

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.

RECEIVED
JUN 07 2018
SC Court of Appeals

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

RESPONDENT(S)

Vs.

JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND ET. AL.,

APPELLANT(S)

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
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

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

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE [10] PAGE DOCUMENT SEEKING
1-of-15

AN INJUNCTION ENTITLED, "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***", DATED FEBRUARY 12, 2018.

(2) 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 DATED FEBRUARY 26, 2018 FILED IN CASES 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM.

(3) THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; CHALLENGING THE RICHLAND COURT'S JURISDICTION; RESPONDING TO DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS AND LETTERS, [31] PAGES DATED OCTOBER 7, 2015 FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084.

(4) THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; SEEKING TO FILE OBJECTIONS; RENEWING THE PETITION TO REMOVE;***, [92] PAGES DATED MAY 2, 2014 FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084.

(5) EXHIBIT, "NEBULOUS/ FRIVOLOUS---NOT! # 7. THIS IS THE [32] PAGE AMENDED COMPLAINT THAT MAKE UP A PORTION OF CASE 2013-CP-400-0084.

(6) EXHIBIT, "NEBULOUS/ FRIVOLOUS---NOT! # 6. THIS IS THE [152] PAGE DOCUMENT DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 2015 FILED IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 ON OCTOBER 1, 2015.

(7) THE ELECTRONIC FILING SHEET FROM CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM IN THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT. ALL THESE DOCUMENTS ARE ATTACHED TO THE FACE OF THIS DOCUMENT FOR ALL PURPOSES. ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES, OBJECTIONS ETC. THAT ARE ARGUED WITHIN THESE DOCUMENTS, ARE NOW BEING ARGUED UNDER CASE 2017-0002108 AND ALL OTHER RELATED STATE AND FEDERAL CASES ALSO.

INSOMUCH, PURSUANT TO RULE 240(i) S.C.A.C.R. THE COURT

SHALL ENTERTAIN A PETITION AND OR MOTION IF IT HAS THE EFFECT OF FINALLY DECIDING A PARTY'S APPEAL WHICH THIS AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE ETC., DO INDEED HAVE THE EFFECT OF FINALLY DECIDING THE APPEAL.

SECONDLY, THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING FILED PURSUANT TO THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT. FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING. THUS, I AM CHALLENGING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION TO ENTER THE ORDER ISSUED ON FEBRUARY 16, 2018. A JUDGMENT 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); STRATTEN-v.-MECKLENBERG COUNTY-DEPT.-OF-SOCIAL-SERVICES 521 Fed. Appx' 278, 2013 WL 2364587 CA4 (N.C.2013); BLUE-SKY-TRAVEL-AND-TOURS-LLC.-v.-AL TAXYAR --Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 1451636 CA4 (Va.2015); BARLOW v.-SOLGATE-PALMOlive-CO. 772 F3d. 1001, 90 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 85 CA4 (Md.2014).

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, CANNOT BE WAIVED BY THE APPELLANT, EVEN WITH CONSENT, CAN BE RAISED AT ANY STAGE EVEN FOR THE FIRST TIME BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, AND THE COURT SHALL NOT FAIL TO TAKE NOTICE, 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.2017); SIZWARD-v.-RIDDLE F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 707018(DSC.2013); EX-PARTE-CANNON 685 S.E.2d. 814, 821 (S.C. App.2009); McCANN-v.-BRIGHTHARB 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).

LETS START WITH THE ORDER(S) OF CONCERN THEMSELVES. THE ORDERS ARE VOID DUE TO EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT KNEW WE WERE ARGUING THAT THE COURT DID NOT HAVE JURISDICTION DUE TO REMOVAL WHERE THE FEDERAL CASE

