

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

---

**RECEIVED**

AUG 03 2021

S.C. SUPREME COURT

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2020-000974  
APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-000629

---

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS  
CASE NO. 2020-001667 ET. AL.,

---

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY  
THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
APPEAL FROM KERSHAW COUNTY  
THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

CASE NO. 2006-CP-400-3567 ET. AL.,  
CASE 2004-GS-28-0385

---

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE

APPELLANT/PETITIONER

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,

RESPONDENT(S)

---

**RECEIVED**

**AUG 03 2021**

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**


---

**S.C. SUPREME COURT**

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 CHALLENGE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR FILING CASE 2021-000629 IN THE MANNER THEY DID VIOLATING THE APPELLANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY ESTABLISHING STRUCTURAL ERROR; MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S FAILURE TO RULE ON THE MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE ALL CASES INVOLVED; MOTION TO RENEW THE PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE; MOTION TO STRIKE THE RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE DATED JULY 23, 2021 FILED IN CASE 2021-000629; MOTION TO RENEW ALL PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTIONS, PETITIONS, OBJECTIONS, INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND OR DECLARATORY RELIEF MADE UNDER CASE 2020-000974 TO ALSO BE HEARD AND RULED UPON UNDER CASE 2021-000629 AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT P.O. BOX 11330 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211; THE MCKAY LAW FIRM 3700 FOREST DRIVE STE 404 COLUMBIA, S.C. 29204, THE LAW FIRM OF SMITH-ROBINSON P.O. DRAWER 39 CAMDEN, S.C. 29021-0039 AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAIL BOX ON JULY 30, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

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

JULY 30, 2021

IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

---

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2020-000974  
APPELLATE CASE NO. 2021-000629

---

APPEAL FROM THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS  
CASE NO. 2020-001667 ET. AL.,

---

APPEAL FROM RICHLAND COUNTY  
THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS  
APPEAL FROM KERSHAW COUNTY  
THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

CASE NO. 2006-CP-400-3567 ET. AL.,  
CASE 2004-GS-28-0385

---

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 CHALLENGE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR FILING CASE 2021-000629 IN THE MANNER THEY DID VIOLATING THE APPELLANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY ESTABLISHING STRUCTURAL ERROR; MOTION TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S FAILURE TO RULE ON THE MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE ALL CASES INVOLVED; MOTION TO RENEW THE PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE; MOTION TO STRIKE THE RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE DATED JULY 23, 2021 FILED IN CASE 2021-000629; MOTION FOR SANCTIONS DUE TO POTENTIAL FRAUD UPON THE COURT; MOTION TO RENEW ALL PREVIOUSLY FILED MOTIONS, PETITIONS, OBJECTIONS, INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND OR DECLARATORY RELIEF MADE UNDER CASE 2020-000974 TO ALSO BE HEARD AND RULED UPON UNDER CASE 2021-000629 AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

---

IN RE: CASE(S) 2020-000974; 2021-000629 AND ALL OTHER RELATED CASES PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT SEEKING TO INVOKE ITS ORIGINAL JURISDICTION.

TO: THE S.C. SUPREME COURT,  
THE LAW FIRM OF SMITH-ROBINSON,  
THE MCKAY FIRM ET. AL.,

SINCE THE MCKAY LAW FIRM IN ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE HAS NOW MADE AN APPEARANCE BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO CIRCUMVENT THE DEFAULT UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 ET. AL.,? THERE IS NO LONGER ANY NEED FOR ME TO SERVE THE S.C. DEPT.

OF CORRECTIONS OR THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL DIRECTLY WHERE THE MCKAY LAW FIRM REPRESENTS ALL DEFENDANTS WHO ARE PRESENTLY PARTY FROM RICHLAND COUNTY.

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF 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, 2020 THAT IS FILED IN THE BENJAMIN CASE CASE PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(2) 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;\*\*\*\*, (28) PAGES DATED MAY 16, 2021 FILED IN THE RON SANTA McCRAY CASE PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(3) A COPY OF EXHIBIT, "ORLANDO PARKER". 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 2020-CP-23-05097; PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION;\*\*\*\*, (19) PAGES DATED JUNE 21, 2021 FILED BY ORLANDO PARKER A CASE PRESENTLY PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(4) A COPY OF EXHIBIT, "CASE 2020-000974". THIS IS A COPY OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT 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, (12) PAGES DATED JUNE 8, 2021 FILED UNDER CASE 2020-000974.

