

RECEIVED

OCT 13 2021

SC Court of Appeals

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

DOCKET CASE NO. 21-1330; 21-6275; 20-7073; 19-2005 ET. AL.,

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

APPELLANT/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; NOTICE
OF INTENT TO SEEK LEAVE TO APPEAL THE ORDER DENYING THE
STAY UNDER CASE 21-6275; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF
TIME TO FILE INFORMAL BRIEF TO RESET ONCE THE SUPREME
COURT DECIDE IF IT WILL GRANT THE WRIT OF CERTIORARI
AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS; MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: TO SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI

3-of-5

TO:

TO: THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,
THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,
THE 1st. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS,
THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY ET.


AL.,

FIRST THE APPELLANTS WANT TO GIVE THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY AND COURTS JUDICIAL NOTICE. SINCE THE PETITIONER ARE INDEED OFFICIALLY SEEKING ON THE RECORD AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE CRIMINAL AFFAIRS OF THE JUDGES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. BE ADVISED THAT JUDGE JEAN TOAL CAME OUT OF RETIREMENT FOR THE SPECIFIC PURPOSE OF SITTING ON THIS CASE IN THE RICHLAND COURT TO CONCEAL LEGAL DOCUMENTS FILED UNDER CASE 2013-CP-400-0084 AND THE OTHER RELATED CASES. ONE OF THE ESSENTIAL WAYS THEY DO THIS IS TO TAKE ANY INCRIMINATING DOCUMENT THAT MAY BE IN THE POSSESSION OF THE CLERK OF COURT AND THEN INSTRUCT THEM TO SHIP THEM TO THEIR STORAGE WAREHOUSE SO IF THERE IS ANY POTENTIAL INVESTIGATION. THEY WOULD GIVE THE FALSE IMPRESSION THAT YOU ARE BEING GIVEN ALL DOCUMENTS WITHIN THEIR POSSESSION. PLEASE DO NOT FALL FOR THIS AND ENSURE THAT THEY RETRIEVE EVERY SINGLE DOCUMENT RELATED TO THESE CASES THAT THEY ARE POTENTIALLY CONCEALING BY STORING THEM IN THEIR WAREHOUSE AWAY FROM THE CLERK OF COURT'S DIRECT POSSESSION. DON'T FALL FOR THE BANANA UP THE TAILPIPE TRICK AS EDDIE MURPHY WOULD SAY ON BEVERLY HILLS COP.

INSOMUCH, THIS FILING IS TO GIVE ALL COURTS AND PARTIES JUDICIAL NOTICE THAT WE ARE ALSO SEEKING TO APPEAL THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S FAILURE TO STAY CASE 21-6275. SEE THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI DOCUMENTS ATTACHED.

THE APPELLANTS UNDER CASE 21-6275 MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESET TO FILE ANY REQUIRED BRIEF ONCE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DETERMINES WHETHER OR NOT THEY WILL ENTERTAIN THESE PROCEEDINGS.

RESPECTFULLY,
JONAH THE TISHBITE

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ron Santa McCray', written over a horizontal line.

RON SANTA McCRAY

Ron Santa McCray

OCTOBER 7, 2021

NO. _____

RECEIVED

OCT 13 2021

SC Court of Appeals

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA
JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;
RON SANTA McCRAY--PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE NEWMAN; DIRECTOR STIRLING;
DORM MANAGER LT. REED; GENERAL COUNSEL; ANNIE RUMBLER;
CAPT. BRIGHTHART; WARDEN WILLIAMS; BARTON VINCENT ET. AL.,
DEFENDANTS--APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY, LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD AKA JONAH
GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, DO HEREBY CERTIFY, THAT WE HAVE

MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY ON THIS DATE OF OCTOBER 7, 2021, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED MOTION(S) TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR THAT PARTY'S COUNSEL, AND ON EVERY OTHER PERSON REQUIRED TO BE SERVED, BY DEPOSITING AN ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX PROPERLY ADDRESSED TO THEM, BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID. THE NAMES AND ADDRESSES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

(1) THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 1100 EAST MAIN STREET SUITE 501 RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219.

(2) THE MCKAY LAW FIRM 1303 BLANDING STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(3) JUDGE NEWMAN AND THE RICHLAND COURT OF COMMON PLEAS 1701 MAIN STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(4) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT 85 BROAD STREET CHARLESTON, S.C. 29401.

(5) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT AT THE M.H.C. BUILDING & U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. AND COOPER STREET CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(6) THE THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA. 19106.

(7) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY AT
970 BROAD STREET #806, NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL 4444
BROAD RIVER ROAD COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.


WE DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING
IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

EXECUTED ON OCTOBER 6, 2021

NOTE: COPY SERVED ON FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AS WELL
COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MASS. 02210.

RESPECTFULLY,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ron Santa McCray', with a circular flourish at the end.

RON SANTA McCRAY

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

NO. _____

RECEIVED

OCT 13 2021

SC Court of Appeals

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA

JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE;

RON SANTA McCRAY--PETITIONER(S)

Vs.

THE UNITED STATES; JUDGE NEWMAN; DIRECTOR STIRLING;
DORM MANAGER LT. REED; GENERAL COUNSEL; ANNIE RUMBLER;
CAPT. BRIGHTHART; WARDEN WILLIAMS; BARTON VINCENT ET. AL.,
DEFENDANTS--APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RON SANTA McCRAY

#353031 COOPER B-59

LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205

RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD AKA

#300839 F2B. RM. 1260

LEE C.I. 990 WISACKY HWY.

BISHOPVILLE, S.C. 29010

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

(1) DOES THE FILING SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER CASE 20-7073 FILED BEFORE THE FOURTH CIRCUIT SERVES AS A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO AN INFORMAL BRIEF ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE PETITIONER IN THAT CASE MOTIONED TO HAVE IT CONSTRUED AS SUCH?

(2) DOES THE ORDER UNDER CASE 21-6275 DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY FALL WITHIN THE PROVISIONS OF THE COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE ALLOWING THE PETITIONER(S) IN CASE 21-6275 TO APPEAL IT DUE TO WHAT IS ARGUED IN THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI?

