

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
THE COUNTY OF RICHLAND

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T.
TISHBITE

PLAINTIF(S)

Vs.

THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL;
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA;
THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS
ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
) IN THE 5TH. JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
)

) CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 ET. AL.,
)
)

) AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING
) JUDICIAL NOTICE; NOTICE
) SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL;
) MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE AND
) DECLARATORY RELIEF; MOTION FOR
) AN EXTENSION OF TIME AND
) MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

RECEIVED

DEC 17 2020

SC Court of Appeals

IN RE: SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL, MOTIONING FOR INJUNCTIVE AND
DECLARATORY RELIEF AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS BEFORE THE S.C.
COURT OF APPEALS.

TO: THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS,
JUDGE NEWMAN,
THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,
THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL ET. AL.,

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

(1) EXHIBIT, "REMOVAL". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; PETITION TO REMOVE AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (4) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 3, 2020.

(2) EXHIBIT, "VOID AB INITIO". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS JURISDICTION; MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT; AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (5) PAGES DATED NOVEMBER 13, 2020.

(3) EXHIBIT, "DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS JURISDICTION; MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT; AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (22) PAGES DATED MARCH 20, 2021 INTENDED TO BE FILED WITHIN CASE 2020-CP-23-01050 IN THE GREENVILLE COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.

(4) EXHIBIT, "FRAUD ORDER". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER ISSUED BY JUDGE NEWMAN DATED CLOCKED STAMPED FILED WITH THE CLERK OF COURT ON NOVEMBER 23, 2020.

INSOMUCH, THE APPELLANT SEEKS LEAVE TO FILE BEFORE THE ~~S.C. COURT OF APPEALS AN APPEAL OF THE ORDER FILED BY JUDGE~~ NEWMAN DATED FILED WITH THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS ON NOVEMBER 23, 2020. THE APPELLANT RECEIVED A COPY OF THE ORDER IN QUESTION ON DECEMBER 8, 2020. THE APPELLANT HAS (30) DAYS FROM THE TIME HE RECEIVED THE ORDER TO SEEK LEAVE TO APPEAL IT. THIS WOULD GIVE THE APPELLANT UNTIL JANUARY 8, 2021 TO SEEK TO APPEAL THAT ORDER. THUS, THIS SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL MUST BE DEEMED TIMELY MADE WHERE IT IS SOUGHT PLACING THE MAILING IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON DECEMBER 14, 2020.

IN ADDRESSING THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE, JUDGE NEWMAN, PRODUCING THIS ORDER OF CONTINUANCE, VIOLATED THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION, FRAUD UPON THE COURT,

CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, MACHINATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING THE APPELLANT'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS RENDERING THE ORDER AND CASE UNCONSTITUTIONAL BY CARRYING THIS CASE BEYOND THE LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO THE HOLDINGS ADJUDICATED UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723(U.S.2016) WHERE THE SUPREME COURT ADJUDICATED HOLDING A CASE FOR (4) YEARS WITHOUT CONCLUDING IT IS TOO LONG AND HERE THE CASES ARE ESSENTIALLY HELD GOING UNRESOLVED FOR OVER (14+) YEARS VIOLATING THE APPELLANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS UNDER THE 5TH., 14TH. AMENDMENTS AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE TO WHICH THE APPELLANT ADAMANTLY OBJECTS, PLACING THE COURT AND DEFENDANTS IN FORFEITURE BY BOTH THEIR SILENCE CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, BODMAN v. STATE, 403 S.C. 60, 742 S.E.2d. 363(S.C.2013); 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. HARE, 820 F3d. 93 (4th.Cir.2016).