INSOMUCH, THE (4) ATTACHED EXHIBIT(S) WERE ALREADY SERVED ON THE DEFENDANT(S) DIRECTLY IN PREVIOUS PLEADING. BUT IF THE MCKAY LAW FIRM AND THE LAW FIRM OF SMITH-ROBINSON CLAIM THEY DO NOT HAVE A COPY OF THE ATTACHMENTS? THEY CAN BE OBTAINED ELECTRONICALLY FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FILED WITH THIS PLEADING. THIS DOCUMENT IS SERVED ON YOU IN LIEN OF SERVICE OF THE ATTACHMENTS GIVING YOU NOTICE OF THEIR EXISTENCE WHERE YOUR CLIENTS WERE ALREADY SERVED THESE ATTACHMENTS DIRECTLY. BY THE LAWS OF DUE PROCESS I AM NOT REQUIRED TO SERVE YOU MULTIPLE TIMES. GET THE FROM YOUR CLIENTS OR VIEW THEM ELECTRONICALLY FROM THE COURT. FOR THE RECORD. ALL CLAIMS, ISSUES, DEFENSES, MOTIONS, PETITIONS, OBJECTIONS, INJUNCTIVE AND OR DECLARATORY RELIEF ARGUED UNDER CASE 2020-000974 IS NOW SOUGHT AND ARE ARGUED UNDER CASE 2021-000629 TO ESTABLISH THE JURISDICTIONAL FACTS IN THESE CASES IN THEIR TOTALITY AND AS A MEANS OF CHALLENGING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION IN THE WAY THIS CASE, CASE 2021-000629, IS FILED BEFORE THIS COURT AS AN ACT OF MACHINATION TO AVOID CONSOLIDATION, VIOLATING THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY AND FOR THE PURPOSE OF MOVING AND OR MOTIONING TO STRIKE THE MCKAY LAW FIRM'S RESPONSE AND FILING DATED JULY 23, 2021 DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS. THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF MOTIONS TO STRIKE THE MCKAY FIRM'S FILING FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

FIRST, THE CASE UNDER CASE NO. 2021-000629, WAS NEVER FILED AS AN INDEPENDENT ACTION SEEKING WRIT OF CERT., THERE IS NO ORDER ISSUED BY THE SUPREME COURT SEVERING THE FILING AND THE APPELLANT OBJECTS TO THE MCKAY LAW FIRM ASSERTION OF THIS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 AND STATE LAW. IF THIS CASE IS FILED AS A WRIT OF CERT?, WHICH IT ISN'T, IT PRODUCES A MEANS TO PREVENT CONSOLIDATION WHERE ALL THE OTHER RELATED CASES ARE FILED INVOKING THE SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION. THE PLAINTIFF OBJECTS TO THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT. IT IS PERSPICUOUS

