

RECEIVED

SEP 22 2021

SC Court of Appeals

EXHIBIT, "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT"

File in CASES

2021-000354 And

2020-0001667

2

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DOCKET NO. 20-7073

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE
ET. AL.,

APPELLANT

Vs.

JUDGE McLEOD; THE UNITED STATES ET. AL.,


DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS

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 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION; MOTION FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT BRIEF; MOTION TO REMAND THE CASE BACK

DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT; MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON
THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL OTHER PARTIES BY
PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON OCTOBER 9, 2020.

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

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

OCTOBER 9, 2020

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA
THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DOCKET NO. 20-7073

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE
ET. AL.,

APPELLANT

Vs.

JUDGE McLEOD; THE UNITED STATES ET. AL.,

DEFENDANT(S)

AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; MOTION TO CHALLENGE
THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS JURISDICTION; MOTION FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT BRIEF; MOTION TO REMAND THE CASE
BACK DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT; MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASE DOCKET NO. 20-7073 AND OTHER JURISDICTIONAL MATTERS.

TO: THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ET. AL.,

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT REQUESTED THAT THE APPELLANT FILE HIS PLRA IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS AND TO SUBMIT HIS BRIEF. SUCH ACTION NOW PRESENTS A CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED BY THE APPELLANT AND MUST BE ADDRESSED BEFORE THE APPELLANT FILES HIS BRIEF AND THE MERITS OF THE BRIEF BE ADJUDICATED WHERE DEPENDING UPON THE RULING. IT WOULD CHANGE THE VERY NATURE IN WHICH THE APPELLANT WOULD BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THE BRIEF AS WELL AS THE NATURE OF THE ISSUES THAT WOULD BE NEEDED TO BE ARGUED. THUS, THE APPELLANT WOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY PREJUDICED IN SUBMITTING ANY BRIEF UNTIL THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES ARE ADDRESSED ON THE COURT RECORD PRODUCING CITINGS OF LAW BEFORE ANY MERITS ON THE ISSUES INTENDED TO BE PRESENTED CAN BE RULED ON AS THE LAW REQUIRES. THIS IS CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER WHEREBY THE APPELLANT MOTIONS THAT THIS CASE BE REMANDED FOR FURTHER ADJUDICATION DUE TO FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OTHER UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION WHICH RENDERS THE DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION AND THE FINAL ORDER PRODUCED BY THEM VOID WHICH IS THE SOURCE OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ENTERTAINING AND INVOKING ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER OVER THIS APPEAL. THIS DON'T EVEN TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THAT THERE IS A POTENTIAL APPEAL PENDING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1252 AND 1251. THEREFORE, THE APPELLANT ALSO MOTIONS FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME, TO RESET, TO SUBMIT ANY BRIEF ONCE THESE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES ARE ADDRESSED ON THE COURT RECORD AND RESOLVED WHICH WOULD ALSO WARRANT THAT THIS CASE BE REMANDED BACK DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT FOR FURTHER ADJUDICATION. IF SUCH OCCURS. THE SUBMITTING OF THE BRIEF WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED.

THE LAW IS WRITTEN, "ITA LEX SCRIPTA EST---EX DOLO MALO NON ORITUR ACTIO". OUT OF FRAUD NO ACTION ARISES. THE FINAL ORDER ISSUED UNDER CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM IS DEAD. IT IS VOID FOR VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THIS SAME ORDER IS THE SOURCE IN WHICH THIS COURT ATTEMPTS TO ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER THIS APPEAL CREATING AN AUTOMATIC CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER. FRAUD NEVER

GIVES A RIGHT OF ACTION. NO COURT WILL LEND ITS AID TO A MAN OR LOWER COURT WHO FOUNDS HIS CAUSE OF ACTION AND RULINGS UPON AN IMMORAL OR ILLEGAL ACT. FRAUD VITIATES EVERYTHING THAT IT ENTERS. THIS INCLUDES THE MOST SOLEMN ACTS, ORDERS, JUDGMENTS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS ON RECORD. ALL ACTS, JUDGMENTS, ORDERS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THIS APPLIES TO THE ACTS, ORDERS, JUDGMENTS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS ON RECORD, AND SUCH A COLLATERAL ATTACK IS FREE OF ALL PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS. THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, PURPOSELY, CRIMINALLY, MALICIOUSLY LISTED THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE INCORRECTLY TO UNJUSTLY DISMISS THIS CASE TO KEEP THE PARTIES FROM BEING SERVED IN ACTS OF MACHINATION TO PREVENT THE LEGAL ISSUES FROM BEING PROPERLY PRESERVED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD FOR PURPOSES OF APPEAL TO DENY THE APPELLANT THESE APPEALABLE ISSUES. THE ISSUES ARE NOT PROPERLY PRESERVED DUE TO THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION THAT OCCURRED WHICH IS WHY THE CASE WAS DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE BECAUSE THE COURT KNEW THE CLAIMS WERE SOUND AND THEY WANTED TO PREVENT SERVICE ON THE UNITED STATES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS RELATED TO THE CLINTON BILL OF 1996 AND REMOVAL OF THE STATE CASE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., CONTAINING FIDUCIARY HEIR CLAIMS IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS. WRIT OF ERROR IS FILED DUE TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR WHERE THE CONSPIRING PARTIES VIOLATED THE APPELLANT'S SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY IN LISTING THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE IN A MANNER THAT THE APPELLANT NEVER INTENDED IN THEIR EFFORTS TO KEEP THE APPELLANT FROM BEING PROPERLY AND FAIRLY HEARD AND TO ALLOW THEM TO BE SILENT ON ESSENTIAL CLAIMS PRESENTED IN THIS CASE AND CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY WERE SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE PRODUCING STRUCTURAL ERROR THAT VOID THEIR JURISDICTION AB INITIO. THIS, AND ALL OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES MUST BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT BEFORE ANY BRIEF BE SUBMITTED OR THE MERITS OF THE

BRIEF AS A WHOLE BE ADDRESSED OR DETERMINED WHICH WILL HAVE A DIRECT IMPACT ON HOW THE APPELLANT IS TO SUBMIT HIS BRIEF, MYLES v. DOMINOS PIZZA, LLC., 2017 WL 238436(D.C.Miss.2017); FIRST TECHNOLOGY CAPITAL INC. v. BANCTEC INC., 2016 WL 7444943(D.C.Ky.2016); U.S. v. HARRIS, F.Supp.2d., 2005 WL 839448(N.D.Tex.2005); UNITED STATES v. JOHNSON, 2018 WL 3626337(D.C.Tex.2018); UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.2017); ASTERBADI v. LEITESS, 176 Fed. Appx' 426 CA4 (Va.2006); MORIN v. INNEGRITY LLC., 424 S.C. 559, 819 S.E.2d. 131(S.C.2018)(CONCEALING THE ESTOPPEL FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 IS FRAUD VOIDING THAT COURT'S JURISDICTION); U.S. v. DENEDO, 556 U.S. 904, 129 S.Ct. 2213, 173 L.Ed.2d. 1235(U.S.2009); UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. GREGORY HOLT AKA ABDUL MAALIK MUHAMMAD, 2017 WL 1181509(W.D.La.2017).

BY THAT WHICH IS TO BE ARGUED IN THIS DOCUMENT. IT PRODUCES AN AUTOMATIC CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER TO PROCEED, WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED REQUIRING THE COURT TO ADDRESS THEM NOW BEFORE ANY BRIEF BE SUBMITTED WITHIN THIS CASE WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MUST ADDRESS THE MERITS OF THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES PRODUCING CITINGS OF LAW AND EVIDENTIARY FACTS AND SUPPORT AND NOT MERELY RULE AND DENY THE MOTION WITHOUT STATING WHY, WHICH WOULD VOID THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. WITHOUT JURISDICTION THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT PROCEED AT ALL TO HEAR THE BRIEF OR ADDRESS ITS MERITS IN ANY CAUSE; JURISDICTION IS THE POWER TO DECLARE LAW, AND WHEN IT CEASE TO EXIST, THE ONLY FUNCTION REMAINING TO THE COURT IS THAT OF ANNOUNCING THE FACT AND DISMISSING THE CAUSE, WHICH IN THIS CASE WOULD BE TO REMAND OR FORWARD TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1252, STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998); TAMM v. CINCINNATI INSURANCE COMPANY, 2020 WL 60932 (S.D.N.Y.2020); CHASE v. ANDEAVOR LOGISTICS L.P., 2019 WL 5847879 * 2 W.D.Tex.; UNITED STATES v. VALLANDARES, 2019 WL 4888629 * 1 W.D.Tex..