BY JUDGE NEWMAN RULING IN THE ORDER THAT, **"THIS DOES NOT END THE CASE"**, SHE CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO CIRCUMVENT RULING ON THE MOTION FOR HER RECUSAL TO MAKE ANY DECISION IN THIS CASE, WHICH VOIDS HER JURISDICTION AB INITIO DUE TO CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016) IN THAT SHE ESSENTIALLY SAT UPON HER OWN CASE AS INDICATED BY THE REMOVAL, TO DO THE CASE IRREPARABLE HARM IN RETALIATION TO CAUSE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT IN REMOVING THE CASE TO FEDERAL JURISDICTION. BY HER ACTIONS, THE ORDER BEING BROUGHT BEFORE THIS COURT'S REVIEW MUST BE DEEMED A FINAL ORDER ON THE ISSUE OF HER RECUSAL AND THE DEFAULT THAT WAS FILED WITHIN THE CASE(S) OR SHE WOULD HAVE NEVER DETERMINED THAT, "THIS DOES NOT END THE CASE", WHERE THE DEFAULT ARGUED WOULD HAVE LEGALLY PREVENTED HER FROM MAKING SUCH A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. ORDERS THAT HAVE A FINAL AND IRREPARABLE EFFECT ON RIGHTS OF A PARTY ARE APPEALABLE, COHEN v. BENEFICIAL INDUS. LOAN CORP., 337 U.S. 541, 69 S.Ct. 1221(U.S.1949); AL SHIMARI v. C.A.C.I. INTERN, INC., 679 F3d. 205 (4th.Cir.2012); DIGITAL EQUIPMENT CORP. v. DESKTOP

DIRECT, INC., 511 U.S. 863, 114 S.Ct. 1992, 128 L.Ed.2d. 842(U.S.1994).

YOU COMPOUND THIS FACT BY THIS FRAUDULENT, CRIMINAL AND OBSTRUCTIVE, PROTECTORATE ATTEMPT WORKING WITH THE DEFENDANTS ON THE PART OF JUDGE NEWMAN VIOLATING HER OATH OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS WHERE THIS CASE WAS TIMELY REMOVED TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT. JUDGE NEWMAN'S JURISDICTION TO DO ANYTHING IN THIS CASE, TO INCLUDE MAKING A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION THAT "THIS DOES NOT END THE CASE.", WAS A CLEAR VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW, WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOIDED HER JURISDICTION AB INITIO DEMONSTRATING HER PRESENCE ON THIS CASE IN ANY FORM PRODUCED A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT ROSE TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL CREATING A INDISPUTABLE CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE WARRANTING THE SEEKING OF THIS APPEAL. THE ISSUES AND CONCERNS ARGUED WITHIN THIS CASE ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, NOT THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG TO BE CERTAIN, KENWOOD GARDENS CONDOMINIUMS INC. v. WHALEN PROPERTIES, LLC., 2016 WL 6788052, * 11+ (Md.2016); UNITED STATES v. QUINONES, 2016 WL 4413149, * 6+ (S.D.W.Va.2016); ACKERMANN v. EXXONMOBIL CORP., 734 F3d 237 (4th.Cir.2013); ESPINOZA v. ALLSTATE TEXAS LLOYD'S, 222 F.Supp.3d. 529 (W.D.Tex.2016); ~~BARTELS BY AND THROUGH BARTELS v. SABER HEALTH CARE GROUP, LLC.~~, 880 F3d. 668 (4th.Cir.2018); INTERNATIONAL ENERGY VENTURES MANAGEMENT, LLC. v. UNITED ENERGY GROUP, LTD., 818 F3d. 193 (5th.Cir.2016).

IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, RETALIATION AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, JUDGE NEWMAN PRODUCED THIS ORDER CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO HAVE A DETERIMENTAL EFFECT WITHIN FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS TO WHICH SHE HAD ABSOLUTELY NO POWER OR AUTHORITY AND TO AID THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE TO AVOID THE DEFAULT TOTALLY LOSING HER INDEPENDENCE BEING COMPROMISED FOR ULTERIOR MOTIVES WHICH VOID HER JURISDICTION FOR SUCH OVERWHELMINGLY PREJUDICIAL AND EGREGIOUSLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL

ACTION REQUIRING THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS TO ADDRESS THIS MATTER NOW DUE TO THE IRREPARABLE HARM THE DETERMINATION HAS DONE TO THE APPELLANT'S PROCEEDINGS WHERE HERE, SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AT ANY STAGE, EVEN FOR THE FIRST TIME ON APPEAL, EVEN AFTER A FINAL ORDER HAS BEEN ISSUED, CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED BY THE APPELLANT AND THE COURT OF APPEALS "[S]HALL [N]OT" FAIL TO TAKE NOTICE, ROBINSON v. ESTATE OF HARRIS, 389 S.C. 360, 698 S.E.2d. 801(S.C.App.2010); EX PARTE CANNON, 685 S.E.2d. 814, 820 (S.C.App.2009); SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES v. TRAN, 418 S.C. 308, 792 S.E.2d. 254(S.C.App.2016); WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. FARAG, 2016 WL 2944561 (N.C.2016); BENTON v. BURNS, 2017 WL 491251 (D.C.Md.2017); PEGG v. HERNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112 (4th.Cir.2017); STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998); TAMM v. CINCINNATI INSURANCE COMPANY, 2020 WL 60932 (S.D.N.Y.2020); CHASE v. ANDEAVOR LOGISTICS L.P., 2019 WL 5847879, * 2 W.D.Tex.; SORRINGWIND ENERGY, LLC. v. CATIC U.S.A. INCORPORATED, --F3d.--, 5TH. Cir.(Tex.); 460 S. LAKE AVENUE, LTD. v. APPLETON, 2019 WL 7184737, * 1 C.D.Cal.; ARBAUGH v. Y & H CORP., 546 U.S. 500, 126 S.Ct. 1235(U.S.2006); STEVENS E. HECKER, PLAINTIFF v. THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEFENDANT, 2020 WL 134168(Fed.Cl.2020); JEFFERS v. J.P. MORGAN CHASE & CO., 2019 WL 6255311, * 1, S.D.Tex.; ANTHONY W. HALL, PLAINTIFF v. FRENKEL, LAMBERT...., 2020 WL 136658, * 2, E,D,N.Y.; DAVIS v. PALUMBO, 2019 WL 6915949, * 1, W.D.MO..

UNLESS THE COURT POSSESSES SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER THE DISPUTE, THEREFORE, ANY ORDER IT MAKES IS VOID, OOO-RM INVEST v. NET ELEMENT INTERNATIONAL, INC., F.Supp., 2014 WL 12613282 (S.D.Fla.2014). THE COMMON PLEAS JUDGE ABUSING HER DISCRETION "MUST" (EMPHASIS ADDED) RESOLVE THE QUESTION OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER THE CASE BEFORE SHE MAY ISSUE "ANY" (EMPHASIS ADDED) ORDERS EXERCISING SUCH JURISDICTION WHICH INCLUDE THE JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OF ADJUDICATING, "THIS DOES NOT END THE CASE", DUE TO THE DEFAULT DOCUMENT ALSO FILED IN THIS CASE, WHICH OF COURSE IS JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE, WHICH CANNOT

BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, ALLOWING THE APPELLANT TO SEEK INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF TO REQUIRE THE COMMON PLEAS COURT TO STRIKE AND VOID THE ORDER, AND FOR THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS TO DECLARE THE RIGHTS RELATED TO THE CONTROVERSY AND DETERMINE THE VALIDITY OF THE DEFAULT, SINCE JUDGE NEWMAN'S ORDER CONSTITUTE A FINAL RULING TO THE CONTRARY BY HER ACTIONS WHERE NO SUBSEQUENT JUDGE CAN OVERRULE THEIR PREDECESSOR CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE. THE COURT OF APPEALS IS REQUIRED TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF THE LOWER COURT'S SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION IF IT APPEARS THAT THE LOWER COURT DID NOT POSSESS SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, KOSCIUSKO v. PARHAM, 428 S.C. 481, 836 S.E.2d. 362(S.C.App.2019); FIRST CITIZENS BANK AND TRUST COMPANY, INC. v. TAYLOR, 431 S.C. 149, 847 S.E.2d. 249 (S.C.App.2020); JOHNSON v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF PROBATION, PAROLE AND PARDON SERVICES, 372 S.C. 279, 641 S.E.2d. 895 (S.C.App.2007); COOK v. TAYLOR, 272 S.C. 536, 252 S.E.2d. 923; ENOREE BAPTIST CHURCH v. FLETCHER, 287 S.C. 602, 340 S.E.2d. 546 (S.C.App.1986); NEW HAMPSHIRE v. MAINE, 532 U.S. 742, 121 S.Ct. 1808, 149 L.Ed.2d. 968(U.S.20012); SARA Y. WILSON, APPELLANT v. CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, RESPONDENT.,--S.E.2d.--, 2017 WL 1075196(S.C.App.2017); M.D.C. INNOVATIONS 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).

