE ESTABLISHING BEFORE THE COURT THE BENEFICIARY RIGHTS WHERE THEY IMPAIRED THE OBLIGATION OF THE "CONTRACT", "COVENANT", "COMPACT" IN VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONST., VIOLATING RIGHTS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE OF ARTICLE IV § 2, AS WELL AS THE ILLEGAL ARRESTING AND OR ATTACHING AND OR EXECUTING OF OUR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN VIOLATION OF THE RESTRICTIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE "GRANT", "CONTRACT" IN THE FORM OF THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY YOUR NATIONS GAVE THESE SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHRITES AS IS ARGUED IN CASE 16-2299 EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS ACT; ALL ESTABLISHED BY CONTRACT, DEFAULT AND COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084; AND WHERE THE KING-KHALIFAH'S CONVICTION WAS OBTAINED BY FUNDAMENTAL STRUCTURAL ERROR, TO INCLUDE THE SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND THE CONSPIRING STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS ATTACKED THE BENEFICIARY PLAINTIFFS IN THE PARALLEL AND RELATED CASES DUE PROCESS MATTERS IN RETALIATION BECAUSE THEY SOUGHT TO AID HIM SEEK REDRESS FOR CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED RIGHTS IN VIOLATION OF PLUIPA AND 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000, 12203(a)(b), 1985(2), 1985(3) AND 1986. WRIT OF ERROR WAS THE APPROPRIATE VEHICLE TO FILE NOT JUST UNDER CASE 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA, BUT ALSO UNDER 9:17-cv-01803-TMC OR ANY OTHER RELATED CASE WHERE THESE ISSUES COULD COULD NOT POSSIBLY BEEN HEARD UNDER § 2254. THE HOLDINGS MADE IN ROSS v. BLAKE, 136 S.Ct. 1850(2016) ATTACH AND APPLY TO THE STATE COURTS AND THE S.C.

DISTRICT COURT JUDGES AS WELL WHERE THEY ENGAGED IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD, MACHINATION AND MISREPRESENTATION, IT CREATES A SITUATION WHERE THERE ARE NO AVAILABLE REMEDIES. ARTICLE III DYNAMICS EXIST IN THESE CASES WARRANTING THE FILING OF THE WRIT OF ERROR THAT WAS SUBMITTED BEFORE THE DISTRICT COURT, NOT MERELY § 2254 WHICH WAS ATTACHED DUE TO THE CONVICTIONS ALREADY BEING INVALIDATED BY THE FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT WHICH IS CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. THE WRIT OF ERROR IS THE APPROPRIATE VEHICLE TO USE UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE NEITHER THE KING-KHALIFAH NOR JASON GOURDINE ENTERED THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2254, BUT ENTERED THE COURT UNDER THE ALL WRITS ACT OF 28 U.S.C. § 1651, WRIT OF ERROR, WHICH WAS TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER § 1983. THEREFORE, DUE TO THIS CONTINUAL FRAUD UPON THE COURT CONSPIRED IN BY ALL PARTIES CASE 17-7532 CANNOT PROCEED AS CONSTRUCTED UNTIL IT BE ACKNOWLEDGED IN THE SAME FASHION AS THE COURT DID UNDER CASE 17-7186, THAT WRIT OF ERROR IS FILED, AND REMAND TO CORRECT THE FRAUD. CASE 17-7186 CANNOT PROCEED UNTIL THE COURT ACCEPTS THE PLRA FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS WE SENT THEM FOR THAT CASE, STOP BLOCKING THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 SUBMISSION AS THE INFORMAL BRIEF IN CASE 17-7186 AND RULE ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA, STOP THE FRAUD!!! I, WE, MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT, UNITED STATES v. DENEDO, 556 U.S. 904, 129 S.Ct. 2213, 173 L.Ed.2d. 1235(U.S.2009); UNITED STATES v. APPLE MAC PRO COMPUTER, --F3d.--, 2017 WL 1046105 (3rd.Cir.2017); UNITED STATES v. GREGORY HOLT AKA ABDUL MAALIK MUHAMMAD, 2017 WL 1181509(W.D. La.2017); STERN v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 6986704(N.C.2016); CLARKE v. UNITED STATES, 2017 WL 390294(N.C.2017); IN RE: BARTLEY 2016 WL 6068862(4th.Cir.2016).

INSOMUCH, THE OATH OF OFFICE IS A QUID PRO QUO CONTRACT UNDER U.S. CONST. ARTICLE 6 Cl. 2 AND 3, DAVIS v. LAWYERS SURETY CORPORATION, 459 S.W.2d. 655, 657 Tex. App., IN WHICH CLERKS, OFFICIALS AND OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT PLEDGE TO PERFORM, SUPPORT AND UPHOLD THE UNITED STATES AND STATES CONSTITUTIONS WITH ITS MANDATES IN RETURN FOR SUBSTANCES SUCH AS WAGES, PERKS AND BENEFITS. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAS HELD THAT NO STATE, NOR LEGISLATOR, NOR EXECUTIVE, NOR JUDGE CAN EVER

WAR AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION WITHOUT VIOLATING HIS UNDERTAKING TO SUPPORT IT WHICH IS THE HEART OF THEIR OATH OF OFFICE, COOPER v. AARON, 358 U.S. 1, 78 S.Ct. 1401(1958); IN RE: NEELY, 390 P.3d. 728, 2017 Wy. 25.

ANY JUDGE, CASE MANAGER, CLERK OR OTHER STATE AND OR FEDERAL OFFICIAL WHO DOES NOT COMPLY WITH HIS OATH OF OFFICE REGARDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WARS AGAINST THAT CONSTITUTION AND ENGAGES IN A FORM OF TREASONOUS ACTS IN VIOLATION OF THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND, AND IN THIS CASE IN VIOLATION OF THE SUPERSEDING AUTHORITY OF THE KING-KHALIFAH. IF A JUDGE OR CASE MANAGER OR CLERK DOES NOT FULLY COMPLY WITH THE CONSTITUTION THEN HIS ORDERS AND OR THEIR ACTS ARE VOID, THEY ARE WITHOUT JURISDICTION AND SUCH A PERSON ENGAGES IN ACTS OF TREASON AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION ITSELF. PROPONENTS ARE SUBJECTED TO PENALTIES AND REMEDIES FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT, CONSPIRACY UNDER 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 242 AND IN THIS CASE 1001, AS WELL AS TREASON AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION AND VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE III SECTIONS TO INCLUDE THIS OUTRAGEOUS FRAUD, AUERBOCK v. SAMUELS, 10 UTAH.2d., 152, 349 P.2d. 1112, 1114; ALLEGHANY CORP. v. KIRBY, D.C.N.Y. 218 F.Supp. 164, 183; KEETON PACKING CO. v. STATE, 437 S.W. 20, 28.

REFUSING TO LIVE BY YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE PLACES ALL CONSPIRING PARTIES IN DIRECT VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS IN EVERY CASE. VIOLATING YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE IS NOT JUST CAUSE FOR IMMEDIATE DISMISSAL AND REMOVAL FROM OFFICE, IT IS A FEDERAL CRIME.... FEDERAL LAW REGULATING OATH OF OFFICE BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IS DIVIDED INTO (4) PARTS ALONG WITH AN EXECUTIVE ORDER WHICH FURTHER DEFINES THE LAW FOR PURPOSES OF ENFORCEMENT, 5 U.S.C. § 3331, PROVIDES THE TEXT OF THE ACTUAL OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ARE REQUIRED TO TAKE BEFORE ASSUMING OFFICE. 5 U.S.C. § 3333 REQUIRES MEMBERS OF CONGRESS SIGN AN AFFIDAVIT TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY HAVE TAKEN THE OATH OF OFFICE REQUIRED BY 5 U.S.C. § 3331 AND HAVE NOT OR WILL NOT VIOLATE THAT OATH OF OFFICE DURING THEIR TENURE OF OFFICE AS DEFINED BY THE 3rd. PART OF THE LAW, 5 U.S.C. § 7311 WHICH EXPLICITLY MAKES IT A FEDERAL CRIMINAL OFFENSE FOR VIOLATIONS OF THEIR OATH OF OFFICE

WHICH THERE ARE SIMILAR PROVISIONS THAT APPLY TO ALL JUDGES, CLERKS, CASE MANAGERS AND EVEN FOR STATE OFFICIALS. FOR ANYONE EMPLOYED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ADVOCATE THE OVERTHROW OR VIOLATE THE U.S. CONSTITUTION IN THE MANNER THAT OCCURRED WITHIN THESE CASES 18 U.S.C. § 1918 PROVIDES PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF "OATH OF OFFICE" DESCRIBED IN 5 U.S.C. § 7311. WHENEVER A JUDGE OR CASE MANAGER OR CLERK ACTS WHERE HE OR SHE DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION TO ACT, THE JUDGE OR CASE MANAGER OR CLERK ENGAGES IN ACT OR ACTS OF TREASON, ESPECIALLY AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION, UNITED STATES v. WILL, 449 U.S. 200, 216, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d. 392, 406(1980); COHEN v. VIRGINIA, 19 U.S. (6 WHEAT) 264, 404, 5 L.Ed. 257(1821).

