

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

MAY 26 2021

SC Court of Appeals

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2020-000974

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
CASE NUMBER 2020-001667

APPEALED FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

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

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE

APPELLANT/PETITIONER

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,


RESPONDENT

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

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 AND OR PETITION TO SUPPLEMENT THE INITIALLY FILED MOTION AND OR PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION; MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE PREVIOUSLY FILED AFFIDAVIT OF NON FRIVOLOUS FILING; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION; MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL, THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID, BY PLACING IT AND ITS ATTACHMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON MAY 24, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jonah The Tishbite", with a stylized flourish at the end.

MAY 24, 2021

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2020-000974

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
CASE NUMBER 2020-001667

APPEALED FROM RICHLAND COUNTY
THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

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

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE

APPELLANT/PETITIONER

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION AND
OR PETITION TO SUPPLEMENT THE INITIALLY FILED MOTION
AND OR PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S
ORIGINAL JURISDICTION; MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE
PREVIOUSLY FILED AFFIDAVIT OF NON FRIVOLOUS FILING;

RECEIVED

MAY 26 2021

SC Court of Appeals

MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION; MOTION FOR DECLARATORY
JUDGMENT AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: TO CASE 2020-001667, 2020-00974 AND ALL OTHER RELATED
MATTERS.

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

HERE THE COURTS AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "001667 # 1". THIS IS A COPY OF THE
"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", (10)
PAGES DATED DECEMBER 14, 2020 THAT INITIATED THE APPEAL UNDER
CASE 2020-001667 IN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

(2) EXHIBIT, "001667 # 2". THIS IS A COPY OF THE
AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE: MOTION TO FILE IN
FORMA PAUPERIS; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO ALLOW (6)
MONTH FINANCIAL STATEMENT TO ARRIVE; MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUBMIT
ATTACHED ORDER OF CONTINUANCE AS A FINAL ORDER; MOTION FOR A
RE-SET TO BE GIVEN TO CORRECT ANY DEFICIENCIES ONCE THE COURT OF
APPEALS RULE ON HIS PLEADING AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (10)
PAGES DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2021 THAT WAS FILED IN CASE 2020-001667
IN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

(3) EXHIBIT, "001667 # 3". THIS IS A COPY OF THE

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR A REHEARING; MOTION TO STAY AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (5) PAGES DATED MARCH 24, 2021 THAT WAS FILED UNDER CASE 2020-001667 IN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

(4) EXHIBIT, "001667 # 4". THIS IS A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE MOTION FOR REHEARING AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (8) HANDWRITTEN PAGES DATED APRIL 23, 2021 THAT WAS FILED IN CASE 2020-001667 IN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

(5&6) EXHIBIT(S), "FRAUD ORDER" AND "FRAUD ORDER # 2". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ENVELOPE THE ORDER CAME IN AND THE ORDER DENYING THE REHEARING FILED UNDER CASE 2020-001667 IN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS. THE APPELLANT IS SEEKING TO APPEAL THIS ORDER BY SUPPLEMENTING IT TO THIS CASE DUE TO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION BEING INVOKED WAY BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS EVER RULED WHICH USURPS THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION POWER. THE APPELLANT RECEIVED THE ORDER ON MAY 21, 2021. HE HAS (10) DAYS TO SEEK TO APPEAL IT MAKING THIS FILING TIMELY PLACED IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON MAY 24, 2021.

(7) EXHIBIT, "RAGE # 1". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AMENDED COMPLAINT THAT CONSTITUTE CASE 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568 AND 3569. THE PREVIOUS ATTACHMENTS EXPLAIN HOW THE CASE NUMBER CHANGED FROM CASE 2006-CP-400-0552 TO CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 ET. AL.. PLEASE NOTE THAT MANY OF THE ISSUES ARGUED WITHIN CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 ET. AL., ARE IDENTICAL TO THE LEGAL ISSUES OF CONTROVERSY UNDER CASE 2020-0001615, 2021-00309, 2021-000508, 2020-000974 AS WELL AS OTHER PCR CASES POTENTIALLY BEING PROCESSED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AS WE SPEAK. THIS DEMONSTRATES THAT THE LEGAL ISSUES OF CONCERN WERE ALREADY UNDER THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WELL BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS RULED UNDER CASE 2020-001667 IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND FRAUD MISINTERPRETING STATE AND FEDERAL LAW. THIS INCLUDES THE SUPPRESSION OF THE DNA PRODUCING THE SUPPRESSION OF EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND THE SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE, FILE NO.

55010014 IN VIOLATION OF WEARRY v. CAIN 2016 OUT OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PRESENTLY BEING ARGUED UNDER CASE 2020-00974.

