

201 The SC Court of Appeals

IN RE: CASES 2020-001667 and
RECEIVED

2021-000354


JAN 24 2022

SC Court of Appeals

US SUPREME COURT RULES

REQUIRE THAT I SERVE A COPY
of this pleading on the court
in the ABOVE CASES. 2021 will
become known as the YEAR of
miracles.

1/6/22

Thank you
Jahjah


4

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

RECEIVED

JAN 24 2022

SC Court of Appeals

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

IN RE: TO SEEKING AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION, SEEKING A NEW CASE
MANAGER, SEEKING AN EXTENSION TO FILE CASE 20-7073 VIA
APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR UNDER RULE 22.

TO: JUDGE SOTOMAYOR,
THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ET. AL.,

THE PETITIONERS IN THIS CASE IS RETURNING THESE DOCUMENTS
BACK TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT VIA MS. WALKER AND OTHER
CLERKS SEEKING IT BE FORWARDED TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR PURSUANT TO
RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN
THEM UNTIL MY BROTHER LENEAU CRAWFORD HAS CONTACTED YOU AND
CONFIRMED WHAT IS GOING ON. THE PETITIONERS IN THIS CASE ARE
MOTIONING FOR A NEW CASE MANAGER AND AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION
MS. WALKER. WE WANT YOU OFF THIS CASE. IT IS OBVIOUS TO THE
PETITIONERS THAT MS. WALKER'S PRESENCE ON THIS CASE IS IN
FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY TO CAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM TO THIS

CASE, ESPECIALLY IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT SHE WAS NOT THE FIRST CASE MANAGER ASSIGNED TO THIS CASE, MS. SUSAN FRIMPONG WAS. THERE WAS NO REASON TO EXCHANGE CASE MANAGERS UNLESS AS IT HAS MANIFESTED ITSELF WITHIN THIS CONTEXT, THERE WERE NEFARIOUS INTENTIONS. LET THE PETITIONERS ADDRESS THIS RECENT LETTER MS. WALKER MADE USE OF CONSPIRING UNDER COLOR OF LAW AND OR AUTHORITY IN ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE DATED DECEMBER 15, 2021. FIRST, WHEN THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY SPOKE WITH MS. WALKER SHE STATED THAT SHE DID NOT RECEIVE THE MAIN BULK PLEADING BUT HAD THE PLEADING THAT CONTAINED THE MOTION TO EXPEDITE THE CASE AND ADVANCE THE CAUSE, WHICH SHE PREVIOUSLY LIED TO MY FAMILY AND STATED NO SUCH MECHANISM WITHIN THE SUPREME COURT EXISTED TO SEEK TO EXPEDITE CASES. SHE THEN TELLS THE PETITIONER FAMILY MEMBER(S) THAT SHE WOULD NOT RETURN THE LAST PLEADING BUT WOULD WAIT UNTIL MY FAMILY CALLED HER BACK TO GET CLARITY BEFORE SHE RETURNED IT, BUT SHE LIED ABOUT THAT AS WELL. SHE IMMEDIATELY RETURNED THE BULK PLEADING AND THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE PRETENDING THAT SHE DID NOT UNDERSTAND HOW IT WAS BEING FILED. IN PARAGRAPH (1) OF HER DECEMBER 15, 2021 SHE AND HER CO-CONSPIRATORS DIVERT THE FILING FROM EVER REACHING JUDGE SOTOMAYOR VIOLATING RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES WHICH REQUIRED HER TO FORWARD THE PLEADING TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR PROMPTLY. THEN IF YOU READ PARAGRAPH (2) OF THE LETTER, SHE CLAIMS THAT THE FINAL ORDER FROM THE STATE SUPREME COURT CASE WAS NOT PRESENT IN APPENDIX 1 WHEN SHE KNEW GOOD AND WELL IT WAS IN THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE PLEADING TO PROTECT IT, WHICH SHE ADMITTED TO THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY MEMBERS THAT SHE DID HAVE, BEING REPLACED DUE TO SHE AND HER CO-CONSPIRATORS SPOILIATING, DESTROYING THE STATE FINAL ORDERS WHEN THEY WERE INITIALLY SENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

MS. WALKER THEN ASSERTS THAT CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 AND 2020-0001667 APPEAR TO HAVE ONLY CRAWFORD AS A PARTY WHEN THAT IS NOT THE CASE BEING ARGUED IN THE MANNER SHE PURPOSELY MISREPRESENTED. IT IS CASE 2020-000974 WHICH EMBODY THOSE CASE WHICH WAS FILED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT WHERE CASE

2020-001615 THE RON McCRAY CASE AND 2020-000974 THE CRAWFORD CASE WERE SOUGHT CONSOLIDATED FOR RULING PRODUCING ONE ORDER FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT DATED AUGUST 6, 2021 THAT SHE AND HER COHORTS INITIALLY SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, IN THE INITIAL PLEADING, NOW SHE LIES IN RELATION TO THIS FILING, CLAIMING SHE DID NOT HAVE THE FINAL STATE SUPREME COURT ORDER IN HER POSSESSION, CRIMINALLY VIOLATING HER OATH OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION AND JUSTIFY THE RETURN OF THE PLEADING TO THE PETITIONERS TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW.