WHEN IT COMES TO THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND OR FEDERAL ATTORNEYS REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND TO THE PLEADINGS SINCE THEY APPEARED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 REMOVED TO THESE FEDERAL CASES. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN SCHEVER v. RHOADES, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S.Ct. 1683(1974) ADJUDICATED THAT "WHEN A STATE OFFICER ACTS UNDER A STATE LAW IN A MANNER VIOLATIVE OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION, HE COMES INTO CONFLICT WITH THE SUPERIOR AUTHORITY OF THAT CONSTITUTION, AND HE IS IN THAT CASE STRIPPED OF HIS OFFICIAL OR REPRESENTATIVE CHARACTER AND IS SUBJECT IN HIS PERSON TO THE CONSEQUENCES OF HIS INDIVIDUAL CONDUCT. THE STATE HAS NO POWER TO IMPART TO HIM ANY IMMUNITY FROM RESPONSIBILITY TO THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES AND IN THIS CASE, TO THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE KING-KHALIFAH OF THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES. BY LAW A JUDGE IS A STATE OFFICER AND OR FEDERAL EMPLOYEE. THE JUDGE THEN ACTS NOT AS A JUDGE BUT AS A PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL.

THERE IS TRUSTEE OVER THESE CASES AND THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DECREES SUPERSEDE ALL. UNDER FEDERAL LAW WHICH IS APPLICABLE TO ALL STATES, THAT IF A COURT OR PARTIES IS "WITHOUT AUTHORITY, ITS JUDGMENTS OR ACTS OR ORDERS ARE REGARDED AS NULLITIES. THEY ARE NOT VOIDABLE, BUT SIMPLY VOID, AND FORM NO BAR TO A RECOVERY SOUGHT, EVEN PRIOR TO A REVERSAL IN OPPOSITION TO THEM. THEY CONSTITUTE NO JUSTIFICATION, AND ALL PERSONS CONCERNED IN EXECU-

TING SUCH ACTS, JUDGMENTS, OR SENTENCES ARE CONSIDERED, IN LAW, AS TRESPASSERS". YOU CAN'T ATTACH A RULE 40(d) NOTICE TO CASES 16-1953 OR 16-2141 AND ASHLEY BROWNLEE CAN'T BLOCK THE PLRA FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS OR THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 FROM BEING FILED IN CASE 17-7186, ELLIOTT V. RIERSOL, 1 PET. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340(1828).

WHEN JUDGES, CLERKS OR CASE MANAGERS ACT WHEN THEY DO NOT HAVE JURISDICTION TO ACT, OR THEY ENFORCE A VOID ORDER OR ACT (AN ORDER ISSUED BY JUDGES WITHOUT JURISDICTION) THEY BECOME TRESPASSERS OF THE LAW, AND ARE ENGAGED IN ACTS OF TREASON SET AGAINST THEIR OATHS AND THE CONSTITUTION. THE COURT IN YATES V. VILLAGE OF HOFFMAN ESTATES, ILLINOIS, 209 F.Supp. 757(N.D.Ill. 1962) HELD THAT "NOT EVERY ACTION BY A JUDGE OR A CLERK OR A CASE MANAGER IS AN EXERCISE OF THEIR SPECIFIC FUNCTION...IT IS NOT A JUDICIAL, CLERICAL OR CASE MANAGER FUNCTION FOR THEM TO COMMIT AN INTERNATIONAL TORT EVEN THOUGH THE TORT OCCURS IN THE COURTHOUSE". WHEN A JUDGE OR OFFICIAL ACTS AS A TRESPASSER OF THE LAW OR HIS OATH OF OFFICE, WHEN THE JUDGE OR OFFICIAL DOES NOT FOLLOW THE LAW OR HIS OATH OF OFFICE, THE JUDGE AND OR OFFICIAL IS SUBJECT TO DISMISSAL, CRIMINAL PENALTIES AND LOSES SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND THE OFFICIAL'S ACTS AND THE JUDGE'S ORDERS ARE VOID AND ARE OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT.

ALL ACTS ARE ILLEGAL AND VOID, WHERE IN CONFLICT WITH THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. NO PERSON SHALL BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY OR PROPERTY, WHICH INCLUDE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS LAW, NOR SHALL HE BE ADJUDICATED OF OR TRIED FOR ANY OFFENSE BY AN EX POST FACTO LAW WHERE EX POST FACTO LAW SHALL BE PASSED AND ALL SAID RIGHTS, TITLES, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES ARE INVIOLATE AND WOULD VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, R.A.M. OF SOUTH FLORIDA, INC. V. W.C.I. COMMUNICATORS, INC., 869 SO.2d. 1210, 29 FLA. L. WEEKLY D. 761.

CONSTRUCTIVE FRAUD IS BREACH OF LEGAL OR EQUITABLE DUTY WHICH, IRRESPECTIVE OF MORAL GUILT, IS DECLARED BY LAW TO BE FRAUDULENT BECAUSE OF ITS TENDENCY TO DECEIVE OTHERS OR VIOLATE CONFIDENCE, DAVES V. LAWYERS SUR. CORP., 459 S.W.2d. 655(1970);

CORDIAL v. ERNST & YOUNG, 199 W.Va. 119, 483 S.E.2d. 248(1996).

FORCED BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY BY FRAUD TO BREACH CONTRACT IS PUNITIVE IN NATURE BY THESE CONSPIRING PARTIES. THE FIDUCIARY SOVEREIGN POWER HAS PARAMOUNT RIGHT TO PROTECT THE LIVES, HEALTH, MORALS, COMFORT AND GENERAL WELFARE OF HIS HOLY COMMONWEALTH WHO ARE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST", EDEN v. GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER CO., 858 F2d. 198(4th.Cir.1988); CURTIS v. CAFE ENTERPRISES INC., 2016 WL 6916786(N.C.2016); HOME BLDG & LOAN ASS'N v. BLAISDELL, 290 U.S. 398, 54 S.Ct. 231, 88 A.L.R. 1481, 78 L.Ed. 413(U.S.1934); ELLIOTT v. BOARD OF SCHOOLS TRUSTEE OF MADISON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS,--F3d.--, 2017 WL 5988226(7th. Cir.2017); NORTH CAROLINA ASS'N OF EDUCATORS, INC. v. STATE, 368 N.C. 777, 786 S.E.2d. 255(N.C.2016).

THE LAW DICTATES THAT FRAUD DESTROYS THE VALIDITY OF EVERYTHING IT ENTERS INCLUDING THE ACTS OF ASHLEY BROWNLEE AND JENNIFER RICE ACTING AS PROXY FOR THE JUDGES. IT FATALLY EFFECTS EVEN THE MOST SOLEMN ACTS OR JUDGMENTS AND DECREES. LABEO DEFINES FRAUD TO BE ANY CUNNING DECEPTION OR ARTICLE USED TO CIRCUMVENT OR DECEIVE ANOTHER, MR. WELLS, IN HIS VERY WORK ON RES JUDICATA SAYS, SEC. 499, "FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING", NUDD v. BURROWS, 91 U.S. 667-683(1875); U.S. v. THROCKMORTON, 98 U.S. 61-71(1871); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016).

JURISDICTION UNDER CASE 17-7532 AS IS 17-7186 IS VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, FRAUD AND STRUCTURAL ERRORS. THESE STRUCTURAL ERRORS DEFIES ANALYSIS BY HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE ESPECIALLY SINCE THERE IS TRUSTEE APPOINTED, WEAVER v. MASSACHUSETTS, 137 S.Ct. 1899, 198 L.Ed.2d. 420, 85 U.S.L.W. 4433(U.S. 2017); PIRELA v. HORN,--Fed. Appx'--, 2017 WL 4176224(3rd.Cir. 2017); GARCIA FINANCIAL GROUP v. VIRGINIA ACCELERATORS CORP., 3 Fed. Appx' 86, 2001 WL 117497(4th.Cir.2001) WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME TO VOID ALL ORDERS AND STOP THIS ARBITRARY JUDICIAL, CLERICAL OR OTHERWISE ACTIONS ISSUED AND OR DONE IN BOTH CASE 17-7532 AND 17-7186, BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INTERNATIONAL UNION OPERATING ENGINEERS, 2016 WL 1253285; WELLS FARGO BANK N.A.

v.-FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561(2016).