TO WHICH CASE 2017-0002108 WAS REMOVED TO WAS NOT DISMISSED NOR WAS THERE ANY REMAND ORDER. THEREFORE, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE RESPONDENT, ALONG WITH VARIOUS JUDGES IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, IN SECRET EX PARTE GATHERING(S), IN THEIR MEETING OF THE MINDS, GOT WITH THE VARIOUS JUDGES OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT, AND THOSE FEDERAL JUDGES WITH THE JUDGES OF THIS COURT, BEGAN THE PROCESS OF FRAUDULENTLY DISMISSING THE CASES TO ALLOW THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO INAPPROPRIATELY ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER CASE 2017-0002108 TO DISMISS IT. THEN YOU ADD WHAT THEY DID INVOLVING OFFICER MEGGETT AND THE S.C.D.C. AT LIEBER C.I., TO PREVENT COPIES OF ESSENTIAL EVIDENCE FROM BEING TIMELY FILED TO CREATE AN INCOMPLETE RECORD AND SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND UNITED STATES FROM REPLYING AND PRODUCE EVIDENCE THAT THEY TIMELY SOUGHT TO DEFEAT THE AFFIDAVITS OF DEFAULT AND THE VOIDING OF JURISDICTION BECAUSE THE JUDGES INVOLVED KNEW THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THE UNITED STATES AND DEFENDANTS IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 WERE IN DEFAULT, AND THE JUDGES DID NOT WANT THE DEFAULT, COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN TO BE ESTABLISHED IN THE COURT RECORD. THIS IS "FRAUD". IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL, AND IT VOIDS THE COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND ARBITRARY JUDICIAL ACTION PLACING THIS COURT IN FORFEITURE ON ALL CAUSE OF ACTION THAT ARE PLACED BEFORE THIS COURT. I, WE, OBJECT.

IF THE COURT WOULD TAKE NOTICE OF THE ORDER IN WHICH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT MADE USE OF TO MAKE A FINAL DETERMINATION IN THIS CASE. THE FEBRUARY 16, 2018 ORDER WAS BASED UPON THE ORDER ISSUED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ON JANUARY 5, 2018. IF YOU LOOK AT THE ORDER FROM CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM TO WHICH CASE 2017-0002108 WAS REMOVED TO. THE FEDERAL CASE WAS NOT DISMISSED UNTIL FEBRUARY 12, 2018. THUS, THE JANUARY 5, 2018 ORDER ISSUED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, FOR WHICH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT BASED ITS FEBRUARY 16, 2018 ORDER ON IS "VOID". THE PREDICATE ORDER BEING VOID DUE TO THE REMOVAL, RENDERS VOID THE SUBSEQUENT ORDER THAT IS BASED UPON ITS PREDECESSOR. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ABUSED ITS DISCRETION IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY MAKING USE OF IT. I, WE, OBJECT. THE SUBSEQUENT AND ALLEGED FINAL ORDER IS "VOID" AB INITIO. A VOID JUDGMENT IS

ONE THAT, FROM ITS INCEPTION, IS A COMPLETE NULLITY AND IS WITHOUT LEGAL EFFECT, UNITED-STATE-v.-MUNGO, 754 F3d. 267(4th.Cir. 2014); UNIVERSAL-BENEFITS-INC.-v.-McKINNEY, 349 S.C. 179, 561 S.E.2d. 659(S.C.App.2002); WARE-v.-WARE, 743 S.E.2d. 817, 822+ (S.C.App.2013); WEBSTER-v.-GLANTON, 259 S.C. 387, 192 S.E.2d. 214(S.C.App.1972).