LIST OF PARTIES

THE PARTIES ARE NOT ALL LISTED IN THE CAPTION. BUT DUE TO THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE WHERE THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT PURPOSELY LISTED THE PARTIES INCORRECTLY VIOLATING THE PETITIONERS' CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHT OF AUTONOMY IN HOW THE PETITIONER(S) SOUGHT TO BRING THIS CASE. THE AFOREMENTIONED ARE THE PARTIES THAT IN ACTS OF MISREPRESENTATION APPEAR ON THE FACE OF THIS APPEAL. THE NAMES OF THE U.S. CONGRESS MEMBERS AND (50) STATES FEDERAL AND STATE ATTORNEYS AND OR ATTORNEY GENERALS DUE TO ATTACKING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL PROVISIONS DUE TO IT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ARE DECEPTIVELY NOT LISTED IN THE RECORD.

RELATED CASES

THIS PETITION IS ALSO RELATED TO CASE 21-6275 WHERE THE

CONSPIRING PARTIES DID ESSENTIALLY THE SAME EXACT THING, LIST THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY TO MAKE IT APPEAR AS IF THE PETITIONER(S) WERE MAKING ATTEMPTS TO SUE INDIVIDUALS WHO COULD NOT BE SUED FOR THE CLAIMS MADE TO UNJUSTLY DISMISS THE ACTION WHICH IS STILL PENDING BEFORE THE FOURTH CIRCUIT WHERE THAT COURT AND CASE DENIED THE MOTION TO STAY PENDING SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI, THE SEEKING TO APPEAL THAT ORDER OF DENIAL IS ALSO APART OF THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

THIS PETITION IS ALSO RELATED TO CASES COMING UP FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT INVOLVING THE PETITIONERS AND AT MINIMUM (20) OTHER INMATES SEEKING A RULING REGARDING THE STATE'S MISUNDERSTANDING AS TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S HOLDINGS PURSUANT TO FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) WHERE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAS BEEN HOLDING MANY INMATES POST CONVICTION RELIEF APPLICATIONS IN LIMBO MANY OF US FOR OVER (16) YEARS AFTER TIMELY ASSERTING THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON ALSO VIOLATING UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723 (U.S.2016) AND WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016) WHERE DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CLAIMS MADE. THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL HAS BLOCKED, PREVENTED, CONCEALED THE RELEASE OF EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA TESTING AND A SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE FOR OVER (16) YEARS.

ALSO RELATED TO CASES LISTED IN THE APPENDIX EXHIBIT, "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINION BELOW.....1
JURISDICTION.....1-2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES AND CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....3-7
STATEMENT OF CASE.....8
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....13
CONCLUSION.....20

INDEX OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A--EXHIBIT "REHEARING ORDER". THIS EXHIBIT INCLUDES ALL ORDERS FROM BOTH CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275. IT ALSO INCLUDES THE FINAL ORDER OR MAGISTRATE ORDERS THAT ARE THE SOURCE OF THE APPEALS IN QUESTION AS WAS REQUEST BY THE SUPREME COURT.

APPENDIX B--EXHIBIT, "FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT".

APPENDIX C--EXHIBIT, "REHEARING MOTION".

APPENDIX D--EXHIBIT, "INITIAL NOTICE OF APPEAL AND A COPY OF THE LETTER FROM THE SUPREME COURT SETTING THE TIMETABLE FOR THIS FILING.

OPINIONS BELOW

THE OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT APPEARS AT APPENDIX A TO THE PETITION AND IS UNPUBLISHED. THE OPINION OF THE S.C. UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR BOTH CASES 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM AND 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC ALSO APPEAR AT APPENDIX A AND THEY ARE UNPUBLISHED.

JURISDICTION

THE DATE ON WHICH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DECIDED THE PETITIONER'S CASE UNDER CASE 20-7073 BY TIMELY FILED MOTION FOR REHEARING WAS ON APRIL 9, 2021. THE DATE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DENIED THE MOTION TO STAY UNDER CASE 21-6275 WAS DATED FILED ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2021. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION DUE TO THE DISABILITY IN HIS HANDS MOTIONED FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME BY HIS RIGHTS UNDER THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT AND WAS SENT A RESPONSE BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT INFORMING THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER THE CONDITIONS SUCH IS TO BE GRANTED. A COPY OF THE ORDER DENYING THE MOTION FOR REHEARING IN CASE 20-7073 AND THE STAY UNDER CASE 21-6275 APPEAR IN

APPENDIX A. THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOKED UNDER 28
U.S.C. § 1254(1).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES	PAGE NUMBERS
BIGGINS v. HAZEN PAPER CO.,--F3d.--, 1994 WL 398013 (1st.Cir. 1994).....	21
BENSON v. FOSTER, 2020 WL 2770267, * 2+ E.D.Wis.....	16
BONNIE B. v. SAUL, 2021 WL 780475 (S.D.Cal.2021).....	21
BURNS v. INCH, 2020 WL 8513758, * 4 N.D.Fla.....	16
CLARK v. CARTLEDGE, 829 F3d. 303, 2016 WL 3741864 (4th.Cir. 2016).....	14
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA v. WILLIAMS, 294 U.S. 176, 55 S.Ct. 380, 79 L.Ed. 841 (U.S.1935).....	22
CTL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS v. NIGERIAN PETROLEUM CORP., 951 F2d. 573 (3rd.Cir.1991).....	21
DRAKE v. TRACAELEAS INDEMNITY COMPANY, 2019 WL 5423099, * 3 D.Md.....	18
DUVALL v. GREENLAND PROPERTIES, LLC., 2020 WL 4879209, * 2 D.Md.....	16
FERNANDEZ-SANTOS v. UNITED STATES, 2021 WL 1165197, * 2+ PUERTO RICO.....	16
FOMAN v. DAVIS, 372 U.S. 178, 181-82, 83 S.Ct. 227, 228-30, 9 LEd.2d. 222 (1962).....	14
FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019).....	19
FOSTER v. CHATMAN, 578 U.S. 1123, 136 S.Ct. 1737, 195 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.2016).....	16
GELBOIM v. BANK OF AMERICA CORP., 574 U.S. 405, 135 S.Ct. 897, 190 L.Ed.2d.789(U.S.2015).....	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED CON'T