SINCE THERE WAS NO RULING ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA AS THEY RELATE TO EX-PARTE-VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339, 348-349, 25 L.Ed. 676(1880) AND THE-SLAUGHTER HOUSE-CASES, 83 U.S. (16 WALL) 36, 1873 AND INSTEAD THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CHOSE FRAUD UNDER CASE 17-7186 TO MANIPULATE WILSON INTO FILLING OUT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS USED PRIOR TO THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION'S OMNIBUS CRIME BILL TO CIRCUMVENT RULING. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND PARTIES VIA SANCTIONS SOUGHT AND GRANTED BY DECREE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT MUST BE DEEMED IN FORFEITURE. ACTS OF CONGRESS OR THE COURTS THAT ARE REPUGNANT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW. THE CONSTITUTION IS SUPREME TO ANY ACT OF THE COURTS OR LEGISLATURE, EVANCHO-v.-PINE-RICHLAND-SCHOOL DISTRICT, 237 F.Supp.3d 267(W.D.Pa.2017); TAYLOR-v.-U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2074, 195 L.Ed.2d. 456, 84 U.S.L.W. 4462(U.S.2016).

INSOMUCH, YOUR ACTIONS IN HANDLING THESE MATTERS VIOLATE THE CONTRACT, THE GRANT GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT IN VIOLATION OF THE PRIVILEGE AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE OF ARTICLE IV § 2 AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ESTABLISHING CAUSE BEFORE ALL COURTS ALLOWING ME TO INTERVENE AND CORRECT YOUR FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, BRESAULT v.-I.C.C., 494 U.S. 1, 110 S.Ct. 914, 108 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.1990); BROWN-v.-BROWN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); HARRIS v.-HHGREGG-INC., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1331166(N.C.2013); AMERICAN MUT.-LIBERTY-INS.-CO.-v.-PLYWOOD-PLASTICS-CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157(DSC.1948); ORARAH-v.-NEW-YORK-DEPT.-OF-EDUC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 4240733(N.Y.D.C.2015); GORDON-v.-TBC-RETAIL-GROUP,-INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 4247738(DSC.2016).

THE LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS ON ISSUES SUCH AS THE ONES BEING ARGUED WITHIN THESE CASES. IF A RULING, AND WE CAN ADD THE ACTS OF THE CLERKS AND CASE MANAGERS JENNIFER RICE AND ASHLEY BROWNLEE, HAS BEEN OBTAINED UNDER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE

PROVISION AND OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW AND OR ACT, WHICH INCLUDE FRAUD. THE LAW EXPLAINED IF THIS POSITION IS WELL TAKEN, WHICH IT IS, IT EFFECTS THE **"FOUNDATION"** OF THE **"WHOLE"**(EMPHASIS ADDED) PROCEEDING. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW OR ACT OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IS VOID AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO ACT, OR DETERMINATION MADE OR DONE AT ALL, BEING A STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE. THE GENERAL RULE IS THAT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE AND OR ACT AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION OF LAW, THOUGH HAVING THE FORM AND NAME OF LAW, IT IS IN REALITY NO LAW BY SUCH ACTS, BUT IS WHOLLY VOID AND INEFFECTIVE FOR ANY PURPOSE, WHICH INCLUDE ATTACHING A RULE 40(d) NOTICE TO IT BY RICE IN CASES 16-1953 AND 16-2141 OR BROWLEE SENDING FRAUDULENT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS AND BLOCKING THE FILING OF THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 IN CASE 17-7186 OR THIS CASE GOING FORWARD UNDER 17-7532, SINCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY DATES FROM THE DATE OF ITS ENACTMENT AND OR WHEN THE ACT WAS DONE....IN LEGAL CONTEMPLATION, IT IS INOPERATIVE AS IF IT HAD NEVER BEEN PASSED OR DONE....SINCE AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND OR ACT IS VOID, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE FOLLOWS THAT IT IMPOSES NO DUTY (CLERKS OR CASE MANAGERS ACTING AS PROXY FOR THESE JUDGES CANNOT BLOCK OUR FILINGS OR ATTACH TO THEM), CONFERS NO RIGHTS, CREATES NO OFFICE (JUDICIAL, CLERICAL, CASE MANAGERS), BESTOWS NO POWER (NONE OF YOU HAVE JURISDICTION INCLUDING THE CLERKS AND CASE MANAGERS TO DO WHAT THEY'VE DONE.) OR AUTHORITY ON ANY PERSON (EMPHASIS ADDED), AFFORDS NO PROTECTION (YOU ARE NOT IMMUNE ONCE WE'VE NOTIFIED YOU OF THE WRONGS, AND YOU FAIL TO CORRECT OR CONTINUE IN THEM.), AND JUSTIFIES NO ACTS PERFORMED UNDER IT (DONE BY JENNIFER RICE AND ASHLEY BROWNLEE ACTING AS PROXY FOR THESE JUDGES IN FRAUD AS WELL AS THE PLRA AND STATE v. GENTRY ISSUES.)....A VOID ACT CANNOT BE LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH A VALID ONE. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW CANNOT OPERATE TO SUPERSEDE ANY EXISTING LAW (THIS MEANS THE LAW ESTABLISHED BEFORE THESE PROVISIONS OF LAW WERE ENACTED MUST NOW STAND ALLOWING US TO JOINTLY FILED, SEEK CLASS ACTION, ETC.). INDEED INSOFAR AS A STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION AND OR ACT RUN COUNTER TO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE OF THE LAND (THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, EX PARTE VIRGINIA, SCHWARE, McBURNEY, INDICTMENTS ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS

PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION), IT IS SUPERSEDED THEREBY, NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY FRAUD OR AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND NO COURTS ARE BOUND TO ENFORCE IT. ALL LAWS, RULES (LIKE THE RULE 40(d) NOTICE FILED BY RICE), STATUTES (THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA) AND PRACTICES (LIKE THE JUDGES USING THESE CLERKS AND CASE MANAGERS TO BLOCK FILING OF DOCUMENTS, STEALING INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY IN VIOLATION OF THE HOBBS AND THE EXPROPRIATION EXCEPTION TO THE F.S.I.A.), WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION ARE **"NULL"** AND **"VOID"**, MARBURY v. MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; VINES v. UNITED STATES, 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1163(1), 1165(1); ROBINSON v. ARVONIO, 27 F3d. 877 REHEARING DENIED CERT. GRANTED VACATED 115 S.Ct. 1247, 513 U.S. 1186, 131 L.Ed.2d. 129; LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19(2014); JOHNSON v. UNITED STATES,--S.Ct.--, 2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063 (U.S. 2016); GEFT 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); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016).

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT NEVER EXPECTED THE DELUGE OF PROCEEDINGS THAT HAS NOW ENTERED INTO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT WHICH NOW CREATE EVIDENCE TO SUBSTANTIATE THE FRAUD WHEN COMPARED WITH CASE(S) 17-7186 AND 17-6960. AS FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH, I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, GIVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT JUDICIAL NOTICE AS A MATTER OF LAW LET IT BE KNOWN IN AND FOR THE RECORD. I, AS KING-KHALIFAH, DEMAND THAT JENNIFER RICE, ASHLEY BROWNLEE, ALL CLERKS AND CASE MANAGERS, ALL JUDGES TO PRODUCE THEIR BOND AND OR OATH OF OFFICE AND OR WRIT OF COMMISSION THAT WOULD ALLOW ANY CLERK, CASE MANAGER OR JUDGE TO NEGATE THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION PROTECTED UNDER BOTH THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES CLAUSE OF ARTICLE IV § 2 AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. FAIL TO DO THIS THEREUPON ALL RELIEF AND DEMANDS MUST BE GRANTED NOT DENIED ON THE COURT RECORD PRODUCING THE BOND AND OR OATH OF OFFICE AND OR WRIT OF COMMISSION AND CITING OF LAW BEFORE CASE 17-7532 OR 17-7186 CAN BE DEEMED LEGAL DUE TO THIS FRAUD AND STRUCTURAL

ERRORS AND ALL ISSUES BE PRESERVED AS DUE PROCESS REQUIRES. **IT IS SO ORDERED.** I, WE, WANT AND MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT. PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202. IN CASES OF ACTUAL CONTROVERSY,...ANY COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, UPON THE FILING OF AN APPROPRIATE PLEADING, MAY DECLARE THE RIGHT AND OTHER LEGAL RELATIONS OF ANY INTERESTED PARTY SEEKING SUCH DECLARATION WHETHER OR NOT FURTHER RELIEF IS OR COULD BE SOUGHT***. I, WE MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT BRIEF TO RESET ONCE THESE MATTERS ARE RULED ON, ON THE COURT RECORD TO PRESERVE ALL ISSUES FOR ANY NEEDED APPEAL BEFORE THESE CASES PROCEED BY DUE PROCESS LAW, WILLIAM-DOUGLAS-BROWN-AND-BRENDA-HARRIET BROWN-v.-CSX-TRANSPORTATION-INC., 2017 WL 1028579(4th.Cir.2017); ALLSTATE-INSURANCE-COMPANY-v.-INGRAHAM, 2017 WL 976301(DSC.2017); L-3-COMMUNICATIONS-CORPORATION-v.-SERCO-INC.,--Fed. Appx'--, 2016 WL 7232118(4th.Cir.2016).

