

NO. _____

RECEIVED

NOV 17 2021

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES SC Court of Appeals

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

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF
CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,
RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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) DO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBENT COUNTY TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) AND HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159(U.S.2018) APPLY TO THE STATES BY THE PETITIONER(S) 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AS IT PERTAINS TO THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THEIR RIGHTS UNDER THE 14th. AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE AS IT PERTAINS TO PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AND ORDERS THAT TRIGGER A JUDGMENT RELATED TO THE TORRENCE RULING COMING FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA?

(2) DO THE PRESENCE OF JUDGE KAYE HEARN FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT SITTING UPON THESE CASES PRODUCE A CONSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURAL ERROR PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359 (U.S.2016) WHERE SHE IS A DEFENDANT IN THE RELATED CASES THAT ARE SOUGHT 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER PRODUCING A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL VOIDING THE STATE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION?

(3) DO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723 (U.S.2016), UNDER MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193

L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4064(U.S.2016), UNDER NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249, 197 L.Ed.2d. 611, 85 U.S.L.W. 4205 (U.S.2017), AND UNDER WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016) APPLY TO THE CRAWFORD CASE PRODUCING EXCEPTIONAL AND OR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THE OTHER INMATES ARE ENTITLED TO CLAIMS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DUE TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA CONCEALING, SUPPRESSING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA EVIDENCE AND SLED INVESTIGATIVE FILE, ALSO BLOCKING CRAWFORD FROM FILING FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED FOR OVER (16) YEARS WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER DETERMINING WHY AND THE LEGAL ISSUES ARGUED WITHIN ALL THEIR CASES ARE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME AND OR IDENTICAL?

(4) DID THE PETITIONER(S) MEET THE CRITERION FOR ESTABLISHING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND 1455(c) TRANSFER DUE TO THE SEEKING OF DISQUALIFYING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SEEKING TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY BY THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION RULES?

(5) BY THE RECENT AND PAST RULINGS COMING OUT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SINCE 2016, DID THE STATE COURTS ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION BY ADJUDICATING THE ISSUE OF FATAL DEFECTS OF CRIMINAL INDICTMENT UNDER THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION WHEN DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRED THAT SUCH ISSUES BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION?

LIST OF PARTIES

THE PARTIES WITHIN THIS PARTICULAR CASE ARE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERAL; THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS; KERSHAW COUNTY AND ITS CLERK; BERKLEY COUNTY AND THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGES FROM BOTH KERSHAW AND BERKELEY COUNTIES; THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS IN ITS ENTIRETY; JUDGE NEWMAN; THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS; THE S.C. SUPREME COURT AND THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS PURSUANT TO THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER TO THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT.

RELATED CASES

THIS CASE IS RELATED TO THE APPEAL OF BOTH CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND ALL CASES REFERRED WITHIN THAT PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI THAT IS PRESENTLY PENDING WITHIN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINION BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1-2
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	3-5
STATEMENT OF CASE.....	6-11
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.....	12-34
CONCLUSION.....	34-39

INDEX OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX---A THE ORDERS FROM THE LOWERS COURTS.
APPENDIX---B EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE #1".
APPENDIX---C EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE # 2".
APPENDIX---D EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE # 3".
APPENDIX---E EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE # 4".
APPENDIX---F EXHIBIT, "PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE # 5".
APPENDIX---G EXHIBIT, "WRIT OF CERTIORARI # 1"
APPENDIX---H EXHIBIT, "WRIT OF CERTIORARI # 2".
APPENDIX---I EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 1".
APPENDIX---J EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 2".
APPENDIX---K EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 3".
APPENDIX---L EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 4".
APPENDIX---M EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 5".
APPENDIX---N EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 6".

APPENDIX---O EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 7".
APPENDIX---P EXHIBIT, "BLOCKED FROM PCR COURT # 8".
APPENDIX---Q EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 1".
APPENDIX---R EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 2".
APPENDIX---S EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 3".
APPENDIX---T EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 4".
APPENDIX---U EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 5".
APPENDIX---V EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 6".
APPENDIX---W EXHIBIT, "CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUE # 7".
APPENDIX---X EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER # 1".
APPENDIX---Y EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER # 2".
APPENDIX---Z EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER # 3".
APPENDIX---AA EXHIBIT, "28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER # 4".

OPINION BELOW

THE CONDITIONAL ORDER IN THE RON SANTA McCRAY CASE WAS ISSUED IN CASE 2019-CP-08-1992 FROM THE BERKELEY COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS ON APRIL 12, 2021 AND THE ORDER OF CONTINUANCE IN THE CRAWFORD CASE UNDER 2006-CP-400-3567 FROM THE RICHLAND COMMON PLEAS COURT WAS ISSUED NOVEMBER 2020 FOR WHICH THE PETITIONER(S) ASSERT PRODUCE JUDGMENT THAT TRIGGER A RULING PURSUANT TO TORRENCE AND HALL v. HALL CASES BY THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND THE INVOKING OF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON SUPPORTED BY THE FORTBEND COUNTY TEXAS v. DAVIS CASE. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDER ADJUDICATED BOTH THE PETITIONER(S) CASES THAT WERE SOUGHT CONSOLIDATED BY ORDER ISSUED ON AUGUST 6, 2021 FOR WHICH THE PETITIONERS TIMELY, IMMEDIATELY, SOUGHT REVIEW BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. THE ORDERS ARE UNPUBLISHED AND ARE ATTACHED AND FOUND UNDER APPENDIX--A.

JURISDICTION

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION IS ESTABLISHED WHERE (1) THE STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION IN A

WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH THE DECISION OF ANOTHER STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT AND OR OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS PURSUANT TO UNITED STATES v. WHEELER AND; (2) THE STATE COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW THAT HAS NOT BEEN, BUT SHOULD BE, SETTLED BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO THE FORTBEND COUNTY TEXAS v. DAVIS CASE, AND THE STATE COURT OF LAST RESORT HAS DECIDED AN IMPORTANT FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT PURSUANT TO STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT; MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA; BETTERMAN v. MONTANA; NELSON v. COLORADO AND WEARRY v. CAIN AND OTHER U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT. THE DATE THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT DECIDED THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES IS ON AUGUST 6, 2021 WHERE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS TIMELY SOUGHT. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT CLERK NOTIFIED THE PETITIONERS THAT THEY HAD UNTIL NOVEMBER 15, 2021 TO FILE MAKING THIS PLEADING TIMELY. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION IS INVOKED UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 2101 AND OR 1254(1).

JURISDICTION OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS ALSO ESTABLISHED UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASE	PAGES
BARNES v. STATE, 859 S.E.2d. 260(S.C.App.2021).....	27
BENSON v. FOSTER, 2020 WL 2770267(E.D.Wis.2020).....	14
BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609(U.S.2016).....	25
BRADDY v. U.S., 2016 WL 1031301(E.D.Va.2016).....	39
BRNOVICH v. DEMOCRATIC..., 141 S.Ct. 2321(U.S.2021).....	27
BURNS v. INCH, 2020 WL 8513758(N.D.Fla.2020).....	14
BURNS v. STATE..., 79 S.Ct. 1164(U.S.1959).....	28
BODMAN v. STATE, 742 S.E.2d. 363(S.C.2013).....	16
CHELSEY... v. LOUISVILLE..., 2020 WL 4745771(W.D.Ky.2020).....	39
CITY... v. MILBURN, 398 P.3d. 486(2017).....	34
COLLINS v. YEMEN, 141 S.Ct. 1761(U.S.2021).....	27
COMMONWEALTH... v. WILLIAMS, 55 S.Ct. 380(U.S.1935).....	24
CRETE... v. SULLIVAN..., 2021 WL 2685253(D.Md.2020).....	36
DOLORES... v. ROBINSON, 2019 WL 12095416(C.D.Cal.2019).....	30
DRAKE v. TRAVELERS..., 2019 WL 5423099(D.Md.2019).....	25
EASTWOOD v. LEHMAN..., 2010 WL 774073(D.Nev.2010).....	31
ENGLISH v. GEN..., 100 S.Ct. 2270(U.S.1990).....	37
EVANCHO v. PINE-RICH..., 237 F.Supp.3d.267(M.D.Pa.2017).....	33
FARROW v. LIPETZKY, 2017 WL 1540637(N.C.2017).....	34
FERNANDEZ... v. U.S., 2021 WL 11165197(D.PUERTO RICO.2021).....	14
FORTBEND... v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct.1843(U.S.2019).....	14
FOSTER v. CHATMAN, 136 S.Ct. 1737(U.S.2016).....	13
FREYTAG v. C.I.R., 111 S.Ct. 2631(U.S.1991).....	28
GEARIN v. MARION..., 233 P. 296(1922).....	38
HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118(U.S.2018).....	14
HENDERSON... v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197 U.S.....	32
HILL v. SNYDER, 821 F3d. 763(6th.Cir.Mich.).....	34
IN RE: NEW YORK..., 2021 WL 1666860(S.D.N.Y.2021).....	30
IN RE: SOCIETY..., 2021 WL 3290962(N.D.ILL.2021).....	31
IN RE: WALDEN..., 273 F.Supp.3d. 1367(2017).....	31
JENNINGS v. RODRIQUEZ, 138 S.Ct. 830(U.S.2018).....	36