BY THE EXHIBITS ATTACHED THAT CASE 2020-0001667 OUT OF THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS WAS FILED BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT VIA MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT CASE 2020-000974 FOR THE PURPOSE OF PETITIONING TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION, MOTIONING TO CONSOLIDATE ALL CASES, WHICH IS CLEARLY WRITTEN IN EXHIBIT, "CASE 2020-000974" AND SUPPORTED BY THE REMAINDER OF THE EXHIBITS ATTACHED. THIS PRODUCES CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE VIOLATING THE APPELLANT'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY IN HOW THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF SOUGHT TO BRING THIS ACTION BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS AND MOTION TO MODIFY CASE 2021-000629 TO BE VIEWED AND FILED IN THE MANNER THE APPELLANT INTENDED. THE MCKAY FIRM AND PARTIES IN FRAUD ARE CONSPIRING TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS WHICH TAINT AND CORRUPTS THEIR SUBMITTED FILING THEREFORE THE PLAINTIFF MOTIONS THAT IT BE STRICKEN FROM THE RECORD. THE APPELLANT NEVER FILED THESE PROCEEDINGS SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI. THE PLAINTIFF FILED THE ACTION AS A PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION LIKE THE OTHER INMATES INVOLVED WITHIN THE VARIOUS COUNTIES FROM AROUND THE STATE. TO NOT ALLOW THE APPELLANT REVIEW UNDER THE PROVISION OF LAW THE ACTION WAS INITIALLY FILED IN LIGHT OF THESE CIRCUMSTANCES PRESENTED? SUCH AN ACTION WOULD VIOLATE THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF'S RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. THE ONE WHO BRINGS THE ACTION IS MASTER TO DECIDE WHAT LAW HE WILL RELY UPON. THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF RELIES UPON THE LAW OF PETITIONING TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION FOR CONSOLIDATION PURPOSES BY HIS CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY. THUS, THE WAY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT HAS CASE 2021-000629 BEFORE THIS COURT AS A PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERT. RENDERS THE CASE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID PRODUCING CHALLENGE TO THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION WHICH IS TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS/CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. SEE ATTACHED EXHIBITS. THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF MOTIONS TO STRIKE THE MCKAY FIRM FILING DUE

TO THIS FRAUD UPON THE COURT FRAUDULENTLY CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS. THE APPELLANT RESPECTFULLY DEMAND A RULING ON THE MOTION TO STRIKE. ALSO SEE BODMAN v. STATE, 403 S.C. 60, 742 S.E.2d. 363(S.C.2013); IANELLI v. U.S., 420 U.S. 770, 95 S.Ct. 1284, 43 L.Ed.2d. 616; STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003 (U.S.1998); WALLS v. BOEING COMPANY, 2019 WL 4931365 \* 2 D.S.C.; NATIONSTAR MORTG., LLC. v. MEISER, S.E.2d., 2016 WL 1700516 (S.C.App.2016); McCOY v. LOUISIANA, 138 S.Ct. 1500, 200 L.Ed.2d. 821 (U.S.2018); CATERPILLAR INC. v. WILLIAMS, 482 U.S. 386, 107 S.Ct. 2425 (U.S.1987).

ADDITIONALLY, THE MCKAY LAW FIRM IS PROCEDURALLY BARRED IN MAKING THESE CLAIMS AND ITS FILING. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS. FOR THIS REASON ALSO THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO STRIKE IT. THE TRIAL JUDGE BEFORE THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT ORDERED THE DEFENDANTS VIA THEIR ATTORNEYS TO APPEAR AT THE RECENT HEARING IN QUESTION THAT IS THE SOURCE OF THIS APPEAL. THEY FAILED TO APPEAR OR RESPOND ON THE RECORD OPENING THEM UP TO FORFEITURE. ONCE THE RICHLAND COUNTY JUDGE SOUGHT TO FILE AN ORDER OF CONTINUANCE IN BIAS ACTING AS ATTORNEY FOR THE DEFENDANTS LOSING HER INDEPENDENCE ABUSING HER DISCRETION VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE TRIGGERING THE SEEKING OF A TORRENCE v. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS RULING RELATED TO THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE PURSUANT TO THE HOLDINGS MADE UNDER UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415 (4th.Cir.2018) AND FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843 (U.S.2019), WHICH APPLY TO STATE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AS WELL? THE DEFENDANTS WERE PROCEDURALLY BARRED AND CANNOT COME BACK UNDER THIS FRAUD PRODUCED PROCEEDING TO CIRCUMVENT THE FACT THAT THEY FAILED TO TIMELY RESPOND. THE EXCUSE THAT THE DEFENDANTS GIVE IS ESSENTIALLY THE SAME EXACT AND IDENTICAL EXCUSE THE DEFENDANTS GAVE IN THE WHITE OAK MANOR CASE FOR WHICH THAT COURT ADJUDICATED THAT A DEFENSE OR CLAIM THAT YOU COULD NOT FIND THE PLEADING IS NOT SUFFICIENT EXCUSE TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT. THE APPELLANT WANTS THE COURT TO LOOK AT THIS OUTRIGHT BLATANT LIE PERPETRATED BY THE ATTORNEYS FOR THE DEFENDANTS. THE MCKAY LAW FIRM CLAIMS, AND I QUOTE, "THE UNDERSIGNED ATTORNEYS