INASMUCH, BY THIS FIASCO OF DUE PROCESS THAT YOU CALL 17-7532. YOUR JURISDICTION IS MADE VOID PURSUANT NOT TO JUST CASE 17-6960, BUT CASE 17-7532 ALSO, TO INCLUDE ANY ORDER PRODUCED OR CONTAINED THEREIN. THE RULES ARE SUSPENDED BY DECREE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT WHOSE POWER AND AUTHORITY SUPERSEDES THIS COURT BINDING UPON YOU VIA CONTRACT AND DEFAULT PROTECTED UNDER BOTH ARTICLE IV § 2 AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. BOTH CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186 ARE ESSENTIALLY ON REMAND AND THE COURTS UNDER BOTH CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186 JURISDICTION IS LIMITED AND RESTRICTED TO ADDRESSING THE FRAUD THAT ESTABLISHED THIS TRAVESTY OF PROCEEDINGS, AND TO DO NOTHING EXCEPT GRANT THE RELIEF DEMANDED. PRODUCE YOUR BOND AND OR OATH OF OFFICE AND OR WRIT OF COMMISSION THAT DEMONSTRATE THAT YOU CAN VIOLATE THE PROVISIONS OF BOTH ARTICLE IV § 2 AND 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 POWERS BY CONTRACT AND DEFAULT OR STAND DOWN!!! THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, NOR ITS CLERKS OR CASE MANAGERS ACTING AS PROXY FOR CORRUPT JUDGES, NOR THE STATE MAY EXCLUDE A PERSON, NAMELY, THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY

BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH (10) THOUSAND YEARS BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION STANDING UPON EX POST FACTO LAW, TO PRACTICE LAW (LAWGIVER OF GOD) OR ANY OTHER OCCUPATION GIVEN TO HIM BY "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" (FIDUCIARY, KING, KHALIFAH), IN A MANNER OR FOR REASONS THAT CONTRAVENE THE DUE PROCESS POWERS AND AUTHORITY GIVEN TO HIM OR IN A MANNER THAT VIOLATES THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS WHICH IN THIS CASE WOULD BE BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED AND FOR PROTECTORATE PURPOSES WHICH WOULD ALSO VIOLATE BOTH ARTICLE IV § 2 AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THE SAME WAY THIS NATION DID FOR THEM SODOMITES AND GOMORRAHRITES BY ALLOWING THEM TO MARRY BY USE OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. THE SAME WAY WE HAVE THE LEGAL RIGHT TO UNDO IT UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE WHERE YOU ATTACHED, EXECUTED OR ARRESTED THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN STATE IN VIOLATION OF CONTRACT WITH OUT OUR CONSENT. THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS AXE SWINGS BOTH WAYS. THE SOVEREIGN POWER HAS PARAMOUNT RIGHT TO PROTECT THE LIVES, HEALTH, MORALS, COMFORT AND GENERAL WELFARE OF HIS PEOPLE AS FIDUCIARY HEIR WHERE THEY ARE BENEFICIARIES OF THE "TRUST", ELLIOTT v. BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES OF MADISON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS, --F3d.---, 2017 WL 5988226(7th.Cir.2017); NORTH CAROLINA ASS'N OF EDUCATORS, INC. v. STATE, 368 N.C. 777, 786 S.E.2d. 255(N.C.2016); McBURNEY v. YOUNG, 569 U.S. 221, 133 S.Ct. 1709, 185 L.Ed.2d. 758(U.S.2013); SCHOENEFELD v. SCHNEIDERMAN, 821 F3d. 273 (2nd. Cir.2016); 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); TRUSTEES OF DARTHMOUTH COLLEGE v. WOODWARD, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201; FIFTH THIRD BANCORP v. DUDENHOEFFER, 132 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d. 457, 82 U.S.L.W. 4578(U.S.2014); 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).

YOU CANNOT OBTAIN JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS TAINTED BY FRAUD. YOUR JURISDICTION IS LIMITED TO ADDRESSING THE FRAUD.

THE DEFAULT IS BINDING UPON THIS COURT AND NATION AS IS THE CONTRACT, U.S. v. ABDUL-WAHAB, 715 F3d. 521 CA4 (Va.2013); BROWNING v. TIGER EYE BENEFIT CONSULTING, 313 Fed. Appx' 656, 2009 WL 497391 CA4 (Va.2009); U.S. EX REL NATHAN v. TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICAL NORTH AMERICAN INC., 707 F3d. 451 CA4 (Va.2013); U.S. v. JONES, 716 F3d. 851 CA4 (Va.2013); CHARLEY ENTERPRISE, INC. v. DICKEY BARBECUE RESTAURANTS, INC., 807 F3d. 553(4th.Cir.2015) (DEMONSTRATING ALL MUST BE RULED UPON TO PRESERVE FOR U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW); NELSO v. U.S. BANK N.A., 2015 WL 685271 (DSC.2015); U.S. v. ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); U.S. v. WELLS, 578 Fed. Appx' 234 CA4 (Va.2014); CHRISTIANSON v. M.B.N.A. AMERICAN BANK N.A., S.E.2d., 2013 WL 8507850 (S.C.App.2013); SPRINGOB v. UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 407 S.C. 490, 757 S.E.2d. 384 (S.C.2014); STRATTEN v. MECKLENBERG COUNTY DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES, 521 Fed. Appx' 278, 2013 WL 2364587 CA4 (N.C.2013); GENTRY TECHNOLOGY OF S.C. INC. v. BAPTIST HEALTH SOUTH FLORIDA, , 2015 WL 1219251(DSC.2015); LOUGHMAN v. U.S., 134 S.Ct. 2384(U.S.2014); SMITH v. CLARKE/SMOOT/RUSSELL --F3d.--, 2015 WL 4717932 CA4 (Md.2015).

WE MOTION TO STAY CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186 AS WE DO THE VARIOUS OTHER PARALLEL APPEALS, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FRAUD THAT PRODUCED THEM OR THAT IS GOING ON IN THEM. STAY CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186!!! AND STOP PLAYING THESE GAMES. RULE ON THE MOTIONS, ALL OF THEM UNDER § 1983 NOT § 2254. EXTENSION OF TIME IS SOUGHT UNTIL THIS IS DONE. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT ABSTAIN FROM ANSWERING FEDERAL QUESTION IN ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND IN VIOLATION OF YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE WHICH IS A CRIMINAL OFFENSE, LAKE CARRIER ASS'N v. MacMILLIAN, 406 U.S. 498, 92 S.Ct. 1749(U.S.1972). WE INVOKE THE DOCTRINE OF COMITY. ALL ORDERS ISSUED UNDER CASE 17-7532 AND THE CLERK'S ACTS UNDER 17-7186 ARE VOID FOR FRAUD AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. BOTH CASES 17-7532 AND 17-7186 ARE TAINTED BY THE FRAUD. THE MOTION TO STAY WAS CIRCUMVENTED AS WELL AS THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE CASES WILL BE HEARD UNDER APPEAL OF CASES 17-6693, 17-7410 AND 17-7139. ALL OTHER CASES ARE SOUGHT STAYED DUE TO INVOKING THE DOCTRINE OF COMITY. SANCTIONS ARE IMPOSED AND ADDITIONAL PLEADING

