

The State of South Carolina  
In The Court of Appeals

Appellate Case No. 2020-001667

Appeal from Richland County  
The Court of Common Pleas

Case(s) No. 2006-CR-400-3567 et al.

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD aka Jonah  
GABRIEL JAH JAH T. TISHBITZ,

vs.  
4 of 20

Appellate  
**RECEIVED**  
APR 05 2021  
SC Court of Appeals

The State of South Carolina et al,

Respondents

Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial  
Notice; motions to supplement

The motions for rehearing; motions  
to withdraw the motions to stay  
due to fraud upon the court,

criminal conspiracy and obstruction  
of justice and motions to motions

therefor

IN RE CASES 2020 - 001667;

2006-CP-400-3567, 3568 AND 3569

For The SC Court of Appeals,  
The SC Attorney General,  
The SC Dept. of Corrections  
et al.,

The Appellant in the above captioned matter gives the court and all parties judicial notice. The Appellant motions to supplement his previously filed motions for rehearing dated March 24, 2021 and motions to withdraw his filed motion to stay the case due to egregious acts of fraud upon the court, criminal conspiracy and  
6 of 20

obstruction of justice on the part  
of the SC COURT of APPEALS con-  
spiring UNDER color of state law  
with the SC ATTORNEY GENERAL  
and the SC DEPT of CORRECTIONS in  
this case requiring sanctions and  
forfeiture, again, on all causes  
which the appellant motions for  
and seeks before this court and  
all parties involved.

The appellant in his motion  
to stay informed the court that  
the SC SUPREME COURT was in the  
process of hearing the same  
exact identical issue UNDER

CASE 2020-001615, the Ron-Santa  
McCRAY CASE. But what the  
Appellant did not know at the  
time he filed his previous motion,  
which the SC Court of Appeals was  
fully aware of, was that the issue  
was already essentially adjudi-  
cated in the Appellant's favor  
under the JORRENCE CASE. So in  
egregious acts of fraud, obstruction  
and criminal conspiracy. The SC  
Court of Appeals dismissed the  
Appellant's appeal to prevent the  
JORRENCE RULING from having a

direct impact on the appellants' appeal which proved the appellant was correct when he asserted that the order of continuance though on its face appears not to be a final order. Due to the circumstances, the default and voiding of jurisdiction for unconstitutional action and violation of the separation of powers clause. The order of continuance must be deemed final for purposes of appeal, Kosciusko v. Parham, 428 SC 481, 836 S.E.2d 362 (SC App. 2019); First Citizen Bank and Trust Company, Inc. v. Taylor, 431 SC 149, 847 S.E.2d

249 (SC App. 2020); Asterbadi v. Lettess, 176 Fed Appx' 426 CA4 (la 2006); Plyme v United States, F. Supp3d, 2016 WL 1377402 (DC Md 2016); United States v. Conrad, 675 Fed Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C. 2017); Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Environment, 523 US 83, 118 Sct 1003 (US 1998); Chase v Endeavor Logistics, L.P., 2019 WL 5847879, \* 2 W.D. Tex.; Henderson Ex Rel Henderson v. Shipset, 131 Sct 1197, 1198 + US.; Walls v Boeing Company, 2019 WL 4931365 \* 2 D. Sc.; Montgomery v Louisiana, 136 Sct 718, 193 LEd2d 599, 84 USLW.

4063 (US 2016); 24 SENATORIAL DIST.  
REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v ALCORP, 820 F.3d  
624 (4th Cir. 2016).

Inasmuch, due to the voiding  
of jurisdiction, there is nothing  
left for the court to do, thus, making  
any order placed in all (3) cases  
in question a final order for the  
purposes of appeal. A final judgment  
disposes of the whole subject matter  
of the action or terminates the  
particular proceeding or action as  
the order of continuance did  
in this case being filed in clear  
violation of the separation of

POWER CLAUSE, LEAVING NOTHING TO  
do but to ENFORCE by EXECUTION  
WHAT HAS BEEN DETERMINED BY  
THE default and voiding of the  
(3) COURTS subjudice JURISDICTION. BY  
such ALL ORDERS WITHIN ALL (3) CASES  
BECOME FINAL FOR THE PURPOSES OF  
APPEAL, Good v Hartford Accident  
& Indemnity Co., 201 SC 32, 21-522  
209 (SC 1942); Charlotte-Mecklenburg  
Hosp. Authority v. South Carolina  
Dept. of Health and Environmental  
Control, 387 SC 265, 692-522 894  
(MEM) (SC App 2010). THE ORDERS ARE VOID.

— SINCE NO ORDERS RELATED TO  
THE (3) CASES IN QUESTION PROCEEDINGS  
12 of 20

CAN BE PHASED IN THE (3) CASES, NOR  
CAN THOSE PROCEEDINGS MOVE ANY  
FURTHER WHERE THE DEFAULT MUST  
BE GIVEN FULL FAITH AND CREDIT WITH  
IN THE COURT RECORD, ESPECIALLY  
IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE  
BETTERMAN CASE OUT OF THE US  
SUPREME COURT REPEALS THE CASES  
UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID DUE TO THE  
CASES BEING LEFT PENDING FOR OVER  
15 YEARS. THE PLAINTIFFS DUE PROCESS  
CLAIMS CANNOT BE DENIED, JORRENCE  
V. SC DEPT OF CORRECTIONS, -- SEED --, 2021  
WL 114310 (SC 2021); BETTERMAN V.  
MONTANA, 136 S Ct 1609, 194 L Ed 2d  
723 (US 2016).