~~INASMUCH, THE APPELLANT MOTIONS FOR AND SEEKS SANCTIONS AS~~
WELL AS INJUNCTION AND DECLARATORY RELIEF TO REMEDY THESE OUTRAGEOUS ACTS AND ABUSE OF DISCRETION ON THE PART OF JUDGE NEWMAN, AND THE APPELLANT SEEKS, DUE THE THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, THAT THE DEFENDANTS WITHIN THESE CASES BE DEEMED IN FORFEITURE BECAUSE THEY CONSPIRED TO PREVENT DISCOVERY FROM BEING ISSUED. THE APPELLANT SEEKS THAT THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS NOW RULE ON THE DEFAULT DOCUMENTS ATTACHED THAT WERE TIMELY AND PROPERLY FILED BEFORE THE RICHLAND COURT OF COMMON PLEAS ONCE THE APPELLANT DISCOVERED THAT COURT'S INTENT TO CONDUCT THE RECENT HEARING IN ACTS OF MACHINATION TO ALLOW THEM TO SLIP THIS ILLEGAL AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ORDER OF CONTINUANCE WITHIN THIS CASE TO VIOLATE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. A

COPY OF THE DOCUMENTS IN QUESTION ARE HEREWITH ATTACHED, STATE v. BRANDT, 393 S.C. 526, 713 S.E.2d. 591(S.C.App.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); BARDRES v. HALEY, 58 F.Supp.3d. 514 (DSC.2014); U.S. v. SOUTH CAROLINA, 720 F3d. 518 CA4 (S.C.2013).

ALL ACTS, JUDGEMENTS, ORDERS OR DECREES DONE BY ALL COURTS ON RECORD THAT ARE REPUGNANT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THAT ARE CONTRARY TO DUE PROCESS LAW ARE "VOID" AND CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW PRODUCING DIRECT AND AUTOMATIC JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE THAT CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED BY THE APPELLANT AND CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AT ANY STAGE. THUS, IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE APPELLANT, THIS APPEAL MUST BE ESTABLISHED RELATED TO THE CASE(S) INVOLVED, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT EXIST WITHIN THESE CASES PURSUANT TO BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609 (U.S.2016) OUT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AND FRAUD UPON THE STATE COURT WHERE THE COURT HOLDING THESE CASES FOR ESSENTIALLY (14+) YEARS VIOLATES THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, COUNTY OF RICHLAND v. SIMPKINS, 348 S.C. 664, 560 S.E.2d. 902(S.C.App.2002); COMPTON v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, 392 S.C. 361, 709 S.E.2d. 639 (S.C.App.2011); ASTERBADI v. LEITESS, 176 Fed. Appx' 426 CA4 (Va,2006); PYNE v. UNITED STATES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 1377402(D.C.Md.2016); MYLES v. DOMINOS PIZZA, LLC., 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.2017); IN RE: GENESYS DATA TECHNOLOGIES INC., 204 F3d. 124 (4th.Cir.2000). THE APPELLANT MOTIONS FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE BRIEF AND SEEK THAT THE COURT OF APPEALS NOTIFY HIM OF ALL TIMELINES NECESSARY TO PERFECT THIS APPEAL BY HIS RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE AS WELL AS BY HIS RIGHTS UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AND THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT OF 28 U.S.C. 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.. FOR THE RECORD. PLEASE DO NOT ATTEMPT TO PULL THAT CRIMINAL STUNT ASSERTING THAT


