

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2020-000974

APPEAL FROM S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
CASE NO. 2020-001667

APPEAL 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(S)

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 TO SUPPLEMENT AND MOTION TO CHALLENGE ANY CLAIM OF MOOTNESS; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER; MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE RELATED THERETO; MOTION FOR A P.R. BOND AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND ALL INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON JUNE 9, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lawrence L. Crawford". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, circular flourish at the end. There are some additional scribbles and lines below the main signature.

JUNE 8, 2021

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2020-000974

APPEAL FROM S.C. COURT OF APPEALS
CASE NO. 2020-001667

APPEAL 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(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO
SUPPLEMENT AND MOTION TO CHALLENGE ANY CLAIM OF
MOOTNESS; MOTION FOR AN INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE

ORDER DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER; MOTION TO
ADVANCE THE CAUSE RELATED THERETO; MOTION FOR A P.R.
BOND AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CRAWFORD AND THE OTHER APPELLANTS INVOKING THE S.C.
SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION. FOR THE RECORD. THIS IS A
TYPED VERSION OF THE EXACT HANDWRITTEN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS DATED
JUNE 8, 2021 THAT WAS PREVIOUSLY FILED WITHIN THIS CASE.

TO: THE S.C. SUPREME COURT,
THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS,
THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,
THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE LETTER DATED MAY 26, 2021 FROM THE
S.C. SUPREME COURT SENT TO THE KERSHAW COUNTY CLERK TO INQUIRE
ABOUT THE APPELLANT/PETITIONER BEING BLOCKED FILING PLEADING
BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY CLERK SINCE THE TIME OF HIS CONVICTION.

(2) A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL
NOTICE; 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,
(9) PAGES DATED MAY 24, 2021. THIS DOCUMENT WAS ALREADY SERVED ON
THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, BUT ATTACHED IS AN ADDITIONAL COPY IN AN
ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION.

(3) EXHIBIT, "THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER # 1". THIS IS

A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE WITHDRAWAL OF A PARTY; MOTION AND OR PETITION TO FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE INFORMAL BRIEF OR FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT PLEADING AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, (14) PAGES DATED MAY 20, 2021 THAT IS FILED IN CASE 21-1330 IN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT.

(4) EXHIBIT, "THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER # 2". THIS IS THE [12] PAGE S.C.D.C. DOCUMENT DATED MAY 4, 2021. BY THIS DOCUMENTS AND THE APPELLANT EXPOSING THE ACTIONS OF MS. McCRAE IN THE EDUCATION BUILDING, THE APPELLANT'S LIFE HAS BEEN PLACED IN MORTAL DANGER WHICH IS COMPOUNDED BY THE MATTERS ARGUED IN EXHIBIT, "THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER # 1". IT IS BASED UPON WHAT IS ALLEGED THAT THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE, MOTIONS FOR AN INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER AND IT BE REQUIRED THAT THE APPELLANT BE IMMEDIATELY REMOVED TO THE COUNTY JAIL WITH ALL OF HIS PROPERTY WITHOUT EXCEPTION, NONE BE SEIZED OR CONFISCATED IN RETALIATION, WITH ALL HIS LEGAL BOXES, WITH THE LEGAL BOXES AND PROPERTY HE CHOOSES REMAINING IN HIS IMMEDIATE POSSESSION UNTIL FINAL PROCESSING OUT THE SYSTEM. IT IS ALSO BY THESE DOCUMENTS AND THAT WHICH IS TO BE ARGUED THAT THE APPELLANT SEEKS A P.R. BOND TO ALSO BE IMMEDIATELY GIVEN SINCE HE IS NO FLIGHT RISK WHERE THERE IS AN ACTUAL INNOCENCE CLAIM BEING ARGUED, AND THE STATE ALREADY DEFAULTED ON THE CONVICTION UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569 WHICH IS ALSO BEFORE THIS COURT EMERGING FROM CASE 2020-001667 OUT OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS.