MAY SOON FOLLOW. PRODUCE YOUR BOND AND OR OATH OF OFFICE AND OR WRIT OF COMMISSION THAT WOULD ALLOW YOU TO VIOLATE THE U.S. CONSTITUTION UNDER BOTH ARTICLE IV § 2 AND ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 AND THE DECREES OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH WHO IS UNDER CONTRACT VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION WITH EX POST FACTO LAW OR STAND DOWN, REED v. BIG WATER RESORT, LLC, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 2935891(DSC.2016); DAN RYAN BUILDERS, INC. v. CRYTAL RIDGE DEVELOPMENT, INC, 783 F3d. 976, 91 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 625 (4th.Cir.2015); BLUE SKY TRAVEL AND TOURS, LLC. v. AL TAYYAR, --Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); BARLOW v. COLGATE PALMOLIVE CO, 772 F3d. 1001, 90 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 85 CA4 (Md. 2014); JOHNSON v. U.S, --S.Ct.--, 2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015); YATES v. FORD MOTOR CO, --F.Supp.3d.--, 2015 WL 6758983(E.D.N.C. 2015); W. GULF MAR. ASS'N v. I.L.A. DEEP SEA LOCAL 24, 751 F2d. 721, 728(5th.Cir.1985); IN RE: MORNING SONG BIRD FOOD LITIGATION, 2015 WL 12791472(D.C.Cal.2015); IN RE: NARANTO, 768 F3d. 332, 348(4th.Cir.2014); ULMET v. UNITED STATES, 888 F2d. 1028(4th.Cir. 1989); SMITH v. BAYER CORP, --U.S.--, 131 S.Ct. 2368, 2382, 180 L.Ed.2d. 341(2011); 202 NORTH MONROE, LLC. v. SOWER, 850 F3d. 265(6th.Cir.2017). **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

RESPECTFULLY,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI, KING, KHALIFAH,
CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL
THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT

JASON MORRIS GOURDINE

CHRISTOPHER DARNELL WILSON

DECEMBER 20, 2017

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit

~~Foreign~~ ~~Sovereign~~

~~#~~ 2

COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ET. AL.,

FILED
NOV 13 2017
U.S. Court of Appeals
Fourth Circuit

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

(CASES 2:17-cv-1127-JMC-MGB ET. AL.,)

DOCKET NO.(S) 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960; 17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186; 17-7410; 17-7428 ET. AL.,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE AKA JAHJAH AL MAHDI ET. AL.,

PETITIONER(S)

VS.

THE JUDGES WHO SIGNED THE ORDER IN CASE 16-1953; THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD ET. AL.,


DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, JAHJAH AL MAHDI ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; RENEWING THE MOTIONS ETC. IN THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS; SUBMISSION OF BRIEF AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (5) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2017; FILING WRIT OF ERROR VACATING ORDERS ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415 DUE TO FRAUD

UPON THE COURT; SUPPLEMENTING THE ISSUES ON APPEAL IN SUBSTITUTE INFORMAL BRIEF, ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON NOVEMBER 9, 2017. IT IS DEEMED FILED THAT DATE, HOUSTON v. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379(1988).

RESPECTFULLY,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI



ANTHONY COOK

Anthony Cook

ROBERT MITCHELL

Robert Mitchell

david duren

david duren

CHRISTOPHER WILSON

Christopher Wilson

YAHYA MUQUIT

Yahya Muquit

NOVEMBER 9, 2017

COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ET. AL.,

PETITION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

(CASES 2:17-cv-1127-JMC-MGB ET. AL.,)

DOCKET NO.(S) 17-6693; 17-6925; 17-6960; 17-7139; 17-7137; 17-7134; 17-7068; 16-1953; 16-2141; 17-1415; 16-2299; 17-7186; 17-7410; 17-7428 ET. AL.,

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE AKA JAHJAH AL MAHDI ET. AL.,

PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE JUDGES WHO SIGNED THE ORDER IN CASE 16-1953; THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE ROBERT E. HOOD ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; RENEWING THE MOTIONS ETC. IN THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS; SUBMISSION OF BRIEF AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (5) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2017; FILING WRIT OF ERROR VACATING ORDERS ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415 DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT; SUPPLEMENTING THE ISSUES ON APPEAL IN SUBSTITUTE INFORMAL BRIEF

HERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING OBJECTIONS TO THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND MOTION TO MOTION, (3) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2017 THAT IS FILED IN CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM THAT ESTABLISH THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 17-7410.

(2) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AND AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; ESTABLISHING SERVICE UPON ALL JUDGES AND CASES THROUGH THE KING-KHALIFAH'S TRUSTEE, JUDGE JACQUELYN AUSTIN, (3) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2017 THAT WAS SERVED ON HER RELATED TO CASE 8:16-cv-3328-RBH-JDA AND ALL OTHER RELATED PARALLEL CASES SUB JUDICE THAT ESTABLISH THE PARALLEL APPEALS WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT.

THE PETITIONERS GIVE THE COURT AND PARTIES WITHIN ALL CASES CAPTIONED JUDICIAL NOTICE. THE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415 FILED OCTOBER 31, 2017 IS VOID FOR FRAUD AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. DUE TO THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT, WRIT OF ERROR IS NOW FILED PURSUANT TO THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE, WHICH TAINTS THE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415 RENDERING IT VOID AND INADMISSIBLE. THIS MEANS THAT THE RULING OBTAINED FROM THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT UNDER CASE 17-1415 CANNOT BE USED BY ANY COURT, SPECIFICALLY WITHIN ALL 4TH. CIRCUIT CASES PENDING, ALSO ESTABLISHING THAT NEITHER RES JUDICATA NOR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHES REGARDING THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017, BLUE-SKY TRAVEL-AND-TOURS, LLC. v. AL-TAYYAR,--Fed. Appx'--,2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); BARLOW-v.-COLGATE-PALMOLIVE-CO., 772 F3d. 1001, 90 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 85 CA4 (Md.2014); JOHNSON-v. UNITED-STATES,--S.Ct.--,2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015); YATES-v. FORD-MOTOR-CO.,--F.Supp.3d.--,2015 WL 6758983(E.D.N.C.2015).

YOU HAVE FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE JUDGES PRESIDING OVER CASE 17-1415 ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. WHEN THEY SAW THE MAGNITUDE OF THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT

DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES UNDER CASE 17-1415 CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY, WITH THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE FEDERAL U.S. ATTORNEYS, THE DEFENDANT THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER PARTIES TO MAKE THE DOCUMENT MOOT BY MAKING A FRAUDULENT RULING UPON IT FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES KNEW IF THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL OR THE U.S. FEDERAL ATTORNEYS WERE REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017. THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS NOR THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, AS WAS SOUGHT UNDER CASE 17-6960, WOULD HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO PRODUCE ANY EVIDENCE TO PROVE THAT THEY, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES, RESPONDED TIMELY TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WHICH NOW GIVE JAHJAH AL MAHDI THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY TO ACT AS HE DO AND INTEND TO DO WITHIN THESE PROCEEDINGS. THE CONSPIRING 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES UNDER CASE 17-1415'S PLAN, ~~SCHEME~~ scheme AND PLOT WAS TO MAKE THE FRAUDULENT RULING THAT THEY DID IN EFFORTS TO RENDER THE DOCUMENT MOOT TO ALLEVIATE THE DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENT THAT THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS AND S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL RESPOND TO THE DOCUMENT BECAUSE THE JUDGES KNEW THEY COULD NOT DEFEAT THE CLAIMS OR SUCCESSFULLY REBUT THE DOCUMENT IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THUS, THE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415 IS VOID AND CANNOT BE USED BY THE COURT STANDING IN EGREGIOUS VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, AS WELL AS THE RICO ACT, PRODUCED TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT WITH CLEAR INTENT AT MISREPRESENTATION, THAT THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE FEDERAL ATTORNEYS NOR THE UNITED STATES COULD PRODUCE ANY EVIDENCE THAT WOULD SUBSTANTIATE THAT THEY TIMELY RESPONDED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION AND WAS DESIGNED TO AID THE DEFENDANTS AND THEIR EMPLOYER THE UNITED STATES AVOID SUIT. THUS, NOT ONLY IS THE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415 VOID FOR VIOLATIONS OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. IT CANNOT BE USED AS A BASIS FOR ANY DETERMINATION, WHICH INCLUDE RES JUDICATA OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MUST NOW RULE ON THE DOCUMENT WITHIN THE PENDING