THERE IS A FILING FEE NECESSARY FOR THIS APPEAL. YOU BASTARDS IN THIS STATE FRAMED ME FOR THE MURDER OF MY OWN CHILD CONCEALING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE KNOWING SHE DIED OF NATURAL CAUSES BEING RAPED BY HER HALF BROTHER. YOU SUPPRESSED TRUTH WHICH IS WHY NEWMAN ACTED TO PREVENT DISCOVERY FROM ISSUING. YOU AIDED THAT BOY COVER HIS CRIMES BECAUSE YOU DISCOVERED THAT THE APPELLANT IS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR TO THE (4) GLOBAL THRONES OF RELIGIOUS PROPHECY, DESTROYING MY WORLD BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED ALSO VIOLATING THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE AND THE FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WAS SILENT TO AID YOU. THE APPELLANT IS LAWGIVER, KING, KHALIFAH, HIGH PRIEST AND IMAM OF THE ONE TRUE GOD. THE APPELLANT AS TOLD BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURTS, DENOUNCE HIS AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP AND INVOKE THE ISRAELI LAW OF RETURN WHERE I SHALL RETURN TO MY ANCESTRAL LANDS TO SIT UPON THE THRONE OF MY FOREFATHER KING DAVID, RETRIEVE THE ARK AND BUILD THE TEMPLE OF GOD AS PROPHECY FORETELLS. THE POWER, STRENGTH, ANOINTING AND SPIRIT OF THE MOST HIGH GOD WAS NEVER IN WHAT YOU RAT, STINKING DEVILS WITHIN THIS STATE AND NATION STOLE FROM ME. IT REMAINS IN WHAT DESPITE YOUR EVIL, LAWLESSNESS. KIDNAPPING AND LACK OF REVERENCE FOR THE ONE TRUE GOD THAT I STILL HAVE....THAT'S MY FAITH, MY TRUST AND LOVE OF GOD, DESPITE THE EVILS THAT YOU'VE DONE AND THE WORLD CAN THROW AT ME THAT I STILL POSSES. WE ARE DEALING WITH A FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT CHALLENGING CONVICTION AND THE APPELANT IS ARGUING LAW PURSUANT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, LAWS OF

THE UNITED STATES AND TREATIES RELATED THERETO. THUS, ANY ALLEGED FILING FEE WOULD BE WAIVED AND OR NOT APPLICABLE IN THIS CASE, ALLEGO, INC. v. SCULLY, 400 S.C. 33, 733 S.E.2d. 114 (S.C.App.2012); SANDERS v. SAVANNAH HIGHWAY AUTOMATIVE COMPANY,--S.E.2d.--, 2020 WL 6154305 (S.C.App.2020); NATIONSTAR MORTG., LLC. v. MEISNER, S.E.2d., 2016 WL 1700516(S.C.App.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 (W.D.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). THE APPELLANT IS LAWGIVER OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, THE FORERUNNER OF HIS CHRIST BY HIS ORIGANAL STATUS AS SUCH