(5) EXHIBIT, "YAHADINA". THIS IS A COPY OF THE FORENSIC D.N.A. APPLICATION NOW FILED WITHIN THE KERSHAW COUNTY GENERAL SESSIONS COURT. BY THIS EVIDENCE PRESENTED. IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT THE APPELLANT WAS INDEED BLOCKED FROM THE COURT IN FILING AND OR SEEKING THAT D.N.A. WHICH IS SUPPORTED BY CASE 2020-001667 NOW SOUGHT SUPPLEMENTED UNDER CASE 2020-000974 WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THE APPELLANT COULD NOT FILE THE PLEADING. THE APPELLANT'S SISTER WAS FORCED TO FILE IT ON APRIL 15, 2021. THE

KERSHAW COUNTY COURT ALREADY HAS A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN A RECENT RULING UNDER BARNES v. STATE, --S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL 2306725 (S.C.App.2021), HAS TAKEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO REMIND THE CLERKS OF THEIR MINISTERIAL DUTY TO DOCKET FILINGS IRRESPECTIVE OF POTENTIAL FLAWS THAT MAY EXIST, MILLER v. STATE, 377 S.C. 99, 102, 659 S.E.2d. 492, 493 (2008)(IT IS NOT WITHIN THE CLERK OF COURT'S AUTHORITY TO REFUSE TO PERFORM HER DUTY BASED ON HER OPINION THAT A FILING LACKS LEGAL MERIT OR IS UNTIMELY."). THIS DUTY IS NOT DISCRETIONARY. SEE 21 C.J.S. COURTS § 335(2021). UNLESS SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED BY STATUTE OR A COURT RULE, A CLERK OF COURT MAY NOT EXERCISE ANY JUDICIAL POWER RESERVED FOR A JUDGE. ID ("THE CLERK CANNOT WITHOUT EXPRESSED CONSTITUTIONAL OR STATUTORY AUTHORITY, EXERCISE ANY JUDICIAL FUNCTION."). THIS INCLUDES THE PROHIBITION OF PERFORMING ANY ACTION CONTINGENT TO DECIDING QUESTIONS OF LAW" ID ("IT FOLLOWS THAT A CLERK OF COURT CANNOT ORDINARILY DETERMINE QUESTIONS OF LAW."). ACCORDINGLY, A CLERK OF COURT DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO REJECT A FILING BASED ON OSTENSIBLE OR PRECEIVED FAILURES, INCLUDING WHETHER THE DOCUMENT IS CONTAINED ON THE PROPER FORM. BECAUSE THE CLERK'S ROLE IS MINISTERIAL IN THIS RESPECT, THE CLERK SHALL NOT BE "CONCERNED WITH THE MERIT OF A PAPERS OR WITH THEIR EFFECT AND INTERPRETATION...." ID § 337. STATED DIFFERENTLY, "[A] CLERK OF COURT MAY NOT REJECT A PLEADING FOR LACK OF CONFORMITY WITH REQUIREMENTS OF FORM; ONLY A JUDGMENT MAY DO THAT, HOOKE v. SIVLEY, 187 F3d. 680, 682 (5th.Cir.1999); ALSO SEE GOROD v. TABACHNICK, 428 Mass. 1001, 696 N.E.2d. 547, 548 (1998). IN ABSENCE OF AN ORDER FROM A JUDGE CLERKS MAY NOT REFUSE TO ACCEPT FILINGS. THE CLERK SHALL ACCEPT THE FILING, THEREBY PERMITTING THE COURT TO DECIDE ANY ISSUES THE PARTY MAY HAVE WITH IT. BY THE RESPONSE GIVEN BY THE KERSHAW CLERK OF COURT SENT TO THE APPELLANT VIA THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THE KERSHAW CLERK PRODUCED NO ORDER FROM ANY JUDGE DEMONSTRATING WHY THE APPELLANT WAS BLOCKED FROM FILING FOR OVER (15) YEARS AND THE KERSHAW COUNTY SOLICITOR'S OFFICE WAS INVOLVED HERE IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION AND FRAUD CORRUPTING THE CONVICTION ITSELF.

