

RECEIVED

SEP 22 2021

SC Court of Appeals

Exhibit, " § 1407 TRANSFER "

≡

File up cases

2021-000354

And 2020-0001667

≡

512

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

RON SANTA McCRAY
#353031 COOPER B-59
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

IN RE: SEEKING THE TRANSFER OF CASES 2021-000740, 2021-000629,
2020-000974, 2020-001615, 2021-000309, 2021-000508, 2021-000592,
2021-000814, 2021-000296, 2004-GS-385, 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568,
3569 ET. AL.,

TO: THE S.C. SUPREME COURT,
THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

THE PETITIONERS IN THESE CASES ARE GIVING THE COURT
AND ALL PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE. A COPY OF THIS PLEADING IS TO BE
FILED IN ALL THE SOUTH CAROLINA CASES CAPTIONED TO GIVE YOU ALL
NOTICE THAT THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CASES ARE BEING SOUGHT
TRANSFERRED TO THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR REVIEW UNDER
CASE 21-1330. YOUR JURISDICTION RELATED TO THESE CASES IS
PRESENTLY DIVESTED DUE TO THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. §§ 1602-1612


ET. SEQ. AND 1407 TRANSFER. PLEASE LEAVE ALL THESE CASES ALONE
UNTIL THE 3rd. CIRCUIT HAS HAD OPPORTUNITY TO REVIEW THESE
MATTERS AND HOPEFULLY GET THESE MATTERS BEFORE THE MULTI-DISTRICT
PANEL AND OR TRUSTEE FOR REVIEW. WE THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. STILL
REMAIN,

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ron Santa McCray'.

RON SANTA McCRAY

A smaller, more legible handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ron Santa McCray'.

AUGUST 29, 2021

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE 1st., 3rd., 4th. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;
RON SANTA McCRAY; YAHYA MUQUIT ET. AL.,

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS;
WARDEN NELSON; THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)


AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD; RON SANTA McCRAY ET. AL., DO
HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN
AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR RECUSAL;
MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN THEIR
ENTIRETY; MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF
COMMON PLEAS IN ITS ENTIRETY; MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE S.C.
SUPREME COURT IN ITS ENTIRETY; MOTION FOR TAG ALONG TRANSFER


PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1407, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ. AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT 1231 GERVAIS STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201, THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS 1701 MAIN STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201, THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. 835 CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402, THE 4th. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219, THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT 501 WEST TENTH STREET RM. 310 FORT WORTH TEXAS 76102, THE 1st. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S. COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY SUITE 2500 BOSTON MASS. 02210, THE MCKAY LAW FIRM FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA RICHLAND DEFENDANTS 1303 BLANDING STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201, THE FIRM OF DUBOSE-ROBINSON PC FOR KERSHAW DEFENDANTS 935 BROAD STREET CAMDEN, S.C. 29020, THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19106 AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID, BY DEPOSITING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON AUGUST 29, 2021. IT IS DEEMED FILED THAT DATE, HOUSTON v. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2397 (U.S.1988).

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ron Santa McCray', is written over the typed name below.

RON SANTA McCRAY

A smaller, more legible handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ron Santa McCray', is written below the typed name.

AUGUST 29, 2021

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE 1st., 3rd., 4th. CIRCUIT(S) ET. AL.,

DOCKET CASE NO.(S) 21-1330; 21-6275 ET. AL.,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;
RON SANTA McCRAY; YAHYA MUQUIT ET. AL.;

APPELLANTS/PETITIONERS

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE LINARES; THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS;
WARDEN NELSON; THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION FOR
RECUSAL; MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT
COURT IN THEIR ENTIRETY; MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE RICHLAND
COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS IN ITS ENTIRETY; MOTION
TO DISQUALIFY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN ITS ENTIRETY;
MOTION FOR TAG ALONG TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28
U.S.C. § 1407 AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASES 9:21-cv-2526-TLW-MHC; 2006-CP-400-3567; 2021-000740;

2021-000309; 2021-000508; 2021-000592; 2021-000814; 2021-000296;
2004-GS-385; 2020-000974; 2020-000629; 2020-0001615 ET. AL.,

TO: THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,
THE 4th. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,
THE 1st. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,
THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
THE S.C. SUPREME COURT,
THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL ET. AL.,

HERE THE COURT(S) AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) A COPY OF THE COMPLAINT THAT MAKE UP CASE
9:21-cv-2526-TLW-MHC.