JOHNSON v. PARRIS, 2021 WL 1232774(E.D.Tenn.2021).....	25
JOHNSON v. PERSON, 781 Fed. Appx' 69(3rd.Cir.2019).....	28
JOHNSON v. U.S., 2015 WL 2473450(U.S.2015).....	34
JONES v. NEUSCHARD, 2021 WL 1056597(N.D.Cal.2021).....	25
KINGDOM... v. U.S., 136 S.Ct. 1969(U.S.2016).....	36
JUSTIN... v. MATT..., 2021 WL 4350123(W.D.Mich.2021).....	25
LEXICON... v. MILBERG..., 118 S.Ct. 956(U.S.1998).....	31
LOUMIET v. U.S., 65 F.Supp.3d. 19 (2014).....	16
MAINE... v. U.S., 140 S.Ct. 1308 U.S.	36
MARSHALL v. JERRICO, 100 S.Ct. 1610(U.S.1980).....	24
MARTIN v. U.S., 2018 WL 1626578(D.Md.2018).....	34
MASTERPIECE... v. COLORADO..., 138 S.Ct. 1719(U.S.2018).....	38
MARBURY v. MADISON, 5TH. U.S. (2 CRANCH) 137.....	34
McFAULY v. RAMSEY, 61 U.S. (20 HOW) 523.....	39
MILLER v. STATE, 659 S.E.2d.492(S.C.2008).....	28
MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718(U.S.2016).....	16
MONTANA v. U.S., 99 S.Ct. 970(U.S.1979).....	28
MURPHY v. SMITH, 138 S.Ct. 784(U.S.2018).....	36
NATION... v. SHALALA, 112 F3d. 151.....	37
NETTLES v. RUMBERGER..., 276 SO.3d. 663(Ala.App.2018).....	30
NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249(U.S.2017).....	13
NEW... v. POOLE, 966 F3d. 145(2nd.Cir.2020).....	39
ODOM v. STATE, 523 S.E.2d. 753(S.C.1999).....	27
PARKLANE... v. SHORE, 99 S.Ct. 645(U.S.1979).....	287
PARADIS v. CHARLESTON, 2021 WL 3668152(S.C.2021).....	18
PASCAL v. CITY..., 2021 WL 4303202(Pa.2021).....	23
PEGG v. HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112(4th.Cir.2017).....	16
PENN... v. MAPP, 521 F3d. 290 CA4 (Va.2008).....	18
PEOPLE v. FIELDS, N.E.3d., ILL. APP. (1st.) 122012-UB.....	34
PLATT v. NEWBERRY..., 205 P. 296(1922).....	38
PROPHET v. BALLARD, 2018 WL 1518351(W.Va.2018).....	13
PYNE v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 1377402(D.C.Md.2016).....	34
RIVERA v. SUPERINTENDENT..., 738 Fed. Appx' 59(3rd.Cir.2018).....	23
SHOUP v. CASSANO, 2021 WL 4259962(U.S.2021).....	17
SNYDER v. NOLEN, 380 F3d. 279(7th.Cir.2004).....	28
SMOTHERS v. GRESHAM..., 23 P.3d. 333(2011).....	38

STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS...., 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998).....	13
STRUNK v. GASTELO, 2019 WL 5684414(S.D.Cal.2019).....	14
SUPERNUS... v. IANCU, 913 F3d. 1351 Fed.Cir.(Va.).....	36
TAGGART v. LORENZEN, 139 S.Ct. 1795(U.S.2019).....	17
TAYLOR v. U.S., 136 S.Ct. 2074(U.S.2016).....	33
TELESCOPE... v. LUCERO, 936 F3d. 740(8th.Cir.2019).....	39
TORRENCE v. S.C.D.C., 2021 WL 1114310(S.C.2021).....	14
U.S. v. AJRAWAT, 2018 WL 3045619(4th.Cir.2018).....	34
U.S. v. COTTON, 122 S.Ct. 1781(U.S.2002).....	31
U.S. v. KOEBER, 2018 WL 4188465(UTAH.2018).....	25
U.S. v. LIBOUS, 858 F3d. 63(2nd.Cir.2017).....	34
U.S. v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415(4th.Cir.2018).....	15
U.S. v. LAWRENCE, 2015 WL 856866(S.D.Va.2015).....	18
VINES v. U.S., 28 F3d. 1123 CRIM. LAW 1165(1).....	34
WELLS... v. H.M.H...., 859 F3d. 295(4th.Cir.2017).....	33
WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002(U.S.2016).....	13
WIDMYER v. BALLARD, 2018 WL 1518350(W.Va.2018).....	13
WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899(U.S.2016).....	18
WHITE OAK... v. LEXINGTON...., 753 S.E.2d. 537(S.C.2014).....	17
WITHROW, 95 S.Ct. 1456.....	23
ZIVOTOFSKY... v. KERRY, 135 S.Ct. 2076(U.S.2015).....	39
24 SENATORIAL... v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624(4th.Cir.2016).....	34

OTHER CITINGS

ARTICLE 1 § 10 U.S. CONSTITUTION.....	8
28 U.S.C. § 1407.....	10
28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ.....	30
42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF ADA.....	19
18 U.S.C. §§ 242, 1001.....	10
42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(2), 1985(3).....	10

STATEMENT OF CASE

THE PETITIONER LAWRENCE CRAWFORD WAS TRIED, CONVICTED AND FRAMED FOR THE MURDER OF HIS 11 YEAR OLD CHILD IN APRIL 2004 BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED WHO DIED BY THE SEXUAL ASSAULTS OF HER HALF BROTHER MICHAEL LEE WHERE THE CAUSE OF DEATH WAS SUPPRESSED IN THE AUTOPSY AND WHERE THE STATE BROUGHT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS INTO THE COURTROOM FOR THE SAKE OF ESTABLISHING LAW. THESE WERE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS THAT HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CHARGE OF MURDER FOR WHICH HE PRESENTLY STANDS CONVICTED OF TO TAINT THE MINDS OF THE JURORS DURING THE TIME OF 9/11 WHICH OF COURSE PREJUDICED THE PETITIONER DUE TO CLAIMS THAT HE WAS CHRISTIAN, JEWISH AND MUSLIM COMBINED BEING A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION AND OF ROYAL BLOODLINE. THE STATE SUPPRESSED EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA EVIDENCE TESTING AND A INVESTIGATIVE FILE IN THE POSSESSION OF S.L.E.D. (S.C. LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION). THE SOLICITOR JOHN MEADORS LIED IN ACTS OF PERJURY AND PROSECUTIONAL MISCONDUCT STATING ON THE COURT RECORD THAT HE DID NOT KNOW WHAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS TALKING ABOUT RECORDED ON RECORD AT THE PETITIONER'S COMPETENCY HEARING BEFORE TRIAL, SUPPRESSING THIS EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE EVEN WHEN DIRECTLY ASKED FOR IT. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS FORCED TO REPRESENT HIMSELF AT TRIAL IN ORDER TO PLACE THE EXISTENCE OF THIS EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE ON THE COURT RECORD DUE TO STATE APPOINTED COUNSEL'S REFUSAL TO PURSUE AND INVESTIGATE THE EXISTENCE OF THIS ACTUAL INNOCENCE EVIDENCE, VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S RIGHT OF AUTONOMY UNDER

McCOY v. LOUISIANA 2018. A SHAM INDICTMENT WAS PRODUCED THAT NEVER WENT TO THE GRAND JURY THOUGH IT FRAUDULENTLY GAVE THE IMPRESSION THAT IT DID, A FEW DAYS BEFORE THE PETITIONER WAS BROUGHT TO TRIAL AFTER HOLDING THE PETITIONER OVER 4½ YEARS IN CAPTIVITY AS A PRETRIAL DETAINEE DESPITE CONSTANT OBJECTION, MOTION FOR A SPEEDY TRIAL, IGNORING THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE THAT IS JURISDICTIONAL IN THIS CASE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. THIS PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE IS AT THE HEART OF THE MATTERS RELATED TO ALL CASES BEFORE THE STATE SUPREME COURT AND U.S. SUPREME COURT. ON DIRECT APPEAL IN A JUDGE KAYE HEARN LED COURT. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD MADE EVERY EFFORT TO BRING THESE JURISDICTIONAL CLAIMS BEFORE THAT COURT BUT WAS BLOCKED BY JUDGE HEARN'S STATING THERE IS NO HYBRID DEFENSE WHERE THAT COURT DENIED THE MOTION TO ACT PRO SE BEFORE THAT COURT PRODUCING STRUCTURAL ERROR ALSO VIOLATING McCOY v. LOUISIANA 2018, TO PREVENT THE LEGAL MATTERS FROM BEING PROPERLY ESTABLISHED WITHIN THE COURT RECORD AND TO CREATE AN INCOMPLETE RECORD TO THWART ANY POTENTIAL SUBSEQUENT JUDICIAL REVIEW. THAT DIRECT APPEAL WAS AFFIRMED INCLUDING THE SENTENCE OF LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TRIED TO FILE FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF IN 2006. BUT JUDGE HEARN, JUDGE TOAL, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AND OTHER CONSPIRING STATE ACTORS GOT THE KERSHAW COUNTY CLERK OF COURT AT THE TIME, JOYCE McDONALD, TO BLOCK AND PREVENT THE PETITIONER FROM FILING HIS PCR SINCE 2006 UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND THE S.C. CONSTITUTION AND THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE WHERE THE STATE LEGISLATURE AND CONSTITUTION ALLOWS FOR COLLATERAL REVIEW OF CONVICTION. THE STATE OF SOUTH

CAROLINA DID THIS EGREGIOUS ACT OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION FOR OVER (16+) YEARS DUE TO THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS DYNAMICS ARGUED IN THE CASE WITHOUT ANY ORDER OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IN THE LOWER COURT THAT WOULD EXPLAIN WHY DUE TO WHO IT WAS ALLEGED THAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS BY HIS HEREDITARY RIGHTS UNDER STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW AND ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION BEING A MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION. TO MAKE THE RECORD CLEAR. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD NEVER BROUGHT ANY OF THE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS BEFORE THE STATE COURT FIRST. THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND SOLICITOR DID, BRINGING THE PETITIONER'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS INFORMED THEM BY FAMILY MEMBERS, INTO THE TRIAL AND ESSENTIALLY CONVICTED THE PETITIONER OF THESE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS THAT BROKE NO LAWS TO TAINT THE MINDS OF THE JURORS DURING THE TIME OF 9/11 PRODUCING OVERWHELMING PREJUDICE VIOLATING THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE 1st. AMENDMENT.

ONCE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD WAS ILLEGALLY BLOCKED FROM FILING BEFORE THE KERSHAW COUNTY COURT REGARDING HIS PCR APPLICATION, WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER OR DETERMINATION EXPLAINING WHY BY JOYCE McDONALD. THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL PRACTICE WAS CONTINUED BY HER SUCCESSOR JANET HASTY UNTIL THIS PRESENT DAY CONSPIRING WITH THE STATE ACTORS AND WAS BROUGHT BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT BUT NO SANCTIONS WERE ATTRIBUTED TO THE ACTION AND THE ATTORNEY FOR THE CLERK OF COURT LIED STATING NO SUCH BLOCKAGE OCCURRED WHEN THE EVIDENCE IN THE APPENDICES INDISPUTABLY PROVE

OTHERWISE. DUE TO THESE INITIAL ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE BY THE STATE ACTORS CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED, ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTIONS. THIS FORCED THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TO FILE FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT CHALLENGING THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONVICTION IN RICHLAND COUNTY DUE TO THE PARTIES ILLEGALLY PREVENTING THE FILING OF PCR IN KERSHAW COUNTY, THE COUNTY OF CONVICTION. THIS PRODUCED CASES 2006-CP-400-3567, 3568, 3569, 2013-CP-400-0084 AND 2013-CP-400-2294 WHICH WERE FILED UNDER THE INDEPENDENT ACTION RULE FOR FRAUD UPON THE COURT DUE TO THE INORDINATE DELAY AND THE RICHLAND COURT WORKING WITH THE CONSPIRING STATE ACTORS TO HOLD THESE CASES IN LIMBO FOR OVER (16+) YEARS DESPITE THE PLAINTIFF(S) OBJECTIONS AND TIMELY MOTIONING FOR DEFAULT BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON WITHIN ALL THESE CASES IN QUESTION SINCE 2014, BUT WAS COMPLETELY IGNORED BY THE RICHLAND COURT CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW AND FRAUD UPON THE COURT.