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
GONZALEZ v. THALER, 565 U.S. 134, 132 S.Ct. 641, 181 L.Ed.2d. 619 (U.S.2012).....	19
GREEN v. UNITED STATES, 2019 WL 4879209, * 2+ D.Md.....	16
GULFSTREAM AEROSPACE CORP. v. MAYACAMAS CORP., 485 U.S. 271, 108 S.Ct. 1133, 99 L.Ed.2d. 296, 56 U.S.L.W. 4243(U.S.1988).....	24
HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+... IN RE: ROCHE, 448 U.S. 1312, 101 S.Ct. 4, 65 L.Ed.2d. 1103 (U.S.1980).....	14 20
IN RE: SAN JUAN DUPONT PLAZA HOTEL FIRE LITIGATION, 888 F2d. 940 (1st.Cir.1989).....	21
IN RE: SOCIETY INSURANCE CO. COVIT-19 INSURANCE LITIGATION, 2021 WL 3290962 (N.D.ILL.2021).....	18
JUSTIN PATRICK ODLE, PETITIONER v. MATT MACAULEY, RESPONDENT, 2021 WL 4350123 (W.D.Mich.2021).....	18
KELL v. BENSON, 925 F3d. 448(10th.Cir.2019).....	22
KOTLER v. AMERICAN TOBACCO CO., 981 F2d. 7 (1st.Cir.1982).....	14
LEXICON INC. v. MILBERG, WEISS, BERSHAD, HYNES & LERACH, 523 U.S. 26, 118 S.Ct. 956, 140 L.Ed.2d. 62(U.S.1998).....	17
MALLAS v. U.S. 903 F2d. 1111 (4th.Cir.1993).....	20
MARSHALL v. JERRICO INC., 446 U.S. 238, 242, 100 S.Ct. 1610; 64 L.Ed.2d. 182(1980).....	22
MICROSOFT CORP. v. BAKER, 137 S.Ct. 1702, 198 L.Ed.2d. 132, 85 U.S.L.W. 4330(U.S.2017).....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED CON'T

CASES	PAGE NUMBER
MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4063(U.S.2016).....	13
MOSELY v. UNITED STATES, 2018 WL 1187778(N.C.2018).....	14
MORRISON v. ACCUWEATHER, INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 3015226 (M.D.Pa.2016).....	14
PETER D. HOLDINGS LLC. v. WOLD OIL PROPERTIES, LLC., 2020 WL 5406238 (D.C.WYM.2020).....	21
PROPHET v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518351(W.Va.2018).....	19
HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159 (U.S.2018).....	24
RAINBOW SCHOOL, INC. v. RAINBOW EARLY EDUCATION HOLDINGS, LLC., 887 F3d. 610(4th.Cir.2018).....	17
SHOOP v. CASSANO,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 4259962 (MEM)(U.S.2021)....	24
ST. BERNARD PARISH GOVERNMENT v. UNITED STATES, 916 F3d. 987, 993 Fed. Cir.....	16
STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998).....	14
SMITH v. BERRY, 502 U.S. 244, 112 S.Ct. 678, 116 L.Ed.2d. 678 (U.S.1992).....	13
STRUNK v. GASTELO, 2019 WL 5684414(S.D.Cal.2019).....	19
TAMM v. CINCINNATI INSURANCE COMPANY, 2020 WL 60932 (S.D.N.Y.2020).....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED CON'T

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

THOMPSON v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, 742 Fed. Appx' 316
(MEM) (9th.Cir.2018)..... 24

UNITED STATES v. BALLARD, 2018 WL 6252604, * 25+ E.D.Pa..... 18

UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.
2017)..... 14

TORRES v. OAKLAND SCAVENGER CO., 487 U.S. 312, 315-16, 108 S.Ct.
2405, 2407-08, 101 L.Ed.2d. 285(U.S.1988)..... 14

UNITED STATES v. KOEBER, 2018 WL 4188465, * 2 UTAH..... 22

UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415(4th.Cir.2018)..... 15

U.S. v. FELDMAN, F.Supp., 1992 WL 350629(S.D.N.Y.1992)..... 21

U.S. v. COTTON, 231 F3d. 890(4th.Cir.2000)..... 14

VAETH v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 775386
(D.C.Md.2016)..... 13

VETTE v. K-9 UNIT DEPUTY SANDERS, 989 F3d. 1154 (10th.
Cir.2021)..... 17

WELLS FARGO BANK N.C. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C., LLC., 859 F3d.
295 (4th.Cir.2017)..... 14

WHOLE WOMAN HEALTH v. JACKSON,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 3910772
(U.S.2021)..... 15

WIDMYER v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518350(W.Va.2018)..... 19

WILLIAM v. PENNSYLVANIA, 579 U.S. 1, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d.
132 (U.S.2016)..... 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED CON'T

CASES

PAGE NUMBER

WITHROW, 421 U.S. AT 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456..... 18
24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d.
624 (4th.Cir.2016)..... 13

OTHER

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DIRECTIVE TO EXCUSE INFORMALITY OF FORM OR
TITLE.

F.R.A.P., RULE 2 U.S.C.A.

STATEMENT OF CASE

THE PETITIONER FILED A § 1983 ACTION ESTABLISHING CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW BEFORE THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT MAKING EFFORTS AMONG MANY THINGS TO SUE THE UNITED STATES, THE U.S. CONGRESS MEMBERS, THE (50) STATES FEDERAL AND STATE ATTORNEY GENERALS FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF TO CHALLENGE THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL PROVISIONS DUE TO THOSE PROVISIONS DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGETING AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT IN VIOLATION OF THE 5TH., 6TH., 14TH. AMENDMENTS AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE, AS WELL AS THE UNITED STATES BEING ARRESTING AND OR EXECUTING AND OR ATTACHING IN VIOLATION OF THE GRANT, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE LEAD PETITIONER SEEKING TO PLACE THESE MATTERS BEFORE A JURY, WHICH IS ALSO BASED UPON A DEFAULT PURSUANT TO A JURISDICTIONAL PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE EMERGING FROM A RELATED STATE CASE. THE JUDGE(S) AND OR COURT PURPOSELY LISTED THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY WHICH WAS A REPEATED ACT OF MACHINATION OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND PARTIES TO THWART FAIR AND PROPER JUDICIAL REVIEW. THE PETITIONER(S) IMMEDIATELY OBJECTED AND SOUGHT THAT THE DISTRICT COURT AMEND THE DEFENDANTS AND LIST THEM AS THE PETITIONER(S) SOUGHT WHICH WAS IGNORED BY THE DISTRICT COURT IN THEIR EFFORTS TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE THE PETITIONER(S) WAS TRYING TO SUE PEOPLE WHO COULD NOT BE SUED FOR THE CLAIMS MADE. THE PETITIONER(S) APPEALED PRODUCING CASE

20-7073. THERE WERE SUBSTANTIAL JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES MADE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER WHICH BY THE PETITIONER(S) CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF DUE PROCESS. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WAS REQUIRED TO ADDRESS THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES BEFORE IT COULD EVER MAKE A RULING ON THE MERITS OF THE APPEAL BY INFORMAL BRIEF OR ANY OTHER MEANS. THESE SUBSTANTIAL JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES COULD NOT LEGALLY BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. YET, THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BY ITS ACTIONS ATTEMPTED TO DO JUST THAT DEMANDING THE PETITIONER SUBMIT INFORMAL BRIEF TO ADDRESS THOSE MERITS CIRCUMVENTING RULING ON THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES. THE PETITIONER THEN MOTIONED TO HAVE HIS PLEADING CONSTRUED AS A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO THE FILING OF THE INFORMAL BRIEF WHICH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IGNORED AND DISMISSED THE APPEAL FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT THERE IS NO NEED FOR THE SUPREME COURT TO ADDRESS THE MERITS OF ANY UNDERLYING ISSUES IN THIS CASE BECAUSE DUE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ACTIONS THOSE ISSUES ARE NOT PROPERLY PRESERVED. THERE IS ONLY ONE ISSUE PERTAINING TO THIS PARTICULAR CASE 20-7073 THAT NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED.