PARALLEL APPEALS TO MAINTAIN THE INTEGRITY OF THE COURT AND THE PARTIES MUST BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND AS DUE PROCESS DEMANDS, INHABITANTS OF TOWN OF FAIRFIELD v. TIME WARNER CABLE NORTHEAST LLC,--F.Supp.3d.--,2015 WL 1565237(2015); IN RE: CHINEESE MANUFACTURED DRYWALL PRODUCTS LITIGATION, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 1584060 (2016); FERRARA v. QUADROZZI EQUIPMENT LEASING CORP., 2013 WL 3226755 (E.D.N.Y.2013); IN RE: CLEAN BURN FUELS, LLC, 2014 WL 2987330(N.C.2014); WILLIAMS v. SECRETARY OF VETERAN AFFAIRS,--F.Supp.3d.--,2015 WL 5935169(N.D.Ala.2015); LaPENN v. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES INS. CO, 316 Fed. Appx' 894, 2009 WL 485274(11th. Cir.2009); MILLER v. PARRISH, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1868028 (Va. 2013); MORRIS v. WACHOVIA SECURITIES INC, 448 F3d. 268, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. P. 93, 858 CA4 (Va.2006); NORBREGA v. HINKLE, 576 Fed. Appx' 224 CA4 (Va.2014); U.S. v. ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'--,2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); FOX EX REL FOX v. ELK RUN COAL CO. INC, 739 F3d. 131 CA4 (2014); NELSON v. U.S. BANK N.A, 2015 WL 6852712(DSC.2015); STRATTON v. MECKLENBERG COUNTY DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES, 521 Fed. Appx' 278, 2013 WL 2364587 CA4 (N.C.2013); WALKER v. BEAUMONT INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, 2016 WL 6666833; CABI v. BOSTON CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL, 161 F.Supp. 3d. 136(2016); BENTON v. BURNS, 2017 WL 491251 (D.C.Md.2017); PEGG v. HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112 (4th.Cir.2017); U.S. v. LAWRENCE, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 856866 (S.D.Va.2015); NUCAR CORP. v. BELL, 251 F.R.D. 191, 194(DSC.2008); GREAT AMERICAN INC. CO. v. NEXTDAY NETWORK HARDWARE CORP., 73 F.Supp.3d. 636(2014); IN RE: WALLACE, 649 Fed. Appx' 298 (MEM)(4th.Cir.2016).

FURTHERMORE, THERE IS A CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT EXISTS IN CASE 17-1415, NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE WHICH ALSO RENDERS THE ORDER AND CASE VOID. CASE 17-1415 WAS INITIATED INVOKING THE PROVISIONS OF THE PLRA PURSUANT TO THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIAS DOCUMENTS. ONCE THE JUDGES UNDER THAT CASE ORDERED US TO SUBMIT FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS INVOKING THIS PROVISION OF LAW WHICH VIOLATE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339(1880), THE PROCEEDINGS BECAME ILLEGAL AND VOID. UNTIL A RULING WAS MADE ADDRESSING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA AS IS ARGUED WITHIN THESE PARALLEL CASES. CASE

17-1415 IS ILLEGAL AND VOID AND THE COURT WAS REQUIRED TO STAY THAT CASE UNTIL SUCH A DETERMINATION WAS MADE. WE OBJECT. THE LAW AS IS DETERMINED BY THE U.S SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS ON ISSUES SUCH AS THIS. IF A RULING HAS BEEN OBTAINED UNDER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION AND OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW. THE COURT EXPLAINED THAT IF THIS POSITION IS WELL TAKEN, WHICH IT IS, IT EFFECTS THE **"FOUNDATION"** OF THE **"WHOLE"** (EMPHASIS ADDED) PROCEEDING. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IS VOID AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO DETERMINATION MADE AT ALL, BEING A STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE. BY THIS, THE ORDER AND DETERMINATION UNDER CASE 17-1415 IS TAINTED AND CANNOT BE USED IN ANY PENDING APPEAL AND RES JUDICATA NOR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL ATTACHES IN THESE CASES BY THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND STRUCTURAL ERROR, VINES v. UNITED STATES, 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1163(1), 1165(1); ROBINSON v. ARVONIO, 27 F3d. 877 REHEARING DENIED, CERT. GRANTED VACATED 115 S.Ct. 1247, 513 U.S. 1186, 131 L.Ed.2d. 129; LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19 (2014); JOHNSON v. UNITED STATES,--S.Ct.--,2015 WL 2473450(U.S. 2015); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063 (U.S.2016); GEFT 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). WE OBJECT.

THE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415 FILED ON OCTOBER 31, 2017 AND PRIOR TO THAT IS ILLEGAL STANDING IN EGREGIOUS VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 MAKING IT A CRIMINAL ACT FOR ANY JUDGE, COURT OR PARTY TO USE IT EXCEPT FOR HIGHLIGHTING THE FRAUD THAT PRODUCED IT WHERE IT WAS PRODUCED TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES IN CASE 17-1415 CONSPIRED TO MAKE THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 MOOT TO AID THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE U.S. FEDERAL ATTORNEYS AND THEIR EMPLOYER THE UNITED STATES AVOID SUIT BECAUSE THE CONSPIRING 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES KNEW IF THE DEFENDANTS WERE PLACED IN A POSITION WHERE THEY WOULD BE REQUIRED TO RESPOND, THEY COULD NOT PRODUCE ANY EVIDENCE THAT WOULD DEMONSTRATE THEY TIMELY MOVED TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURIS-

DICTION TO STOP THE KING-KHALIFAH FROM INVOKING THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY GIVEN TO HIM BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. WE OBJECT TO THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL DUE TO THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE 17-6960 IS REQUIRED TO RESPOND TO REBUT THE CLAIMS, NOT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IN ANY MANNER TO INCLUDE THEIR FRAUDULENT EFFORT TO MOOT THE DOCUMENT TO PREVENT THAT RESPONSE AND AID THEM, U.S. v. RON PAIR ENTERPRISE INC., 489 U.S. 235, 119 S.Ct. 1027, 103 L.Ed.2d. 290(U.S.1989); IN RE: ARGO CREDIT, LLC., --B.R.--, 2017 WL 4404269(2017); LAKE CARRIER ASS'N v. MacMILLAN, 406 U.S. 498, 92 S.Ct. 1749(U.S. 1972); U.S. v. $41,320 U.S. CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240; 1997 WL 10291 U.S. (APPELLATE BRIEF) BRIEF OF SENATORS ORIN G. HATCH, STROM THURMOND ET. AL.; FORRESTER v. WHITE, 484 U.S. 219, 108 S.Ct. 538(U.S.1988); PULLIAM v. ALLEN, 466 U.S. 522, 536-543, 104 S.Ct. 1970, 1977-1982, 80 L.Ed.2d. 565 (1984); EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339, 348-349, 25 L.Ed. 676 (1880).

FURTHERMORE, THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 CANNOT BE DEEMED MOOT FOR ADDITIONAL REASONS:

(1) IT WAS NOT FILED WITHIN CASES 17-7410 AND 17-7428 AT THE TIME OF THE ISSUING OF THE ORDER IN CASE 17-1415. THUS, ANY FRAUDULENT DETERMINATION MADE WOULD NOT IMPACT THOSE PARALLEL CASES OR EFFECT THEIR BEING FILED AS INFORMAL BRIEF.

(2) BY THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED, "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS; SUBMISSION OF BRIEF AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (5) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2017 SERVED ON THE 4TH. CIRCUIT. THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT IS SUBMITTED IN SUBSTITUTION OF THE INFORMAL BRIEF FOR ALL CASES CAPTIONED. THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 IS AN APPEAL DOCUMENT. CASE 17-1415 IS A WRIT OF MANDAMUS PROCEEDING. THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT THROUGHOUT ITS PAGES CLEARLY INFORM THE COURT THAT THESE ARE ISSUES ON APPEAL. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES IN CASE 17-1415 CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO RENDER THE DOCUMENT MOOT IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRE-

TION AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT CANNOT ISSUE RULING ON APPEAL ISSUES SUBSTITUTING A MANDAMUS PROCEEDINGS FOR AN APPEAL. THIS IS ESSENTIALLY WHAT THEY HAVE DONE IN VIOLATION OF CLEARLY ESTABLISHED LAW. A MANDAMUS CANNOT SUBSTITUTE AS AN APPEAL, ROCHE v. EVAPORATED MILK ASS'N, 391 U.S. 21, 63 S.Ct. 938, 87 L.Ed. 1185 (U.S.1943); IN RE: WILLIAMS, 381 Fed. Appx' 284, 2010 WL 2231958(4th.Cir.2010); WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES, 2015 WL 11109497, * 1, E.D.Va..