WERE BROUGHT INTO THE CASE BUT COULD NOT LOCATE THE PLEADINGS AND FILINGS BELONGING TO THIS CASE BECAUSE THE "CLERK OF COURT'S OFFICE" HAD PLACED THE DOCUMENTS IN A WAREHOUSE." THIS IS WHAT THE ATTORNEY FOR THE DEFENDANTS SAID. THIS IS CRAZY AND LUDICROUS. WHAT THE HECK IS THE CLERK OF COURT DOING WITH LEGAL PLEADINGS AND FILINGS THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO BE KEPT IN THEIR OFFICE IN THEIR DIRECT POSSESSION AT THEIR IMMEDIATE DISPOSAL? WHAT LAW FIRM TAKES ITS CLIENTS LEGAL DOCUMENTS OR ITS FILINGS AND PLEADING OF ITS CLIENTS RELATED TO THE FIRM'S CASE LOAD AND SAY "HERE CLERK OF COURT. YOU GO KEEP TRACK OF ALL OUR CLIENTS PLEADINGS AND GO FILE THEM FOR US IN YOUR WAREHOUSE." THIS IS LUDICROUS. THE DEFENDANTS ARE TRYING TO INSULT THE INTEGRITY AND INTELLIGENCE OF THIS COURT AND TAKE THE COURT AND PLAINTIFF FOR IDIOTS WITH THIS BLATANT OUTRIGHT LIE, DECEPTION AND FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT OF THE JURISDICTIONAL FACTS BEFORE THIS COURT. TO ALLOW THIS LATE PROCEDURALLY TIME BARRED RESPONSE IN BEFORE THIS COURT AS A MEANS TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT WOULD BE CRIMINAL, FRAUD UPON THE COURT, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION PRODUCING OVERWHELMING PREJUDICE AGAINST THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS. THE MANOR COURT ADJUDICATED LOSING DOCUMENTS IS NOT SUFFICIENT CAUSE TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE DEFENDANTS COULD HAVE EASILY MOTIONED FOR A CONTINUANCE ON THEIR OWN INSTEAD OF FAILING TO SHOW UP IN COURT AT ALL, AND ASSERT ANY PROBLEM OR CONCERN THEY POTENTIALLY HAD ON THE COURT RECORD. THEY FAILED TO DO SO. IF THAT WERE THE PLAINTIFF THE COURT WOULD HAVE DISMISSED THE ACTION AGAINST THE DEFENDANTS. LETTING THIS FILING IN NOW WOULD EXTREMELY PREJUDICE THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF AT THIS STAGE, VIOLATING HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS AND HIS RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. THIS WOULD BE COMPOUNDED RENDERING THIS CASE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID WHERE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843 (U.S.2019) ADJUDICATED ONCE THE PARTY TIMELY ASSERTS RIGHTS BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULED ARGUED WHICH THE PLAINTIFF DID THE MOMENT THE LOWER COURT JUDGE SOUGHT TO FILE AN

ORDER OF CONTINUANCE IN THIS CASE? THESE RIGHTS BECOME MANDATORY ALSO PROCEDURALLY BARRING THIS RESPONSE. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO STRIKE IT FROM THE RECORD. THE APPELLANT ASSERTS RIGHTS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL AS IT PERTAINS TO ISSUE PRECLUSION REGARDING THE WHITE OAK MANOR CASE WHERE THE CLAIM OF ASSERTING THAT THEY COULD NOT FIND THE CASE PLEADING IS NOT SUFFICIENT EXCUSE TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT WHICH IS SUPPORTED BY WHEELER AND FORTBENT TEXAS CASES, WHITE OAK MANOR INC. v. LEXINGTON INS.CO., 407 S.C. 1, 753 S.E.2d. 537 (S.C.2014); DOE v. BISHOP OF CHARLESTON, 407 S.C. 128, 754 S.E.2d. 494(S.C.2014).