FEDERAL LAW IS CLEAR ON THIS ISSUE AS IS ADJUDICATED UNDER ACKERMANN-v.-EXXON-MOBIL-CORP., 734 F3d. 237(4th.Cir.2013). THE REMOVAL STATUTE DEPRIVES A STATE COURT OF FURTHER JURISDICTION OVER THE REMOVED CASE AND "ANY" (EMPHASIS ADDED) POST REMOVAL ACTION, (ei. LIKE THE ORDER YOU ISSUED ON JANUARY 5, 2018), POST REMOVAL TAKEN BY THE STATE COURT IN THE REMOVED CASE, THAT ACTION IS VOID AB INITIO (FROM THE BEGINNING). YOU HAVE CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND UNITED STATES IN COURTS TO WHICH YOU HAD NO JURISDICTION AND EVEN THIS COURT, TO PREVENT EVIDENCE OF THE DEFAULT, COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND THE SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY OF THE CROWN FROM BEING MADE A PART OF THE COURT RECORD. YOU HAVE CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO CLOSE THE BARN DOOR WHEN THE HORSES HAVE ALREADY ESCAPED AND HAVE GONE TO NOVA SCOTIA. THE ORDER OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ISSUED ON JANUARY 5, 2018 WAS ISSUED AFTER THE REMOVAL, WHICH MEANS THAT THE ORDER WAS VOID FOR ALL PURPOSES WHICH INCLUDE FOR THE PURPOSE OF ISSUING YOUR ORDER DATED FEBRUARY 16, 2018, AND YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE DUE TO YOUR INTENTIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MARTIN-EVANS-v.-CHESAPEAKE-APPALACHIA,LLC. F.Supp. 3d., 2015 WL 6681185(N.D.Va.2015); BARTELS-BY-AND-THROUGH-BARTELS v.-SABER-HEALTH-CARE-GROUP,LLC. 880 F3d. 668(4th.Cir.2018); U.S.-BANK-NATIONAL-ASSOCIATION-v.-S.R.A.-AUGUSTA-SPE,LLC. F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6808132(D.MAINE.2016); LEE-v.-CITY-OF-FAYETTEVILLE, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 4148313(N.C.2016).

I, WE, ALSO OBJECT TO THE COURT'S DETERMINATION TO NOT HEAR THE 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 DUE TO THE COURT'S CLAIM THAT I HAVE FAILED TO FILE AN AMENDED APPENDIX AS REQUIRED BY ORDER DATED JANUARY 5, 2018. THAT ORDER IS VOID DUE TO REMOVAL WHICH TAINTS AND VOIDS YOUR FEBRUARY 16, 2018 ORDER. IT IS VOID AB INITIO. RULE 240 PROVIDES MOTIONS AND PETITIONS GENERALLY RULE 240(c) FORM AND CONTENT OF MOTIONS AND PETITIONS. ALL MOTIONS OR PETITIONS FILED IN THE APPELLATE COURT SHALL BE IN WRITING, SHALL STATE THE GROUNDS THEREOF, AND SHALL COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 267. THE PAGES OF THE MOTION OR PETITION AND ALL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS SHALL BE CONSECUTIVELY NUMBERED. EACH MOTION OR PETITION SHALL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

(3) WHERE THE RECORD ON APPEAL OR APPENDIX HAS NOT BEEN FILED, OR WHERE THE FACTS RELIED UPON IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION OR PETITION ARE NOT CONTAINED WITHIN THE RECORD ON APPEAL OR APPENDIX, THE PARTIES SHALL FILE "AFFIDAVITS" (EMPHASIS ADDED) AND OTHER DOCUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THEIR PETITIONS. I, WE, OBJECT. THE SUPREME COURT ABUSED ITS DISCRETION IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT TO SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND UNITED STATES TO PREVENT EVIDENCE OF THEIR DEFAULT FROM BEING MADE A PART OF THE COURT RECORD. THE FILING OF AN APPENDIX IS NOT REQUIRED BY RULES OF COURT TO HAVE THE DOCUMENT IN QUESTION ADJUDICATED. YOUR FRAUD CAN NOW BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED, STATE-x-GRIFFITH-EX-REL ESTATE-OF-GRIFFITH, S.E.2d., 2011 WL 11734335(S.C.2011); ARATA x-VILLAGE-WEST-OWNERS-ASS'N-INC., S.E.2d., 2011 WL 11735004(S.C. App.2011); ROBINSON-x-ESTATE-OF-HARRIS, 389 S.C. 360, 698 S.E.2d 801 (S.C.App.2010).