INSOMUCH, WHAT PROMPTED THE APPELLANT TO FILE THIS PLEADING WAS THE LETTER ISSUED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DATED MARCH 26, 2021 WHERE THE ONLY CONCERN OR INQUIRY THAT WAS SEEMINGLY SOUGHT BY THE LETTER WAS WHETHER OR NOT THE APPELLANT WAS DENIED OPPORTUNITY TO FILE HIS D.N.A. APPLICATION WHICH BY THE ATTACHMENTS IT IS OBVIOUS THAT THIS WAS THE CASE. NONETHELESS, THIS WAS NOT THE ONLY ISSUE. THE APPELLANT WAS CONCERNED THAT BASED UPON THE WAY THE LETTER WAS FRAMED IT COULD POTENTIALLY OPEN THE DOOR FOR AN INAPPROPRIATE RULING OF MOOTNESS ONCE THE COURT DISCOVERED THAT THE D.N.A. APPLICATION IS NOW FILED. THEREFORE, IT IS REQUIRED THAT I OFFICIALLY OBJECT TO ANY CLAIM OF MOOTNESS BASED UPON THE FOLLOWING FACTS.

ONE, THE COURT REQUIRED THAT MY FAMILY FILE THE INITIAL PLEADING AND WOULD NOT ALLOW ME TO FILE IT INDEPENDENTLY OF MY FAMILY'S INVOLVEMENT AND THE APPELLANT WOULD SEEK TO INVOKE JURISDICTION ON OTHER JURISDICTIONAL MATTERS IF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WAS NOT INVOKED AND THE APPELLANT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO A REPETITIVE VIOLATION OF HIS SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY TO PROCEED ALONE.

NEXT, THE APPELLANT'S SISTER LIVES IN CHICAGO. THERE IS NO TELLING WHAT RESTRICTION WOULD BE REESTABLISHED AGAINST THE APPELLANT ONCE SHE WITHDRAWS WHICH IS HER INTENT.

NEXT, THE ISSUE CLEARLY ARGUED IN THE INITIAL FILING MAKING UP THIS CASE DID NOT ARGUE JUST THE BLOCKING OF THE FILING OF A D.N.A. APPLICATION. IT WAS FILED ARGUING ALSO THE BLOCKING OF POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPLICATION SINCE 2006. THUS, THIS QUESTION AND ISSUE IS ATTACHED TO CLAIM THAT THE CONVICTION IS NOW VOID DUE TO THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY PRODUCING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VOIDING THE CONVICTION AND THE COURT'S JURISDICTION WHICH IS TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION.

NEXT, THERE IS THE REVIEW SOUGHT PURSUANT TO TORRENCE v. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS 2021 BY WAY OF THE DEFAULT BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE ARGUED UNDER CASE 2020-001667 APPEALED TO THIS COURT INVOKING THIS COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION AS WELL AS UNDER CASE(S) 2020-0001615; 2021-000309; 2021-000508; 2021-000592 AND OTHER PENDING CASES SOUGHT CONSOLIDATION AND OR JOINT AND OR COLLECTIVE REVIEW.

NEXT, THERE IS THE ISSUE OF THE DEFAULT AND MONETARY RELIEF THE APPELLANT WOULD BE ENTITLED TO PRODUCE FROM CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568 AND 3569.