CHARLOTT-MECKLENBURG cited to the case of Adickes v Allisap & Bratton, 21 Sct at 245. The court's decision in Adickes in 1884 did not, of course, concern an Administrative Appeal, and the cases in question are not Administrative Appeals. Yet it is instructive today in distinguishing between a final judgment and one that is interlocutory. In Adickes, the court found a judgment was final although "there was some further act to be done" 21 Sct at 259. The court noted "nothing was lacking but a calculation of the interest, similar in

THESE CASES, WHERE ALL THAT IS  
LEFT IS AN ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE  
DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION,  
A CALCULATION OF THE COMPOUNDED  
MONETARY DAMAGE, WHICH IN TRUTH  
SHOULD NOT BE CALCULATED WHERE IT  
COMES TO 3.2 BILLION COMPOUNDED BY  
EACH SUBSEQUENT ACT OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL  
CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE  
OCCURRING OVER A (15) YEAR PERIOD,  
WHICH MAY BE NECESSARY; BUT IF SO,  
BEING A MERE CLERICAL MATTER, WITH  
ITS INJUNCTIVE RELIEF BEING DEFERRED  
TO THE OFFICER OF THE COURT, WHOSE  
DUTY IT IS TO ENTER THE FORMAL  
DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

And parties involved "ID, And as to the argument that the judgment is not final by the SC Court of Appeals, the objection or ruling goes to form rather than the substance" ID. This includes legal name change and title reclamation.

Adickes provides an example of a final judgment that nonetheless requires an additional "Act to be done". In the cases before us in both the SC Supreme Court and the SC Court of Appeals based upon all related cases sub judice, the Act to be done is to acknowledge the default

Against both the state of South  
Carolina, (The SC Attorney General)  
and the SC Dept. of Corrections,  
Especially in light of the egregious  
acts of fraud upon the court,  
establish they are responsible  
for all court cost in the form  
of the deficit on my Cooper  
Trust Fund, make any needed  
copies making me exempt from  
their present policy, dismiss  
the conviction, give me that  
SLED file and DNA testing  
to Michael Lee, ensure my  
law library access until release,  
17 of 20

don't touch my hair, keep me  
in a one man cell until my  
RELEASE and calculate and or  
acknowledge the 3.2 billion in  
money damages which compounded  
due to their continuous lawlessness  
which are ministerial and or  
clerical due to the default and  
voiding of jurisdiction via the  
unconstitutional actions done.  
Thus, the rights of the parties  
are final, Charlotte-Mecklenburg  
387 SC at 267, 692 S2d at 894;  
JORRENCIE v South Carolina Dept of

18 of 20

CORRECTIONS, -- SEED. --, 2021 WL  
114310 (SC App. 2021).

Without jurisdiction, the  
COURT CANNOT PROCEED AT ALL IN  
ANY CAUSE; JURISDICTION IS THE  
POWER TO DECLARE LAW, AND WHEN  
IT CEASES TO EXIST, THE ONLY FUNCTION  
REMAINING TO THE COURT IS THAT OF  
ANNOUNCING THIS FACT, ESTABLISHING  
AFOREMENTIONED RELIEF SOUGHT IN  
THIS CASE, ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE  
ORDER OF CONTINUANCE MUST BE CON-  
SIDERED AS A FINAL ORDER AND  
DISMISS THE CAUSE AGAINST THE  
APPELLANT RELATED TO THE CONVICTIONS,

19 of 20

ARBOROUGH v Y & H CORP., 546 US 500,  
126 S Ct 1235 (US 2006); STEWART E.  
HECKER, plaintiff v. THE STATE OF  
WASHINGTON, defendant, 2020 WL  
134168 (Fed Cl. 2020); SORRING WIND  
ENERGY, LLC v CATHIC USA CORPORATION,  
- 3d, -, 5th. Cir (Tex.); 460 S LAKE  
AVENUE, Ltd. v Appleton, 2019 WL  
7184737, \* CD CAL.; SLAYTON v JOHNSON  
AND JOHNSON, 2019 WL 720844, \* 1  
CD CAL.

Respectfully,  
Jonah The Fishbiter



April 2, 2021

The State of South Carolina  
In The Court of Appeals

Appellate Case No. 2020-001667

Appeal from Richland County  
The Court of Common Pleas

CASE(S) No. 2006-CP-400-3567 et al.

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD AKA TOPAH  
GABRIEL TAHJAH T. TISHBITE

Appellant

vs.

1 of 20

**RECEIVED**

APR 05 2021

SC Court of Appeals

The State of South Carolina et al.,  
Respondent

Affidavit of Service

I, Jonathan Jishbite, do hereby  
certify, that I have mailed and  
OR SERVED A COPY of an Affidavit  
of Facts giving judicial notice;  
motion to supplement the motion  
for rehearing; motion to withdraw  
the motion to stay due to fraud  
upon the court, criminal con-  
spiracy and obstruction of justice

And motion to motion therefor,  
on the SC COURT of Appeals, the  
SC ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE SC  
DEPT of CORRECTIONS AND all involved  
PARTIES by US MAIL postage prepaid  
by depositing it in the institution  
mailbox on April 2, 2021.

Respectfully,  
Jonah The Fishbiter

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonah The Fishbiter', with a circular mark above the 'i' in 'fishbiter'.

April 2, 2021

RECEIVED

APR 05 2021

SC Court of Appeals

File in case

2020-001667

PLEASE

RETURN <sup>2</sup> TO ME THE  
ADDITIONAL COPY CHECKED  
STAMPED.

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD

# 300839 F2B Rm 1260

LEE CI 990 Wisacky Hwy

Bishopville, SC 29010

RECEIVED  
APR 05 2011  
SC Court of Appeals

SC COURT of APPEALS

P.O. Box 11629

Columbia SC 29211