(3) BY THE [2] DOCUMENTS ATTACHED, THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; FILING OBJECTIONS TO THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (3) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2017 IN CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM ESTABLISHING THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 17-7410 THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT IS PENDING REVIEW IN RESPONSE TO THE REPORT AND RECONMMENDATION. BY THE DOCUMENT ENTITLED AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; ESTABLISHING SERVICE UPON ALL JUDGES AND CASES THROUGH THE KING-KHALIFAH'S TRUSTEE, JUDGE JAQUELYN AUSTIN, (3) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2017. THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT IS PENDING REVIEW IN CASE 8:16-cv-3328-RBH-JDA AND ALL PRESENTLY PENDING CASES SUB JUDICE THAT ESTABLISH ALL PARALLEL APPEALS PENDING BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IF JUDGE AUSTIN DID NOT ENGAGE IN ANY FRAUD. THUS, THE DOCUMENT IS NOT MOOT ESTABLISHING THAT THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND OR THE U.S. FEDERAL ATTORNEYS ARE REQUIRED TO RESPOND. IT IS PENDING IN THE david duren STATE APPEAL BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. AGAIN, THE DOCUMENT IS NOT MOOT HAVING NEVER BEEN CHALLENGED BY THE RESPONDENT WITHIN THAT STATE CASE WHERE THAT STATE CASE IS REMOVED TO THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT ESTABLISHING THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 17-6693. WE RENEW OUR MOTION THAT THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 BE ACCEPTED IN SUBSTITUTION OF THE INFORMAL BRIEF WITHIN ALL CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT. THIS IS MOTIONED AND GRANTED BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC COURT WHOSE SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY IS BINDING UPON THIS COURT BY THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084. **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

SINCE THERE WAS NO RULING ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA AS THEY RELATE TO EX-PARTE-VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339, 348-349, 25 L.Ed. 676(1880) OR THE-SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES, 83 U.S. (16 WALL) 36, 1873. THE COURT UNDER CASE 17-1415'S JURISDICTION IS VOID AND ILLEGAL DUE TO THE EXISTING STRUCTURAL ERROR, FRAUD UPON THE COURT, VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION WHICH CORRUPTS THE ENTIRE CASE AND ALL ORDERS CONTAINED THEREIN, U.S.-v.-$41,320-U.S.-CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240; BROWN-v.-U.S., 2014 WL 2871398 (DSC.2014). THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT ABSTAIN FROM ANSWERING THIS CRUCIAL FEDERAL QUESTION EVEN VIA DECLARATORY JUDGMENT WHICH WAS CLEARLY SOUGHT EVEN THROUGH THE WRITS OF MANDAMUS IN ACTS OF FRAUD, MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW WHICH VOIDS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR THAT DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, PAUL-ADAMS-v.-CALIFORNIA-INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; DONATONI-v.-DEPARTMENT-OF-HOMELAND-SECURITY,--F.Supp.3d.--,2016 WL 1755871; U.S.-v.-HARE, 820 F3d. 93 (4th. Cir.2016); U.S.-v.-ALEDEKCHA, 2010 WL 4054267 (D.C.Md.2010); HUNT-v.-U.S., F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 5131716(DSC.2007); LAKE-CARRIER ASS'N-v.-MacMILLIAN, 406 U.S. 498, 92 S.Ct. 1749(U.S.1972). THESE ARE NOW ALSO ISSUES ON APPEAL. THUS, THE DOCUMENT IS NOT MOOT.

INSOMUCH, YOUR ACTIONS VIOLATE THE CONTRACT, THE GRANT, GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS BY THE SOLE CORPORATION IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF THE CONTRACT IN VIOLATION OF ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ESTABLISHING CAUSE BEFORE ALL COURTS ALLOWING ME TO INTERVENE AND RENDER VOID ALL ORDERS ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415, PRESAULT-v.-I.G.C., 494 U.S. 1, 110 S.Ct. 914, 108 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.1990); BROWN-v.-BROWN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); HARRIS-v.-HHGREGG-INC., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1331166(N.C.2013); AMERICAN-MUT.-LIBERTY-INS.-CO.-v.-PLYWOOD-PLASTICS-CORP., 81 F.Supp. 157(DSC.1948); OPARAH-v.-NEW-YORK-DEPT.-OF-EDUC., F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 4240733(N.Y.D.C. 2015).

I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, GIVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS IN ALL CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT JUDICIAL

NOTICE THAT I AM INVOKING AND EXERCISING SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND POWER AND I AM RENDERING OF A NULLITY, VOID, ALL ORDERS ISSUED IN CASE 17-1415 FOR VIOLATIONS OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. CASE 17-1415 IS NOW ESSENTIALLY ON REMAND LIMITING AND RESTRICTING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION TO DO NOTHING EXCEPT GRANT THE RELIEF THAT IS SOUGHT. AS I FORETOLD YOU. THE "TERM" OR "CONCEPT" OF A "JUDGE" OR "ATTORNEY", "LAWYER" DO NOT COME FROM YOU OR YOUR LAWS. THEY DO NOT COME FROM YOUR NATION, NOR DO THEY COME FROM ENGLAND OR ENGLISH LAW. THEY COME FROM US, THE SOLE CORPORATION AND IS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS AS A "GRANT" WITH "RESTRICTIONS" THROUGH ADAM AND ABRAHAM, MEMBERS OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AS IS ARGUED IN CASE 16-2299. THEIR OWNERSHIP IS WITH ME, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, AS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH, LAWGIVER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION BEING THE ORIGINAL FOUNTAIN OF ALL LAW AND SOVEREIGN POWER. YOU CANNOT LEGALLY ATTACH, ARREST OR EXECUTE THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF A FOREIGN SOVEREIGN SOLE CORPORATION WITHOUT CONSENT, WHICH IS WITHDRAWN DUE TO YOUR FRAUD, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, MACHINATION AND VIOLATIONS OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, ABSENT OF ITS RIGHTS AND PREROGATIVES. DUE TO THE DEFAULT EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084, AND BY THE "COVENANT", "CONTRACT", AS FIDUCIARY HEIR, KING, KHALIFAH AND LAWGIVER PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT CANNOT BY MY ORIGINAL STATUS UNDER CONTRACT TAKE AWAY THE KING-KHALIFAH'S RIGHTS OR PREROGATIVES, OR BURDEN THE OBLIGATION OF THAT CONTRACT WITH EX POST FACTO LAW, TRUSTEES-OF-DARTHMOUTH-COLLEGE-v.-WOODWARD, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201. ALSO SEE GENESIS 17:17; GENESIS 18:17-19; LUKE 11:52; ISAIAH 11:1-5; ZECHARIAH 6:12-13; ISAIAH 16:5; ISAIAH 32:1-4; ISAIAH 42:18-22; JEREMIAH 23:5-6; JEREMIAH 33:15-21(A CRUCIAL ONE); EZEKIAL 34:22-30; EZEKIAL 37:22; DANIEL 11:1-3; MALACHI 3:1-6; PSALM 89; PSALM 132; PEUGH-v.-U.S., 133 S.Ct. 2072, 186 L.Ed.2d. 84, 81 U.S.L.W. 4372(2013); U.S.-v.-WELLS, 578 Fed. Appx' 234 CA4 (Va.2014); GRAHAM-v.-McFADDEN, 2015 WL 505536(DSC.2015); OGDEN-v.-SANDERS, 25 U.S. 213(1827); TRUSTEES OF-CINCINNATI-SOUTHERN-RY.-v.-PORTER, 21 OHIO N.P. (N3) 441, 1918 WL 96530.

THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE U.S. FEDERAL ATTORNEYS FOR THE UNITED STATES MUST RESPOND, NOT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT JUDGES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY ATTEMPTING TO MAKE THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 MOOT TO PROTECT THEM AND CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001. THE STATE AND FEDERAL ATTORNEYS MUST DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY TIMELY SOUGHT TO DEFEAT THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION BY UNCONTESTED AFFIDAVITS IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 OR ALL RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES AND TITLES STAND. IN SUCH, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT NOR ANY STATE MAY EXCLUDE A PERSON, NAMELY, THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN FIDUCIARY KING-KHALIFAH WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY, BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH BEFORE THIS NATION WAS FORMED, TO PRACTICE LAW (LAWGIVER, ATTORNEY, JUDGE, LEGISLATOR OF GOD), OR ANY OTHER OCCUPATION GIVEN TO HIM BY "COVENANT", "CONTRACT" (FIDUCIARY, KING, KHALIFAH), IN A MANNER OR FOR REASONS THAT CONTRAVENE THE DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, POWER OR AUTHORITY GIVEN TO HIM OR IN A MANNER THAT VIOLATES THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE OR ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THE FIDUCIARY AND JUDICIAL DUTY COMMANDS IT, 29 U.S.C.A. § 1104; SPIRES-v.-SCHOLLS,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2017 WL 4174774(DSC.2017); FIFTH-THIRD BANCORP-v.-DUDENHOEFFER, 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).