NEXT, THERE IS THE ISSUE OF THE INJUNCTION AND OR PROTECTIVE ORDER TO HAVE THE APPELLANT IMMEDIATELY MOVE TO THE KERSHAW COUNTY JAIL AND THE P.R. BOND BE IMMEDIATELY ISSUED. IF THE APPELLANT'S CONVICTION MUST BE DEEMED VOID VIA THE DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION EMERGING FROM CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 AS IS ARGUED IN THE McCRAy, SEQUOIA, AND BENJAMIN CASE CASE(S) AND OTHER APPELLANT(S) CASES, INCLUDING THE FACT THAT THE STATE BLOCKED THE FILING OF MY PCR APPLICATION FOR 15+ YEARS ESTABLISHING CLEAR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VOIDING THEIR JURISDICTION RELATED TO THE CONVICTION. IT WOULD DEFY JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS TO ALLOW THE APPELLANT TO REMAIN IN THE CUSTODY OF THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS IN LIGHT OF THESE SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THERE IS DECLARATORY RELIEF STILL PENDING. THUS, MOVING THE APPELLANT OUT OF THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS TO THE COUNTY JAIL AWAITING P.R. BOND WOULD BE THE APPROPRIATE STEPS TO TAKE ALSO IN LIGHT OF THE PRESENT THREATS OF IMMINENT DANGER THAT THIS COURT PREVIOUSLY IGNORED THAT HAS CULMINATED, CONTINUED, AND GOTTEN WORSE WARRANTING THIS COURT'S PROMPT ACTION. THEREFORE, THIS CASE CANNOT BE DEEMED MOOT THOUGH THE D.N.A. APPLICATION VIA THE APPELLANT'S SISTER IS NOW ACTUALLY FILED, TANDOM v. NEWSOM, --S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 1328507 (U.S.2021); FRIENDS OF THE EARTH INC. v. LAIDLAW ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (TOC), INC., 528

U.S. 167, 120 S.Ct. 693 (U.S.2000); UZUEGBNAM v. PRECZEWSKI, 141 S.Ct. 792 (U.S.2021); GENESIS HEALTH CARE CORP. v. SYMCZYK, 569 U.S. 66, 133 S.Ct. 1523, 185 L.Ed.2d. 636 (U.S.2013).

THERE IS NO "CASE OR CONTROVERSY" AND ACTION BECOMES "MOOT" WHEN ISSUES PRESENTED ARE NO LONGER LIVE OR PARTIES LACK LEGAL COGNIZABLE INTEREST IN OUTCOME WHICH IS NOT THE CASE HERE. THE ISSUES ARE STILL LIVE AND THERE IS A COGNIZABLE LEGAL INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME, CHAFLIN v. CHAFLIN, 588 U.S. 165, 133 S.Ct. 1017 (U.S.2013); CHAD THOMPSON ET. AL. PLAINTIFFS v. GOVERNOR OF OHIO MICHAEL DIVINE ET. AL., DEFENDANTS, 2021 WL 2264449 (S.C.OHIO.2021); UNITED STATES v. SANCHEZ-GOMEZ, 138 S.Ct. 1532. 1537, 200 L.Ed.2d. 792 (U.S.2018).

A CASE BECOMES MOOT WHEN JUDGMENT, IF RENDERED, WILL HAVE NO PRACTICAL LEGAL EFFECT UPON THE EXISTING CONTROVERSY WHERE IN LIGHT OF THE FACTS NOW ARGUED THIS IS NOT THE CASE HERE. FURTHER, UNDER THE EXCEPTION TO THE MOOTNESS DOCTRINE, IF THE ISSUE RAISED IS CAPABLE OF REPETITION BUT GENERALLY WILL EVADE REVIEW, AS IT EXIST IN THIS CASE BY CLEAR PROBABILITY, THE APPELLATE COURT CAN TAKE JURISDICTION, SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC INTEREST FOUNDATION v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, 421 S.C. 110, 804 S.E.2d. 854 (S.C.App.2017).

UNDER AN EXCEPTION TO THE MOOTNESS DOCTRINE, AN APPELLATE COURT MAY DECIDE QUESTIONS OF IMPERATIVE AND MANIFEST URGENCY, LIKE THE CLAIM OF THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER AND OTHER MATTERS ARGUED, TO ESTABLISH RULE FOR FUTURE CONDUCT IN MATTERS OF PUBLIC AND OR IN THE APPELLANT'S INTEREST SUCH AS THE PCR BEING BLOCKED ALSO AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE CONVICTION ATTACHED TO IT, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT MANY OF THE ISSUES SOUGHT REVIEW, AS SEEN IN CASE 2020-0001667, ARE IDENTICAL TO THE LEGAL ISSUES DEFAULTED ON IN THE MCCRAY, SEQUOIA, WILSON AND OTHER APPELLANTS CASES SEEKING TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION, BOUCHELLE INCORPORATED v. CHARLESTON