FEDERAL COURTS MAY NOT, VIA THE DOCTRINE OF "HYPOTHETICAL JURISDICTION" DECIDE CAUSE OF ACTION BEFORE RESOLVING WHETHER COURT HAS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION WHERE IN THIS CASE THERE ARE CLAIMS OF APPOINTED TRUSTEE, CLAIMS OF COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, JUDGES SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE VOIDING THEIR JURISDICTION AB INITIO, VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS RELATED TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF AUTONOMY AND OR APPEAL PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1252 AND 1251 PENDING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, ALL OF THE AFOREMENTIONED THE DISTRICT COURT WAS SILENT ON TO PREVENT THE ISSUES FROM BEING PRESERVED COMPOUNDED BY EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT REQUIRING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO REMAND THIS CASE FOR ADDITIONAL AND PROPER ADJUDICATION; DOING SO WOULD CARRY COURTS BEYOND BOUNDS OF AUTHORIZED JUDICIAL ACTION AND THUS OFFEND FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF SEPARATION OF POWERS, AND WOULD PRODUCE NOTHING MORE THAN HYPOTHETICAL JUDGMENT, WHICH WOULD COME TO THE SAME AS ADVISORY OPINION, DISAPPROVED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, UNITED STATES v. GORDON, 2019 WL 5586966 * 1, E.D.Mich.; IN RE: GEE, 941 F3d. 153, 161+ 5TH.Cir.(La.); UNITED STATES v. CAVERGNE, 785 Fed. Appx' 212, 217+, 5TH. Cir.Tex..

INSOMUCH, LET'S LOOK AT THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT OCCURRED WITHIN THE DISTRICT COURT ESTABLISHING JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE NOT JUST TO THE FINAL ORDER ISSUED WITHIN THE LOWER COURT; BUT ALSO PRESENTING A DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER SINCE THE ORDER IN QUESTION IS THE VEHICLE AND JURISDICTIONAL PREREQUISITE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ENTERTAINING JURISDICTION OVER THESE MATTERS.

(1) WE HAVE THE FEDERAL JUDGES WITHIN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT WITH THE AID OF THE CLERKS AND OR CASE MANAGER(S) BEING INSTRUCTED BY THE JUDGES IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND MACHINATION LISTING THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES WRONG TO JUSTIFY THEM SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE(S) WHEN THEY ARE DEFENDANTS IN THE CASE TO JUSTIFY AND OR AID THEM TO AVOID SUIT; (2) THE DISMISSAL WAS DONE IN ACTS OF

FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND MACHINATION TO PREVENT SERVICE AND TO KEEP THE INTENDED JURY FROM HEARING AND THEMSELVES SILENT IN ADDRESSING THESE SUBSTANTIAL CLAIMS IN THEIR EFFORTS TO CREATE AN INCOMPLETE RECORD AND PREVENT THE CLAIMS FROM BEING PROPERLY PRESERVED TO DENY THE PLAINTIFF APPEALABLE ISSUES AND CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS ALSO IN VIOLATING THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE; (3) THERE IS A POTENTIAL APPEAL PENDING BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1252 AND 1251. THIS POSES SEVERAL CONSTITUTIONAL AND JURISDICTIONAL INFIRMITIES AND OR CONCERNS ESTABLISHING THE AFOREMENTIONED AND THAT WHICH FOLLOWS:

(A) WHEN THE JUDGES LISTED THE NAMES OF THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY THE PLAINTIFF IMMEDIATELY BROUGHT IT TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION, OBJECTED AND MOTIONED THAT THE RECORD BE AMENDED TO REFLECT THE TRUE NAMES OF THE DEFENDANTS WHICH WAS IGNORED BY THE COURT VIOLATING THE PLAINTIFF'S DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO AMEND ONCE BEFORE SERVICE RENDERING THE PROCEEDING UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID; (B) THE JUDGES DID IT ALSO TO PREVENT SERVICE ON THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE UNITED STATES RELATED TO THE CLINTON BILL OF 1996 AND FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY ACT CLAIMS RELATING TO FIDUCIARY HEIR AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE HANDS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM BEING GIVEN REVIEW AND; (C) THE CLINTON BILL DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETS AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT AND THEY MAKING USE OF THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE AS A MEANS FOR THE PLAINTIFF TO ENTER THE COURT WHEN THIS STATUTE'S CONSTITUTIONALITY IS BEING CALLED INTO QUESTION WITHIN THE FILED PROCEEDINGS PRODUCES AN ADDITIONAL JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGE. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE WOULD ALSO HAVE VOIDED THE DISTRICT COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR MAKING USE OF IT WHICH THE JURY WOULD HAVE CLEARLY DETERMINED HAD THEY BEEN GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY THAT WAS DENIED THEM BY THE JUDGES' FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION, SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE, CONCEALING THESE MATERIAL FACTS IN VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 AND THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE WHERE THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS WAS AT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL FROM THE CASE'S ONSET VOIDING

THE JUDGE'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER AB INITIO CORRUPTING THE FINAL ORDER WHICH IS THE SOURCE OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT INVOKING ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER TO HEAR THIS APPEAL. WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, IF JUDGE MARCHANT KNEW TO RECUSE HIS BUTT OFF OF CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-BM STILL PENDING UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT? THEY SHOULD HAVE DONE THE SAME IN CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM WHICH AID IN SUPPORTING AND SUBSTANTIATING THE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS, WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016); CANADA v. MILLER, F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 1512245 (2014)(DEMONSTRATING THAT AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING SHOULD HAVE OCCURRED IN THE DISTRICT COURT); UNITED STATES v. QUINONES,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 4413149, * 6+ (S.D.W.Va.2016); KENWOOD GARDENS CONDOMINIUM, INC. v. WHALEN PROPERTIES, LLC., 2016 WL 6788052, * 11+ (Md.2016); IANNELLI v. U.S., 420 U.S. 770, 95 S.Ct. 1284, 43 L.Ed.2d. 616; GREAT AMERICAN INS. CO. v. NEXTDAY NETWORK HARDWARE CORP., 73 F.Supp.3d. 636(2014); SCHOONER EXCHANGE v. McFADDEN, 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); HORNE v. HARBOR PORTFOLIO V.I., C.P.,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2018 WL 1737520 (N.D.Ga.2018); UNITED STATES v. LANEHAM, 2017 WL 4857437 (D.C.MEXICO.2017); U.S. v. ISMAIL, 97 F3d. 50 (4th.Cir.1996); MINA v. CHESTER COUNTY, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 6550543 (2015); U.S. v. BANK OF AMERICA CORP., F.Supp.3d., 2014 WL 2777397(N.C.2014); 28 U.S.C. § 2679; CAPITAL TRANS INTERN, LLC. v. INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM INV. CO., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 557236 (FLA.2013); THORTON v. MARYLAND GENERAL HOSP., F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1943065 (Md.2013); BRADDY v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 1031301 (E.D.Va.2016); ADAIR ASSET MANAGEMENT, LLC. v. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, 2016 WL 3248569 (2016); HUNT v. U.S., F.Supp.2d., 2007 WL 5131716 (DSC.2007); BROWN v. U.S., 2014 WL 2871398 (DSC.2014); JOHNSON STEEL STREET-RAIL CO. v. WILLIAM WHARTON JR. & CO., 152 U.S. 252, 14 S.Ct. 608, 38 L.Ed. 429 (U.S.1894).