ADDITIONALLY, DUE TO EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT OCCURRED BEFORE THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT UNDER CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM. THE PETITIONER(S), DUE TO CONCERNS THAT PREVIOUSLY OCCURRED WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHERE VARIOUS JUDGES CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES THAT

SURROUND THIS CASE. THOSE JUDGES WORKED TO CONCEAL AND OR CIRCUMVENT RULING TO ADDRESS THE INJUSTICES THAT OCCURRED WITHIN THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT GOING UNCHALLENGED IN FRAUD FOR OVER (15) YEARS. THE PETITIONER(S), CRAWFORD AND McCRAY, IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION, FILED A SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDING BEFORE THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT WHERE THE PRIOR RELATED PROCEEDINGS UNDER BOTH CASES 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM AND 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM WERE BOTH DISMISSED BY THE OBSTRUCTION AND FRAUD WITHOUT PREJUDICE ALLOWING THE PETITIONER(S) TO RE-FILE THE CAUSES OF ACTION ASSERTED. THIS PRODUCED CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MHC. THE COMPROMISED JUDGES IN SOUTH CAROLINA, ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASE(S), DID THE SAME INJUSTICE UNDER CASE 9:20-cv-2139-TLW-MMC AS THEY DID UNDER CASE 9:19-cv-1400-TLW-BM, LISTING THE DEFENDANTS IN THE CASE INCORRECTLY TO UNJUSTLY DISMISS THAT CASE PRODUCING APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-6275 BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT.

DUE TO ESSENTIALLY THE EXACT SAME ISSUES BEING ARGUED IN BOTH CASES BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT INVOLVING THE EXACT SAME ISSUE OF THE DISTRICT COURT LISTING THE DEFENDANTS INCORRECTLY IN BOTH CASES TO AVOID SUIT AND IMPEDE, OBSTRUCT, HINDER AND DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1985(2) AND 18 U.S.C. § 1001 TO THWART JUST AND FAIR REVIEW BY ALSO ATTEMPTING TO BLOCK THE PETITIONER RON SANTA McCRAY FROM ASSERTING HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BY IGNORING 4 OUT OF THE 5 REPEATED NOTICES SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-6275 FOR WHICH THE DISTRICT COURT HAD NO JURISDICTION TO ISSUE ANY FINAL ORDER DUE TO THE 4

PREVIOUSLY FILED NOTICES SEEKING LEAVE UNDER RULE 73(c). THE PETITIONER(S) MOTIONED TO STAY THE CASE UNDER 21-6275 DUE TO ANY POTENTIAL RULING COMING FROM SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI REGARDING CASE 20-7073 WOULD HAVE A DIRECT IMPACT ON THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASE 21-6275. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DENIED THE MOTION TO STAY CASE 21-6275 BY ORDER DATED FILED SEPTEMBER 21, 2021. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT DUE TO THE STRUCTURAL ERROR EXISTING PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359(U.S.2016) WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY. THE ORDER DENYING THE STAY TRIGGERS A JURISDICTIONAL JUDGMENT PLACING THE DENIAL OF THE STAY WITHIN THE EXCEPTION TO ALLOW THE PETITIONER(S) TO SEEK TO APPEAL IT TO PREVENT ANY FURTHER INJUSTICE BY WAY OF WRIT OF CERTIORARI AS WELL.

RULE 12(4) PROVIDES IN PART THAT WHEN TWO OR MORE JUDGMENTS ARE SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SAME COURT AND INVOLVE IDENTICAL OR CLOSELY RELATED QUESTIONS, A SINGLE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI COVERING ALL THE JUDGMENTS SUFFICES ALLOWING THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD AND McCRAY TO FILE ONE PETITION. THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI NOW FOLLOWS.

NOTE TO THE COURT: THE INITIAL NOTICE SEEKING TO FILE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS RECEIVED BY THE COURT ON MAY 20, 2021 ALSO SEEKING EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE MAKING THIS PLEADING TIMELY. IT WAS

THEN RETURNED STATING THAT THE ORDER FROM THE DISTRICT COURT WAS NOT ATTACHED THAT WE HAVE UNTIL NOVEMBER 15, 2021 TO CORRECT THE DEFICIENCY. THUS, THIS FILING MUST BE DEEMED TIMELY.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED FOR ESSENTIALLY (2) TWO REASONS: (1) THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS CONFLICT WITH OTHER DECISIONS OF OTHER COURTS OF APPEALS ON THE SAME MATTER AND DECIDED FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THIS COURT. THE PETITIONER FILED PLEADING BEFORE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHERE EVERY SINGLE OBJECTION AND RESPONSE MADE BY THE PETITIONER RELATED THERETO CONSTITUTE CLEAR GENUINE MATTERS AND OR ISSUES FOR WHICH THE PETITIONER SOUGHT REVIEW AND RELIEF BEFORE THE 4th. CIRCUIT UNDER CASE 20-7073 DEMONSTRATING CLEAR ISSUES AND AN EQUIVALENT TO AN INFORMAL BRIEF. THE DOCUMENT ATTACHED IN THE APPENDIX FILED UNDER CASE 20-7073 SERVE AS A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO THE INFORMAL BRIEF WHICH IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PETITIONER SHOULD HAVE BEEN CONSTRUED AS SUCH WHERE THESE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BEING SILENT ON THESE CLAIMS WHEN IT WAS THEIR FIDUCIARY DUTY TO SPEAK CONSTITUTE AN ACT OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT RENDERING THOSE PROCEEDINGS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID, SMITH v. BERRY, 502 U.S. 244, 112 S.Ct. 678, 116 L.Ed.2d. 678(U.S.1992); 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); VAETH v. BOARD OF TRUSTEES, F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL

775386(D.C.Md.2016); 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 (N.C.2018); 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); HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+ U.S.; UNITED STATES v. CONRAD, 675 Fed. Appx' 263, 265 CA4 (N.C.2017); U.S. v. COTTON, 231 F3d. 890(4th.Cir.2000); MORRISON v. ACCUWEATHER, INC., F.Supp.3d., 2016 WL 3015226(M.D.Pa.2016).