WRECKING, INC., 2019 WL 3946082, * 1 (S.C.App.2019). IF NOT DECIDED ON THE COURT RECORD, IT WOULD HAVE POTENTIALLY COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES RELATED TO THE APPELLANT'S SAFETY, HIS SEEKING P.R. BOND, THE BLOCKING OF HIS PCR APPLICATION, AND THE ESTABLISHED DEFAULT AND VOIDING OF JURISDICTION SEEKING TORRENCE RULING PURSUANT TO CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568 AND 3569 THAT ARE ALSO NOW PRESENTLY BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT, WHICH ISSUES, ARE NOT DECIDED BY WHETHER OR NOT THE D.N.A. APPLICATION WAS BLOCKED FILED, SPENCER v. KEMNA, 523 U.S. 1, 118 S.Ct. 978, 140 L.Ed.2d. 43 (U.S.1998). MOOTNESS INQUIRY DOES NOT ASK IF THE PRECISE RELIEF SOUGHT BASED ON THE CHALLENGED ACTION IS STILL AVAILABLE, BUT RATHER, WHETHER THE COURT CAN RENDER ANY EFFECTIVE RELIEF ON THE CLAIMS MADE IN THEIR TOTALITY, ADAMS v. DUNCAN, 179 F.Supp.3d. 632 (S.D.W.Va.2006).

AN ACTION IS NOT MOOT IF LITIGANT WILL SUFFER ANY PRESENT, FUTURE OR COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ALLEGED WRONGFUL CONDUCT, OR IF A COURT CAN PROVIDE PARTIAL RELIEF WHERE A FULL REMEDY MAY NO LONGER BE AVAILABLE. THE AFOREMENTIONED CLAIMS ARGUED BY THE APPELLANT FITS WITHIN BOTH THE CATEGORIES STATED WHICH DEMONSTRATE THAT IT WOULD BE HIGHLY INAPPROPRIATE AND AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION TO DETERMINE NOW THAT THE D.N.A. APPLICATION IS FILED THE CONTROVERSY IS OVER WHEN ALL THESE SUBSTANTIAL CLAIMS AND ISSUES REMAIN UNRESOLVED GIVING WAY TO REPETITIVE WRONG DOING AND OTHER SUBSTANTIAL COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCES TO THE EXTREME PREJUDICE OF THE APPELLANT THAT OF COURSE WOULD VIOLATE HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS PRODUCING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF v. WILFREDO MEJIA, DEFENDANT, 2021 WL 2143574 (D.D.C.2021); CURTIS v. STATE, 345 S.C. 557, 549 S.E.2d. 591 (S.C.App.2001); WEDLAKE v. ACORD, 2021 WL 1291922, * 2+ (S.C.App.2021); COOPER v. SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, 835 S.E.2d. 516, 523 (S.C.App.2019); STATE v. COHEN, 2019 WL 2025268, * 1 (S.C.App.2019).

INSOMUCH, NO MATTER WHICH WAY THIS CASE IS REVIEWED, EVEN

IF THE COURT WOULD DETERMINE THAT SINCE THEY BLOCKED THE FILING OF THE PCR APPLICATION FOR OVER (15) YEARS, DENYING THE APPELLANT HIS ONE BITE AT THE COLLATERAL APPEAL VOIDING THE CONVICTION, OR THE CONVICTION BEING VOID DUE TO THE STATE AND THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS DEFAULTING UNDER CASE(S) 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568 AND 3569. ALL OF THESE ARE ONLY "LEGAL INNOCENCE" CLAIMS WHERE THE APPELLANT IS ASSERTING "ACTUAL INNOCENCE" CLAIMS WHICH CAN ONLY BE PROVEN BY THE TESTING OF THE D.N.A. IN THE POSSESSION OF THE KERSHAW COUNTY CORONER'S OFFICE AND JOHNNY FELLOWS THE CORONER AT THE TIME. THIS DON'T EVEN TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE MONETARY RELIEF AND DECLARATORY RELIEF SOUGHT. THUS, CASE 2020-000974 CANNOT BE DEEMED MOOT UNDER THE AFOREMENTIONED CIRCUMSTANCES.