INSOMUCH, THE JUDGES WERE SILENT ON THE MOTION TO RECUSE THEMSELVES AND THE MOTION TO AMEND THE DEFENDANTS, IF THEY DID NOT ENGAGE IN ACTS OF SPOILIATION DESTROYING THE FILED MOTIONS FROM THE RECORD, IN ORDER THAT THE RECORD WOULD NOT REFLECT EXACTLY WHO THE PARTIES WERE IN THIS CASE WHOM THE PLAINTIFF WAS BRINGING SUIT AGAINST IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO PREVENT THE PLAINTIFF'S ISSUES FROM BEING PROPERLY PRESERVED FOR PURPOSES OF APPEAL, AND TO PREVENT THEY BEING REQUIRED TO RECUSE THEMSELVES AS WELL AS TO PREVENT THE U.S. CONGRESS MEMBERS AND UNITED STATES FROM BEING SERVED TO HALT AND OR PREVENT ATTACK UPON THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF AEDPA AND THE PLRA OF THE CLINTON BILL, F.S.I.A. CLAIMS, AND FIDUCIARY HEIR WITH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS WHERE IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001, THEY CONCEALED MATERIAL FACTS TO KEEP ANY RULING ON THESE ISSUES SILENT IN THE COURT RECORD DISMISSING THIS CASE DEMONSTRATING THAT THE POTENTIAL FOR BIAS WAS AT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL ESTABLISHING CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA 2016. THIS VIOLATED THE PLAINTIFF'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS RENDERING THE FINAL ORDER VOID FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION PRODUCING A DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION. SUCH EXIST WHERE THE FINAL ORDER FROM THE LOWER COURT IS A PRECURSOR TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT EXERCISING ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER, WHICH CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME, AT ANY STAGE, EVEN AFTER THE FINAL ORDER WAS ISSUED AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED BY THE PLAINTIFF. IT IS WELL SETTLED THAT WILLFUL BLINDNESS AND CONSCIOUS AVOIDANCE IS THE LEGAL EQUIVALENT TO KNOWLEDGE WHERE THE JUDGES IN QUESTION VIOLATED THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, PAUL ADAMS v. CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION, 2016 WL 6464444; DONATONI v. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,--F.Supp.3d.--, 2016 WL 1755871; U.S. v. HARE, 820 F3d. 93 (4th.Cir.2016); 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. FEGUSON, 676 F3d. 260 (2nd.Cir.2011); U.S. v. TOFANAH, 765

F3d. 141 (2nd.Cir.2014); UNITED STATES v. VALBRUN, 877 F3d. 440, 105 Fed. R. EVID. SERV. 207 (1st.Cir.2017); U.S. v. JINWRIGHT, 683 F3d. 471 (4th.Cir.2012).

SILENCE WILL EQUATE WITH FRAUD WHEN THERE IS A LEGAL AND MORAL DUTY TO SPEAK. THE JUDGES WERE REQUIRED TO RULE ON THE MOTION FOR THEIR RECUSAL AND ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WERE PURPOSELY INCORRECTLY LISTED. INSTEAD THEY ACTED IN FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. KNOWING FAILURE TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION SUCH AS THE RULING ON THE MOTION TO RECUSE AND TO RULE ON THE MOTION TO AMEND THE DEFENDANTS LISTED TO REFLECT WHO IS PARTY IN THIS CASE IS DONE IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND WAS NECESSARY TO PREVENT THE DISMISSAL IN THIS CASE FROM BEING MISLEADING WHICH IS FRAUD, U.S. v. KORN, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 2898056 (W.D.N.Y.2018); TONEY v. COM., 1998 WL 684203 (4th.Cir.1998); S.E.C. v. FARMER, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 5838867 (S.D.Tex.2015).

IT WAS THE JUDGE'S FIDUCIARY DUTY TO SPEAK INSTEAD OF ENGAGING IN FRAUD UPON THE COURT SUPPRESSING TRUTH. SUPPRESSION OF TRUTH WITH INTENT TO DECEIVE, SUCH AS THEY CONSPIRING TO CONCEAL THAT THEIR ACTIONS WERE AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION AND INAPPROPRIATE IS FRAUD. FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT WITHOUT ANY MISREPRESENTATION OR DUTY TO DISCLOSE CAN CONSTITUTE FRAUD, EVEN IN ABSENCE OF FIDUCIARY, STATUTORY, OR OTHER INDEPENDENT LEGAL DUTY TO DISCLOSE MATERIAL INFORMATION, LIKE RULING ON THE MOTIONS SUBMITTED; COMMON LAW FRAUD INCLUDES ACTS TAKEN TO CONCEAL, CREATE FALSE IMPRESSION LIKE THE CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED, MISLEAD, OR OTHERWISE DECEIVE TO PREVENT OTHER PARTIES FROM ACQUIRING MATERIAL INFORMATION SUCH AS A PROPER AND FAIR RULING ON THE MOTION(S) TO RECUSE AND AMEND, 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); IN RE: DURAMAX DIESEL LITIGATION,--F.R.D.--, 2018 WL 949856 (E.D.Mich.2018); UNITED STATES v. PALIN, 874 F3d. 418 (4th.Cir.2017); 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). COURTS HAVE INHERENT EQUITY POWER TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENTS WHENEVER THEIR ENFORCEMENT WOULD BE MANIFESTLY UNCONSCIONABLE BECAUSE OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS, MDC INNOVATIONS, LLC. v. NORTHERN,--Fed. Appx'--, 2018 WL 1129607 (4th.Cir.2018); HAMER v. NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICE 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).

IN FURTHER ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF THE COURT AND JUDGES GETTING THE CLERKS AND OR CASE MANAGER(S) TO LIST THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY SO IN ACTS OF MACHINATION THE JUDGES COULD MAKE IT LOOK LIKE IT WAS CLERICAL ERROR SO IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT THEY CAN CONCEAL THE MATERIAL FACT THAT THEY WERE SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 AS WELL AS THE PLAINTIFF'S SUBSTANTIAL DUE PROCESS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF AUTONOMY. IT IS WELL SETTLED IN LAW THAT THE PARTY WHO BRINGS SUIT IS MASTER TO DECIDE WHAT LAW HE WILL RELY UPON. THIS IS WHERE THE RIGHT OF AUTONOMY PRESENTS ITSELF. THIS INCLUDES HIS DECIDING THE MANNER IN HOW TO LIST EXACTLY WHO ARE THE DEFENDANTS HE INTENDS TO BRING ACTION AGAINST, THE FAIR v. KOHLER DIE & SPECIALTY CO., 228 U.S. 22, 33 S.Ct. 410(U.S.1913); CATERPILLAR INC. v. WILLIAMS, 482 U.S. 386, 107 S.Ct. 2425 (U.S.1987); LANCASTER v. KAISER FOUNDATION..., 958 F.Supp. 1137 (E.D.Va.1997); POWERS v. SOUTH CENTRAL UNITED FOODS & COMMERCIAL WORKERS..., 719 F2d. 760 (5th.Cir.1983).

A VIOLATION OF AUTONOMY IS COMPLETE WHEN THE COURT ALLOW COUNSEL TO, AND OR IN THIS CASE, THE COURT ITSELF PERMITS ITSELF TO USURP CONTROL OF AN ISSUE WITHIN THE PLAINTIFF'S SOLE PREROGATIVE, SUCH AS HOW HE INTENDS TO BRING THE ACTION AND WHO HE SEEKS TO LIST AS DEFENDANTS, WHEN PRESENT, SUCH AN ERROR IS NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS REVIEW, WILLIAMS v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 4656231 (D.CONN.2018); UNITED STATES v. COBBLE, 2018 WL 4283063 (M.D.Ga.2014).

THE RIGHT TO DEFEND AND OR BRING SUIT IS PERSONAL, AND A DEFENDANT AND OR PLAINTIFF'S CHOICE IN EXERCISING THAT RIGHT MUST BE HONORED OUT OF THAT RESPECT FOR THE INDIVIDUAL WHICH IS THE LIFE BLOOD OF LAW, PEOPLE v. FLORES, 34 Cal. App. 5TH. 270, 246 Cal. Rptr.3d. 1, 3, Tex.App. BEAUMONT (Tex.2019); BROADNAX v. STATE, 2019 WL 1450399 (Tenn.2019); SAVICKS v. REWERTS, F.Supp., 2018 WL 5629726 (W.D.Mich.2018). SOME OF THESE CASES CITED RELATE TO INEFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL. BUT THE SUBSIDIARY FACTS RELATED TO AN INDIVIDUAL HAVING A PERSONAL RIGHT TO DEFEND AND OR SUE POSSESSING THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY APPLY HERE, WHETHER ITS CRIMINAL OR CIVIL PROCEEDINGS, AND SUCH RIGHTS CANNOT BE USURPED BY THE JUDGES OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT WHICH PRODUCES CLEAR VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LAW RENDERING THE PROCEEDING IN QUESTION UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID PRODUCING AN INSTANT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION OVER THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID FINAL ORDER THAT ESTABLISHES THIS APPEAL. THE APPELLANT OBJECTS AND MOTIONS THAT THIS CASE BE REMANDED TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT TO CORRECT THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE, BROADNAX v. STATE, 2019 WL 1450399 (Tenn.2019); DAWN v. UNITED STATES, 411 F.Supp.3d. 90, 98 D.Mass.; McCOY v. LOUISIANA, 138 S.Ct. 1500, 200 L.Ed.2d. 821(U.S.2018); U.S. v. ALADEKCHA, 2010 WL 4054267 (D.C.Md.2010); WHITE v. MANIS, 2014 WL 1513280 (DSC.2014); U.S. v. LAWRENCE, F.Supp.3d., 2015 WL 856866 (S.D.Va.2015); PENN AMERICA INS. CO. v. MAPP, 521 F3d. 290 CA4 (Va.2008).