DURING THE COURSE OF THESE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND VIOLATION OF THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION, THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD, McCRAY AND THE OTHER INMATES INVOLVED SUBJUDICE, DISCOVERED LEGAL ISSUES THAT POTENTIALLY EFFECTED NOT JUST THE STATES OF SOUTH CAROLINA; BUT ALSO THE STATES OF NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, ILLINOIS, N. CAROLINA, GEORGIA AND OTHER STATES AT THE STATE LEVEL, AND ALL STATES AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL AS IS SEEN BY THE CONVICTION LEGAL

ISSUES IN THE APPENDICES. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD SOUGHT TO ARGUE THE DISCOVERED LEGAL JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES FOR A PAST CONVICTION HE HAD IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY IN 1986 FOR WEAPON POSSESSION WHICH HE PLED GUILTY WHILE ATTENDING RUTGERS UNIVERSITY BECAUSE AT HIS AGE HE HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OF LAW. THIS ESTABLISHED MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION UNDER CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH IN THE N.J. DISTRICT COURT WHERE ALL OTHER STATE CASES ARE SOUGHT TRANSFER AS TAG ALONG CASES UNDER THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION RULES. THE CONSPIRING STATE AND FEDERAL JUDGES DUE TO THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CLAIMS BEING MADE CONSPIRED TO IMPEDED, HINDER, OBSTRUCT AND DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE VIOLATING 42 U.S.C. § 1895(2), 1985(3) AND 18 U.S.C. §§ 242 AND 1001 TO THWART REVIEW AND CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS WHICH PRODUCED THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-1330 IN THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS WHERE DISQUALIFICATION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THE 4TH. CIRCUIT IS SOUGHT AND TRANSFER PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407. THIS IS ALSO COMPOUNDED BY THE FACT THAT THE FEDERAL CASES ARE FILED CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL AND ITS PROVISIONS THAT DISPROPORTIONATELY TARGET AFRICAN AMERICANS AND OTHER MINORITIES TO THEIR DETRIMENT WHICH PRODUCED THE OTHER PRESENT PETITION BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT APPEALING CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. SEE DOCUMENTS IN APPENDICES. IF THE LEGAL ISSUES AT BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL ARE PROPERLY AND FAIRLY HEARD, WE ARE POTENTIALLY DEALING WITH NATIONAL PRISON REFORM IN A COVIT-19 ENVIRONMENT THAT THE PUBLIC WAS SCREAMING FOR FOR YEARS TO NO AVAIL WHICH BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATORS HAVE BEEN UNABLE

TO ACHIEVE. WITH THE LEGAL ISSUES FILED IN BOTH THE PETITIONER(S) CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES AT THE STATE LEVEL AND ALL THE OTHER INMATES CASES INVOLVED. THE PETITIONER(S) MADE EVERY EFFORT TO JUSTLY AND FAIRLY EXHAUST AS IT RELATES TO THE LEGAL ISSUES, ONLY TO BE MET WITH EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THIS PRODUCED CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 WITHIN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHICH IS THE SOURCE OF THIS PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI WHERE THE OTHER INMATES IN QUESTION CASES ARE STILL PENDING BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DEMONSTRATING THAT THE ISSUES OF CONCERN ARE NOT MOOT WHERE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT REFUSED TO HEAR THE MATTERS UNDER THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASE BECAUSE MONETARY RELIEF WAS DEFAULTED ON WITHIN THESE TWO CASES AGAINST THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THUS, IT PRODUCED "POISON PILL" LITIGATION WHICH IN FRAUD WAS CIRCUMVENTED BECAUSE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT KNEW FULLY WELL THE PETITIONER(S) WERE CORRECT IN THEIR ASSESSMENT OF THE LAW AS IT PERTAINS TO THESE MATTERS. THOUGH THE OTHER CASES ARE STILL PENDING, THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DISMISSED THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES ESSENTIALLY ADJUDICATING ALL LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS ARGUED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS IN THE APPENDICES BY THEY DETERMINING NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXISTED WITHIN THESE CASES THAT WARRANT THEY ENTERTAINING THESE MATTERS WITHIN THEIR ORIGINAL JURISDICTION DESPITE THE FACT THAT THESE CASES STILL REMAIN UNRESOLVED FOR OVER (16+) YEARS. THE DOCUMENTS WITHIN THE APPENDICES ARE SUBMITTED TO SUPPORT ALL THESE CLAIMS MADE.

RULE 12(4) PROVIDE: PARTIES INTERESTED JOINTLY, SEVERALLY, OR OTHERWISE IN A JUDGMENT MAY PETITION SEPARATELY FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI; OR ANY TWO OR MORE MAY JOIN IN A PETITION ALLOWING THE PETITIONERS TO SUBMIT PETITION TOGETHER. WHEN TWO OR MORE JUDGMENTS ARE SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED ON A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SAME COURT AND INVOLVE IDENTICAL OR CLOSELY RELATED QUESTIONS, A SINGLE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI COVERING ALL JUDGMENTS SUFFICES.... THIS PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI NOW FOLLOWS.

NOTE TO THE COURT: THE INITIAL NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO FILE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS SENT TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DATED AUGUST 12, 2021 ASKING FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION MAKING THIS PLEADING TIMELY. IT WAS RETURNED TO THE PETITIONER(S) STATING WE NEED TO FILE COPY OF THE LOWER COURTS ORDERS WITH THE PLEADING AND HAD UNTIL NOVEMBER 15, 2021 TO CORRECT THE DEFICIENCY WHICH IS DONE. THUS, THE FILING MUST BE DEEMED TIMELY.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED BECAUSE THE DECISION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT CONFLICTS WITH DECISION OF THE COURTS OF APPEALS IN VARIOUS CIRCUITS INCLUDING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ON THE SAME MATTER AND THEY DECIDED FEDERAL QUESTION IN A WAY THAT CONFLICTS WITH RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THIS COURT AND OR ADDRESS A MATTER THAT SHOULD BE DECIDED BY THIS COURT AS IT PERTAINS TO CASES SUCH AS FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843; HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118; WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899; BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 718; NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249; WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002; STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 118 S.Ct. 1003 AND THE OTHER RELEVANT CASES CITED WITHIN THE DOCUMENTS CONTAINED IN THE APPENDICES. THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HAS JURISDICTION OVER THE FINAL JUDGMENT OF STATE POST CONVICTION COURTS AND EXERCISES THAT JURISDICTION IN APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES, 28 U.S.C.A. § 1257(a); WEARRY v. CAIN, 577 U.S. 385, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78(U.S.2016). WHEN APPLICATION OF A STATE 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, FOSTER v. CHATMAN, 578 U.S. 1023, 136 S.Ct. 1737, 195 L.Ed.2d. 1 (U.S.2016); WIDMYER v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518350 (W.Va.2018); PROPHET v. BALLARD, F.Supp., 2018 WL 1518351 (W.Va.2018).

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, SUCH AS THE ONE USED BY THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DETERMINING THAT THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES THAT WARRANT THEY ENTERTAINING THESE MATTERS IN THEIR ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WHEN ALL THE FEDERAL LAW AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS WITHIN THE APPENDICES WERE ADJUDICATED BEING A PART OF THOSE PROCEEDINGS, THE STATE RULING IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF FEDERAL LAW AND THUS POSES NO BAR TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION, STRUNK v. GASTELO, 2019 WL 5684414 (S.D.Cal.2019). BY THE LITIGATION CONTAINED IN THE APPENDICES THE STATE GROUND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION IN THIS CASE, UNDER BOTH CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974 ARE NOT INDEPENDENT OF THE MERITS OF FEDERAL CLAIMS ARGUED AND HAVE BECOME A BASIS FOR THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S DECISION GIVING WAY TO ALLOW THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO ENTERTAIN JURISDICTION OVER THESE MATTERS, FERNANDEZ-SANTOS v. UNITED STATES, 2021 WL 11165197, * 2+ D.PUERTO RICO; BURNS v. INCH, 2020 WL 8513758, * 4 N.D.Fla.; BENSON v. FOSTER, 2020 WL 2770267, * 2+ E.D.Wis..

INSOMUCH, IN REGARD TO QUESTIONS PRESENTED #1. DO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS, 139 S.Ct. 1843(U.S.2019) AND HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159(U.S.2018) APPLY TO THE STATES BY THE PETITIONER(S) 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AS IT PERTAINS TO THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND THEIR

RIGHTS UNDER THE 14TH. AMENDMENT EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS
CLAUSE AS IT RELATES TO PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AND ORDERS
THAT TRIGGER A JUDGMENT RELATED TO THE TORRENCE RULING COMING
FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA? THE PETITIONER(S) BRING THE
U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ATTENTION TO APPENDICES "B" THROUGH "F".
THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF ARGUING THIS ISSUE.
THIS ISSUE CONCERNS PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES AND WHETHER THE
S.C. TORRENCE v. S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS, --S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL
1114310(S.C.2021) RULING IS A MIRROR AND OR IS SIMILAR TO THE LAW
ADJUDICATED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT UNDER HALL v. HALL, 138
S.Ct. 1118. IN THE CASE OF UNITED STATES v. WHEELER, 886 F3d. 415
(4th.Cir.2018), THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ADDRESSED THE DUE PROCESS
INJUSTICE THAT PERSISTED WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURTS RELATED TO
THEIR ADHERENCE TO ESTABLISHED PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES. THAT
COURT DETERMINED THAT THERE WERE TWO TYPES OF PROCEDURAL
PROCESSING RULES, THOSE THAT WERE JURISDICTIONAL AND NON
JURISDICTIONAL. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT THE
PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON HERE IN THE STATE COURT IS
JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED DUE TO
IT BEING ATTACHED TO THE S.C. CONSTITUTION UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 23
AND OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW ARGUED WITHIN THE ATTACHMENTS
PRODUCING A VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS PROVISIONS IF
NOT ADHERED TO, VOIDING THE STATE COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR
UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT
MATTER JURISDICTION AND THE CONVICTION(S) ATTACHED TO IT,
TRIGGERING THE PROVISIONS OF FINAL ORDER PURSUANT TO BOTH
TORRENCE AND HALL. WHAT FURTHER ESTABLISH THIS CLAIM IS THAT THE