THE APPELLANT MOTIONS AND RENEWS HIS INITIALLY FILED MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE. THE APPELLANT INITIALLY FILED A MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE ONLY TO HAVE IT UNJUSTLY IGNORED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT TO THE APPELLANT'S DETRIMENT. LOOK AT THE RECENT ATTEMPTS ON THE APPELLANT'S LIFE NOW. NOW THEY PLACED THE APPELLANT IN THE CELL WITH A MOLLY AND HEROINE USER SUBJECT TO VIOLENT TENDENCIES AND RAPE OF OTHER INMATES, SITTING AND NODDING OUT DAILY ON WHATEVER DRUG IS IN HIS SYSTEM. THERE ARE NO SAFEGUARDS IN PLACE TO PROTECT THE APPELLANT UNTIL AFTER THE DEED OR CRIME IS DONE. HOW MUCH MORE MUST OCCUR OR HOW LONG MUST THIS CASE DRAG ON UNTIL THE HARM DONE BECOMES IRREVERSIBLE AND POTENTIALLY, OBVIOUSLY, DEADLY? I RENEW THE MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE ALL THESE RELATED CASES INCLUDING THE McCRAY, CASE, SEQUOIA, WILSON, BROWN AND ANY OTHER CASE PENDING BEFORE THIS COURT AND THE APPELLANT SEEKS THAT THE HONORABLE S.C. SUPREME COURT REVIEW THESE CASES COLLECTIVELY IN THE COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION AND GIVE ALL THE APPELLANTS INVOLVED KNOWLEDGE OF ITS RULING BEFORE ANY FURTHER ATTEMPTS AT PHYSICAL ASSAULT AND OR ATTEMPTED MURDER AGAINST THE APPELLANT OCCURS. I MOTION THAT THE RESPONDENTS BE MADE TO ANSWER WITHIN (10) DAYS OF RECEIPT OF THIS DOCUMENT ANY OPPOSITION. IF THEY FAIL, I MOVE, THAT (10) DAYS AFTER THAT, THE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND PROTECTIVE ORDER BE IMMEDIATELY GRANTED AND

THE APPELLANT WITH ALL HIS PROPERTY, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, BE MOVED TO THE KERSHAW COUNTY JAIL, THEIR SOLITARY , OUT OF PRISON POPULATION IN A SINGLE MAN CELL UNTIL ANY NECESSARY SUBSEQUENT HEARING MAY OCCUR TO ESTABLISH THE SOUGHT P.R. BOND AND OTHER POTENTIAL RELIEF, BRANNON POE, CPA, LLC. v. STRAVOLO, S.E.2d., 2016 WL 2745274 (S.C.2016); STATE v. BROAD RIVER POWER COMPANY, 164 S.C. 208, 162 S.E. 74 (S.C.1931); FORBES v. DEHON, 17 S.C. Eq. 45, SPEARS Eq. 45, 1843 WL 2962.

A MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE IN A CRIMINAL CASE MUST STATE FACTS IN SUCH A MANNER THAT THE COURT MAY JUDGE WHETHER THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA WILL BE EMBARRASSED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF ITS AFFAIRS BY THE DELAY. YOU HAVE STATE ACTORS PLANNING POTENTIAL ASSASSINATION PLOTS AND OR PHYSICAL ASSAULTS AND A BLOCKING FROM THE COURT VIOLATING DUE PROCESS LAW EXPANDING OVER (15) YEARS. TO DELAY ANY FURTHER WOULD BE AN EMBARRASSMENT TO THIS STATE, U.S. v. NORTON, 91 U.S. 558, 1 OTTO 558, 1875 WL 17934, 23 L.Ed. 250 (U.S.1875); CENTRAL R. CO. v. BOURBON COUNTY, 116 U.S. 538, 6 S.Ct. 601, 29 L.Ed. 725 (U.S. 1886); GONZALEZ v. CROSBY, 545 U.S. 524, 125 S.Ct. 2641, 162 L.Ed.2d. 480 (U.S.2005); NATIONAL GAS CO. OF WEST VIRGINIA v. PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WEST VIRGINIA, 55 S.Ct. 646 (MEM) (U.S.1935).

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

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

JUNE 8, 2021