THERE IS ANOTHER ISSUE THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED HERE. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS REQUIRED THAT THE APPELLANT FILE IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH THIS APPEAL. THIS IS ONE OF THE KEY AND ESSENTIAL ISSUES SOUGHT TO BE ARGUED WITHIN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT THAT THE JUDGES INVOLVED CONSPIRED TO BE SILENCE AND OR TO BE SILENT ON BY DISMISSING THIS CASE. THE STATUTE'S UNCONSTITUTIONALITY IS BEING CALLED INTO QUESTION DUE TO IT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT WHERE THE EVIDENCE GATHERED BY THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATOR, LAW PROFESSOR AND AUTHOR, MICHELLE

ALEXANDER, DOCUMENTED IN HER BOOK ENTITLED, "MASS INCARCERATION DURING THE AGE OF COLOR BLINDNESS, THE NEW JIM CROW" AND THE EVIDENCE BY THE INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATORS WHO CONSTRUCTED THE DOCUMENTARY THAT AIRED ON PBS ENTITLED, "13" ARE INTENDED TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE JURY WITHIN THE CASE SUBJUDICE. ONCE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT REQUIRED THE APPELLANT TO FILE THESE PLRA DOCUMENTS IN THIS APPEAL? IT CREATED AN AUTOMATIC CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER AND TAINTED, CORRUPTED THIS ENTIRE APPEAL RENDERING IT UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PLAINTIFF CANNOT ILLEGALLY RULE ON THIS ISSUE DUE TO THE APPELLANT INVOKING HIS 7TH. AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL TO HAVE THEM HEAR THIS ISSUE. THUS, FOR THIS REASON ALSO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MUST REMAND THIS CASE AND LET THE JURY HEAR THE CAUSE WHICH IS THE PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT, WHERE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND THE U.S. CONGRESS MEMBERS IN THEIR INDIVIDUAL AND OFFICIAL CAPACITIES ARE BEING SUED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DECLARATORY RELIEF TO REMEDY THIS INJUSTICE ALONG WITH THE PUNITIVE DAMAGES SOUGHT. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT REVIEWING THIS CAUSE OF ACTION WHEN THE PLAINTIFF CLEARLY INVOKED HIS CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT UNDER THE 7TH. AMENDMENT TO HAVE THE CAUSE PLACED BEFORE A JURY WOULD ALSO VIOLATE THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, THE PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY IN HOW HE SEEKS TO BRING THE ISSUE BEFORE THE COURT BEING MASTER TO DECIDE WHAT LAW HE WILL RELY UPON AS WELL AS VIOLATE HIS 7TH. AMENDMENT RIGHTS VOIDING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. I MOTION THAT THIS CASE BE REMANDED, CURTIS v. LOETHER, 415 U.S. 189, 94 S.Ct. 1005, 39 L.Ed.2d. 260(U.S.1974); PENNSYLVANIA NAT. MUT. CAS. INS. CO. v. TANNER, 2013 WL 140425(DSC.2013); ORTIZ v. FIREBOARD CORP., 527 U.S. 815, 119 S.Ct. 2295, 144 L.Ed.2d. 715(U.S.1999); CITY OF MONTEREY, LTD., 526 U.S. 687, 119 S.Ct. 1624 (U.S.1999); FELTNER v. COLUMBIA PICTURES TELEVISION, INC., 523 U.S. 340, 118 S.Ct. 1279 (U.S.1988).

INASMUCH, 15 A.L.R. Fed.2d. 143 RUNS AFOUL OF THE SAFEGUARDS PLACED INTO EFFECT BY EX PARTE VIRGINIA, OF 1887. THIS LEGISLATIVE PROVISION DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETS AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT MAKING THE LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENT UNCONSTITUTIONAL WHICH MUST BE DECLARED VOID AND OR NO EFFECT FOR WHICH THE JURY MUST BE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR THIS ISSUE BY THE PLAINTIFF'S DUE PROCESS RIGHTS WHICH NOW ALSO ESTABLISHES CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S JURISDICTION FOR MAKING USE OF THIS PROVISION OF LAW MAKING IT A REQUISITE TO ENTRY INTO THIS APPEAL BY THIS LEGISLATION'S SURREPTITIOUS UNCONSTITUTIONAL DESIGN AND AIM. THE LEGISLATION WAS FRAUDULENTLY USED AND OR SET IN PLACE TO THE DESTRUCTION OF FAIR LANDMARKS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION. THE EVIDENCE GATHERED BY MICHELLE ALEXANDER AND THE AUTHORS OF THE DOCUMENTARY "13" MUST BE GIVEN OPPORTUNITY TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE JURY WHICH RIGHT THE PLAINTIFF DOES NOT WAIVE OR FORFEIT. AN ACT OF CONGRESS THAT IS REPUGNANT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW, SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES, 83 U.S. (16 WALL) 36 (U.S.1873); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624 (4th.Cir.2016); EVANCHO v. PINE-RICH AND SCHOOL DISTRICT, 237 F.Supp.3d. 267, 301 (M.D.Pa.2017); TAYLOR v. U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2074, 195 L.Ed.2d. 456, 84 U.S.L.W 4462 (U.S.2016); KLAYMAN v. OBAMA, 142 F.Supp.3d. 172 (D.D.C.2015); ZIVOTOFSKY EX REL ZIVOTOFSKY v. KERRY, 135 S.Ct. 2076, 192 L.Ed.2d. 83, 83 U.S.L.W. 4391 (U.S.2015); EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339 (U.S.1880).

IT IS PERSPICUOUS FROM THE PLEADING WHICH OCCURRED UNDER 1997 WL 10291 U.S. (APPELLATE BRIEF) BRIEF OF U.S. SENATORS ORIN G. HATCH, STROM THURMOND ET. AL., THAT CONGRESS CAN INDEED BE SUED FOR ISSUES OF CONCERN SUCH AS THIS. SO WHAT THE HECK ARE THESE COMPROMISED JUDGES DOING DISMISSING THIS CASE, SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE, WHICH FURTHER SERVE TO SUBSTANTIATE THE CLAIMS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, WHICH VOIDS THE DISTRICT COURT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION? THIS WAS ALSO ARGUED UNDER

CASE 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM WHERE THESE CASES ORIGINATE FROM VIA THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD WHICH ALSO SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN DISMISSED ESTABLISHING CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND COMMON DESIGN OF THE PARTIES ACTING IN CONCERT IN ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THE LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS COMING UNDER ATTACK HERE TRANSGRESS THE LIMITS OF CONGRESS WHERE BY THEIR ACTION THEY'VE ESTABLISHED A MODERN DAY RACIAL CASTE SYSTEM AND NEW FORM OF JIM CROW LAWS SETTING IN PLACE A FORM OF MODERN DAY SLAVERY VIOLATING THE 13TH., THE C.A.T. TREATY AND 15TH. AMENDMENTS, ALSO WHERE THE STATES TAKE AWAY THE RIGHT TO VOTE, CIRCUMVENTING AND OR DIMINISHING AND OR NEGATING AND OR WATERING DOWN, SURREPTITIOUSLY, CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS SET IN PLACE BY EX PARTE VIRGINIA, 100 U.S. 339 (U.S.1880); THE AMISTAD, 40 U.S. 518, 15 PET. 518, 1841 WL 5024, 2006 A.M.C. 2955, 10 L.Ed. 826 (U.S.Conn.1841) AND THE 14TH. AMENDMENT. NO STATE SHALL MAKE OR ENFORCE LAWS THAT ABRIDGE THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES....., CROSON, 488 U.S. AT. 490. CONGRESS LACKS THE POWER UNDER SECTION 5 TO ADOPT LEGISLATION THAT IS OTHERWISE "PROHIBITED" BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, McCULLOCH, 17 U.S. AT.423. CONGRESS MAY NOT LEGISLATE UNDER SECTION 5 IN A WAY THAT VIOLATES RIGHTS PROTECTED BY THE 14TH. AMENDMENT ITSELF. SECTION 5 GRANTS CONGRESS NO POWER TO RESTRICT, ABROGATE OR DILUTE THE GUARANTEES SET IN PLACE BY THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION WHICH IS DESIGNED TO PROTECT THEM FROM LEGISLATION, LAWS OR ACTS THAT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGET THEM TO THEIR DETRIMENT, WHETHER IT WAS INTENTIONAL OR UNINTENTIONAL, WHETHER IT IS OVERT DETRIMENTAL ACTION OR SURREPTITIOUS DETRIMENTAL ACTION. CHALLENGE IS MADE WHERE THIS LEGISLATION DIRECTLY EFFECTS THE PLAINTIFF GIVING THE PLAINTIFF STANDING TO BRING SUIT. THIS CASE MUST BE REMANDED TO HAVE THE JURY ADDRESS THESE MATTERS BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CAN USE THE PLRA AS A MEANS OF ENTRY INTO THIS COURT. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S USE OF IT, ALSO DUE TO THE FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DONE WITHIN THE LOWER DISTRICT COURT TO BE SILENT, THWART JUDICIAL REVIEW, AND TO SILENCE THESE ISSUES IN THE COURT RECORD TO PREVENT OR HINDER ANY