NON COMPLIANCE WITH "MERE TECHNICALITIES" WILL NOT DEFEAT APPELLATE JURISDICTION WHICH HAS CLEARLY OCCURRED HERE BY THE 4th. CIRCUIT'S ACTIONS, FOMAN v. DAVIS, 372 U.S. 178, 181-182, 83 S.Ct. 227, 228-30, 9 L.Ed.2d. (1962). RATHER, AN APPEAL SURVIVES SO LONG AS THE LITIGANT'S FILING "IS FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF WHAT THE RULE REQUIRES", TORRES v. OAKLAND SCAVENGER CO., 487 U.S. 312, 315-16, 108 S.Ct. 2405, 2407-08, 101 L.Ed.2d. 285(U.S.1988); KOTLER v. AMERICAN TOBACCO CO., 981 F2d. 7 (1st.Cir.1982); CLARK v. CARTLEDGE, 829 F3d. 303, 2016 WL 3741864 (4th.Cir.2016).

(2) THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE DECISION OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS CONFLICT WITH OTHER DECISIONS OF OTHER COURTS OF APPEALS ON THE SAME MATTER AND THEY DECIDED FEDERAL QUESTIONS IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS

OF THIS COURT AND THE PETITIONER(S) ARE PETITIONING TO HAVE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT TO STAY CASE 21-6275 WHICH IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO CASE 20-7073 UNTIL THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DECIDE WHETHER IT WILL GRANT THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI REGARDING THE SEEKING REVIEW OF CASE 20-7073. TO PREVAIL IN APPLICATION FOR A STAY, THE APPLICANT MUST CARRY THE BURDEN OF MAKING A STRONG SHOWING THAT IT IS LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS, THAT IT WILL BE IRREPARABLY INJURED ABSENT THE STAY, THAT THE BURDEN OF EQUITIES FAVOR IT, AND THAT THE STAY IS CONSISTENT WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST. DUE TO THE HEART OF THESE MATTERS ESSENTIALLY RELYING UPON THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RULINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) SUPPORTED BY THE RULING IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S OWN COURT PURSUANT TO UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415 (4th.Cir.2018) RELATED TO THE MANDATES OF PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AND WHETHER THE COURT'S DECISION IN THE FORTBEND CASE APPLIES TO STATE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES BY THE PETITIONER(S) DUE PROCESS RIGHTS UNDER THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THE 14TH. AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE. THUS; THE SUPREME COURT'S HOLDINGS UNDER THE FORTBEND CASE MAKE A STRONG SHOWING THE PETITIONER(S) WOULD MORE THAN LIKELY SUCCEED, WHOLE WOMAN HEALTH v. JACKSON, --S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 3910772 (U.S.2021).

FURTHER, IT IS WELL SETTLED THAT THE SUPREME COURT HAS JURISDICTION TO ENTERTAIN A FEDERAL CLAIM OR REVIEW OF A STATE COURT JUDGMENT WHEN IT REST ON A STATE GROUND THAT IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF THE MERITS OF A FEDERAL CLAIM AND AN ADEQUATE

BASIS FOR THE COURT'S DECISION. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT THESE SAME FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW APPLIES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL PERTAINING TO FEDERAL DECISIONS. THERE WAS A MOTION TO DISQUALIFY, RECUSE AND TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TO THE 3rd. CIRCUIT. THE DECISION NOT TO STAY CASE 21-6275 AND REQUIRE THE FILING OF INFORMAL BRIEF IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF THE QUESTION OF THE CASE(S) TRANSFER AND THE SEEKING OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S RECUSAL AND OR DISQUALIFICATION WHICH TRIGGERS THE "COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE", FOSTER v. CHATMAN, 578 U.S. 1123, 136 S.Ct. 1737, 195 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.2016); FERNANDEZ-SANTOS v. UNITED STATES, 2021 WL 1165197, * 2+, D.PUERTO RICO; BURNS v. INCH, 2020 WL 8513758, * 4 N.D.Fla.; BENSON v. FOSTER, 2020 WL 2770267, * 2+ E.D.Wis..

THE SUPREME COURT HAS AN INDEPENDENT OBLIGATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION EXIST, EVEN ABSENCE OF A CHALLENGE FROM ANY PARTY, ST. BERNARD PARISH GOVERNMENT v. UNITED STATES, 916 F3d. 987, 993 Fed. Cir.; DUVALL v. GREENLAND PROPERTIES, LLC., 2020 WL 6163558, * 1 W.D.Ky.; GREEN v. UNITED STATES, 2019 WL 4879209, * 2+ D.Md..

UNDER THE "COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE" AN ORDER MAY BE DEEMED FINAL, UNDER STATUTE PROVIDING FOR APPEAL ONLY FROM FINAL DECISIONS FROM FEDERAL COURT, IF IT DISPOSES OF A MATTER SEPARATE FROM, AND COLLATERAL TO THE MERITS OF THE MAIN PROCEEDING, WHICH THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BY DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY AND REQUIRING THE PETITIONER(S) TO FILE INFORMAL BRIEF. THE ACTION HAD THE EFFECT

OF ALSO DENYING THE MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION, RECUSAL AND 1407 TRANSFER, WHICH IN THIS CASE IS TOO IMPORTANT TO BE DENIED REVIEW, AND TOO INDEPENDENT OF THE CAUSE ITSELF TO REQUIRE THAT APPELLATE CONSIDERATION BE DEFERRED UNTIL THE WHOLE CASE IS ADJUDICATED TRIGGERING THE COLLATERAL ORDER PROVISIONS, 28 U.S.C.A. § 1291; GELBOIM v. BANK OF AMERICA CORP., 574 U.S. 405, 135 S.Ct. 897, 190 L.Ed.2d. 789(U.S.2015); RAINBOW SCHOOL, INC. v. RAINBOW EARLY EDUCATION HOLDINGS, LLC., 887 F3d. 610 (4th.Cir.2018); VETTE v. K-9 UNIT DEPUTY SANDERS, 989 F3d. 1154 (10th.Cir.2021).

IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT WHERE THE PLAINTIFF(S) CASES ARE SOUGHT TRANSFERRED FOR PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 OF THE MULTI-DISTRICT STATUTE WHICH WAS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY OBSTRUCTED AND OR CIRCUMVENTED FOR OVER (15) YEARS IN ONE FORM OR THE OTHER, AND THE 4th. CIRCUIT ASSIGNS CASE TO ITSELF FOR REVIEW WHERE FRAUD AND CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR EXIST PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899 (U.S.2016), SO AS THE PETITIONER(S) ARE INAPPROPRIATELY DENIED THE RIGHT TO DISQUALIFY, TRANSFER AND REMAND ONCE THE LOWER COURT CASES WERE UNCONSTITUTIONALLY DISMISSED, AND SINCE THE JURISDICTIONAL DEFECT IS NOT CURED BY THESE SUBSEQUENT EVENTS WITHIN THE 4th. CIRCUIT, THE ERROR IS NOT HARMLESS; INSTEAD GIVEN SUBSTANTIAL NATURE OF RIGHTS VIOLATED, REVERSAL IS REQUIRED, LEXICON INC. v. MILBERG, WEISS, BERSHAD, HYNES & LERACH, 523 U.S. 26, 118 S.Ct. 956, 140 L.Ed.2d. 62

(U.S.1998); IN RE: SOCIETY INSURANCE CO. COVIT-19 INSURANCE LITIGATION, 2021 WL 3290962 (N.D.ILL.2021).

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S INVOLVEMENT IN THIS CASE, UNCONSTITUTIONALLY WAIVING, AVOIDING AND OR CIRCUMVENTING CLEAR JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS PLACED BEFORE THEM WITHIN THESE CASES GIVES RISE TO AN UNACCEPTABLE RISK OF ACTUAL BIAS THAT CAN EASILY BE REMEDIED BY THE 1407 TRANSFER. THIS RISK SO ENDANGERS THE APPEARANCE OF NEUTRALITY WHEN THEY ARE ALSO NAMED AS DEFENDANTS SUBJUDICE THAT WAS CRIMINALLY BLOCKED FROM THE RECORD, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY TO AVOID SUIT, THAT THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S PARTICIPATION IN THIS CASE "MUST BE FORBIDDEN IF THE GUARANTEE OF DUE PROCESS IS TO BE ADEQUATELY IMPLEMENTED". WHEN THE OBJECTIVE RISK OF ACTUAL BIAS ON THE PART OF THE JUDGE(S) RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL, UNDER THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE, THE FAILURE TO RECUSE AND OR TRANSFER IN THIS CASE, CANNOT BE DEEMED HARMLESS, WITHROW, 421 U.S. AT 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456; JUSTIN PATRICK ODLE, PETITIONER v. MATT MACAULEY, RESPONDENT, 2021 WL 4350123 (W.D.Mich.2021); DRAKE v. TRACAELEAS INDEMNITY COMPANY, 2019 WL 5423099, * 3 D.Md.; UNITED STATES v. BALLARD, 2018 WL 6252604, * 25+ E.D.Pa..

WHEN APPLICATION OF A STATE LAW BAR DEPENDS ON A FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RULING, THE STATE LAW PRONG OF THE STATE'S HOLDING IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF FEDERAL LAW, AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION IS NOT PRECLUDED. WHETHER A STATE LAW DETERMINATION IS CHARACTERIZED AS "ENTIRELY DEPENDENT ON", "RESTING PRIMARILY

ON" OR "INFLUENCED BY" A QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW, THE RESULT IS THE SAME; THE STATE LAW DETERMINATION IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF FEDERAL LAW AND THUS, POSE NO BAR TO THE SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION. THESE SAME FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF LAW BY WAY OF SUBSIDIARY CLAIMS RELATED TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT'S RULING DENYING THE MOTION TO STAY IS TANTAMOUNT TO A RULING DENYING THE MOTION FOR RECUSAL AND DISQUALIFICATION AND THE 1407 TRANSFER. THE DECISION IS DEPENDENT UPON, REST PRIMARILY ON AND IS DIRECTLY INFLUENCED BY A CLEAR DENIAL OF THE MOTION TO RECUSE AND DISQUALIFY INVOKING THE COLLATERAL ORDER EXCEPTION PERMITTING SUPREME COURT REVIEW, WIDMYER v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518350 (W.Va.2018); PROPHET v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518351 (W.Va.2018); STRUNK v. GASTELO, 2019 WL 5684414 (S.D.Cal.2019).

GENERALLY, A STAY WILL ISSUE UPON SHOWING THAT THERE IS REASONABLE PROBABILITY THAT THE JUSTICES WILL FIND ISSUE SUFFICIENTLY SUBSTANTIAL TO GRANT CERTIORARI WHERE IN THIS CASE EVEN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S HOLDINGS UNDER GONZALEZ v. THALER, 565 U.S. 134, 132 S.Ct. 641, 181 L.Ed.2d. 619 (U.S.2012) IS HARMONIOUS AND SUPPORTS THE COURT'S HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) AND MUST BE DEEMED APPLICABLE TO THE STATES BY THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS, DEMONSTRATING THAT THERE IS A FAIR PROSPECT THAT THE DECISION BELOW IS ERRONEOUS, AND IRREPARABLE HARM TO THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER CASE 21-6275 IS LIKELY TO RESULT IF REQUEST FOR STAY IS DENIED, AND BALANCE OF EQUITIES AND TO PUBLIC FAVORS ISSUANCE OF

STAY, IN RE: ROCHE, 448 U.S. 1312, 101 S.Ct. 4, 65 L.Ed.2d. 1103
(U.S.1980).

CONCLUSION

IF LITIGANT FILES PAPERS IN FASHION THAT IS TECHNICALLY AT VARIANCE WITH LETTER OF PROCEDURAL RULE, COURT MAY NONETHELESS FIND LITIGANT COMPLIED WITH RULE IF LITIGANT'S ACTION IS FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT OF WHAT THE RULE REQUIRES, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE DOCUMENT WAS FILED AS A CHALLENGE TO THE 4TH. CIRCUIT'S ARTICLE III JURISDICTION POWER PRODUCING JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES THAT CANNOT BE WAIVED AND OR FORFEITED WHICH OCCURRED HERE RENDERING THE PROCEEDINGS A VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. EACH OBJECTION CONSTITUTES AN ISSUE FOR REVIEW. THERE IS A RESPONSE IN SUPPORT OF EACH OBJECTION AS TO WHY IT BECOMES AN ISSUE. THUS, THE FILING MUST IN FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS TO THE PETITIONER(S) BE DEEMED A FUNCTIONAL EQUIVALENT TO THE FILING OF AN INFORMAL BRIEF, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE PETITIONER(S) MOTIONED BEFORE THE COURT UNDER CASE 20-7073 TO CONSTRUE IT AS SUCH, F.R.A.P. RULE 2, 28 U.S.C.A.; MALLAS v. U.S., 903 F2d. 1111 (4th.Cir.1993); U.S.