PROTECTED BY THE LAWS OF TRUSTS, THE LAWS OF CONTRACT, COVENANT,
PROTECTED BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 10 AND THE
FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE. A MAN OF FAITH MUST STAND STRONG BEFORE HIS
GOD. THE BELIEVER CANNOT BE AFRAID IF PEOPLE DON'T OR CAN'T SEE
THE THINGS THAT HE SEES,....THE BELIEVER SHOULD ONLY BE AFRAID OR
CONCERNED IF HE NO LONGER SEES THIS GODLY TRUTH. THE SQUARE ROOT
OF IMPOSSIBLE?,....IS ME!!! GET THIS APPEAL PROCESS STARTED. I
HAVE COME TO RESTORE ALL THINGS AND FILL THE EARTH WITH JUSTICE
AND FAIRNESS THE SAME WAY IT HAD BEEN FILLED WITH TYRANNY AND
OPPRESSION, MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP, LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS
COM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719, 201 L.Ed.2d. 35(U.S.2018); McFAUL v.
RAMSEY, 61 U.S. (20 HOW) 523, 525, 15 L.Ed. 1010, 1011
(U.S.1858); U.S. v. SEEGER, 380 U.S. 163 (U.S.1965); U.S. 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); NEW HOPE
FAMILY SERVICES INC. v. POOLE, 966 F3d. 145(2nd.Cir.2020);
TELESCOPE MEDIA GROUP v. LUCERO, 936 F3d. 740 (8th.Cir.2019);
CHELSEY NELSON PHOTOGRAPHY LLC. v. LOUISIVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY
METRO GOVERNMENT,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2020 WL 4745771 (W.D.Ky.2020);
SCHWARE v. BOARD OF EXAM OF THE STATE OF N.M., 353 U.S. 232, 77
S.Ct. 753, 64 A.L.R.2d. 288, 1 L.Ed.2d. 796(U.S.1957); POINDEXTER
v. GREENHOW, 114 U.S. 270, 5 S.Ct. 903, 29 L.Ed. 185(U.S.1885);
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
SCHOOL TRUSTEES OF MADISON CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS,--F3d.--, 2017 WL
5988226 (7th.Cir.2017).

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE



DECEMBER 14, 2020

Exhibit

"REMOVAL"

=

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
THE COUNTY OF RICHLAND

) THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
) THE 5TH. JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
)

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

)
) CASE NO. 2006-CP-400-3567
) ET. AL.,
)

PLAINTIFF(S)

Vs.

) AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE
)
)

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ET. AL.,


DEFENDANTS

I, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR RECUSAL; PETITION TO REMOVE, ON THE CHIEF ADM. JUDGE OF RICHLAND COUNTY, ~~THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT, THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT~~ AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT WITH ATTACHMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON NOVEMBER 4, 2020. IT IS DEEMED FILED ON THAT DATE; HOUSTON v. LACK.

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

NOVEMBER 4, 2020



THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
THE COUNTY OF RICHLAND

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

PLAINTIFF(S)

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ET. AL.,

DEFENDANTS

THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
THE 5TH. JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO. 2006-CP-400-3567
ET. AL.,

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING
JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR
RECUSAL; PETITION TO REMOVE
AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567 ALSO RELATED TO CASES
9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC; 9:19-cv-1400-TWL-BM; 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM;
1:18-cv-13459-NLH ET. AL.,

TO: THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
THE SOUTH CAROLINA DISTRICT COURT,
THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT,
JUDGE NEWMAN,
THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE OF RICHLAND COUNTY ET.
AL.,

THE PLAINTIFF(S) RECEIVED NOTICE THAT A
VIDEO-CONFERENCING HEARING IS TO OCCUR ON NOVEMBER 12, 2020

RELATED TO CASE 2006-CP-400-3567. THE PLAINTIFF(S) MOTIONS FOR JUDGE, NEWMAN, JUDGE McLEOD AND ANY OTHER RICHLAND COUNTY JUDGE'S RECUSAL AND DISQUALIFICATION FROM OFF ANY CASE FILED BY THE PLAINTIFF(S) AND OBJECTS TO ANY HEARING OCCURRING BECAUSE YOUR JURISDICTION IS ALREADY VOID PLACING THE PARTIES IN FORFEITURE ON THE CAUSES AND DEFAULT FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THIS IS CHALLENGE TO THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT'S JURISDICTION. JUDGE NEWMAN YOU ARE A DEFENDANT IN CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC. SEE EXHIBIT, "NEW ACTION" WHICH IS COPY OF THE COMPLAINT THAT MAKES UP CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC. WHAT THE HECK ARE YOU DOING? MORE FRAUD AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION HUH? YOU ARE A DEFENDANT UNDER CASE 20-7073 PENDING WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT RELATED TO THESE MATTERS. YOU ARE A DEFENDANT UNDER CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM THAT IS THE SOURCE OF THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 20-7073 RELATED TO THESE MATTERS. YOU ARE A DEFENDANT UNDER CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NHL WHICH THE FINAL ORDERS ARE VOID IN THAT CASE DUE TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION DEMONSTRATING THAT TECHNICALLY THE CASE IS STILL PENDING, SEE EXHIBIT, "N.J. DISTRICT COURT FRAUD # 1" ATTACHED. YOU TRIED TO ADJUDICATE THESE MATTERS UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-0552 SPOILIATING THE FINAL ORDER IN THAT CASE THAT'S OVER 14 YEAR OLD IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING YOUR OATH OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTION IN EFFORTS TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS. I OBJECT AND MOTION FOR YOUR RECUSAL. YOU CANNOT SIT UPON YOUR OWN