PROPER SUBSEQUENT FUTURE APPEAL, DIRECTLY IMPACTS THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER' WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT HAS USED THE FINAL ORDER PRODUCED BY OVERWHELMING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AS A MEANS TO HEAR AND DECLARE LAW RELATED TO THIS APPEAL, CITY OF ROME v. U.S., 446 U.S. 156 (1980); S.C. v. KATZENBACH, 383 U.S. 301 (U.S.1966); PLAUT v. SPENDTHRIFT FARMS INC., 115 S.Ct. 1447 (U.S.1995); MISSISSIPPI UNIV. FOR WOMEN v. HOGAN, 458 U.S. 718, 732 (U.S.1982); ADARAND CONSTRUCTORS INC. v. PENA, 115 S.Ct. 2097 (U.S.1995); NORTH CAROLINA STATE CONFERENCE OF N.A.A.C.P. v. McCRORY, 831 F3d. 204 (4th.Cir.2016); JOHNSON v. McGRANDY, 512 U.S. 997, 1018, 114 S.Ct. 2647, 129 L.Ed.2d. 775 (U.S.1994); VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS v. METROPOLITAN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORP., 429 U.S. 252, 97 S.Ct. 555, 50 L.Ed.2d. 450 (U.S.1977); WASHINGTON v. DAVIS, 426 U.S. 229, 241, 96 S.Ct. 2040, 48 L.Ed.2d. 597 (U.S.1976); HUNT v. CROMARTIE, 526 U.S. 541, 119 S.Ct. 1545, 143 L.Ed.2d. 731 (U.S.1999); MILLER v. JOHNSON, 515 U.S. 900, 920, 115 S.Ct. 2475, 132 L.Ed.2d. 762 (U.S.1995); ANDERSON v. CELEBREEZE, 460 U.S. 700, 792-93, 103 S.Ct. 1564, 75 L.Ed.2d. 547 (U.S.1983); CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS 1st., 2nd., 4th., 5th., 6th., 8th., 13th., 14th., AND 15th.; COOPER v. HARRIS, 137 S.Ct. 1455, 197 L.Ed.2d. 837, 85 U.S.L.W. 4257 (U.S.2017); BANK OF AMERICA CORP. v. CITY OF MIAMI FLA., 137 S.Ct. 1296, 197 L.Ed.2d. 678, 85 U.S.L.W. 4227 (U.S.2017); COOK COUNTY v. BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION, 2018 WL 1561725(2018).

THERE IS YET ANOTHER MATTER THAT PRESENTS A DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER. THIS CASE WAS NEVER INTENDED BY THE APPELLANT TO BE FILED BEFORE THIS COURT. IT WAS SENT TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BY THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO CONCEAL ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS AND IN ADDITIONAL ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, WHICH PRESENTS AN ADDITIONAL INFRINGEMENT UPON THE PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY PRODUCING STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS ERROR REVIEW.

THE APPELLANT SOUGHT TO FILE THIS APPEAL BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1251(a) AND 1252 WHERE THE APPELLANT IS AT PRESENT WAITING FOR THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S DECISION TO HEAR THIS CASE. SEE EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1252 APPEAL" HEREWITH ATTACHED. THE SUPREME COURT, GOOD LORD WILLING, IS IN THE PROCESS OF DETERMINING WHETHER OR NOT, DUE TO THE PROCEEDINGS EMERGING FROM CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 BASED UPON THE (193) MEMBER STATES OF THE UNITED NATION DEFAULTING IN THAT CASE, BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE THAT IS JURISDICTION IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, SUPPORTED BY THE 4th. CIRCUIT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415(4th.Cir.2018) AND FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) TIMELY ASSERTED BEING APPLICABLE TO STATE PROCESSING RULES VIA THE 5th. AND 14th. AMENDMENTS DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE 14TH. AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, A STATE CASE THAT WAS REMOVED TO THIS CASE SUBJUDICE BEFORE THE COURT IN FRAUD CONSPIRED IN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. IS THE PLAINTIFF TO BE DEEMED THE EMBODIMENT OF A FOREIGN STATE AS ARGUED VIA THE DEFAULT BASED UPON THOSE TIMELY ASSERTED PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AS WELL AS BY STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW AND THE LAW OF CONTRACTS PROTECTED UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION? THIS WOULD ALLOW THE APPELLANT TO INVOKE THAT COURT'S EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §§ 1251(a) AND 1252. THUS, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WOULD BE WITHOUT JURISDICTION UNTIL THE U.S. SUPREME COURT RULES, MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH INC. v. MANNING, 136 S.Ct. 1562, 194 L.Ed.2d. 671 (U.S.2016); CALIFORNIA v. ARIZONA, 440 U.S. 59, 99 S.Ct. 919, 59 L.Ed.2d. 144 (U.S.1979); KANSAS v. NEBRASKA, 574 U.S. 445, 135 S.Ct. 1042, 191 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.2015). THERE ARE ALSO POTENTIALLY DECEDENT DOMICILE ISSUES THAT ATTACH DUE TO REPARATIONS AND FIDUCIARY CLAIMS THAT WOULD WARRANT SUCH A REVIEW, STATE OF TEXAS v. STATE OF FLORIDA, 306 U.S. 398, 59 S.Ct. 563, 83 L.Ed. 817 (U.S.1939); RILEY v. NEW YORK TRUST CO., 315 U.S. 343, 62 S.Ct. 608, 86 L.Ed. 885 (U.S.1942); HANSON v. DENCKLA, 357 U.S. 235, 78 S.Ct. 1228, 2 L.Ed.2d. 1283 (U.S.1958)(ALSO DEALING WITH TRUSTEE AND FIDUCIARY HEIR CLAIMS).

ALSO PURSUANT TO 1952 CONGRESS MANDATE DIRECT REVIEW NOT SIMPLY FOR DECISIONS WITH IMPACT BUT RATHER ALSO FOR DECISIONS WHOSE IMPACT WAS PREDICATED UPON A POTENTIALLY INCORRECT EXERCISE OF JUDICIAL REVIEW WHICH OCCURRED BY THE LOWER COURTS INVOLVED. THE ORDER PRODUCED IN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT VIA CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM, THE CASE AS A WHOLE, WAS A PART OF THE JUDICIAL PROCEEDING WITHIN THE 5TH. CIRCUIT BY THE LITIGATION SUBMITTED BEFORE THE COURTS WHERE THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT STATUTE HAS BEEN DECLARED UNCONSTITUTIONAL BY THE DETERMINATION UNDER CASE 19-1001 ET. AL., AND THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT, WHICH PERMITS THE APPELLANT TO SEEK LEAVE TO INVOKE 28 U.S.C. § 1252. A PARTY HAS A STATUTORY RIGHT TO DIRECT REVIEW IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT OF A DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT HOLDING A FEDERAL STATUTE UNCONSTITUTIONAL WHEN THE FEDERAL STATUTORY UNCONSTITUTIONALITY IS AT ISSUE. THIS IS COUPLED BY THE FACT THAT THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF 51 A.L.R. Fed.2d. 143 IS CALLED INTO QUESTION.