U.S. SUPREME COURT UNDER FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS v. DAVIS 139 S.Ct. 1843 ADJUDICATED WHETHER THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE IS JURISDICTIONAL OR NON JURISDICTIONAL, IF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON IS "TIMELY" ASSERTED? IT BECOMES MANDATORY IN BOTH INSTANCES. JUST LIKE THE FEDERAL COURTS ADDRESSED THE ABUSE AND VIOLATIONS OF DUE PROCESS LAW THAT ATTACHED TO THE FEDERAL COURTS FAILURE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE EXISTENCE AND OR DUE PROCESS RIGHTS THAT EXIST BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES IN QUESTION. THE S.C. STATE COURTS IN REGARD TO THIS IDENTICAL, SIMILAR MATTERS, HAVE ABUSED THEIR DISCRETION, OBSTRUCTED JUSTICE CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, IS FAR MORE EGREGIOUS THAN THE INJUSTICE THAT HAS OCCURRED WITHIN THE FEDERAL COURTS. THE QUESTION THAT IS PLACED BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IS THIS. IS THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S RULING PERTAINING TO FEDERAL PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES APPLICABLE TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA'S PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULES BY THE PETITIONER(S)' RIGHTS UNDER THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENT DUE PROCESS CLAUSE AND OUR RIGHTS UNDER THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE?, MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718; LOUMIET v. UNITED STATES, 65 F.Sdpp.3d. 19 (2014); BODMAN v. STATE, 403 S.C. 60, 742 S.E.2d. 363(S.C.2013); PEGG v. HEARNBERGER, 845 F3d. 112(4th.Cir.2017).

IF THIS POSITION IS TRUE AND AFFIRMED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. THEN IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) ASSERTION THAT ONCE THE CONDITIONAL ORDER AND OR ORDER OF CONTINUANCE WAS FILED IN EITHER THE MCCRAY OR CRAWFORD CASE(S) WHERE THE RIGHTS OF THE PROCEDURAL

PROCESSING RULE WAS TIMELY ASSERTED. THE RIGHTS PERTAINING TO THE RULE BECAME MANDATORY IN FAVOR OF THE PETITIONER(S) WHO CLAIMED THE RIGHT. THEREUPON, THESE ORDERS TRIGGERED A TORRENCE AND OR HALL JUDGMENT WHERE ALL INDICATION POINT TO TORRENCE BEING TRANSPLANTED FROM HALL. IT IS A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE OF LAW RESTING UPON LONGSTANDING INTERPRETIVE PRINCIPLE: WHEN A STATUTORY TERM, AND IN THIS CASE, WE CAN ADD, "A STATE LAW", IS OBVIOUSLY TRANSPLANTED FROM ANOTHER LEGAL SOURCE, IT BRINGS THE OLD SOIL WITH IT. IF THE ORDERS END THE LITIGATION AS THE CONDITIONAL ORDER AND ORDER OF CONTINUANCE FILED IN BOTH CASES DID DUE TO UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION AND VIOLATIONS OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE? IT FALLS WITHIN THE COLLATERAL ORDER EXCEPTION'S "CONCLUSIVENESS" REQUIREMENT IN THAT IT WILL BE A FINAL WORD VIA THE DEFAULT WHERE IN THE CRAWFORD CASE THE WHITE OAK MANOR CASE DETERMINED NOT BEING ABLE TO LOCATE PLEADINGS IS NOT A VALID EXCUSE TO SET ASIDE THE DEFAULT WHICH WAS GIVEN BY THE DEFENDANTS AFTER THE FACT, WHEN THE DEFENDANTS BEING GIVEN NOTICE OF THE NOVEMBER 2020 HEARING FAILED TO EVEN SHOW UP TO PLEAD, IT WILL BE A FINAL WORD ON THE SUBJECT ADDRESSED. THE ARCHETYPAL FINAL DECISION FROM WHICH AN APPEAL MAY BE TAKEN IS ONE THAT TRIGGERS THE ENTRY OF JUDGMENT; APPEAL FROM SUCH DECISION IS A MATTER OF RIGHT, HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 118, 200 L.Ed.2d. 399, 86 U.S.L.W. 4159(U.S.2018); SHOUP v. CASSANO, --S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 4259962 (MEM)(U.S.2021); TAGGART v. LORENZEN, 139 S.Ct. 1795, 204 L.Ed.2d. 129(U.S.2019); WHITE OAK MANOR INC. v. LEXINGTON INS. CO., 407 S.C. 1, 753 S.E.2d. 537 (S.C.2014).

QUESTION PRESENTED # 2: DO THE PRESENCE OF JUDGE KAYE HEARN FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT SITTING UPON THESE CASES PRODUCE A CONSTITUTIONAL, STRUCTURAL ERROR PURSUANT TO WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132, 84 U.S.L.W. 4359 (U.S.2016) WHERE SHE IS A DEFENDANT IN THE RELATED CASES THAT ARE SOUGHT 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER PRODUCING A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL VOIDING THE STATE COURT'S JURISDICTION UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION? THE PETITIONER(S) BRING THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S ATTENTION TO APPENDICES "G" THROUGH "W". THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF ARGUING THIS ISSUE. CIVIL CONSPIRACY ELEMENTS ARE (1) AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE INDIVIDUALS, (2) TO DO AN UNLAWFUL ACT OR TO DO A LAWFUL ACT IN AN UNLAWFUL WAY, (3) RESULTING IN INJURY TO THE PLAINTIFF SUCH AS THIS OVER (16+) YEAR DELAY AND EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, INFLICTED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE CONSPIRATORS, AND (4) PURSUANT A COMMON SCHEME SUCH AS TO CONCEAL MATERIAL FACTS AND THWART FAIR AND JUST REVIEW, PRAADIS v. CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT,--S.E.2d.--, 2021 WL 3668152 (S.C.App.2021); U.S. v. LAWRENCE, F.Sdpp.3d., 2015 WL 856866 (S.D.Va.2015); PENN AMERICAN INS. CO. v. MAPP, 521 F3d. 290 CA4 (Va.2008). ALL OF THIS SIMPLY BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED DUE TO WHAT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S FAMILY TOLD THE S.C. 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE AND S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE REGARDING THE PETITIONER'S CRAWFORD'S "FAMILY TREE" AND LEGAL INHERITANCE BEING THE FIDUCIARY HEIR AND MEMBER OF THE SOLE CORPORATION, PROTECTED BY

STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW, THE LAW OF TRUSTS, THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE OF THE 1st. AMENDMENT AND LAWS OF CONTRACT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION WHERE THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BROUGHT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS BEFORE A COURT OF LAW FOR THE SAKE OF ESTABLISHING LAW WHEN THESE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE ALLEGED CRIME FOR WHICH THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD STANDS CONVICTED OF. FOR THE RECORD THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD IS OFFICIALLY MOTIONED INTERVENED IN THE RON SANTA McCRAY PCR CASE BEFORE THE BERKELEY COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS. EVERY UNCONSTITUTIONAL ATTACK UPON ALL THE INMATES CRIMINAL POST CONVICTION CASES AT EVERY TURN, AT EVERY LEVEL, BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER INVOLVED HERE WERE BASED UPON AND DONE IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO THWART FAIR AND PROPER JUDICIAL REVIEW DUE TO THE OTHER INMATES CONNECTION TO AND THEIR AIDING THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD TO OBTAIN THAT LEGAL EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN HIS CASE WHERE THE INMATES INVOLVED HERE WERE ALSO PROTECTED BY 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT. JUDGE KAYE HEARN, ALONG WITH JUDGE JEAN TOAL WHO IN THE PAST HEADED THE S.C. SUPREME COURT, THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL AT THAT TIME, HENRY McMASTER AND HIS NOW SUCCESSORS, JOHN MEADORS AND MEMBERS OF THE 5TH. CIRCUIT SOLICITOR'S OFFICE UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE, THE KERSHAW COUNTY S.C. CLERKS OF COURT, CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW, IN EX PARTE EXTRA-JUDICIAL SECRET MEETINGS IN THEIR MEETING OF THE

MINDS SUPPORTED BY THE FEDERAL JUDGES OF THE S.C. DISTRICT COURT AND 4TH. CIRCUIT, AT ALL LEVELS ENGAGED IN ACTS OF MACHINATION AND FRAUD TO BLOCK THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD, McCRAY AND THE OTHER INMATES FROM THE COURTS TO PREVENT THE CONTROVERSIAL CONVICTION LEGAL ISSUES FROM EVER OBTAINING FAIR, JUST AND PROPER REVIEW. THIS IS WHY THEY ATTACKED THE OTHER INMATES CASES INVOLVED TO DO THE SAME. THESE ARE EXTRA JUDICIAL ACTS TARGETING THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED DUE TO THE RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL AND POTENTIAL GLOBAL RAMIFICATIONS OF THE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BROUGHT INTO THAT KERSHAW COUNTY S.C. COURT ROOM AT THE CRAWFORD TRIAL TO CONVICT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD OF, DURING THE TIME OF 9/11 WHEN THERE WAS AN INTENSE HATRED OF MUSLIMS, THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD SAID TO BE CHRISTIAN, MUSLIM AND JEW COMBINED, WHICH HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIMINAL CHARGE AT ALL. SINCE THE CONSPIRACY AND ACTS CLAIMED WERE DONE OUTSIDE ANY JUDICIAL DETERMINATION AND AUTHORITY WHERE THERE IS NO ORDER EXPLAINING WHY THIS WAS DONE REGARDING THE PCR COURT BARRING THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD FROM FILING FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF SINCE 2006? THE JUDGES ENGAGED IN NON JUDICIAL, MINISTERIAL ACTS BY BLOCKING THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD FROM THE PCR COURT WITHOUT EXPLAINING WHY WITHIN JURISDICTION SHE HAD ABSOLUTELY NO POWER OR AUTHORITY. JUDGE KAYE HEARN AND PARTIES DID NON JUDICIAL ACTS INSTRUCTING THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS NOT TO MAKE LEGAL COPIES TO HINDER OR PREVENT THE CASES FROM BEING PLACED IN PROPER FORM WITH THE FEDERAL JUDGES INVOLVED WHICH RESULTED IN THE DISMISSAL OF MANY OF THE CASES. THERE ARE EMAILS TO CPL. BOUCH SHE INFORMED THE