~~CASES NOR COULD JUDGE McLEOD AND THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS RISES TO~~
AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL WHICH WOULD ESTABLISH CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT WOULD VOID YOUR JURISDICTION AB INITIO, 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); 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).


ADDITIONALLY, I GIVE THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE. CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567, 3569 AND 3569 ARE PETITIONED REMOVED TO THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT(S) UNDER CASES 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC; 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM AND 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND TO 1:18-cv-13459-NHL IN THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1407, 2679, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.. YOUR JURISDICTION IS DIVESTED TO CONDUCT ANY HEARING(S) RELATED TO THE PLAINTIFF(S), 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); BRADY 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). CANCEL THIS HEARING AND TAKE THIS CASE OFF OF YOUR DOCKET. I OBJECT TO YOU HEARING THESE MATTERS WHICH THE DEFENDANTS ARE IN FORFEITURE ON WHICH WILL BE DEMONSTRATED BY THE SUBSEQUENT DOCUMENT I WILL SOON FILE. IT IS DELAYED DUE TO COVIT-19 ISSUES AND MY OTHER OBLIGATIONS BEFORE THE VARIOUS COURTS. THE FILING IS FORTHCOMING. THIS IS JUDICIAL NOTICE TOWARDS THAT END ALSO.

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

NOVEMBER 3, 2020

4 of 4



Exhibit

"void ab initio"

≡

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
THE COUNTY OF RICHLAND

) IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
) IN THE 5TH. JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
)

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T.
TISHBITE

) CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 ET. AL.,
)
)

PLAINTIF(S)

Vs.

) AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE
)
)
)

THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL;
THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA;
THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS
ET. AL.,

RECEIVED

DEC 17 2020

SC Court of Appeals


DEFENDANT(S)

I, JONAH THE TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT I HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL; MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, JUDGE NEWMAN AND THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT, THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTION, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON DECEMBER 14, 2020.

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

DECEMBER 14, 2020



LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD aka
JONAH GABRIEL TAHYAH T. TISHBITZ
#300839 P2A. RM 2138

RECEIVED

DEC 17 2020

SC Court of Appeals

LET C/I 990 Wisconsin Hwy
Bishopville, SC 29010

IN RE CASES 2006-CP-400-3567,
3568, 3569 et al. seeking appeal

to: THE SC COURT OF APPEALS,

JUDGE NEWMAN,

THE RICHLAND COURT OF

COMMON PLEAS,


THE SC DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,

THE SC ATTORNEY GENERAL

et al.,

The attached documents are to give all parties judicial notice that I am seeking leave to appeal the recent order filed by Judge Newman placing an order of continuance in the Richmond court cases involved.

Respectfully,
Jonah The Fishbiter



DECEMBER 14, 2020

The SC Court of
Appeals
1320 State Street
Columbia, SC 29201

RECEIVED
DEC 17 2020
SC Court of Appeals

Matthew L Crawford
#300039 RA Rm 2138
Use CI 990 Weekly Hwy
Bishopville, SC 29010

00037366 DEC 15 2020
\$002.60
U.S. POSTAGE
METRO