NATURAL SENSE OF THE STATUTE PERMITTING DIRECT REVIEW BY SUPREME COURT FROM JUDGMENT, DECREE OR ORDER OF A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT HOLDING AN ACT OF CONGRESS UNCONSTITUTIONAL IS THAT HOLDING OF STATUTORY CONSTITUTIONALITY. SINCE CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM WAS A PART OF THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE UNDER CASE 19-1001 IN THE 5th. CIRCUIT WHERE RULING OF UNCONSTITUTIONALITY RELATED TO ACA MATTERS, WHICH ARE INTRINSICALLY A PART OF THE ISSUES FILED IN CASE(S) 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM; 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM AND 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-BM, COUPLED BY THE TEXAS DISTRICT COURT'S RULING IN THESE MULTI-DISTRICT SOUGHT AND OR PARALLEL CASES SEEKING § 1407 TRANSFER. THE APPELLANT IS PERMITTED TO SEEK REVIEW UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1252, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER THE FORT BEND TEXAS CASE THAT ESTABLISH THE DEFAULT VIA TIMELY EXERCISE OF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON BEING JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE WHICH CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED IS MANDATORY. THE CASE IS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES

SUPREME COURT'S HANDS AND JURISDICTION TO DECIDE THE MERITS OF THIS JURISDICTIONAL CLAIM, NOT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT. SUCH A REVIEW BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WOULD CONSTITUTE AN USURPATION OF THE SUPREME COURT'S POWER AND AUTHORITY VIOLATING SEPARATION OF POWERS WHICH WOULD VOID THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. WHEN A PARTY HAS A RIGHT TO PURSUE A DIRECT APPEAL TO THE SUPREME COURT UNDER § 1252, THE NORMAL ROUTE TO APPELLATE REVIEW IS BLOCKED, AND THE COURT OF APPEALS IS WITHOUT JURISDICTION, DONOVAN v. RICHLAND COUNTY ASS'N FOR RETARDED CITIZENS SUPRA., 454 U.S. AT 389-390, 102 S.Ct. AT 713-14; VIRGINIA HOUSE OF DELEGATES v. BETHUNE-HILL, 139 S.Ct. 1945, 204 L.Ed.2d. 305 (U.S. 2019); VERLINDEN B.V. v. CENTRAL BANK OF NIGERIA, 461 U.S. 480, 103 S.Ct. 1962, 76 L.Ed.2d. 81 (U.S.1983); OPATA v. REPUBLIC OF SUDAN, 140 S.Ct. 1601 (U.S.2020)(ALSO DEALING WITH PUNITIVE DAMAGES RELATED TO REPARATIONS AS FIDUCIARY HEIR BY ACTS THAT CAN BE CONSTRUED AS STATE SPONSORED OR SANCTIONED TERRORISM REGARDING THE U.S. SLAVE TRADE.); OVERBY v. GORDON, 177 U.S. 214, 20 S.Ct. 603, 44 L.Ed. 741 (U.S.1900); CHENG FAN KWOK v. I.N.S., 392 U.S. 206, 212, 88 S.Ct. 1970, 1974, 20 L.Ed.2d. 1037 (U.S.1968); HECKLER v. EDWARDS, 465 U.S. 870, 104 S.Ct. 1532, 79 L.Ed.2d. 878(U.S.1984); JOHNSON v. BERRYHILL, 2020 WL 406909 (2020); WALTERS v. NATIONAL ASS'N OF RADIATION SERVICES, 473 U.S. 305, 105 S.Ct. 3180, 87 L.Ed.2d. 220, 53 U.S.L.W. 4947(U.S.1985).

INSOMUCH, BY NOT LISTING THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE PROPERLY VIOLATING THE PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY AND OTHER CLAIMS ARGUED. THE FINAL ORDER CANNOT BE DEEMED A FINAL ORDER, TAINTED BY EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT THAT IT IS, WHEN THE RIGHTS OF ALL PARTIES THAT THE APPELLANT INTENDED TO BRING ACTION AGAINST HAVE NEVER BEEN ADJUDICATED BY THIS CLEAR CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR OF THE COURT PURPOSELY LISTING THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY TO THWART JUDICIAL REVIEW WHICH IS A COMMON DESIGN OF THE CONSPIRACY ENGAGED IN BY THE JUDGES AND DEFENDANTS INVOLVED THAT SPITS IN

THE FACE OF 18 U.S.C. § 1001 AND "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" IN THEIR EFFORTS TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS AND KEEP THE RECORD SILENT ON THE ISSUES PRESENTED SUBJUDICE. THIS INCLUDES THEIR EFFORTS TO PREVENT THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THE HANDS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM BEING ADDRESSED. SUCH ACTION VIOLATES DUE PROCESS AND RENDER THE PROCEEDING UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION WHICH IS CORRUPTED BY THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT. BY THE FACTS PRESENTED, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER IS LIMITED TO ADDRESSING THE FRAUD ONLY AND REMANDING THIS CASE BACK DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT TO ALLOW THE MATTERS TO BE PLACED BEFORE A JURY AS IS SOUGHT BY THE PLAINTIFF. THUS, I MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME, TO RESET, ONCE THE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED PRODUCING CITING OF LAW. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT HEAR AN APPEAL OR THE MERITS OF THE BRIEF WHERE ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER IS CLEARLY BEING CALLED INTO QUESTION, ELAN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. v. DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF TAXATION, 2014 WL 1796633 (N.J.D.2014); IN RE: CIRCUIT CITY STORES INC., 515 B.R. 302, 308, Bkrtcy (E.D.Va.2014); WILZIG v. SISSELMAN, 209 N.J. SUPER. 25, 506 A.2d. 1238 (Sup.Ct.1986); TRIZZINO v. KLINE BROS. CO., 106 ILL. App.3d. 230, 435 N.E.2d. 958 (1982); SOUTH TEXAS WILDHORSE DESERT RESORT INVS. INC. v. TEXAS COMMERCE BANK-RIO GRAND VALLEY N.A., 1314 B.R. 107 (S.D.Tex.2004); LIBERTY MUT. INS. CO. v. WETZEL, 424 U.S. 737, 96 S.Ct. 1202 (U.S.1976); U.S. v. \$41,320 U.S. CURRENCY, 9 F.Supp.3d. 582, 2014 WL 1266240; BLACKWATER SECURITY CONSULTING LLC., 460 F3d. 576 CA4 (N.C.2006); DICKENS v. AETNA LIFE INS. CO., 677 F3d. 228 CA4 (W.Va.2012); LEWIS-MURRAY v. MURRAY, S.E.2d., 2005 WL 7084812(S.C.App.2005); CAMPMAN v. DEMIOFF, BOBERG & ASSOCIATES, INC., 319 Fed. Appx' 293 CA4 (S.C.2009); UNITED STUDENT AID FUNDS, INC. v. ESPINOSA, 559 U.S. 260, 130 S.Ct. 1367(U.S.2010); ELDERBERRY OF WEBER CITY, LLC. v. LIVING CENTERS-SOUTHEAST, INC., --F3d.--, 2015 WL 4430836 CA4 (Va.2015); FOX EX REL FOX v. ELK RUN COAL CO. INC., 739 F3d. 131 CA4 (2014); U.S. v. ABDULWAHAB, 715 F3d. 521 CA4 (Va.2013); U.S. EX REL NATHAN v. TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS NORTH AMERICAN INC., 707

F3d. 451 CA4 (Va.2013); U.S. v. JONES, 716 F3d. 851 CA4 (Va.2013); U.S. v. PANLOCK, 494 Fed. Appx' 366 CA4 (W.Va.2012); U.S. v. DALCOUR, 203 U.S. 408, 27 S.Ct. 58 (U.S.1906)(FRAUD TO AVOID THE F.S.I.A. AND DENY REMOVAL TO FEDERAL FORUM.); S & E CONTRACTORS, INC. v. U.S., 406 U.S. 1, 92 S.Ct. 1411 (U.S.1972).