v. FELDMAN, F.Supp., 1992 WL 350629(S.D.N.Y.1992). THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ISSUED A DIRECTIVE TO EXCUSE "INFORMALITY OF FORM OR TITLE". THE DOCUMENT(S) AND OR FILING THOUGH ONE MAY CLAIM IMPERFECT IN FORM, IT IS TECHNICALLY, SUBSTANTIALLY, IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE TECHNICAL AND FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENT OF THE SUBMITTING OF INFORMAL BRIEF. THUS, THE PETITIONER SEEKS WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO SEEK TO HAVE THIS INJUSTICE CORRECTED AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT BE REQUIRED TO RULE ON THE SUBMITTED DOCUMENT(S) IN THE APPENDICES, BIGGINS v. HAZEN PAPER CO.,--F3d.--, 1994 WL 398013 (1st.Cir.1994); IN RE: SAN JUAN DUPONT PLAZA HOTEL FIRE LITIGATION, 888 F2d. 940 (1st.Cir.1989); CTL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS v. NIGERIAN PETROLEUM CORP., 951 F2d. 573 (3rd.Cir.1991); BONNIE B. v. SAUL, 2021 WL 780475 (S.D.Cal.2021); PETER D. HOLDINGS LLC. v. WOLD OIL PROPERTIES, LLC., 2020 WL 5406238 (D.C.WYM.2020).

IN ADDRESSING THE INJUSTICE THAT OCCURRED UNDER CASE 21-6275 REGARDING THE FAILURE TO STAY PENDING THE SEEKING REVIEW VIA WRIT OF CERTIORARI. IT IS NOT APPROPRIATE AND A CLEAR CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR FOR JUDGES TO SIT UPON A CASE FOR WHICH THEY HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME, AND IN THIS INSTANCE, THEY ARE DEFENDANTS IN THE CASE SUBJUDICE TO SEEK INJUNCTIVE AND OR DECLARATORY RELIEF FOR THEIR DISQUALIFICATION AT ALL LEVELS OF COURT CLEARLY DEMONSTRATING THEY ARE ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASES WHERE THEIR NAMES WERE CRIMINALLY BLOCKED FROM BEING MADE A PART OF THE COURT RECORD FOR WHICH THEY ARE POTENTIALLY DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THIS CONSPIRACY VIOLATING 18 U.S.C. § 1001 CONCEALING MATERIAL FACTS, SUBSTANTIATING THAT THE

POTENTIAL FOR BIAS HAS INDEED RISEN TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. SINCE THERE ARE CLEAR HABEAS CORPUS PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION COURTS INVOLVING THE PETITIONER(S) WHICH INCLUDE REMOVAL OF STATE CONVICTION CASES TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT WITHIN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY UNDER THE TAG ALONG RULE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407. DUE PROCESS ENTITLES CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS TO PROCEEDINGS IN WHICH HE MAY PRESENT HIS CASE WITH ASSURANCE THAT NO MEMBER OF THE COURT IS PREDISPOSED TO FIND AGAINST HIM. NO MAN CAN BE A JUDGE IN HIS OWN CASE, MARSHALL v. JERRICO INC., 446 U.S. 238, 242, 100 S.Ct. 1610, 64 L.Ed.2d. 182(1980); COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA v. WILLIAMS, 294 U.S. 176, 55 S.Ct. 380, 79 L.Ed. 841 (U.S.1935); WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 579 U.S. 1, 136, S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132 (U.S.2016); UNITED STATES v. KOEBER, 2018 WL 4188465, * 2 UTAH.


THE COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE APPLIES TO THAT CLASS OF DECISIONS THAT ARE CONCLUSIVE, THAT RESOLVE IMPORTANT ISSUES SUCH AS THE FAILURE TO DISQUALIFY, TRANSFER AND RECUSE AS THE DENIAL OF THE STAY DID REQUIRING THE PETITIONER(S) TO FILE AN INFORMAL BRIEF NOW TRIGGERED, WHICH ARE COMPLETELY SEPARATE FROM THE MERITS, AND THAT ARE EFFECTIVELY UNREVIEWABLE ON APPEAL FROM FINAL JUDGMENT DUE TO THE FRAUD, CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WHICH IN THIS CASE IS OF A JURISDICTIONAL NATURE, MICROSOFT CORP. v. BAKER, 137 S.Ct. 1702, 198 L.Ed.2d. 132, 85 U.S.L.W. 4330(U.S.2017); KELL v. BENZON, 925 F3d. 448

(10th.Cir.2019); THOMPSON v. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
742 Fed. Appx' 316 (MEM) (9th.Cir.2018).

IF THE ORDER ENDS THE LITIGATION ON A PARTICULAR ISSUE IT
WOULD FALL WITHIN THE COLLATERAL ORDER EXCEPTION'S
"CONCLUSIVENESS" WHERE IT ENDS THE ISSUE OF TRANSFER AND ENDS THE
ISSUE OF RECUSAL BEFORE THE CASE PROCEEDS BECAUSE THE 4TH.
CIRCUIT IS REQUIRING THE PETITIONER(S) TO FILE AN INFORMAL BRIEF
DESPITE OUR OBJECTIONS AND THE JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES WHICH
CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED, CAN BE RAISED AT ANY TIME AND AT
ANY STAGE INCLUDING WITHIN THIS PETITION BEFORE THE SUPREME
COURT. THUS, THE COLLATERAL ORDER REQUIREMENT IN THAT IT WOULD BE
A FINAL WORD ON THE SUBJECT ADDRESSED IS MET. THE ARCHETYPAL
FINAL DECISION FROM WHICH AN APPEAL FROM SUCH A FINAL DECISION IS
A MATTER OF RIGHT, SHOOP v. CASSANO,--S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 4259962
(MEM)(U.S.2021); GULFSTREAM AEROSPACE CORP. v. MAYACAMAS CORP.,
485 U.S. 271, 108 S.Ct. 1133, 99 L.Ed.2d. 296, 56 U.S.L.W.
4243(U.S.1988); HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399,
86 U.S.L.W. 4159(U.S.2018).

INSOMUCH, THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORAI SHOULD BE
GRANTED.

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. 29742

Ron Santa McCray

OCTOBER 7, 2021

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

(Your Name)

— PETITIONER

VS.