THE LAW DICTATES THAT NEITHER JUDGES OR GOVERNMENT ATTORNEYS ARE ABOVE THE LAW, UNITED-STATES-x-ISAACS, 493 F2d. 1124, 1143(7th.Cir.1974). 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 POWER OF JUDGES TO ACT OUTSIDE OF THEIR JURISDICTION. SUCH PROCEEDINGS WOULD BE VOID, AND ACTIONABLE. WITHOUT SUCH JURISDICTION EXISTING,

AND OR WHERE ANY SUBSEQUENT ORDER IS TAINTED BY THE FRAUD PROCURING JUDGMENT BY THE PREDICATE VOID ORDER, 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 A VOID JUDGMENT ARE THEMSELVES REGARDED AS INVALID, OLSON-x.-LEITH, 71 WYO. 316, 257 P.2d. 342. THE JUDGMENT OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WAS BASED UPON ORDERS WHICH WERE VOID BECAUSE THE COURT EXCEEDED ITS JURISDICTION IN ENTERING THEM. WHERE A COURT AFTER ACQUIRING JURISDICTION OF A SUBJECT MATTER AS HERE, ALSO INVOLVING INTENTIONAL FRAUD, TRANSCENDS THE LIMITS OF THE JURISDICTION CONFERRED AS WHEN THE CASE WAS REMOVED, ITS JUDGMENT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID, ARMSTRONG-x.-OBUCINO, 300 Ill. 140, 143, 133 N.E. 58(1921).

INSOMUCH, THE ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE 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. THE ACTIONS OF THE CONSPIRING JUDGES AND PARTIES INFRINGE UPON THE "TRUST" BY VIOLATING THEIR OATHS 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 IN CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 ARE PRESUMED TRUE 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.

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 AS IS INDICATED BY THE "GRANT" GIVEN TO YOUR NATIONS, 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. 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.

IF THE STATE OR GOVERNMENT MAY 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 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, 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, cf. PUBLIC-LI-CENSES-AND-PRIVATE-RIGHTS (BARNETT 1953); 33 OLR 10n. 32. STATES POWER TO GRANT PRIVILGES ON ITS OWN CONDITION IS LIMITED, SO THAT IT MAY NOT THEREBY REQUIRE RELINQUISHMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

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. 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 REFLECT 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, 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 ESTABLISHING 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, ESTABLISHING EFFECT UPON INTERSTATE COMMERCE CLAIM, PURSUANT TO THE "PARODY MARRIAGE BILL" AND OR "MARRIAGE AND CONSTITUTION RESTORATION ACT", BY THESE LEGISLATIONS 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. 0

NOW ALL ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE AND OR COURTS 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. THE KING-KHALIFAH AS GOD'S LAWGIVER IS TANTAMOUNT TO THAT AUTHORITY BY THE SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER GIVEN TO HIM BY CONTRACT OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. YOUR LAWS CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO EXCEED THE AUTHORITY OF THE 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, NOR CAN THEY OBSTRUCT OUR OBEDIENCE TO THE ONE TRUE GOD FROM WHOSE PUNISHMENTS THEY CANNOT PROTECT US. ALL LAWS OR HUMAN CONSTITUTIONS WHICH CONTRADICT 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 ABO-

LISHED 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 LAWGIVERS 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 (3) HOLY BOOKS AND 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 ATTORNEY, 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 LAWS AT THAT TIME STAND AND THE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH STAND 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).

INASMUCH, THE PETITIONER(S) FURTHER CHALLENGE THE COURT'S JURISDICTION BECAUSE DESPITE THE WARNING WE GAVE YOU, ENGAGING IN FURTHER ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. YOU LET JUDGE BEATTY AND HEARNS SIT ON THIS CASE CREATING AN ADDITIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS THIS COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATION. IT IS PERSPICUOUS FROM THE AMENDED COMPLAINT ESTABLISHING CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 THAT JUDGE KAYE HEARNS IS A DEFENDANT IN THESE MATTERS WHO HAS NOW SAT UPON HER OWN CASE. BY THE (24) PAGE DOCUMENT FROM CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM, TO INCLUDE THE MATTERS UNDER CASE 9:17-cv-1140-TLW-BM. IT IS CONSPICUOUS THE FRAUD JUDGE BEATTY PLAYED A PART IN PRODUCING THE JANUARY 5, 2018 VOID ORDER YOU USED. THERE IS NO TELLING THE AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE THE JUDGES HAD ON THESE PROCEEDINGS NOR CAN THE COURT CONCLUSIVELY ASSESS THERE WAS NO PREJUDICE BY THE POTENTIALITY OF THIS ADVERSE INFLUENCE. PREJUDICE IS ESTABLISHED BY THE EVENTS THAT OCCURRED. THEIR PRESENCE PRODUCED A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS.

THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL PRODUCING STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOIDS THIS COURT'S JURISDICTION. THE COURT COULD HAVE EASILY HEARD THIS CASE WITHOUT THEM. YET YOU CHOSE FRAUD AND TO IGNORE THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND HOLDINGS MADE BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN THE WILLIAMS CASE. BY SUCH YOUR JURISDICTION IS CHALLENGED IN ISSUING YOUR DETERMINATION RENDERING IT VOID, 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.-WHALENS-PROPERTIES,LLC., 2016 WL 6788052, * 11+ (Md.2016).


KNOWING FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION NECESSARY TO PREVENT RESPONDENT'S AND COURT'S STATEMENTS FROM BEING MISLEADING, LIKE YOU GETTING OFFICER MEGGETT AND S.C.D.C. TO BLOCK OR DELAY COPIES FROM BEING FILED AND CONSPIRING TO HAVE CASES 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM DISMISSED TO DETACH THE REMOVAL SO YOU COULD INAPPROPRIATELY ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER CASE 2017-0002108 ET. AL. TO DISMISS IT AND PREVENT DISCLOSURE THAT THE RESPONDENT AND THE UNITED STATES ARE IN DEFAULT TO PREVENT THE SOVEREIGN RIGHTS FROM ATTACHING TO CASE 2017-0002108 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 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS, TO STEAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND 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 ON CLEAR JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES WHICH CAN BE RAISED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FOR THE FIRST TIME WHICH DO NOT HAVE TO BE PRESERVED BY REHEARING AS AN ACT OF MACHINATION, INTENTIONALLY, PURPOSELY, SILENCING THE RESPONDENT AND 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 TO SPEAK ON THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES AND THE RESPONDENT TO SPEAK ON THE CLAIM OF DEFAULT AND THE COURT SILENCED HIM 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 EVEN BY USE OF A VOID ORDER ISSUED ON JANUARY 5, 2018. THE INQUIRY WAS LEFT UNANSWERED ALLOWING YOU TO FRAUDULENTLY MISREPRESENT THE FACTS IN THESE CASES. FRAUD AND DECEIT WILL RAISE FROM SILENCE, AS YOU DID ABSTAINING FROM RULING ON THE FEDERAL QUESTIONS AND JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES AND AS YOU DISMISSED THE CASE TO SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND UNITED STATES IN ACTS OF MACHINATION WHERE THERE WAS 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 THE FRAUD, SUCH AS YOU USED IT TO CIRCUMVENT RULING ON FEDERAL QUESTION AND THE JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES AND DEFAULT IN RENDERING YOUR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. FRAUD IN ITS ELEMENTARY COMMON LAW SENSE OF DECEIT....INCLUDE THE DELIBERATE CONCEALMENT OF MATERIAL INFORMATION, SUCH

AS YOU CONSPIRING WITH JUDGE WOOTEN TO DETACH THE REMOVAL SO YOU COULD CONCEAL THE DEFAULT AND THAT STATE-v.-GENTRY IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND YOU WORKING WITH THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT TO SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND UNITED STATES, 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, IS A FIDUCIARY TOWARDS THE PUBLIC....AND IF HE OR SHE DELIBERATELY CONCEALS MATERIAL INFORMATION FROM THEM, LIKE CONCEALING THAT STATE-v.-GENTRY IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND CONCEALING THE FACT THAT THE DEFAULT IS INDEED LEGALLY BINDING UPON THIS COURT ESTABLISHING SUPERSEDING ATTORNEY, JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE POWER AND AUTHORITY, 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); BOINDEXTER-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.-WEGHT, F.Supp.2d., 2008 WL 2223869(W.D. Pa.2008).