WITHOUT JURISDICTION THE 4TH. CIRCUIT CANNOT PROCEED AT ALL TO HEAR THE BRIEF OR ADDRESS ITS MERITS IN ANY CAUSE; JURISDICTION IS THE POWER TO DECLARE LAW, AND WHEN IT CEASE TO EXIST, AS IT HAS IN THIS APPEAL, THE ONLY FUNCTION REMAINING TO THE COURT IS THAT OF ANNOUNCING THE FACT AND DISMISSING THE CAUSE REMANDING THIS CASE BACK DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT OR FORWARD IT TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1252. OBJECTION TO FEDERAL COURTS LACKING SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, IN THIS CASE UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, MAY BE RAISED BY ANY PARTY, OR BY THE COURT ON ITS OWN INITIATIVE, AT ANY STAGE IN THE LITIGATION, EVEN AFTER TRIAL AND ENTRY OF A JUDGMENT WHICH IS INDISPUTABLY BEFORE THIS COURT, ARBAUGH v. Y & H CORP., 546 U.S. 500, 126 S.Ct. 1235(U.S.2006); STEVENS E. HECKER, PLAINTIFF v. THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, DEFENDANTS, 2020 WL 134168(Fed.Cl.2020). THE COURT HAS AN INDEPENDENT OBLIGATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION EXIST WHICH REQUIRE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO ADDRESS THE MERITS OF THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES WITHOUT ESSENTIALLY RULING ON THE CLINTON BILL ISSUE WHERE THAT ISSUE IS TO BE HEARD BEFORE THE JURY BY THE APPELLANT'S 7TH. AMENDMENT RIGHTS ALSO RELATED TO DUE PROCESS. THIS DOES NOT EVEN TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THAT THERE ARE STILL (2) EXISTING DEFAULTS MADE MANDATORY VIA THE RULINGS UNDER WHEELER AND FORT BEND TEXAS CASES BY THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE ARGUED AND RELIED UPON RELATED TO THE DEFENDANTS THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED BEFORE THE JURY AS WELL, HICKS v. HEART OF HOSPICE, LLC., 2019 WL 6255496(N.D.Miss.2019); KRIKORIAN v. FORD MOTOR COMPANY, 2019 WL 7042939 (S.D.Ala.2019).

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, BECAUSE IT INVOLVES THE COURT'S POWER TO HEAR A CASE, CAN NEVER BE FORFEITED OR WAIVED.

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION CANNOT INSTRUCT THE APPELLANT TO FILE BRIEF AND DECLARE IT WILL ADDRESS THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES AFTER IT RULES ON THE MERITS OF THE BRIEF. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT WOULD NOT HAVE THE POWER TO DO SO. THIS OCCURRED IN A PRIOR APPEAL FILED BY THE APPELLANT. THE CITINGS OF LAW DEMONSTRATE THAT THE APPELLANT WAS RIGHT WITHIN THOSE PROCEEDINGS. THIS PRODUCED OVERWHELMING PREJUDICE FORCING THE APPELLANT TO WITHDRAW THOSE APPEALS TO PREVENT THE MANIFEST INJUSTICE FROM OCCURRING. THE SAME CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO OCCUR HERE WHERE SUCH ACTION WOULD ALSO AID IN RENDERING THE APPEAL UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID FOR DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND VIOLATION OF 18 U.S.C. § 1001 AND YOUR OATHS OF OFFICE PURSUANT TO 5 U.S.C. §§ 3333, 3331 AND 7311, HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+ U.S.; BURGESS v. UNITED STATES, 2019 WL 7293400 * 1 D.Md.; BARNES v. GIVENS, 2019 WL 5579543, * 3, W.D.Tex.; WALLS v. BOEING COMPANY, 2019 WL 4931365, * 2, D.S.C..

ALTHOUGH COURTS ARE GENERALLY LIMITED UNDER ADVERSARIAL SYSTEM TO ADDRESS THE CLAIMS AND REQUIREMENTS ADVANCED BY THE PARTIES, FEDERAL COURTS HAVE AN INDEPENDENT OBLIGATION TO ENSURE THAT THEY DO NOT EXCEED THE SCOPE OF THEIR JURISDICTION SUCH AS OCCURRED IN THIS CASE WHERE ALL THESE CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERRORS AND DEFECTS ARGUED EXIST WITHIN THIS CASE WHICH PRODUCE AN INSTANT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER AS WELL VIA THE DEFAULT BY THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE ARGUED SUPPORTED BY THE FORT BEND COUNTY CASE AND VIA THE COURT ENTERTAINING JURISDICTION BY MAKING USE OF THIS CORRUPTED, TAINTED FINAL ORDER ISSUED FROM THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT. THEREFORE, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT MUST RAISE AND DECIDE JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS THAT THE PARTIES EITHER OVERLOOKED OR ELECT NOT TO PRESS (EMPHASIS ADDED) WHICH REQUIRE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO ADDRESS THE CLAIMS THAT PRESENT CHALLENGE TO ITS ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER BEFORE IT BE REQUIRED THAT ANY BRIEF BE SUBMITTED WHERE REMAND IS REQUIRED IN THIS CASE AND THE COURT'S JURISDICTION IS LIMITED TO ADDRESSING THE FRAUD ONLY. THE APPELLANT MOTIONS TO

REMAND AND AWAIT THE POTENTIAL U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW, JEFFERS v. J.P. MORGAN CHASE & CO., 2019 WL 6255311, * 1, S.D.Tex.; ANTHONY W. HALL, PLAINTIFF v. FRENKEL, LAMBERT...., 2020 WL 136658, * 2, E.D.N.Y.; DAVIS v. PALUMBO, 2019 WL 6915949, * 1 W.D.MO..

THE HOLDINGS BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) ADJUDICATED IF TIMELY ASSERTED THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON THAT ESTABLISH THE DEFAULT AND RIGHTS OF THE APPELLANT BECOMES MANDATORY WITH ALL CLAIMS THERETO ATTACHED. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT HAS AN INDEPENDENT OBLIGATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION EXIST BASED UPON THE JURISDICTIONAL PLEADING AND IT CANNOT BE CIRCUMVENTED INSTRUCTING THE APPELLANT TO FILE HIS BRIEF AND THEY WILL BE ADDRESSED AFTER THE MERITS OF THE BRIEF ARE DETERMINED.. THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT HAD THE SAME OBLIGATION VIA THE MOTION TO RECUSE AND AMEND THE DEFENDANTS AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS FILED BEFORE IT, BUT CONSPIRED UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO REMAIN SILENT AND DENY THE APPELLANT OF APPEALABLE ISSUES THAT WOULD HAVE POTENTIALLY, EVENTUALLY, COME BEFORE THIS COURT. THE AFOREMENTIONED PRODUCE DIRECT CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER AND MUST BE DETERMINED EVEN IN ABSENCE OF CHALLENGE FROM ANY PARTY, SORRINGWING ENERGY, LLC. v. CATIC U.S.A. INCORPORATED, --F3d.--, 5TH. Cir.(Tex.); 460 S. LAKE AVENUE, LTD. v. APPLETON, 2019 WL 7184737, * 1 C.D.cal.; SLAYTON v. JOHNSON AND JOHNSON, 2019 WL 7208414, * 1 C.D.Cal..

THE FURTHER INJUSTICE THAT OCCURRED FROM THE JUDGES INVOLVE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IS THAT THE APPELLANT ALSO INTENDED TO FILE HIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS UNDER THIS CASE DUE TO THE CONVICTION NO LONGER BEING DEEMED VALID BY RELATED PLEADING BEFORE THE OTHER COURTS INVOLVED. BECAUSE THIS MANIFEST INJUSTICE OCCURRED, THE APPELLANT WAS DENIED THIS OPPORTUNITY WHICH WOULD HAVE BEEN PERMITTED UNDER THE

CIRCUMSTANCES. FRAUD AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VITIATE EVERYTHING THAT THEY ENTER. ALL JUDGMENTS PROCURED BY FRAUD MAY BE COLLATERALLY ATTACKED FOR THAT FRAUD WHICH IS FREE OF ALL PROCEDURAL LIMITATIONS, FIST TECHNOLOGY CAPITAL, INC. v. BANCTEC, INC., 2016 WL 7444943(D.C.Ky.2016); MARTIN v. TARGET CORP. OF MINNESOTA, F.Supp.2d., 2013 WL 1187034 (D.N.J.2013); McCLAIN v. 1st. SECURITY BANK OF WASHINGTON, 2016 WL 8504775 (W.D.Wash.2016).