THE UNITED STATES ET. AL.,

— RESPONDENT(S)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

The petitioner asks leave to file the attached petition for a writ of certiorari without prepayment of costs and to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Please check the appropriate boxes:

Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the following court(s):

THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DUE TO THREAT OF IMMINENT
DANGER THAT STILL EXIST AT THE TIME THIS ACTION IS FILED. (21-6275)

Petitioner has **not** previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in any other court.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration in support of this motion is attached hereto.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration is **not** attached because the court below appointed counsel in the current proceeding, and:

The appointment was made under the following provision of law: _____

_____, or

a copy of the order of appointment is appended.

**AFFIDAVIT OR DECLARATION
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS***

I, LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, am the petitioner in the above-entitled case. In support of my motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, I state that because of my poverty I am unable to pay the costs of this case or to give security therefor; and I believe I am entitled to redress.

1. For both you and your spouse estimate the average amount of money received from each of the following sources during the past 12 months. Adjust any amount that was received weekly, biweekly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually to show the monthly rate. Use gross amounts, that is, amounts before any deductions for taxes or otherwise.

Income source	Average monthly amount during the past 12 months		Amount expected next month	
	You	Spouse	You	Spouse
Employment	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Self-employment	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Income from real property (such as rental income)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Interest and dividends	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Gifts	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Alimony	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Child Support	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Retirement (such as social security, pensions, annuities, insurance)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Disability (such as social security, insurance payments)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Unemployment payments	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Public-assistance (such as welfare)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Other (specify): _____	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Total monthly income:	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>

2. List your employment history for the past two years, most recent first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

Employer	Address	Dates of Employment	Gross monthly pay
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ N/A
			\$

3. List your spouse's employment history for the past two years, most recent employer first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

Employer	Address	Dates of Employment	Gross monthly pay
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$ N/A
			\$

4. How much cash do you and your spouse have? \$ _____
 Below, state any money you or your spouse have in bank accounts or in any other financial institution.

Type of account (e.g., checking or savings)	Amount you have	Amount your spouse has
N/A	\$ N/A	\$ N/A
	\$	\$

5. List the assets, and their values, which you own or your spouse owns. Do not list clothing and ordinary household furnishings.

Home N/A
 Value _____

Other real estate N/A
 Value _____

Motor Vehicle #1
 Year, make & model N/A
 Value _____

Motor Vehicle #2
 Year, make & model N/A
 Value _____

Other assets N/A
 Description _____
 Value _____

6. State every person, business, or organization owing you or your spouse money, and the amount owed.

Person owing you or your spouse money	Amount owed to you	Amount owed to your spouse
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____
_____ N/A _____	\$ _____ N/A _____	\$ _____ N/A _____
_____	\$ _____	\$ _____

7. State the persons who rely on you or your spouse for support. For minor children, list initials instead of names (e.g. "J.S." instead of "John Smith").

Name	Relationship	Age
_____	_____	_____
_____ N/A _____	_____ N/A _____	_____ N/A _____
_____	_____	_____

8. Estimate the average monthly expenses of you and your family. Show separately the amounts paid by your spouse. Adjust any payments that are made weekly, biweekly, quarterly, or annually to show the monthly rate.

	You	Your spouse
Rent or home-mortgage payment (include lot rented for mobile home)	\$ _____ N/A _____	\$ _____ N/A _____
Are real estate taxes included? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Is property insurance included? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
Utilities (electricity, heating fuel, water, sewer, and telephone)	\$ _____ 0 _____	\$ _____ 0 _____
Home maintenance (repairs and upkeep)	\$ _____ 0 _____	\$ _____ 0 _____
Food	\$ _____ 0 _____	\$ _____ 0 _____
Clothing	\$ _____ 0 _____	\$ _____ 0 _____
Laundry and dry-cleaning	\$ _____ 0 _____	\$ _____ 0 _____
Medical and dental expenses	\$ _____ 0 _____	\$ _____ 0 _____

9. Do you expect any major changes to your monthly income or expenses or in your assets or liabilities during the next 12 months?

Yes No If yes, describe on an attached sheet.

10. Have you paid – or will you be paying – an attorney any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form? Yes No

If yes, how much? 50 K FIGHTING THIS CASE FOR OVER 20 YEARS.

If yes, state the attorney's name, address, and telephone number:

11. Have you paid—or will you be paying—anyone other than an attorney (such as a paralegal or a typist) any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?

THE FINANCES ARE ATTRIBUTED TO MY COOPER TRUST FUND.

Yes No

If yes, how much? 50k

If yes, state the person's name, address, and telephone number:


12. Provide any other information that will help explain why you cannot pay the costs of this case.

THREAT OF IMMINENT DANGER ARGUED AND ACCEPTED AS SEEN WITHIN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT UNDER CASE 21-6275

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: ~~SEPTEMBER 2021~~, 20

October 6, 2021


(Signature)

RECEIVED

OCT 13 2021

SC Court of Appeals

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

DOCKET CASE NO. 21-1330; 21-6275; 20-7073; 19-2005 ET. AL.,

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

APPELLANT/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 AKA JONAH GABRIEL JAHJAH T. TISHBITE, RON SANTA McCRAV ET. AL., DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT WE HAVE MAILED AND OR SERVED A COPY OF AN AFFIDAVIT OF FACTS GIVING JUDICIAL NOTICE; NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK LEAVE TO APPEAL THE ORDER DENYING THE STAY UNDER CASE 21-6275; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE INFORMAL BRIEF TO RESET ONCE THE SUPREME COURT DECIDE IF IT WILL GRANT THE WRIT OF CERTORARI AND

OTHER RELATED MATTERS; MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR, ON THE 4th. CIRCUIT, THE 3rd. CIRCUIT, THE 1st. CIRCUIT, THE NEW JERSEY FEDERAL ATTORNEY AND ALL OTHER INVOLVED PARTIES BY U.S. MAIL POSTAGE PREPAID BY PLACING IT IN THE INSTITUTION MAILBOX ON OCTOBER 8, 2021. IT IS DEEMED FILED THAT DATE DUE TO SERVICE ON THE DISTRICT COURTS INVOLVED, HOUSTON v. LACK, 287 U.S. 266, 273-76, 108 S.Ct. 2379 (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.

RON SANTA McCRAY

Ron Santa McCray

OCTOBER 8, 2021

IMS

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD
300839 F&B Rm 1260
LEE CV 990 Wisacky Hwy
Bishopville, SC 29010

RECEIVED
OCT 13 2021
SC Court of Appeals

SC COURT OF APPEALS
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SC 29201