PETITIONERS OF THAT WOULD FURTHER SUPPORT THESE CLAIMS. THE JUDGES ARE NOT EMPLOYEES OF THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR GIVING OUT LEGAL COPIES TO INMATES. THE CONSPIRING PARTIES INSTRUCTED S.C.D.C. MAILROOM PERSONNEL TO ENGAGE IN ACTS OF MAIL TAMPERING TO PREVENT FILINGS. THE JUDGES ARE NOT EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE RESPONSIBLE FOR MAIL DELIVERY. THE CONSPIRING JUDGES AND PARTIES INSTRUCTED COURT CLERKS TO SPOLIATE LEGAL FILINGS OR CONCEAL THEM AS JUDGE TOAL DID INSTRUCTING THE RICHLAND CLERK TO SEND ESSENTIAL LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO THE COURT WAREHOUSE TO PREVENT SCRUTINY IN CASE THERE WAS AN INVESTIGATION, ACTS THEY ALL WERE PRIVY TO. THEY ARE NOT CLERKS OF COURT OR CASE MANAGERS RESPONSIBLE FOR FILING OR DESTROYING OR STORING LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND EVIDENCE OF THEIR FRAUD AND CONSPIRACY. THIS STRIPS THEM OF ANY IMMUNITY. THEY ARE NOT IMMUNE FROM INJUNCTIVE OR DECLARATORY RELIEF TO ADDRESS THE CRIMINAL ACTS. IF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WILL LOOK AT THE PROCEEDINGS UNDER CASES 9:18-cv-01408-TLW-BM; 9:21-cv-2139-TLW-MHC IN SOUTH CAROLINA, AT 1:18-cv-13459-NLH IN THE N.J. DISTRICT COURT AND 2013-CP-400-0084 IN THE RICHLAND S.C. COMMON PLEAS COURT, WHICH IS ANOTHER CASE THAT IS THE SOURCE OF DEFAULT BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON? THESE JUDGES INCLUDING JUDGE KAYE HEARN CONSPIRED WITHIN EACH OTHER'S JURISDICTIONS FOR WHICH THEY HAD ABSOLUTELY NO POWER OR AUTHORITY TO BE IN VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION(S), STATE AND FEDERAL, TO PREVENT THEIR NAMES FROM BEING LISTED AS DEFENDANTS TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE THEY WERE NOT ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON THEIR OWN CASES TO AVOID SUIT, AND TO

MAKE IT LOOK LIKE WE WERE SUING INDIVIDUALS WHO COULD NOT BE SUED FOR THE CLAIMS MADE. JUDGE KAYE HEARN KNEW ALL OF THIS DUE TO HER DIRECT INVOLVEMENT, WAS AWARE OF ALL CLAIMS AND ISSUES FROM THE START IN 2006, AND KNEW THAT SHE WAS ESSENTIALLY SITTING UPON HER OWN CASES TO THWART JUDICIAL REVIEW, ALSO DUE TO THE SEEKING OF 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER BASED UPON THE FEDERAL CASES TO WHICH SHE IS A DEFENDANT. SHE SAT ON THE S.C. SUPREME COURT CASES OF THE PETITIONER(S) TO INFLUENCE THE MINDS OF THE OTHER JUDGES INVOLVED AND TO MOLD THE DECISIONS OF THE COURT TO CAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM TO THE PETITIONER(S) WHO SOUGHT TO INVOKE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S ORIGINAL JURISDICTION, ALSO BECAUSE THESE TWO CASES HAVE MONETARY RELIEF ATTACHED TO BOTH OF THEM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA DEFAULTED ON AND DUE TO CRAWFORD MOTIONING TO INTERVENE IN THE McCRAY PCR CASE TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST. THIS PRODUCES STRUCTURAL CONSTITUTIONAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE VOIDING THE S.C. SUPREME COURT'S JURISDICTION FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. THUS, THE DECISION OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO BOTH CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-000974 MUST BE REVERSED AND VACATED. JUDGE KAYE HEARN SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN ALLOWED TO SIT ON THESE PROCEEDINGS IN ANY WAY KNOWING HER DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT JUDGE KAYE HEARN'S PRESENCE IN THESE CASES PRODUCE A POTENTIAL FOR BIAS THAT RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL. UNDER THE DUE PROCESS, NO MAN CAN BE JUDGE IN HIS OR HER OWN CASE AND NO MAN OR WOMAN IS PERMITTED TO TRY CASES WHERE HE OR SHE HAS AN INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME,

WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA, 579 U.S. 1, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 195 L.Ed.2d. 132 (U.S.2016); PASCAL v. CITY OF PITTSBURG ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, 2021 WL 4303202(Pa.2021); RIVERA v. SUPERINTENDENT HOUTZDALE, S.C.I., 738 Fed. Appx' 59 (3rd.Cir.2018).

JUDGE KAYE HEARNS INVOLVEMENT ON THESE CASES SITTING ON THAT S.C. SUPREME COURT PANEL TO INFLUENCE THE DECISIONS OF THE OTHER JUDGES WHEN SHE IS DIRECTLY ONE OF THE SOURCES OF THE INJUSTICES THAT OCCURRED IN HOLDING THE PETITIONER(S) CASES IN LIMBO FOR OVER (16+) YEARS WHERE SHE CONSPIRED BEYOND HER JUDICIAL AUTHORITY IN THE AFOREMENTIONED ACTS AND WHERE ALL OF THESE JUDGES ARE SOUGHT DISQUALIFIED SEEKING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER GIVES A RISE TO AN UNACCEPTABLE RISK OF BIAS THAT CAN HAVE EASILY BEEN REMEDIED BY HER RECUSING HER SELF ONCE SEEN THAT THIS CASE INVOLVED THE PETITIONER(S) AND THEY WERE SEEKING TRANSFER FOR WHICH SHE CONSPIRED ACROSS MULTIPLE STATE AND FEDERAL JURISDICTION TO PREVENT HER NAME FROM BEING LISTED AS A DEFENDANT IN THE FEDERAL CASES INVOLVED. THIS RISK SO ENDANGERS THE APPEARANCE OF NEUTRALITY WHERE THEY CONSPIRED TO BLOCK THE HEARING OF THESE LEGAL ISSUES FOR OVER (16+) YEARS THAT JUDGE KAYE HEARN'S PARTICIPATION IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT RULING "MUST BE FORBIDDEN" IF THE GUARANTEE OF DUE PROCESS IS TO BE ADEQUATELY IMPLEMENTED, WITHROW, 421 U.S. AT 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456. DUE PROCESS ENTITLES THE PETITIONER(S) TO A PROCEEDING IN WHICH HE MAY PRESENT HIS CASE WITH ASSURANCE "THAT NO MEMBER OF THE COURT IS "PREDISPOSED TO FIND AGAINST HIM". THIS ISSUE IS ALSO BEING ARGUED FOR JUDGE YOUNG WHO SAT ON THE RON SANTA MCCRAY PCR TO

ISSUE THE CONDITIONAL ORDER IN THAT CASE WHEN THAT SAME JUDGE WAS INVOLVED IN PRIOR PROCEEDING INVOLVING McCRAY WHO BY SOUTH CAROLINA LAW AND FEDERAL LAW WAS REQUIRED TO RECUSE HIMSELF CALLING IN QUESTION THE INTEGRITY OF THE CONDITIONAL ORDER ISSUED WITHIN THE McCRAY CASE AS WELL. THIS IS THE TYPE OF REPEATED INJUSTICE THE PETITIONER(S) WERE SUBJECT TO FURTHER WARRANTING THE 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER DISQUALIFYING THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND LOWER COURTS IN THEIR ENTIRETY, 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).

A JUDGE'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL FAILURE TO RECUSE WHEN SHE KNEW OF HER DIRECT INVOLVEMENT IN THESE MATTERS, IN VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS AND THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION(S), CONSTITUTE STRUCTURAL ERROR NOT SUBJECT TO HARMLESS-ERROR REBIEW, EVEN IF THE JUDGE IN QUESTION DID NOT DO THE DEED OF NOT CRIMINALLY LISTING THEM AS DEFENDANTS WHEN ON THE FACE OF THE COMPLAINT THAT MAKE UP CASE 9:21-cv-2139-TLW STILL PENDING AND NOW BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT SEEKING STAY OF THAT CASE. JUDGE KAYE HEARN'S NAME IS LISTED AS A DEFENDANT AS WELL AS JUDGE YOUNG RELATED TO THE PRIOR FEDERAL CASES THAT WERE INAPPROPRIATELY IN ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DISMISSED. 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. IT IS PERSPICUOUS THAT THE OBJECTIVE RISK OF ACTUAL

BIAS AS IT PERTAIN TO BOTH JUDGE KAYE HEARN AND JUDGE YOUNG IN THE McCRAY PCR, RISES TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEVEL CREATING STRUCTURAL ERROR VIOLATING DUE PROCESS THAT IS NOT SUBJECT TO THE HARMLESS ERROR DOCTRINE, JOHNSON v. PARRIS, 2021 WL 1232774 (E.D.Tenn.2021); JONES v. NEUSCHARD, 2021 WL 1056597 (N.D.Cal.2021); WILLIAMS v. PENNSYLVANIA SUPRA.; UNITED STATES v. KOEBER, 2018 WL 4188465, * 2 UTAH; JUSTIN PATRICK ODLE, PETITIONER v. MATT MacAULEY, RESPONDENT, 2021 WL 4350123 (W.D.Mich.2021); DRAKE v. TRAVELERS INDEMNITY COMPANY, 2019 WL 5423099, * 3 D.Md..