(2) A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL
NOTICE; MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDER OF CONTINUANCE RECENTLY FILED;
MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE COMMON PLEAS COURT'S JURISDICTION TO
ISSUE IT DUE TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION; MOTION, RENEWING THE
PREVIOUS FILED MOTION FOR DEFAULT AND JUDGMENT; MOTION FOR
RECUSAL; AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (12) PAGES DATED AUGUST
20, 2021 FILED IN CASE 2006-CP-400-3567.

(3) A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL
NOTICE; MOTION AND OR PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S
ORIGINAL JURISDICTION; NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL TO ASSERT
THE CLAIM OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL
DUE TO OTHER RELATED CASES SEEKING REVIEW UNDER TORRENCE v. S.C.
DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE CHARLESTON COMMON
PLEAS COURT'S JURISDICTION DUE TO THE CONTINUED ACTS OF FRAUD
UPON THE COURT INVOLVING THESE MATTERS AND MOTION TO MOTION

THEREFOR", (13) PAGES DATED JULY 5, 2021 FILED IN CASE 2021-000740 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(4) A COPY OF THE "AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION AND OR PETITION TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION; NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL TO ASSERT THE CLAIM OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DUE TO THE OTHER RELATED CASES SEEKING REVIEW UNDER TORRENCE V. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; MOTION TO CHALLENGE THE GREENVILLE COMMON PLEAS COURT'S JURISDICTION DUE TO THE CONTINUED ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT INVOLVING THESE MATTERS AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR", (13) PAGES DATED JULY 10, 2021 FILED IN CASE 2021-000296 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT.

(5) A COPY OF THE "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", (13) PAGES DATED JULY 29, 2021 THAT WAS FILED IN BOTH CASES 2020-000974 AND 2021-000629 WHOSE ORDERS ARE BEING SOUGHT VACATED BEFORE THE 3rd. CIRCUIT DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT INVOLVING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. ALL ORDERS, JUDGMENTS, DECREES AND ACTS OF ALL COURTS MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHICH IS FREE OF ALL PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS SUCH AS THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CLAIMING THEIR IS NO REHEARING. SEE CASES CITED IN ATTACHMENTS AND PREVIOUS FILINGS.

INSOMUCH, THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS GIVE THE COURT(S) AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT THE SAME EXACT LEGAL ISSUES RELATED TO CONVICTION THAT ARE THE SAME EXACT LEGAL ISSUES BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IN THE CASES REFERRED TO ABOVE, ARE THE SAME EXACT LEGAL ISSUES THAT ARE BEFORE THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH-KMW, THAT ARE ALSO FILED UNDER CASE 1:18-cv-167-0 IN THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT, ARE THE SAME EXACT ISSUES FILED BEFORE THE BOSTON DISTRICT COURT THAT ESTABLISH THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 19-2005 WHICH FURTHER ESTABLISH THAT WE ARE DEALING WITH MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION LITIGATION AND OR PLEADING WARRANTING THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS SEEKING THE TRANSFERRING OF ALL THESE CASES INVOLVED SINCE THE PLAINTIFF(S) LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AND RON SANTA McCRAY MOTIONED TO CONSOLIDATE ALL THESE CASES WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT JUSTIFYING TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1602-1612 ET. SEQ. AND 1407. WHERE COMMON FEDERAL ISSUES EXIST, SUCH AS THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FORT BEND TEXAS CASE AND UNITED STATES v. WHEELER CASE EXIST AND THE OTHER FEDERAL LEGAL QUESTIONS EXIST AMONG ACTIONS IN MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION, THE PRESENCE OF DIFFERENT LEGAL THEORIES AMONG THE SUBJECT MATTER IS NOT A BAR TO CENTRALIZATION. CENTRALIZATION OF ACTIONS IN MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION DOES NOT REQUIRE A COMPLETE IDENTITY OF PARTIES. THE PENDENCY OF RELATED STATE COURT LITIGATION CANNOT BE DEEMED A VALID BAR TO THE CENTRALIZATION OF ACTIONS IN MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION. CENTRALIZATION IS WARRANTED WHERE THESE ISSUES INVOLVE A DEFAULT THAT IS FURTHER ESTABLISHED BY CASE 2006-CP-400-35767 WHERE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO THWART FAIR AND JUST REVIEW IN ACTS OF MACHINATION AND IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, IGNORING JURISDICTIONAL FACTS WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED OR LEGALLY DISPUTED AND THE MATTERS INVOLVE THE FIDUCIARY DUTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION WHICH IS ALSO DEFAULTED ON AT THE STATE LEVEL, IN RE; BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON CORP., FOREIGN EXCHANGE TRANSACTION LITIGATION, 857 F.Supp.2d. 1371 (2012); IN RE:

DARVO CET, DARVON AND PROPOXYPHENE PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION, 780 F.Supp.2d. 1379 (2011); IN RE: MARRIOTT INTERNATIONAL INC., CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION, 363 F.Supp.3d. 1372(2019); SCHOONER EXCHANGE v. McFADDON, 7 CRANCH 116, 11 U.S. 116, 1812 WL 1310, 3 L.Ed. 287 (U.S.1812); DOE v. FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA, 189 F.Supp.3d. 6, 16 (D.D.C.2016); DOGAN v. BARAK, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 6024416 (C.D.2016).

THE PETITIONERS MOTION TO VACATE THE ORDERS ISSUED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO THESE CASES, CASES 2020-00974; 2020-001615 AND 2021-000629 AND SEEK TO TRANSFER ALL CASES INVOLVED DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION WHICH PRESENTS A CHALLENGE TO THE COURT'S JURISDICTION RENDERING THOSE ORDERS VOID FOR THAT UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AS WELL AS THE CONVICTIONS ATTACHED TO THEM. IT WAS AN ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT FOR THE SUPREME COURT TO DETERMINE THAT THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT EXIST IN THESE CASES WHEN NOT ONLY DO YOU HAVE THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL DEFAULTING ON THE LEGAL CLAIMS IN THE FILED POST CONVICTION RELIEF CASES INVOLVED WHICH IS COMPOUNDED BY THE HOLDINGS FROM BOTH THE 4th. CIRCUIT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO WHEELER AND FORT BEND TEXAS CASES. BUT YOU HAVE THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND THE SUPREME COURT CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW TO BLOCK THE APPELLANT "CRAWFORD" FROM THE PCR COURT FOR OVER (15) YEARS WITH NO ORDER ISSUED BY ANY COURT EXPLAINING WHY WHICH FORCED HIS SISTER TO FILE HIS DNA APPLICATION WHICH IS CLEAR EVIDENCE OF THIS EGREGIOUS OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THEY WON'T EVEN ADHERE TO THERE OWN STATE LAWS. IT IS THE CLERKS 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 AUTHORIZED BY STATUTE OR A COURT RULE OR A

JUDICIAL ORDER EXPLAINING WHY? THE PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT CRAWFORD SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN DENIED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS AND ILLEGALLY BLOCKED FROM THE STATE COURT(S) AS IT PERTAINS TO FILING HIS PCR OR SEEKING THAT DNA EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE FOR OVER (15) YEARS, BARNES v. STATE, ---S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL 2306725 (S.C.App.2021).

THE STATE ACTORS ILLEGALLY FRAMED THE PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT "CRAWFORD" A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED SUPPRESSING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE WHICH WAS WHY HE WAS CRIMINALLY BLOCKED FROM THE STATE COURT(S) OR DELAYED IN THE STATE COURT AS IT PERTAINS TO CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 FOR OVER (15) YEARS WARRANTING THE RECUSAL AND DISQUALIFYING OF NOT JUST THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT. BUT ALSO THE S.C. STATE COURTS AS WELL BY OUR RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE AND THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE, U.S. v. \$41,320 U.S. CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582 (2014); WHITE v. MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280 (DSC.2014); BETTERMAN v. MONTANA SUPRA.; UNITED STATES v. JAMES, 712 Fed. Appx' 154, 161+ 3rd.Cir.(N.J.). THE FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL EVIDENCE IN THIS CASE SUCH AS THAT DNA THE PETITIONER/APPELLANT/PLAINTIFF "CRAWFORD" WAS BLOCKED FROM FOR OVER (15) YEARS, ALONG WITH THE FACT THAT THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA PRODUCED FRAUD INDICTMENTS THAT NEVER WENT BEFORE A GRAND JURY IS MORE THAN SUFFICIENT TO UNDERMINE THE CONFIDENCE IN THE CONVICTION. THE SUPPRESSION OF THE PROSECUTION OF EVIDENCE FAVORABLE TO THE ACCUSED UPON REQUEST WHICH WAS REPEATEDLY MADE AND IGNORED BY EVEN THE STATE SUPREME COURT VIOLATES DUE PROCESS WHERE THE EVIDENCE IS MATERIAL EITHER TO GUILT OR TO PUNISHMENT, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE GOOD FAITH OR BAD FAITH OF THE PROSECUTION WHERE IN THIS CASE BAD FAITH IS CLEARLY SHOWN BY THEY COMPROMISING THE STATE SUPREME COURT TO PREVENT REVIEW DUE TO THE UNPRECEDENTED CLAIMS MADE, WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016); UNITED STATES v. BURNS, 2016 WL 3910273; DENNIS v. SECRETARY, PENNSYLVANIA DEPART. OF CORRECTIONS, --F3d.--, 2016 WL 4440925 (3rd.Cir.2016); U.S. v.