WHAT IT WAS IS THAT YOU HAD THESE JUDGES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW WITH THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE IN SHAM LEGAL PROCESS BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED. THEY NEVER INTENDED TO LET THESE CASES REACH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHERE FORMER JUDGE JEAN TOAL WAS INVOLVED IN THESE CRIMES TO PREVENT THE EVIDENCE FROM BEING PLACED ON THE RECORD THAT THE DEFENDANTS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW HAVE CRIMINALLY DELAYED THIS CASE AND OR BLOCKED THE APPELLANT FROM FILING WITHIN KERSHAW COUNTY UNSUPPORTED BY ANY JUDICIAL ORDER EXPLAINING WHY, WHICH PRODUCED THE RICHLAND COUNTY CASE THAT IS THE SOURCE OF THIS APPEAL FOR ALMOST (20) YEARS CRIMINALLY KIDNAPPING THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF AND S.C.D.C. AND THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE PLAYED A DIRECT ROLE IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE RENDERING THE CONVICTION ITSELF UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. AND I WANT THAT DNA TESTED TO PRODUCE THE EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE THAT CLEARLY EXIST OR THEY WOULD NOT HAVE TRIED TO HIDE IT AND PREVENT THE TESTING FOR (20) YEARS. THIS VIOLATES U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723 (U.S.2016) WHERE THE COURT DETERMINED THAT HOLDING A CASE FOR (4) YEARS RENDERS THE CASE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND HERE ITS BEEN HELD SINCE 2006 AND THE PLAINTIFF STAYED (4½) YEARS IN THE COUNTY JAIL AS A PRETRIAL DETAINEE. THE COURT ALSO DETERMINED THAT THE APPELLANT

WOULD HAVE TAILORED RELIEF UNDER THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WHICH THE APPELLANT CLAIM AND ASSERT. THE PLAINTIFF FURTHER OBJECTS THAT THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FAILED TO RULE ON THE APPELLANT'S MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE ALL THESE CASES INVOLVED, MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND FORFEITURE AND RENEWS HIS ORIGINALLY FILED MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE THE CASES, FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF, FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER AND P.R. BOND. THERE IS NO 11TH. AMENDMENT IMMUNITY BY THE CLAIMS MADE, ALLEN v. COOPER, 140 S.Ct. 994, 206 L.Ed.2d. 291 (U.S.2020).

IT IS CLEAR, FROM EXAMINATION OF SEVERAL DECISIONS OF THIS COURT, THAT THERE ARE (3) METHODS BY WHICH ACTIONS MAY BE CONSOLIDATED, IF THE REQUISITE CONDITIONS EXIST WHICH THEY DO IN THESE CASES, (1) BY INCLUSION IN THE SAME COMPLAINT AT THE ONSET WHICH THE SEEKING OF THE DNA BEING TESTED IS IN THE COMPLAINT FILED UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 ET. AL.; (2) UPON MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE MADE BY THE DEFENDANTS: (3) UPON MOTION MADE BY THE PLAINTIFF WHICH THE COURT HAS BEFORE IT, FORD v. NEW YORK LIFE INS. CO., 180 S.C. 390, 185 S.E. 914 (S.C.App.1936).

ONLY WHERE PARTIES ARE IDENTICAL AND CAUSES OF ACTION SUCH AS MAY HAVE BEEN UNITED IN SAME COMPLAINT UNDER STATUTE MAY THE COURT, IN ITS DISCRETION, ORDER CONSOLIDATION OVER THE OBJECTIONS OF EITHER PARTY. CODE 1952 § 10-701; McKINNEY v. GREENVILLE ICE & FUEL CO., 232 S.C. 257, 101 S.E.2d. 659 (S.C.App.1958); CODE 1932 § 487.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA LAW IS VERY LIBERAL IN ITS PROVISIONS ALLOWING JOINDER. SECTION 10-701 CODE OF 1952 STATES THAT CAUSES OF ACTION MAY BE UNITED IN THE SAME COMPLAINT WHEN THEY ALL ARISE OUT OF THE SAME TRANSACTION, IN THIS CASE, THE CONVICTION(S), OR TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE SAME SUBJECT OF ACTION, IN THIS CASE THE STATE v. GENTRY CASE, NOT RELEASING THAT DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE SOUGHT FOR OVER (20) YEARS AND THE OTHER LEGAL ISSUES THAT ARE BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT IN THE CASES INVOLVED IN

THEIR TOTALITY, SOUTH CAROLINA ELEC. & GAS CO. v. AETNA INS. CO., 114 F.Supp. 79 (D.S.C.1953); WINTER v. U.S. FIDELITY & GUARANTY CO., 240 S.C. 561, 126 S.E.2d. 724(S.C.App.1962); KOSCIOSKO v. PARHAM, 428 S.C. 481, 836 S.E.2d. 362 (S.C.App.2019).