(8) 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 FILED IN THE BENJAMIN CASE PCR PROCEEDING THAT IS THE SOURCE OF THE INVOKING OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER CASE 2021-000508. THIS IS THE SAME THING AND LEGAL ISSUE OF CONTROVERSY THAT OCCURRED IN THE APPELLANT'S CASE UNDER 2006-CP-400-3567 WHICH WAS TIMELY AND PROPERLY ASSERTED BY THE APPELLANT THE MOMENT JUDGE NEWMAN CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW SOUGHT TO FILE THE ORDER OF CONTINUANCE IN HIS CASE. THIS ESTABLISHES THE APPELLANT'S RIGHT TO INVOKE TORRENCE REVIEW.

(9) EXHIBIT, "CASE NO. 2020-001615". THIS IS A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS AS TO WHY THE CONDITIONAL ORDER SHOULD NOT BECOME FINAL IN CASE 2019-CP-08-1992; RENEWING THE PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION; RENEWING THE NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL THE CONDITIONAL ORDER SEEKING REVIEW UNDER TORRENCE v. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE BERKELEY COMMON PLEAS COURT'S JURISDICTION DUE TO CONTINUED ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (28) PAGES DATED MAY 16, 2021. THIS DOCUMENT IS PRESENTLY BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2020-001615. THE SAME EXACT ISSUE INVOLVING RON SANTA McCRAY OCCURRED IN THE APPELLANT'S CASE UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567. EVEN THOUGH ONE ORDER WAS A CONDITIONAL ORDER AND THE OTHER AN ORDER OF CONTINUANCE. THE ISSUE OF CONTROVERSY IS IDENTICAL. DOES THE FILING OF THESE SEEMINGLY ON THEIR FACE NON FINAL ORDERS CONSTITUTE FINAL ORDERS DUE TO THE ALLEGATIONS OF DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION THAT WAS TIMELY ASSERTED VIA THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES ARGUED WITHIN THESE CASES?

THE COURT UNDER WHEELER v. UNITED STATES ADJUDICATED THAT THERE ARE TWO TYPES OF PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES, JURISDICTIONAL AND NON JURISDICTIONAL. THE ONES WE RELY UPON ARE JURISDICTIONAL. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ADJUDICATED UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) THAT WHETHER THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE IS JURISDICTIONAL OR NOT, THAT IF THE PARTY TIMELY ASSERTS THEM AS ALL OF US DID, THE RULE BECOMES MANDATORY ESTABLISHING THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION AS WELL AS FORFEITURE ON ALL CLAIMS MADE OR IT WOULD PRODUCE A VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. THE FEDERAL CASES INVOLVED FEDERAL PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES, BUT THE FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPT AND PRINCIPLES OF LAW ARE THE SAME AT THE STATE LEVEL. THUS, THE APPELLANT HAS ESTABLISHED HIS RIGHT TO SUPPLEMENT THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE 2020-000974 AND DEMONSTRATED THAT THE CLAIMS ARE NOT MERITLESS OR FRIVOLOUS.

INSOMUCH, THE APPELLANT MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT HIS PREVIOUSLY FILED AFFIDAVIT OF NO FRIVOLOUS FILING WITH THE FOLLOWING. THE APPELLANT DO DECLARE UNDER OATH THAT THESE ADDITIONAL ISSUES AND CLAIMS SOUGHT FILED ARE NOT FRIVOLOUS ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE STATE AND DEFENDANTS DEFAULTED ON THEM AND REVIEW IS SOUGHT PURSUANT TO TORRENCE v. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,--S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL 1114310 (S.C.2021); JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED AND OR FORFEITED AND CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME AND ANY STAGE PURSUANT TO STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1988); FIRST CITIZEN BANK AND TRUST COMPANY, INC. v. TAYLOR, 431 S.C. 149, 847 S.E.2d. 249(S.C.App.2020); PYNE v. UNITED STATES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 1377402 (D.C.Md.2016); HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+ U.S.; MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016); WEARRY v. CAIN 2016 RELATED TO THE SUPPRESSING OF EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE AND FORTBEND TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019). THUS, ANY CLAIM OF FRIVOLOUS FILING WOULD BE WITHOUT MERIT AND AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION AS WELL

AS AN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS INVOLVED DUE TO MATTERS CHALLENGING ONE'S CONVICTION ARE HISTORICALLY NON FRIVOLOUS ISSUES.


THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO SUPPLEMENT THE PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION BECAUSE THESE MATTERS WERE ALREADY BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT BEFORE THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS MADE THIS FRAUDULENT RULING MISINTERPRETING STATE AND FEDERAL LAW REQUIRING REVIEW WHERE THE MATTER RELATED TO THE FILING OF THE DNA APPLICATION IN KERSHAW COUNTY IS BEFORE THIS COURT AND BY THE FRAUD THE CLAIMS ARE NOT MOOT AS IS ARGUED IN THE McCRAY (28) PAGE DOCUMENT. EVEN UNDER RULES OF EVIDENCE SUCH SUPPLEMENT MUST BE PERMITTED WHERE THE FILING SUBSTANTIALLY PROVES THE APPELLANT'S ALLEGATIONS UNDER CASE 2020-000974 THAT THE APPELLANT SOUGHT THE TESTING OF THAT DNA OFFICIALLY ON THE RECORD SINCE 2006 AND WAS DENIED THIS EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE FOR OVER (15) YEARS ALSO VIOLATING U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723 (U.S.2016) AND THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

THE APPELANT MOTIONS AND OR PETITIONS FOR AN INJUNCTION AGAINST THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS REQUIRING THEY VACATE THE FINAL ORDER UNDER CASE 2020-001667 AND FOR THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN THE DNA SAMPLES TAKEN FROM THE APPELLANT'S CHILD AND TEST THEM TO MICHAEL LEE THE APPELLANT'S STEPSON AND FOR THEM TO PRODUCE THAT SUPPRESSED EVIDENCE IN THE FORM OF THE SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE. THE APPELLANT'S CONVICTION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID HAVING THESE MATTERS PENDING BEFORE THE COURT SINCE BEFORE 2006.

INSOMUCH, ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES AND RELIEF SOUGHT WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS ARE NOW SOUGHT UNDER CASE 2020-00974. ALL OF THESE CASES AND MATTERS ARE INTERLINKED. THE APPELLANT MOVES TO HAVE ALL OF THESE CASES PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CONSOLIDATED AND SEEK THAT REVIEW BE CONDUCTED IMMEDIATELY, AS

WELL AS SEEK LEAVE TO APPEAL THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS FINAL ORDER IN CASE 2020-001667. DUE TO THE DEFAULT, THE FACTS THAT THESE CASES EXIST ACROSS MULTIPLE COUNTIES WITHIN THIS STATE AND THE PARTIES PROPERLY SOUGHT TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION VIA WE ARGUING AGAINST THE TWO PRECEDENT SETTING CASES IN QUESTION. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IS THE PROPER VENUE TO HEAR ALL MATTERS RELATED TO THESE CASE WHERE EVEN CLAIMS OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AND OR RES JUDICATA BY ISSUE PRECLUSION PURSUANT TO THE GENTRY CASE IS INVOKED AS WELL. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT HAS JURISDICTION TO HEAR ALL MERITS OF THE CASES INVOLVED. THE APPELLANT MOTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT, JOSEPH v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPT. OF LABOR, LICENSING AND REGULATION, 417 S.C. 436, 790 S.E.2d. 763(S.C.2016); BRADLEY v. HULLANDER, 266 S.C. 188, 222 S.E.2d. 283 (S.C.App.1976); HEMINGWAY EX REL ESTATE OF DAVIS v. MARION COUNTY, S.E.2d., 2013 WL 8538725 (S.C.App.2013); ADAMS v. McMASTER, 432 S.C. 225, 851 S.E.2d. 703 (S.C.App.2020).

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonah The Tishbite', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

MAY 23, 2021

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE
#300839 F2B. RM. 1260
LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.
BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010

IN RE: TO APPEALING THE FINAL ORDER FROM CASE 2020-001667 VIA
SUPPLEMENT INVOKING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL
JURISDICTION UNDER CASE 2020-000974.

RECEIVED
MAY 26 2021
SC Court of Appeals

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

ATTACHED IS A FILING SUBMITTED TO APPEAL THE FINAL
ORDER ISSUED IN CASE 2020-001667 SEEKING TO SUPPLEMENT INVOKING
THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION DUE TO THE MATTERS
ALREADY BEING BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT UNDER CASE 2020-000974 AND
OTHER RELATED CASES. IF THIS IS THE COURT OF APPEALS. FILE A COPY
IN CASE 2020-001667. IF THIS IS THE SUPREME COURT. PLEASE FILE
THESE DOCUMENTS UNDER CASE 2020-000974. SUPREME COURT YOU HAVE
TWO COPIES OF THE (9) PAGE LEAD DOCUMENT. PLEASE CLOCK STAMP THE
SECOND COPY AND RETURN THAT CLOCKED STAMPED COPY TO ME IF YOU
WOULD BE SO KIND. I THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

MAY 24, 2021

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD

#300839 F3B RM 1260

LEE C I 990 WISKEY HWY

Bishopville SC 29010

RECEIVED

MAY 27 2007

SC Court of Appeals

SC COURT OF APPEALS
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SC 29201