HARE, 820 F3d. 93 (4th.Cir.2016); PEGG v. HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112 (4th.Cir.2017).

BY SOUTH CAROLINA'S OWN STATE LAWS, DEFAULT JUDGEMENT IS AND ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OCCURS WHEN DAMAGE AMOUNTS LIKE THE \$3.2 BILLION WHICH HAS COMPOUNDED OVER THE YEARS IS DETERMINED WHICH IS WHY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW NOT TO ENTERTAIN IT. ITS A POISON PILL AGAINST THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA FROM WHICH THAT COURT IS FRAUDULENTLY PROTECTING THEM FROM OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE. THE DEFENDANTS FAILED TO SHOW UP AT THE LAST HEARING UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 PLACING THEM IN DEFAULT AND FORFEITURE. BY DEFAULTING THE DEFENDANTS FORFEITS HIS RIGHT TO ANSWER OR OTHERWISE PLED TO THE COMPLAINT AND THE STATE ACTORS ARE CONSPIRING TO CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT OF THE DEFAULT. 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). IF THE SUPREME COURT WOULD HEAR IT. THEY WOULD HAVE TO ADMIT THE DEFAULT SO THEY ARE CONSPIRING IN FRAUD TO BE SILENT AND CIRCUMVENT RULING AND TO PREVENT A COMPLETE RECORD FROM BEING ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. REVERSAL IS REVERSAL, REGARDLESS OF REASON, AND AN INVALID CONVICTION IS NO CONVICTION AT ALL IN LIGHT OF ALL THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAWLESSNESS OCCURRING IN THESE CASES WHICH VOID THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, WHICH DUE TO THIS, SUCH WOULD NOT PREVENT REVIEW UNDER § 1983 AS IS SOUGHT BEFORE THE VARIOUS MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION COURT(S). CONVICTION UNDER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW IS NOT MERELY ERRONEOUS, BUT IS ILLEGAL AND VOID, AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO CONVICTION AT ALL, AND CANNOT BE A LEGAL CAUSE OF IMPRISONMENT, PEOPLE v. FIELDS, N.E.3d. ILL. App. (1st.) 122012-UB; FARROW v. LIPETZKY, 2017 WL 1540637(N.C.Calif.2017); UNITED STATES v. AJRAWAT,--Fed. Appx'--, 2018 WL 3045619 (4th.Cir.2018); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624 (4th.Cir.2016).

SILENCE CAN EQUATE WITH FRAUD WHEN THERE IS A LEGAL AND MORAL DUTY TO SPEAK AS THERE IS IN THIS CASE WHERE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT IS TRYING TO BE SILENT AND PROTECT THE STATE FROM THAT \$3.2 BILLION DEFAULT AND PREVENT THE ESTABLISHING OF RIGHTS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.. THE PUBLIC OFFICIALS VIOLATED THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTION(S) BY THIS FRAUD RENDERING ANY ORDER PRODUCED BY THEM VOID FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION WHERE THEY ARE FIDUCIARIES OF THE COURT. KNOWING FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION TO PREVENT STATEMENT OR ORDER FROM BEING MISLEADING IS FRAUD, LIKE THE FACT THAT THE PETITIONER/APPELLANT "CRAWFORD" WAS BLOCKED FROM FILING DNA AND PCR FOR OVER (15) YEARS WITHOUT JUDICIAL ORDER EXPLAINING WHY AND THE DEFAULT CLEARLY OCCURRING NOT JUST UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 BUT IN ALL THESE CASES OF CONCERN SUPPORTED BY WHEELER AND THE FORT BEND TEXAS CASES IS FRAUD, U.S. v. KORN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2898056 (W.D.N.Y.2013); TONY v. COM., 1998 WL 684203 (4th.Cir.1998); SEC v. FARMER, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5838867(S.D.Tex.2015); U.S. v. MOSBERG, 866 F.Supp.2d. 275 (D.N.J.2011); U.S. v. WECHT, F.Supp.2d., 2008 WL 2223869(W.D.Pa.2008).

SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH WITH INTENT TO DECEIVE IS FRAUD. FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT WITHOUT ANY MISREPRESENTATION OR DUTY TO DISCLOSE CAN CONSTITUTE FRAUD, EVEN ABSENCE OF FIDUCIARY, STATUTORY, OR OTHERWISE INDEPENDENT LEGAL DUTY TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION LIKE THE DNA, THE FACT THAT CRAWFORD WAS BLOCKED FROM THE COURT WITHOUT JUDICIAL ORDER EXPLAINING WHY, THAT THE DEFAULT IS SOLIDIFIED BY CASE 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568 AND 3569, WHERE COMMON LAW FRAUD INCLUDES ALL ACTS TAKEN TO CONCEAL, CREATE A FALSE IMPRESSION, MISLEAD, OR OTHERWISE DECEIVE TO PREVENT OTHER PARTY FROM ACQUIRING MATERIAL INFORMATION AS THE STATE SUPREME COURT DID HERE, U.S. v. COTTON, 231 F3d. 890 (4th.Cir.2000); IN RE: DURAMAX DIESEL LITIGATION,--F.R.D.--, 2018 WL 949856 (E.D.Mich.2018); UNITED STATES v. LUSK, 2017 WL 508589(S.D.Va.2017); UNITED STATES v. CALLOWAY, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 4269961(N.D.Cal.2016); MORRISON v. ACCUWEATHER, INC.,

F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 3015226(M.D.Pa.2016).

IT IS WELL SETTLED THAT WILLFUL BLINDNESS AND CONSCIOUS AVOIDANCE IS THE LEGAL EQUIVALENT TO KNOWLEDGE, 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); GLOBAL-TECH APPLIANCES, INC. v. S.E.B., S.A., 563 U.S. 754, 131 S.Ct. 2060, 179 L.Ed.2d. 1167(U.S.2011); U.S. v. TOFANAH, 765 F3d. 141 (2nd.Cir.2014); U.S. v. JINWRIGHT, 683 F3d. 471 (4th.Cir.2012).

FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING THAT IT ENTERS, AND A JUDGMENT PROCURED BY FRAUD MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED AT ANY TIME, WHICH APPLIES TO THE JUDGMENTS AND DECREES OF ALL COURTS AND IS FREE OF ALL PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS WHICH INCLUDE FRAUD BY OFFICERS OF THE COURT WHEN SUCH ACTS EFFECT THE INTEGRITY OF THE NORMAL JUDICIAL PROCESS AS HAS OCCURRED HERE, IN RE: GENESYS DATA TECHNOLOGIES, INC., 204 F3d. 124 (4th.Cir.2000); UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.2017); FOX EX REL FOX v. ELK RUN COAL CO. INC., 739 F3d. 131, 87 Fed. R. SERV.3d. 534 (4th.Cir.2014); MARTIN v. TARGET CORP. OF MINNESOTA, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1187034(D.N.J.2013); MYLES v. DOMINO'S PIZZA, LLC., 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Mass.2017).

INSOMUCH, THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS MOTION FOR THE RECUSAL AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND ITS JUDGES. THE RECUSAL AND DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE NEWMAN, THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS IN ITS ENTIRETY AND THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ITSELF, DUE TO THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURTS, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE INVOLVING THESE STATE ACTORS. THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS MOTION FOR THE RECUSAL AND DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE(S) CHERRY AND WOOTEN. THESE TWO JUDGES ARE THE SAME TWO JUDGES THAT CREATED THE FIASCO OF ADJUDICATION THAT OCCURRED UNDER CASE 21-6275 THAT IS PRESENTLY FILED BEFORE THE 4th. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS SOUGHT

TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT VIA THE 3rd. CIRCUIT UNDER CASE 21-1330. THESE JUDGES ARE ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASES DUE TO THEIR RELATION AND THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS DO INDEED RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL PRODUCING STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE THAT WOULD VOID THEIR JURISDICTION AB INITIO IF THESE JUDGES ARE ALLOWED TO HANDLE THESE CASES INVOLVED. THEREFORE, THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS MOTION FOR THEIR RECUSAL WHERE THE ISSUES ARE NOT MOOT STILL PENDING BEFORE THE VARIOUS COURTS AND THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS ARE CONTINUALLY SUBJECT TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ARGUED. WE SEEK THE DISQUALIFICATION OF THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN THEIR ENTIRETY AS WELL WHERE BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL ACTORS CONSPIRED TO THWART FAIR AND PROPER REVIEW OF THESE MATTERS FOR OVER (15) YEARS, UNITED STATES v. QUINONES, 2016 WL 4413149, * 6+ (S.D.Va.2016); 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 DeNEMOURS & CO., 748 F3d. 160 CA4 (Va.2014); U.S. v. ECCLESTON,--Fed. Appx'--, 2015 WL 4591890 CA4 (Md.2015); U.S. v. HACKLEY, 662 F3d. 671 CA4 (Va.2011).


BY THIS DOCUMENT THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS ALSO FILE THIS PLEADING TO CHALLENGE THE RICHLAND COURT, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION NOT JUST FOR THE PRIOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION DONE WHICH VOID THEIR ORDERS AND ALL OF THEIR JURISDICTION WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME EVEN AFTER A FINAL ORDER HAS BEEN ISSUED IN THE CASES AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED WHERE THE COURT HAS THE INHERENT EQUITY POWER TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENTS PROCURED BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT, MDC 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); PHILLIPS v. BROCK & SCOTT PLLC., 2017 WL 3226866(D.C.Md.2017); 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.; NATION STAR MORTG., LLC. v. MEISER, S.E.2d., 2016 WL 1700516

(S.C.App.2016); HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+ U.S..

THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS ALSO SEEK TO HAVE ALL OF THESE CASES TRANSFERRED TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT AS TAG ALONG CASES PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1407, 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.. THEREFORE, THE JURISDICTION OF THE MULTI-DISTRICT PANEL WOULD SUPERSEDE THE JURISDICTION OF ALL OF THESE COURTS INVOLVED WHICH IS SOUGHT REVIEW BY THE 3rd. CIRCUIT TO ESTABLISH THE RELEVANT JURISDICTIONAL FACTS BEFORE IT UNDER CASE 21-1330, IN RE: PLUMBING FIXTURE CASES, 298 F.Supp. 484 (1968); IN RE: CHINESE-MANUFACTURED DRYWALL PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION, 2015 WL 13387769 (E.D.La.2015); BROOKLYN DOWNTOWN, LLC. v. NEW YORK HOTEL AND MOTELS TRADES, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 779441; SPARLING v. DOLE, F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 1248995 (W.D.Tex.2014); IN RE: DROPLETS, INC. PATENT LITIGATION, 980 F.Supp.2d. 1377 (U.S. MULTI-DISTRICT PANEL). THE FEDERAL AND STATE JUDGES IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAVE PROVEN OVER AND OVER TIME AND TIME AGAIN THAT THEY CANNOT BE TRUSTED IN HANDLING ANY OF THESE CASES PLACED FORTH BY THE PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS IN THIS ACTION. THESE CASES CAPTIONED ABOVE ARE SOUGHT AS TAG ALONG CASES SEEKING TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1602-1612 ET. SEQ. AND 1407. THE COURTS AND JUDGES IN QUESTION ARE REQUIRED TO LEAVE THESE CASES ALONE UNTIL THE 3rd. CIRCUIT RULES ON THESE MATTERS, ACKERMAN v. EXXON MOBIL CORP., 734 F3d. 237 (4th.Cir.2013); BARTELS BY AND THROUGH BARTELS v. SABER HEALTH CARE GROUP, LLC., 880 F3d. 668(4th.Cir.2018).

RESPECTFULLY,

JONAH THE TISHBITE



RON SANTA MCCRAY
Ron Santa McCray

AUGUST 28, 2021

13-of-13

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD

300839 FBI Rm 1260

LEE CIE 990 WISACKY HWY

BISHOPVILLE SC 29010

RECEIVED

SEP 22 2021

SC Court of Appeals

SC COURT OF APPEALS

P.O. Box 11629

COLUMBIA, SC 29211