INASMUCH, IF YOU TAKE A FATALLY DEFECTIVE INDICTMENT AND YOU BRING IT BEFORE THE CRIMINAL COURT FOR THE SAKE OF FRAUDULENTLY PROCURING A CONVICTION, DEPRIVING THE DEFENDANT OF THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE, PREDETERMINING IN ADVANCE THE OUTCOME OF THE PROCEEDINGS BY THE LANGUAGE CONTAINED THEREIN, DEPRIVING THE DEFENDANT OF FAIR AND PROPER NOTICE OF THE "[C]AUSE AND [N]ATURE" OF THE ACCUSATION(S) BEING LEVIED AGAINST HIM DEPRIVING HIM OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IT IS THAT HE IS CALLED UPON TO MEET AND DEFEND, CONTRUCTIVELY AMENDING THE INDICTMENTS ALL OVER THE PLACE ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE(S) CHARGED WHICH IS TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. THEN YOU COUPLE THIS WITH ALL THE OTHER EGREGIOUS DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS ARGUED UNDER CASE(S) 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM; 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM; 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM; 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-BM AND ALL THE OTHER RELATED CASES, VIOLATING DUE PROCESS PRODUCING OVERWHELMING PREJUDICE WHERE THE CLINTON BILL LEGISLATION WAS USED IN ALL OF THEM? SUCH ACTION DONE WITHIN THE PROCEEDINGS RENDERS THE PROCEEDINGS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOIDS THE COURT'S INVOLVED JURISDICTION FOR THAT UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION WHICH IS TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE "DUE PROCESS/CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG" TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION. THE ADDITIONAL LITIGATION SUBMITTED IS FILED WITHIN THE CASES AFOREMENTIONED TO WHICH CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM ORIGINATES FROM VIA THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT. THESE MATTERS ARE SET TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE JURY WHERE APPLICABLE AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1252. ALL JUDGMENTS THAT VIOLATE DUE


PROCESS AND ARE CONTRARY TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARE VOID. THIS APPLIES TO THE JUDGMENTS, ORDERS OR DECREES OF ALL COURTS ON RECORD, WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C., LLC., 859 F3d. 295 (4th.Cir.2017); MOSELY v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 1187778 (W.D.N.C.2018); MILFORD v. MIDDLETON, 2018 WL 348059(DSC.2018); RUBIN v. ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, 138 S.Ct. 816, 86 U.S.L.W. 4064(U.S.2018)(DEALING WITH THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS RELATED TO THE SOLE CORPORATION.).

THE LAW AS DETERMINED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IS CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS ON THE ISSUES SUCH AS THE ONES BEING ARGUED WITHIN THIS APPEAL AND THE CASES SUBJUDICE. IF A RULING HAS BEEN OBTAINED BY AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR LEGISLATIVE STATUTE AND OR INTERPRETATION OF LAW AND OR ACT, WHICH INCLUDE FRAUD. THE LAW EXPLAINED IF THIS POSITION IS WELL TAKEN, WHICH IT IS, IT EFFECTS THE **"FOUNDATION"** OF THE **"WHOLE"** (EMPHASIS ADDED) PROCEEDING, CONFIRMING ALSO THAT **"FRAUD AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION VITIATES EVERYTHING"**. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND OR ACT AND OR STATUTE AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR CONVICTION IS **"VOID"** AND IS AS IF THERE WERE NO LAW AND OR ACT AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR LEGISLATIVE STATUTE AND OR CONVICTION MADE OR DONE AT ALL, BEING STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE WHICH HAVE JURISDICTIONAL RAMIFICATIONS AS WELL. THE GENERAL RULE IS THAT AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR LEGISLATIVE STATUTE AND OR ACT AND OR CRIMINAL CONVICTION AND OR LAW, THOUGH HAVING THE FORM AND NAME OF LAW, IT IS IN REALITY NO LAW BY SUCH ACTS, BUT IS **"WHOLLY VOID"** AND INEFFECTIVE FOR ANY PURPOSE, TO INCLUDE ANY JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OR CONVICTION ATTACHED TO IT, SINCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONALITY DATES FROM THE TIME IT WAS ENACTED AND OR WHEN IT WAS DONE....IN LEGAL CONTEMPLATION, IT IS INOPERATIVE AS IF IT HAD NEVER BEEN PASSED OR DONE.....SINCE AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL STATUTE AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR CONVICTION AND OR LAW AND OR ACT IS VOID, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLE FOLLOWS THAT IT IMPOSES NO DUTY (DUTY TO

MAINTAIN THIS APPEAL OR A CORRUPTED. CONVICTION), CONFERS NO RIGHTS (THE 4TH. CIRCUIT HAS NO RIGHT TO PROCEED IN THIS APPEAL AND THE STATE HAS NO RIGHT TO MAINTAIN AN ILLEGAL CONVICTION ALL PRODUCED BY FRAUD AND VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS LAW.), CREATES NO OFFICE (JUDICIAL, PROSECUTIONAL OR OTHERWISE), BESTOWS NO POWER OR AUTHORITY **"ON ANY PERSON"** (EMPHASIS ADDED)[WHICH MEANS THAT YOUR ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER IS MADE VOID REQUIRING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO DISMISS THE APPEAL AND REMAND THE CASE BACK DOWN TO THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT], AFFORDS NO PROTECTION (THE COURTS AND PROSECUTORS ARE NOT IMMUNE IF THEY FAIL TO CORRECT THE INJUSTICES ONCE REMANDED OR THEY WOULD BE VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE), AND JUSTIFIES NO ACTS PERFORMED UNDER IT (IT WOULD BE ILLEGAL FOR THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO HEAR A BRIEF AT THIS TIME.)....A VOID ACT CANNOT BE LEGALLY CONSISTENT WITH A VALID ONE WHERE HERE IT IS COUPLED BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT THAT OCCURRED RELATED TO THESE MATTERS. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND OR LEGISLATIVE STATUTE AND OR CRIMINAL CONVICTION WHICH ALL OF THIS MUST BE ADDRESSED IN THE LOWER COURT ALSO VIA JURY TRIAL CANNOT OPERATE TO SUPERSEDE AN EXISTING LAW OR BE PERMITTED TO DEPRIVE A DEFENDANT OF LIBERTY. INDEED INSOFAR A CRIMINAL CONVICTION AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND OR LEGISLATIVE STATUTE AND OR ACT RUNS COUNTER TO THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE LAND (THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, DUE PROCESS LAW, THAT INDICTMENTS ARE TO BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE DUE PROCESS/CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, NOT THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG AS THE COURTS MISTAKINGLY HAVE DONE), IT IS SUPERSEDED THEREBY. NO ONE IS BOUND TO OBEY FRAUD AND AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION. A REVERSIBLE CONVICTION IS REVERSIBLE REGARDLESS OF THE REASON, AND AN INVALID CONVICTION IS NO CONVICTION AT ALL. A CONVICTION UNDER AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW IS NOT MERELY ERRONEOUS, BUT IT IS ILLEGAL AND VOID, AND CANNOT BE A LEGAL CAUSE OF IMPRISONMENT. ALL RULES, STATUTES, LAWS, PRACTICES (LIKE THE FRAUD AND MACHINATION ENGAGED IN BY THE JUDGES OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT INVOLVING THESE LEGAL CONCERNS), WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARE **"NULL"** AND **"VOID"**, UNITED STATES v. LIBOUS, 858 F3d. 63 (2nd.Cir.2017); CITY OF LEBANNON v. MILBURN, 286 Or. App. 212,

398 P.3d. 486(2017); PEOPLE v. FIELDS, N.E.3d., ILL. App. (1st.) 122012-UB; FARROW v. LIPETZKY, 2017 WL 1540637 (N.C.Cal.2017); UNITED STATES v. AJRAWAT,--Fed. Appx'--, 2018 WL 3045619 (4th.Cir.2018); BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723 (U.S.2016); MARTIN v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 1626578, * 2 D.Md.; PYNE v. UNITED STATES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 1377402(D.C.Md.2016); MARBURY v. MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137, 180; VINES v. UNITED STATES, 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1163(1), 1165(1); ROBINSON v. ARVONIO, 27 F3d. 877 REHEARING DENIED CERT. GRANTED VACATED 115 S.Ct. 1247, 513 U.S. 1186, 131 L.Ed.2d. 129; LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Supp.3d. 19 (2014); JOHNSON v. UNITED STATES,--S.Ct.--, 2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015); MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016); NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249, 197 L.Ed.2d. 611, 85 U.S.L.W. 4205 (U.S.2017); GEFT OUTDOORS, LLC. v. CONSOLIDATION CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS***, 187 F.Supp.3d. 1002, 1012, S.D.ILL.; HILL v. SNYDER, 821 F3d. 763, 765+ (6th.Cir.Mich.); PEOPLE v. SOLO, N.E.3d., 2017 WL 1838423(2017); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624 (4th.Cir.2016); VAETH v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 775386(D.C.Md.2016).

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonah The Tishbite', is written over the signature line.

OCTOBER 9, 2020

LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD

#300839 F2B Rm 1260

LEE C.I. 990 WISKEY HWY

Bishopville SC 29010

RECEIVED

SEP 22 2021

SC Court of Appeals

SC Court of Appeals

P.O. Box 11629

Columbia, SC 29211