QUESTION PRESENTED # 3: DO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA, 136 S.Ct. 1609, 194 L.Ed.2d. 723(U.S.2016), UNDER MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599, 84 U.S.L.W. 4064(U.S.2016), UNDER NELSON v. COLORADO, 137 S.Ct. 1249, 197 L.Ed.2d. 611, 85 U.S.L.W. 4205(U.S.2017), AND UNDER WEARRY v. CAIN, 136 S.Ct. 1002, 194 L.Ed.2d. 78 (U.S.2016) APPLY TO THE CRAWFORD CASE PRODUCING EXCEPTIONAL AND OR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE THE OTHER INMATES ARE ENTITLED TO CLAIMS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL DUE TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA CONCEALING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA EVIDENCE AND S.L.E.D. INVESTIGATIVE FILE, ALSO BLOCKING CRAWFORD FROM FILING FOR POST CONVICTION RELIEF BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED FOR OVER (16+) YEARS WITHOUT ANY JUDICIAL ORDER DETERMINING WHY AND THE LEGAL ISSUES ARGUED WITHIN ALL THEIR CASES ARE ESSENTIALLY THE SAME AND OR IDENTICAL? THE PETITIONER(S) PRESENT THE

DOCUMENTS FOUND IN THE APPENDICES "B" THROUGH "W" IN SUPPORT OF ARGUING THIS ISSUE. THERE IS NO NEED TO MAKE THIS ISSUE LENGTHY DUE TO THE ARGUMENT ESTABLISHED IN THE PREVIOUS QUESTIONS PRESENTED. THERE ARE NO LEGAL INDICTMENTS BY SHAM LEGAL PROCESS WHICH IS ANOTHER REASON WHY THEY BLOCKED THE GIVING OF THE GRAND JURY PANEL DOCUMENTS. THIS HAS BEEN GOING ON IN FRAUD IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA FOR DECADES. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DETERMINED UNDER BETTERMAN v. MONTANA THAT THE PETITIONER(S) WOULD HAVE AVAILABLE TAILORED RELIEF UNDER THE 5TH. AND 14TH. AMENDMENTS AND THE STATE HELD CRAWFORD FOR OVER (4½) YEARS AS A PRETRIAL DETAINEE DESPITE HIS FILING FOR MOTION FOR SPEEDY TRIAL. THE STATE BROUGHT CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN TRIAL AND ESSENTIALLY CONVICTED HIM FOR THEM WHEN THEY HAD ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIME NOR DID THEY BREAK ANY LAWS WHICH VIOLATE MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA ESTABLISHING UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, WHICH INCLUDE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD UPON THE COURT, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE STATE TOOK AWAY THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE BY THE LANGUAGE WITHIN THE INDICTMENT(S) CONSTRUCTIVELY AMENDING THE INDICTMENTS ALL OVER THE PLACE ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE(S). THE STATE SUPPRESSED EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE IN THE FORM OF DNA EVIDENCE AND S.L.E.D. INVESTIGATIVE FILE #5501014 IN THE STATE'S POSSESSION THEN LIED ABOUT IT ON THE COURT RECORD IN PROSECUTIONAL MISCONDUCT. THE STATE BLOCKED CRAWFORD FROM FILING PCR APPLICATION IN KERSHAW COUNTY FOR OVER (16+) YEARS FORCING HIM TO FILE TORT ACTION IN ANOTHER COUNTY VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. THE ATTORNEY FOR THE CLERK OF COURT,

DUBOSE-ROBINSON, LIED ABOUT IT ON THE COURT RECORD BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHEN APPENDICES "I" THROUGH "O" ESTABLISH CLEAR EVIDENCE CRAWFORD WAS INDEED BLOCKED BY AN EXTRA-JUDICIAL CONSPIRACY WITHOUT COURT ORDER EXPLAINING WHY. THE OTHER INMATES INVOLVED BECAME ATTACHED TO CRAWFORD VIA 42 U.S.C. § 12203(a)(b) OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT TO HELP PREVENT THE RETALITORY ACTS AND TO PROTECT CRAWFORD'S RIGHTS TO THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE ENTITLING THEM TO NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL RELIEF WHERE BY THE PETITIONER(S) CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, THE STATE CANNOT BE PERMITTED TO RELITIGATE ISSUES THEY WAIVED BY REPEATED DEFAULTS ON THE BASES OF THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON AND THE FRAUD THEY ENGAGED IN PLACING THE STATE IN FORFEITURE ON THE CAUSES OF CONVICTION. S.C. CODE ANN § 17-27-45(a) PROVIDE: AN APPLICATION FOR RELIEF FILED PURSUANT TO THIS CHAPTER MUST BE FILED WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER ENTRY OF A JUDGMENT OF CONVICTION OR WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER THE SENDING OF THE REMITTITUR TO THE LOWER COURT FROM AN APPEAL OR THE FILING OF THE FINAL DECISION UPON AN APPEAL, WHICHEVER IS LATER. THE PREVENTING OF THIS BY THE CONSPIRING STATE ACTORS VIOLATED THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS CLAUSE STRIPPING FROM THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS PLACED UPON HIM BY THE LEGISLATORS, COLLINS v. YEMEN, 141 S.Ct. 1761, 210 L.Ed.2d. 432(U.S.2021); BRNOVICH v. DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, 141 S.Ct. 2321, 210 L.Ed.2d. 753(U.S.2021); ODOM v. STATE, 337 S.C. 256, 523 S.E.2d. 753(S.C.App.1999); BARNES v. STATE, 433 S.C. 399, 859 S.E.2d.

260(S.C.App.2021). THE CLERK OF COURT HAS A MINISTERIAL DUTY TO DOCKET FILINGS IRRESPECTIVE OF POTENTIAL FLAWS THAT MAY EXIST AND HER FAILURE TO DO SO CONSPIRING WITH THE OTHER JUDICIAL OFFICERS OF THE COURT(S) INVOLVED WITHOUT ORDER STATING WHY VIOLATED S.C. CODE ANN §17-27-40 PRODUCING ANOTHER SEPARATION OF POWERS VIOLATION THE CLERK ACTING AS JUDGE FOR WHICH SHE HAD NO POWER OR AUTHORITY TO DO TO PREVENT THE HEARING OF THE CONVICTION ISSUES WHERE THE STATE DEFAULTED WITHIN THE MANY CASES INVOLVED HERE PURSUANT TO THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON WARRANTING THE DEFAULT AND RIGHTS OF NON PARTY COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, BARNES v. STATE SUPRA.; MILLER v. STATE, 377 S.C. 99, 659 S.E.2d. 492(S.C.App.2008); SNYDER v. NOLEN, 380 F3d. 279(7th.Cir.2004); JOHNSON v. PERSON, 781 Fed. Appx' 69 (3rd.Cir.2019); BURNS v. STATE OF OHIO, 360 U.S. 252, 79 S.Ct. 1164, 3 L.Ed.2d. 1209(U.S.1959); FREYTAG v. C.I.R., 501 U.S. 868, 111 S.Ct. 2631, 115 L.Ed.2d. 764(U.S.1991); PARKLANE HOSIERY CO., INC. v. SHORE, 439 U.S. 322, 99 S.Ct. 645, 58 L.Ed.2d. 552(U.S.1979); MONTANA v. U.S., 440 U.S. 147, 99 S.Ct. 970, 59 L.Ed.2d. 210(U.S.1979).

QUESTION PRESENTED # 4: DID THE PETITIONER(S) MEET THE CRITERION FOR ESTABLISHING 28 U.S.C. § 1407 AND 1455(c) TRANSFER DUE TO THE SEEKING OF DISQUALIFICATION OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT SEEKING TRANSFER TO THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY BY THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION RULES? HABEAS CORPUS WAS SOUGHT BEFORE THE FEDERAL COURT IN SOUTH CAROLINA UNDER CASE 9:16-cv-3808-TLW-BM. IT IS SOUGHT UNDER CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH. IT WAS SOUGHT REPEATEDLY BEFORE THE VARIOUS

FEDERAL COURTS EVEN LOOKING TO POTENTIALLY ESTABLISH CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION AND THE APPOINTMENT OF LEGAL COUNSEL DUE TO THE COMPLEXITY OF THE CASE BEING ARGUED OVER MULTIPLE STATES. THE STATE CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS ARE ALREADY INVALIDATED BY THE FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND THE DEFAULT BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON WHICH IS JURISDICTIONAL IN NATURE AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. WHEN THE SUPREME COURT LOOK AT THE APPENDICES IN THEIR TOTALITY WITH EMPHASIS ON APPENDICES "Q" THROUGH "AA". THE LEGAL ISSUES UNDER APPENDICES "Q", "S", "T", "U", "V" AND "W" ARE ESSENTIALLY BEING ARGUED FOR THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES IN THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, IN THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CASE 1:18-cv-13459-NLH, AS IS ALSO FOR THE PETITIONERS/INMATES STILL PENDING BEFORE THE LOWERS COURTS INVOLVED. THE PETITIONERS ASK THE COURT TO DISREGARD THE VARIATIONS IN THE PLEADING DUE TO THE CASE INVOLVING MULTIPLE INMATES AND THE LITIGATION IS CONSTRUCTED WITH THIS IN MIND. PLEASE JUST APPLY THE MATTERS THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THESE PARTICULAR PETITIONER(S). THE CLINTON BILL AND THE UNITED STATES EXECUTING, ARRESTING OR ATTACHING THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION DEFAULTED ON IS BEING ARGUED FOR ALL (50) STATES CREATING COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT. ANY ONE OF THE CASES THAT WERE SOUGHT CONSOLIDATED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FOR MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION PURPOSES IS IMMEDIATELY APPEALABLE UPON AN ORDER DISPOSING OF THAT CASE SUCH AS THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ISSUED HERE, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER ANY OF THE OTHER CASES REMAIN PENDING, 28 U.S.C. § 1407; HALL v. HALL, 138 S.Ct. 1118(U.S.2018). ONCE A FINAL

JUDGMENT HAS BEEN ENTERED IN A CASE, IT IS IMMEDIATELY APPEALABLE, REGARDLESS OF WHETHER IT IS CONSOLIDATED WITH ANOTHER STILL PENDING CASE, NETTLES v. RUMBERGER, KIRK & CALDWELL, P.C., 276 SO.3d. 663 (Ala.App.2018); IN RE: NEW YORK CITY POLICING DURING SUMMER 2020 DEMONSTRATIONS, --F.Supp.3d.--, 2021 WL 1666860 (S.D.N.Y.2021); DOLORES PRESS, INC. v. ROBINSON, 2019 WL 12095416(C.D.Cal.2019). 28 U.S.C. § 1407 PROVIDE: WHEN CIVIL ACTIONS WHERE EVEN THE HABEAS CORPUS WAS FILED ALSO UNDER § 1983 AND REMOVAL STATUTES PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., INVOLVING ONE OR MORE COMMON QUESTIONS OF FACT ARE PENDING IN DIFFERENT DISTRICTS, SUCH ACTIONS MAY BE TRANSFERRED TO ANY DISTRICT FOR COORDINATED OR CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS. SUCH TRANSFERS SHALL BE MADE BY THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION AUTHORIZED BY THIS SECTION UPON ITS DETERMINATION THAT TRANSFER OF SUCH PROCEEDINGS WILL BE FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF PARTIES AND WITNESSES AND WILL PROMOTE THE JUST AND EFFICIENT CONDUCT OF SUCH ACTIONS. EACH ACTION SO TRANSFERRED SHALL BE REMANDED BY THE PANEL AT OR BEFORE THE CONCLUSION OF SUCH PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS TO THE DISTRICT FROM WHICH IT WAS TRANSFERRED UNLESS IT SHALL HAVE BEEN PREVIOUSLY TERMINATED: PROVIDED, HOWEVER, THAT THE PANEL MAY SEPARATE ANY CLAIM, CROSS CLAIM, COUNTER CLAIM OR THIRD-PARTY CLAIM BEFORE THE REMAINDER OF THE ACTION IS REMANDED. THE JUDICIAL PANEL UPON ITS OWN INITIATIVE, OR MOTION FILED WITH THE PANEL BY A PARTY IN ANY ACTION IN WHICH TRANSFER FOR COORDINATED OR CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS UNDER THIS SECTION MAY BE APPROPRIATE. A COPY OF SUCH MOTION, WHICH IN THIS CASE IS EMBEDDED WITHIN THE COMPLAINTS FILED, SHALL BE FILED IN THE DISTRICT COURT IN WHICH THE MOVING