THE RIGHTS SOUGHT BY THE CONVICTION(S) VIA UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION DONE BLOCKING THE APPELLANT FROM THE PCR COURT AND OR DELAYING REVIEW WITHIN THE RICHLAND COURT SINCE 2006 ARE CONSISTENT WITH EACH OTHER ALSO RELATED TO CHALLENGE OF THE STATE v. GENRTY CASE RULING AND CAN BE JOINED, THOMPSON v. WATTS, 281 S.C. 504, 316 S.E.2d. 393 (S.C.App.1985); AYERS v. COLUMBIA NEWSPAPER, INC., 267 S.C. 103, 226 S.E.2d. 252 (S.C.1976).


CONSOLIDATION MAY BE ORDERED WHENEVER ACTIONS INVOLVING COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW OR FACT ARE BEFORE THE COURT SUCH AS THE DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE BEING SUPPRESSED AND THE PLAINTIFF BEING BLOCKED AND OR DELAYED BEFORE THE LOWER COURTS INVOLVED FOR OVER (15) YEARS, KEELS v. PIERCE, 315 S.C. 339, 433 S.E.2d. 902 (S.C.App.1993).

UNDER CONSOLIDATION ORDER, PARTIES AND PLEADINGS ARE NOT MERGED, AND EACH ACTION RETAINS ITS OWN IDENTITY. RULES CIV. PRO. RULE 42(a); SARVGHAD v. SITTON BUICK CO. INC., 312 S.C. 429, 440 S.E.2d. 894 (S.C.App.1994).

A COURT'S RULING WILL NOT BE DISTURBED WHEN IT COMES TO SEEKING TO CONSOLIDATE UNLESS THERE IS AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION. THEREFORE, IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE APPELLANT A RULING ON THE MOTION WOULD BE REQUIRED TO PROTECT THE APPELLANT'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS BEFORE ANY OF THE CASES IN THEIR TOTALITY PROCEED TO ALLOW THE APPELLANT TO ESTABLISHING CLAIM OF ABUSE OF DISCRETION IF THE APPELLANT HAVE TO SEEK SUBSEQUENT APPEAL, COOPER v. LEISURE CONNECTIONS TRAVEL INC., S.E.2d., 2010 WL 10088097 (S.C.App.2010); UZENDA v. PITTMAN, 2006 WL 7286732, \* 2, S.C.App.; CREIGHTON v. COLIGNY PLAZA LTD, PARTNERSHIP, 512

S.E.2d. 510, 516 S.C.App.; CALDWELL v. WIQUIST, 402 S.C. 565, 741 S.E.2d. 583 (S.C.App.2013); HERRING v. HOME DEPOT INC., 350 S.C. 373, 565 S.E.2d. 773 (S.C.2002). THE APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF PRAYS FOR THIS RELIEF TO INCLUDE ANY AND ALL OTHER RELIEF THE COURT WOULD DEEM JUST, FAIR AND PROPER.

RESPECTFULLY,  
JONAH THE TISHBITE



JULY 29, 2021

DEFAULT JUDGMENT IS ESTABLISHED AND ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OCCURS WHEN DAMAGE AMOUNTS LIKE THE \$3.2 BILLION WHICH HAS COMPOUNDED OVER THE YEARS IS DETERMINED. BY DEFAULTING THE DEFENDANT FORFEITS HIS RIGHT TO ANSWER OR OTHERWISE PLEAD TO THE COMPLAINT. IN ESSENCE, THE DEFAULTING DEFENDANT CONCEDES LIABILITY, 5 STAR LIFE INSURANCE CO. v. PEEK PERFORMANCE, --S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL 3073289 (S.C.App.2021). ALSO SEE EXHIBIT, "PRISON REFORM" ATTACHED.