I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, FULFILLED MY DUTY BY YOUR NATION'S DUE PROCESS LAWS AND PEACEFULLY, AS A NON-COMBATANT, FILED LEGAL ACTION TO ESTABLISH THE RIGHTS. I GAVE ALL REQUIRED PARTIES FAIR AND PROPER NOTICE. I PROPERLY SERVED THE PARTIES AND BROUGHT THE MATTERS TO THEM UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 TO WHICH THEY APPEARED, WHERE THEY DEFAULTED IN THE STATE CASE AND THAT STATE CASE WAS REMOVED TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT PRODUCING THESE FEDERAL CASES. TO EXCLUDE ME FROM PRACTICE OF LAW AS KING, KHALIFAH AND LAWGIVER OF GOD WITH SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY VIA THE SOLE CORPORATION BINDING UPON THIS COURT BY CONTRACT; AND TO HINDER ME IN MY OCCUPATION 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. I, WE, OBJECT. THE (70) PAGE DOCUMENT DATED OCTOBER 5, 2017 IS SUBMITTED AS INFORMAL BRIEF WITHIN ALL CASES LISTED IN THE CAPTION WHERE APPEAL RELIEF IS SOUGHT. IT IS SO ORDERED BY DECREE AND JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT, 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).

YOUR JURISDICTION AND THE ORDERS ARE VOID UNDER CASE 17-1415 AND YOU SHALL GRANT ALL RELIEF DEMANDED, AS IN ALL PREVIOUS FILED MANDAMUS AND CASES INVOLVED DUE TO THE STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR, FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MACHINATION, CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AS WELL AS FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION, GARCIA FINANCIAL GROUP v. VIRGINIA ACCELERATORS CORP., 3 Fed. Appx' 86, 2001 WL 117497(4th.Cir.2001) WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME EVEN AFTER THE FINAL ORDER IN CASE 17-1415 DUE TO THE INFIRMITIES TO RENDER THOSE ORDERS VOID, BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS, 2016 WL 1253285; WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561(2016); CHRITIANSON v. M.B.N.A. AMERICAN BANK N.A., S.E.2d., 2013 WL 8507850 (S.C.App.2013); STRATTEN v. MECKLENBERG COUNTY DEPT. OF SOCIAL SERVICES, 521 Fed. Appx' 278, 2013 WL 2364587 CA4 (N.C.2013); LOUGHMAN v. U.S., 134 S.Ct. 2384(U.S.2014); SMITH v. CLARK/SMOOT/RUSSELL, --F3d.--,2015 WL 4717932 CA4 (Md.2015).

AS THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN KING-KHALIFAH, I, JAHJAH AL MAHDI, GIVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT JUDICIAL NOTICE IN CASE 17-1415 AND WITHIN ALL OTHER CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT. AS A MATTER OF LAW LET IT BE KNOWN IN AND FOR

ALL RECORDS WITHIN ALL CASES LISTED IN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT. I, THE KING-KHALIFAH, DEMAND THAT THE JUDGES IN CASE 17-1415 AND ALL OTHER CASES LISTED WITHIN THE CAPTION OF THIS DOCUMENT, THAT YOU PRODUCE YOUR BOND AND WRIT OF COMMISSION AND OR OATH OF OFFICE THAT WOULD ALLOW ANY JUDGE TO LEGALLY NEGATE THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT ESTABLISHED BY THE SOLE CORPORATION PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. ALL RELIEF SOUGHT MUST BE GRANTED BY DECREE OF THE KING-KHALIFAH OR PRODUCE YOUR BOND, WRIT OF COMMISSION OR OATH OF OFFICE AND CITING OF LAW THAT DEMONSTRATE YOU CAN VIOLATE THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 1 SECTION 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE DECREES OF A SOVEREIGN FOREIGN 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!!! OR THE ORDERS IN CASE 17-1415 ARE VOID AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SHALL ORDER IN CONGRUENCY WITH THE KING-KHALIFAH'S DECREES ALL RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE U.S. FEDERAL ATTORNEYS ARE REQUIRED TO RESPOND ON THE COURT RECORD. I, WE, MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND THESE TOO ARE ISSUES THAT ARE NOW ON APPEAL. PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202. IN CASES OF ACTUAL CONTROVERSY,...ANY COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, UPON THE FILING OF AN APPROPRIATE PLEADING, MAY DECLARE THE RIGHT AND OTHER LEGAL RELATIONS OF ANY INTERESTED PARTY SEEKING SUCH DECLARATION WHETHER OR NOT RELIEF IS OR COULD BE SOUGHT***, WILLIAM-DOUGLAS-BROWN-AND-BRENDA-HARRIET-BROWN-v.-CSX-TRANSPORTATION-INC., 2017 WL 1028579 (4TH.Cir.2017); ALLSTATE-INSURANCE COMPANY-v.-INGRAHAM, 2017 WL 976301(DSC.2017); L-3-COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION-v.-SERCO-INC.,--Fed. Appx"--, 2016 WL 7232118 (4th. Cir.2016).

IN REFERRING BACK TO THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PLRA AND THE AEDPA, AFFIRMING WHAT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ADJUDICATED IN THE MONTGOMERY CASE. THE GENERAL RULE IS THAT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION OF LAW, 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...SINCE

AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW IS VOID, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE FOLLOWS THAT IT IMPOSES NO DUTY, CONFERS NO RIGHTS, CREATES NO OFFICE (JUDICIAL), BESTOWS NO POWER (JURISDICTION) OR AUTHORITY ON ANYONE, AFFORDS NO PROTECTION (YOU ARE NOT IMMUNE ONCE WE NOTIFIED YOU OF THE PROBLEM IF YOU CONTINUE TO ACT) AND JUSTIFIES NO ACTS(EMPHASIS ADDED WHICH INCLUDE THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE) PERFORMED UNDER IT....A VOID ACT CANNOT BE LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH A VALID ONE. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW CANNOT OPERATE TO SUPERSEDE ANY EXISTING LAW (THIS MEANS THE LAW ESTABLISHED BEFORE THESE PROVISIONS OF LAW WERE ENACTED MUST NOW STAND ALLOWING US TO JOINTLY FILE ETC.). INDEED INSOFAR AS A STATUTE AND OR LEGISLATIVE PROVISION RUN COUNTER TO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE LAND (THE CONSTITUTION, EX PARTE VIRGINIA, INDICTMENTS ARE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION), IT IS SUPERSEDED THEREBY, NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND NO COURTS ARE BOUND TO ENFORCE IT, BONNETT v. VALLER, 116 N.W. 885, 136 Wis. 193(1908); NORTON v. SHELBY COUNTY, 118 U.S. 425(1886). ALL LAWS, RULES, STATUTES AND PRACTICES WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION ARE NULL AND VOID, MARBURY v. MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180.

RESPECTFULLY,
JAHJAH AL MAHDI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL THEOCRATIC STATE AND COURT

YAHYA MUQUIT

CHRISTOPHER WILSON

ANTHONY COOK

ROBERT MITCHELL

david duren

NOVEMBER 8, 2017

Joseph Todd Rowland
#290065 Wando B-239
Lieber C.I. P.O. Box 205
Ridgeville SC 29472

CERTIFIED MAIL®

7017 1070 0000 8670 1278

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®

1024

29201

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
RIDGEVILLE, SC
29472
APR 11 18
AMOUNT
$0.00
R2305K142171-05

FIRST CLASS MAIL

UNITED STATES POSTAGE
PITNEY BOWES
02 1P $ 010.40⁰
0000835844 APR 11 2018
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 29472

FIRST CLASS MAIL

UNITED STATES POSTAGE
PITNEY BOWES
02 1P $ 006.20⁰
0000835844 APR 11 2018
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 29472

RECEIVED
APR 11 2018
MAIL ROOM
LIEBER C.I.

RECEIVED
APR 12 2018
SC Court of Appeals

The S C Court of
Appeals
1015 Sumter Street
Columbia, SC 29201