THE LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS ON ISSUES SUCH AS THE ONES BEING ARGUED IN 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" PROCEEDING (EMPHASIS ADDED). 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 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 CASE 2017-0002108, 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM AND 9:17-cv-01633-TLW-BM AND ALL RELATED STATE AND OR 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 ON ALL CAUSES.), 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 JUDGES IF YOU FAIL TO GRANT RELIEF SINCE YOU VIOLATED YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE AND CONSPIRED WITHIN COURTS TO WHICH YOU HAD NO JURISDICTION), AND JUSTIFIES NO ACTS PERFORMED UNDER IT (YOUR JURISDICTION IS VOID PURSUANT TO THE HOBBS ACT, WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA,


FRAUD AND ISSUES RELATED TO THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE.)....A VOID ACT CANNOT BE LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH A VALID ONE IN YOUR FRAUD UPON THE COURT CORRUPT JUDGES. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW CANNOT OPERATE TO SUPERSEDE AN EXISTING LAW (THIS MEANS THE LAW BEFORE YOU GRANTED SAME SEX MARRIAGE STANDS. THIS MEANS THE KING-KHALIFAH'S SUPERSEDING POWER AND AUTHORITY ESTABLISHED BY DUE PROCESS LAW BEFORE YOUR FRAUD STANDS. THE LAW ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE PLRA, THE AEDPA AND THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE STANDS, ESTABLISHING THE AUTHORITY OF THE KING-KHALIFAH'S ATTORNEY GENERAL, ALLOWING US TO JOINTLY FILE, SEEK CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION, ESTABLISH ORIGINAL JURISDICTION IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ETC.). 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, JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS, RULES, STATUTES AND PRACTICES (LIKE YOUR FRAUD CONSPIRING ACROSS MULTIPLE JURISDICTIONS TO SILENCE THE RESPONDENT AND UNITED STATES TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY ARE IN DEFAULT ESTABLISHING THE KING-KHALIFAH'S SUPERSEDING POWER. YOUR ACTIONS VIOLATE THE "GRANT" BY ALSO GIVING GAYS THE RIGHT TO LEGALLY MARRY IN VIOLATION OF ALSO THE HOBBS ACT EFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE AS ARGUED IN THIS CASE, AND IN VIOLATION OF THE EXPROPRIATION EXCEPTION TO THE F.S.I.A.), WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION ARE "NULL" AND "VOID". YOUR ORDERS ARE VOID AND YOU ARE IN FORFEITURE, 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).

RESPECTFULLY,
JOSEPH TODD ROWLAND, ACTING
ATTORNEY GENERAL TO THE (4)
THRONES FOR HIMSELF AND THE
KING-KHALIFAH




MARCH 2, 2018

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

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joseph Rowland".

JAHJAH AL MAHDI

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jahjah Al Mahdi".

MARCH 2, 2018

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD aka
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH TISHBITE
#300839 WANDO A-127
LIEBER C.R. P.O. BOX 205
RIDGEVILLE, SC 29172

RECEIVED

JUN 07 2018


SC Court of Appeals

RE: JO PENDING ACTIONS 2016-06005
2004-20-0385 ET AL.

FOR THE SC COURT OF APPEALS,

WE RECENTLY FILED PLEADING RELATED
TO THE CAPTIONED MATTERS. THIS LAST
EXHIBIT WAS LEFT OUT AS A MATTER OF
INADVERTENCE. PLEASE FILE WITH
PREVIOUS FILINGS. THANK YOU.

JUNE 2, 2018

Respectfully
JAHJAH Almahdi


LAWRENCE L Crawford
#300839 Wando A-127
LIEBER CTR PO BOX 205
Ridgerville, SC 29122

RECEIVED
JUN 07 2018
SC Court of Appeals

RECEIVED
JUN 05 2018
MAIL ROOM
LIEBER CL

SC COURT of Appeals
1220 STATE STREET
Columbia SC 29201

FOR LEGAL USE ONLY