PARTY'S ACTION IS PENDING. THE PANEL SHALL GIVE NOTICE TO THE PARTIES IN ALL ACTIONS IN WHICH TRANSFER FOR COORDINATED OR CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS ARE CONTEMPLATED. BY THE LEGAL ISSUES AND CLAIMS PRESENTED, THE PETITIONER(S) HAVE MET THE CRITERION FOR ESTABLISHING MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION AND 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER ALONG WITH ALL TAG ALONG CASES, EASTWOOD v. LEHMAN BROS., BANK, F.S.B., F.Supp.2d., 2010 WL 774073 (D.Nev.2010); IN RE: WALDEN UNIVERSITY, LLC., DOCTORAL PROGRAM LITIGATION, 273 F.Supp.3d. 1367 (2017); 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. COVID-19 BUSINESS INTERRUPTION PROTECTION INSURANCE LITIGATION, 2021 WL 3290962(N.D.ILL.2021).

QUESTION PRESENTED # 5: BY THE RECENT AND PAST RULINGS COMING OUT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SINCE 2016, DID THE STATE COURTS ABUSE THEIR DISCRETION BY ADJUDICATING THE ISSUE OF FATAL DEFECTS OF CRIMINAL INDICTMENT(S) UNDER THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION WHEN DUE PROCESS LAW REQUIRED THAT SUCH ISSUES BE ADJUDICATED UNDER THE CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION? THE PETITIONER(S) BRING THE COURT'S ATTENTION BACK TO APPENDICES "Q", "R", "S", "T", "U", "V" AND "W". THESE DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF SEEKING REVIEW FOR THIS QUESTION OF LAW. THE CONCERN EMERGES FROM THE CASE OF UNITED STATES v. COTTON, 535 U.S. 625, 122 S.Ct. 1781, 152 L.Ed.2d. 860(2002) ADJUDICATED BY THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT. WHEN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT MADE ITS

RULING IN THE COTTON CASE, WHETHER IT WAS INTENTIONAL OR UNINTENTIONAL, THAT RULING "MUDDIED THE WATERS" CREATING A SUBSTANTIAL DEGREE OF "VAGUENESS" AND "UNCERTAINTY" AS IT RELATES TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION AND THE "[F]ATAL [D]EFFECTS" OF INDICTMENT(S) USED WITHIN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS AS IT PERTAINS TO "[E]SSENTIAL [E]LEMENTS" OF THE OFFENSE(S). THE COTTON DECISION GIVES THE UNINTENDED, INDISPUTABLE, IMPRESSION THAT THERE IS ONLY "ONE PRONG" TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, SPECIFICALLY, THE LEGISLATIVE PRONG, WHEN IN TRUTH WE ALL KNOW THAT THIS IS AN INCORRECT ASSUMPTION. THIS DECISION CONFLICTS WITH OTHER U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION UNDER STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT, 523 U.S. 83, 118 S.Ct. 1003(U.S.1998); HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL, 131 S.Ct. 1197, 1198+ U.S. AND MONTGOMERY v. LOUISIANA, 136 S.Ct. 718, 193 L.Ed.2d. 599(U.S.2016) AND A PLETHORA OF OTHER CASES COMING OUT OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AND OTHER CIRCUITS SINCE 2016. THE COTTON DECISION IS VAGUE. IT FAILED TO ADDRESS THE EXISTING "DUE PROCESS/CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG" TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION REQUIRING FOR THE SAKE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" THAT THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT NOW REVISIT THIS ISSUE TO GIVE THE COURTS, BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL, "CERTAINTY AND CLARITY" TO CLEAN UP THE SEEMING CONTRASTING OR OPPOSING HOLDINGS AS IT PERTAINS TO THE "FATAL DEFECTS OF AN INDICTMENT" AND WHETHER UNDER THE "CONSTITUTIONAL PRONG" TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION, IS JURISDICTION MADE VOID IN CRIMINAL CASES AS INDICATED BY MONTGOMERY FOR UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION. IF YOU TAKE A FATALLY DEFECTIVE INDICTMENT AND YOU BRING IT BEFORE A 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 RIGHT TO KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IT IS THAT HE IS CALLED UPON TO MEET AND DEFEND, CONSTRUCTIVELY AMENDING THE INDICTMENTS ALL OVER THE PLACE ON ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSES CHARGED ALONG WITH THE OTHER CLAIMS ARGUED IN THIS CASE? SUCH ACTIONS DONE WITHIN THOSE PROCEEDINGS VIOLATE CONSTITUTIONAL DUE PROCESS RIGHTS RENDER THE PROCEEDINGS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND VOID. ALL JUDGMENTS AND OR ACTS AND OR JUDICIAL DETERMINATIONS THAT VIOLATE DUE PROCESS LAW AND ARE CONTRARY TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION ARE VOID AND CANNOT BECOME LAW OR STAND AS LAW, HENDERSON EX REL HENDERSON v. SHINSEL SUPRA.; 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. 84 U.S.L.W. 4462(U.S.2016); STEEL CO. v. CITIZENS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT SUPRA.; WELLS FARGO BANK N.A. v. H.M.H. ROMAN TWO N.C., LLC., 859 F3d. 295 (4th.Cir.2017). 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 OR 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 (SUCH AS THE ONES ARGUED IN THIS CASE), WHICH ARE REPUGNANT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARE "NULL" AND "VOID". THE U.S. SUPREME COURT MUST NOW GIVE THE COURTS CERTAINTY AND CLARITY DUE TO THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES AND MANIFEST INJUSTICE THAT HAS RESULTED FROM THE COTTON RULING, UNITED STATES v. LIBOUS, 858 F3d. 63 (2nd.Cir.2017); CITY OF LEBANNON v. MILBURN, 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.2017); UNITED STATES v. AJRAWAT,--Fed. Appx'--, 2018 WL 3045619 (4th.Cir.2018); BETTERMAN v. MONTANA SUPRA.; 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); 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 SUPRA.; NELSON v. COLORADO SUPRA.; HILL v. SNYDER, 821 F3d. 763, 765+ (6th.Cir.Mich.); 24 SENATORIAL DIST. REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE v. ALCORN, 820 F3d. 624 (4th.Cir.2016).

CONCLUSION

INSOMUCH, THESE CASES PRODUCE SUBSTANTIAL PUBLIC JURIS CLAIMS. THE CITIZENS, ESPECIALLY THE MONORITY GROUPS, OF THIS NATION HAVE BEEN SCREAMING, CRYING OUT, FOR SOME SORT OF PRISON REFORM FROM ALL STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATORS OF THIS NATION TO NO AVAIL FOR DECADES DUE TO THE CONSTANT PARTISAN BICKERING AND WRANGLING THAT HAS BEEN GOING ON FOR YEARS AT ALL LEVELS. THIS SUPREME COURT CAN GIVE IT TO THE NATIONAL PUBLIC. THE VOIDING OR REVERSING OF THE DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE 1996 CLINTON BILL ARGUED IN THIS CASE AND THE FALLACIOUS ASSUMPTION REGARDING THE CRIMINAL INDICTMENT(S) AS IT PERTAINS TO SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF GIVING THE NATIONAL PUBLIC WHAT IS TANTAMOUNT TO SOME FORM OF PRISON REFORM THIS NATION SO DESPERATELY NEEDS. THE TRULY EVIL ONES WILL COME BACK. COUNT ON IT. THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF THE SOLE CORPORATION GIVEN TO THE GLOBAL NATIONS AS A "GRANT" WITH RESTRICTIONS MUST FOR THE SAKE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" BE REVISITED AND ADDRESSED NOW DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN THE RECORD SUBJUDICE BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE IN QUESTION WHICH IS JURISDICTIONAL AND CANNOT BE WAIVED OR FORFEITED. UNLIKE THE WORD "MAY" WHICH IMPLIES DISCRETION THE WORD "SHALL" IN A STATUTE USUALLY CONNOTES A REQUIREMENT. WHEN A STATUTE DISTINGUISHES BETWEEN "MAY" AND "SHALL" IT IS GENERALLY CLEAR THAT "SHALL" IMPLIES A MANDATORY DUTY WHERE IN THIS CASE THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON IS ALSO ATTACHED TO THE S.C. CONSTITUTION UNDER ARTICLE 1 § 23, AND BOTH THIS PROVISION OF LAW AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS UNDER THE FORTBEND COUNTY, TEXAS CASE COMPOUND IT, ESTABLISHING IT IS MANDATORY

SINCE THE PROVISION WAS TIMELY ASSERTED WHICH ESTABLISH ALL JURISDICTION FACTS MADE BEFORE THIS COURT, KINGDOM WARE TECHNOLOGIES, INC. v. U.S., 579 U.S. 162, 136 S.Ct. 1969, 195 L.Ed.2d. 334(U.S.2016); CRETE CARRIER CORP. v. SULLIVAN & SONS, INC., 2021 WL 2685253, * 6 D.Md.; MAINE COMMUNITY HEALTH OPTIONS v. UNITED STATES, 140 S.Ct. 1308, 1320+ U.S.; SUPERNUS PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. v. IANCU, 913 F3d. 1351, 1359 Fed.Cir.(Va.); MURPHY v. SMITH, 138 S.Ct. 784, 200 L.Ed.2d. 75, 86 U.S.L.W. 4069(U.S.2018); JENNINGS v. RODRIQUEZ, 138 S.Ct. 830, 200 L.Ed.2d. 122, 86 U.S.L.W. 4094(U.S.2018). THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA SHOULD HAVE NEVER BROUGHT THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD'S RELIGIOUS BELIEFS WITHIN THAT COURTROOM AT TRIAL FOR THE SAKE OF ESTABLISHING LAW WHEN SUCH BELIEFS HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE CRIME CONVICTING HIM OF IT, RELIGIOUS BELIEFS PROTECTED BY THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE. THEREUPON, THE STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS INVOLVED SHOULD HAVE NEVER CONSPIRED TO DENY THE PETITIONER(S) AND OTHER INMATES SUBJUDICE REMEDY AT EVERY STAGE AND EVERY LEVEL BEHIND RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL HATRED BECAUSE THE RELIGIOUS CLAIMS BY THE STATE WERE INITIALLY INTRODUCED, WHICH IS THE GENESIS OF ALL THE COURT PERCEIVES BEFORE IT, CLAIMS PROTECTED BY "WILL AND TESTAMENT", BY "CONTRACT/COVENANT", BY STATE AND FEDERAL PROBATE LAW AND ARTICLE 1 § 10 OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. THE FRAUD IS OVERWHELMING. "HAERES EST EADEM PERSONA CUM ANTECESSORE"--THE HEIR IS THE SAME PERSON AS HIS ANCESTOR DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE CASES INVOLVED BASED UPON THE PROCEDURAL PROCESSING RULE RELIED UPON. SEE (3) HOLY BOOKS AND SUNNAH OF MUHAMMAD; BOOKS ENTITLED, "BEFORE THE MAYFLOWER, A

HISTORY OF BLACK AMERICA" BY LEONE BENNETT; "SUNAH IBN-E-MAJAH" VOL. 5 ISBN No. 81-7151-294-1 PAGES 391-395; "WORLD'S GREATEST MEN OF COLOR" VOL. 1 BY J.A. RODGERS ISBN NO. 978-0-684-81581-7; "THE KEBAR NAGAST" OR "GLORY OF THE KINGS" A CHRONICLE OF THE RULERS OF ETHIOPIA; THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH 6:12-13 (BIBLE); NATION, COX v. SHALALA, 112 F3d. 151; ENGLISH v. GEN. ELEC. CO., 496 U.S. 72, 79, 100 S.Ct. 2270, 2275, 110 L.Ed.2d. 65(1990). FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, WHICH INCLUDE FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, IS BASIC IN A SOCIETY OF FREEMEN,...IT EMBRACES THE RIGHT TO MAINTAIN THEORIES OF LIFE AND DEATH AND OF THE HEREAFTER WHICH ARE RANKED HERESIES TO MEMBERS OF ORTHODOX FAITHS. MEN MAY BELIEVE WHAT THEY CANNOT PROVE. THEY MAY NOT BE PUT TO PROOF OF THEIR RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES OR BELIEFS. RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE WHICH ARE AS REAL AS LIFE TO SOME MAY BE INCOMPREHENSIBLE TO OTHERS,...THE FATHERS OF OUR CONSTITUTION WERE NOT UNAWARE OF THE VARIED AND EXTREME VIEWS OF RELIGIOUS SECTS, OF THE VIOLENCE OF DISAGREEMENT AMONG THEM, AND THE LACK OF ANY ONE RELIGIOUS CREED ON WHICH ALL MEN MAY AGREE. THEY FASHIONED A CHARACTER OF GOVERNMENT WHICH ENVISAGED THE WIDEST POSSIBLE TOLERANCE TO CONFLICTING VIEWS. MAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO HIS GOD WAS MADE NO CONCERN OF THE STATE. HE IS GRANTED THE RIGHT TO WORSHIP AS HE PLEASE AND IS NOT REQUIRED TO ANSWER TO ANY MAN FOR THE VERITY OF HIS RELIGIOUS VIEWS, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT HE IS THE FIDUCIARY HEIR OF A FOREIGN STATE AND GENUINE PROPHET AND LAWGIVER OF THE ONE TRUE GOD, S.C. RULES OF CIV. PRO. RULE 44 DEFAULTED ON. THE COURTS HAVE EXPLAINED THAT THERE IS NO WRONG WITHOUT REMEDY WHICH THE CONSPIRING PARTIES TOOK FROM THE

PETITIONERS BY THE FRAUD. THE HISTORY OF THE REMEDY CLAUSE INDICATES THAT IT'S PURPOSE IS TO PROTECT ABSOLUTE COMMON LAW RIGHTS RESPECTING PERSONS PROPERTY, AND REPUTATION, AND THOSE RIGHTS EXISTED WHEN THE CONSTITUTION WAS ESTABLISHED. THE COURT HAS STATED THAT THE GUARANTEE OF REMEDY BY THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE FOR INJURY TO PERSON, PROPERTY, OR REPUTATION, "IS ONE OF THE MOST SACRED AND ESSENTIAL OF ALL THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEES" AND THAT "WITHOUT IT A FREE GOVERNMENT CANNOT BE PRESERVED" AND SUCH A CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE DOES NOT DISAPPEAR JUST BECAUSE A PERSON IS INCARCERATED, SMOTHERS v. GRESHAM TRANSFER INC., 332 Or. 83, 23 P.3d. 333 (2011); GEARIN v. MARION COUNTY, 110 Or. 390, 396, 233 P. 929; PLATT v. NEWBERRY ET. AL., 104 Or. 148, 153, 205 P. 296(1922). THE SAME PRINCIPLE OF LAW APPLIES HERE IN S.C.. UNDER THE 1st. AMENDMENT THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BY WHAT THEY DID HERE CANNOT BURDEN THE FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, ESPECIALLY IF THEY BEAR NEXUS TO PROPERTY RIGHTS AND RIGHTS UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1602-1612 ET. SEQ., WHERE THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD IS FOREIGN SOVEREIGN BY HIS ORIGINAL STATUS AS SUCH PURSUANT TO THE (3) HOLY BOOKS, COVENANTS, OR THEY MAY NOT PROHIBIT THE EXPRESSION OF AN IDEA BECAUSE SOCIETY FINDS THE IDEA OFFENSIVE AS MENTIONED, OR DISAGREEABLE. THE FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE ALONG WITH THE OTHER CONSTITUTIONAL AND DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS ARGUED IN THIS CASE WOULD BAR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA FROM ENGAGING IN THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ARGUED WHICH ATTACHES TO THE CONVICTION(S) THEMSELVES ALSO DUE TO CLAIMS OF NON PARTY RES JUDICATA AND OR COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL, MASTERPIECE CAKESHOP LTD. v. COLORADO CIVIL RIGHTS COM'N, 138 S.Ct. 1719, 201

L.Ed.2d. 35(U.S.2018); McFAUL v. RAMSEY, 61 U.S. (20 HOW) 523, 525, 15 L.Ed. 1010, 1011 (U.S.1858); NEW HOPE FAMILY SERVICES INC. v. POOLE, 966 F3d. 145(2nd.Cir.2020); TELESCOPE MEDIA GROUP v. LUCERO, 936 F3d. 740 (8th.Cir.2019); CHELSEY NELSON PHOTOGRAPHY LLC. v. LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO GOVERNMENT, --F.Supp.3d.--, 2020 WL 4745771 (W.D.Ky.2020); BRADDY v. UNITED STATES, 2016 WL 1031301 (E.D.Va.2016); ZIVOTOFSKY EX REL ZIVOTOFSKY v. KERRY, 135 S.Ct. 2076, 192 L.Ed.2d. 83, 83 U.S.L.W. 4391 (U.S.2015). THEREFORE, 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

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


RON SANTA McCRAY

#353031 COOPER B-59

LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205

RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29472

NOVEMBER 6, 2021

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

NO. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

RECEIVED

NOV 17 2021

SC Court of Appeals

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

Vs.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; THE S.C. DEPT. OF
CORRECTIONS ET. AL.,
RESPONDENTS---APPELLEES

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

WE, RON SANTA McCRAY AND 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 NOVEMBER 9, 2021, AS REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND MOTION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS 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 U.S. SUPREME COURT 1 FIRST STREET N.E.,
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20543.

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

(3) THE 3rd. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 21400 U.S.
COURTHOUSE 601 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, P.A. 19106.

(4) THE FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS J.J.M. U.S.
COURTHOUSE 1 COURTHOUSE WAY BOSTON, MA. 02210.

(5) THE FEDERAL ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY
AT U.S. ATTORNEYS OFFICE 970 BROAD STREET 7th. FL. NEWARK, N.J.
07102.

(6) THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT COURT CAMDEN DIVISION
M.H.C. BUILDING U.S. COURTHOUSE 4TH. & COOPER STREET ROOM 1050
CAMDEN, N.J. 08101.

(7) THE S.C. U.S. DISTRICT COURT P.O. BOX 835
CHARLESTON, S.C. 29402.

(8) THE S.C. DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS GENERAL COUNSEL
ATTORNEY IMANI DIANE BYAS S.C.D.C. HEADQUARTER 4444 BROAD RIVER
ROAD, COLUMBIA, S.C. 29221.

(9) THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS P.O. BOX 11629 COLUMBIA,
S.C. 29211.

(10) THE RICHLAND COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS AND

JUDGE NEWMAN 1701 MAIN STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(11) THE S.C. SUPREME COURT P.O. BOX 11330 COLUMBIA,
S.C. 29211.

(12) ATTORNEY D. SETTANA AT THE MCKAY LAW FIRM 1303
BLANDING STREET COLUMBIA, S.C. 29201.

(13) THE LAW FIRM OF DUBOSE-ROBINSON 935 BROAD STREET
CAMDEN, S.C. 29020.

(14) THE S.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL P.O. BOX 11549
COLUMBIA, S.C. 29211.

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


EXECUTED ON NOVEMBER 8, 2021.

RESPECTFULLY,

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD.



RON SANTA MCCRAY



No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD

— PETITIONER
(Your Name)

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? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
Is property insurance included? ☐ Yes ☐ 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

	You	Your spouse
Transportation (not including motor vehicle payments)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Recreation, entertainment, newspapers, magazines, etc.	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Insurance (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments)		
Homeowner's or renter's	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Life	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Health	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Motor Vehicle	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Other: <u>N/A</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Taxes (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments)		
(specify): <u>N/A</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Installment payments		
Motor Vehicle	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Credit card(s)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Department store(s)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Other: <u>N/A</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Alimony, maintenance, and support paid to others	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Regular expenses for operation of business, profession, or farm (attach detailed statement)	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Other (specify): <u>N/A</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>
Total monthly expenses:	\$ <u>0</u>	\$ <u>0</u>

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: ~~November 7, 2021~~, 20

NOVEMBER 7, 2021

LAURENCE L Crawford

#300839 F2B Rm 1260

LEE CE 990 Wilsack Hwy

Bishopville, SC 29010

RECEIVED

NOV 17 2021

SC Court of Appeals

SC COURT of Appeals

P.O. Box 11629

Columbia, SC 29211