THEN IN PARAGRAPH 3 OF THIS RECENT LETTER SHE LIES AGAIN STATING THAT A NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS RECEIVED BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FOR CASE 2020-001667, 2020-000974 FINALLY ADMITTING THE EXISTENCE OF CASE 2020-000974 BUT IN FRAUD CONCEALING THAT IT WAS A JOINT FILING OF NOTICE SEEKING LEAVE TO APPEAL, NOT JUST FOR CASE 2020-00974, BUT WAS ALSO FILED BY RON SANTA McCRAY FOR CASE 2020-001615 AS WELL. THIS IS WHY SHE CONVENIENTLY ASSERTS NO COPY OF THE DOCUMENT WAS KEPT ON FILE SO SHE COULD PERPETRATE THIS FRAUD, LIE AND DECEPTION.

IN PARAGRAPH 4 SHE THEN ADMITS THAT THE PETITIONERS DID INDEED INTEND TO FILE JOINTLY. MS. WALKER THEN IN PARAGRAPH 5 CLAIMS THAT THE PETITION FILED IS FOR THE FEDERAL CASE 20-7073 AS IF THIS IS THE LEAD PETITION WHEN OF COURSE IT IS NOT. THE STATE PETITION FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT (39) PAGES IS THE LEAD PETITION IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE. THAT FEDERAL EXHIBI, DOCUMENT, WAS NEVER SUBMITTED IN THE APPENDIX TO SPECIFICALLY ARGUE THE MERITS OF THE ISSUES SOUGHT REVIEW IN THAT CASE. IT WAS SUBMITTED SPECIFICALLY TO ANSWER THE QUESTION THE SUPREME COURT ASKED, "ARE THERE ANY RELATED CASES PENDING OR POTENTIALLY COMING BEFORE THE COURT", AND IN SUPPORT OF THE QUESTION SPECIFICALLY RELATED TO THE STATE CASES, AS TO "WHETHER OR NOT THE PETITIONERS MEET THE CRITERION REGARDING THE STATE CASES ONLY, FOR 28 U.S.C. § 1407 TRANSFER." SINCE THE LEGAL QUESTIONS INTENDED TO SEEK REVIEW OF CASE 20-2073 ARE ENTIRELY AND DISTINCTLY DIFFERENT, SINCE WE ARE

ESSENTIALLY DEALING WITH PENDENT AND TRANSFER JURISDICTIONS, AND THE QUESTION ONLY RELATES TO THE STATE CASE, NOT SEEKING REVIEW OF THE FEDERAL CASE? THE SUBMITTING OF THE DOCUMENT IN THE APPENDIX TO ESTABLISH THESE JURISDICTIONAL FACT WOULD NOT BE PRECLUDED. MS. WALKER CONSTANTLY, PURPOSELY, MISCONSTRUES THE FILINGS TO IN ACTS OF FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, JUSTIFY HER RETURNING THE PLEADING TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW VIOLATING THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES.

IF THE TIME TO HEAR CASE 20-7073 HAS PASSED? ITS BECAUSE OF THE EGREGIOUS ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE ENGAGED IN BY THESE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, WORKING WITH THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, WHO SPOILIATED, DESTROYED, INITIAL PLEADINGS AND EVIDENCE CAUSING THE DELAY ESTABLISHING CAUSE AND PREJUDICE FOR GRANTING ANY EXTENSION FOR FILING CASE 20-7073 AS IS SOUGHT AND THE WAIVING OF THE REQUIREMENT TO HAVE TO SUBMIT ANY REQUIRED ORDERS SUBJUDICE FOR A SECOND TIME.

AS FOR PARAGRAPH 7 STATING ITS UNCLEAR THAT RON SANTA McCRAY IS PARTY. FIRST, WE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT THE FEDERAL CASE YET. LET'S ADDRESS THE STATE CASES AND THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ORDER. THE RON SANTA McCRAY PCR CASE 2019-CP-08-1992 IS THE SOURCE OF THE APPEAL BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT ESTABLISHING CASE 2020-001615. THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD OFFICIALLY FILED MOTION TO INTERVENE BY RIGHT NOT DISCRETION OF THAT COURT IN THAT McCRAY PCR CASE AUTOMATICALLY MAKING CRAWFORD AN INTERESTED PARTY AT THE PCR LEVEL. THE McCRAY PCR IS AN ACTION CHALLENGING CONVICTION. THE CRAWFORD CASE 2006-CP-400-3567 IS A FALSE IMPRISONMENT TORT ALSO ACTION CHALLENGING CONVICTION WHICH PRODUCED APPEAL UNDER 2020-0001667 IN THE S.C. COURT OF APPEALS, THEN PRODUCED CASE 2020-000974 IN THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FOR CRAWFORD. THE SAME EXACT LEGAL ISSUES BEING ARGUED IN CHALLENGING THE CONVICTION OF RON SANTA McCRAY PCR UNDER 2019-CP-08-1992 ARE THE IDENTICAL AND

ESSENTIALLY EXACT LEGAL ISSUES BEING ARGUED TO CHALLENGE THE CONVICTION OF CRAWFORD UNDER CASE 2006-CP-400-3567. ONCE BOTH THE CASES APPEARED BEFORE THE S.C. SUPREME COURT THEY WERE MOTIONED CONSOLIDATED DUE TO THESE MATERIAL FACTS. THE S.C. SUPREME COURT PRODUCED ONE ORDER, NOT MANY, COMBINING THE RULING IN BOTH CASES UNDER ONE ORDER FOR THE SAME EXACT REASONS SOUGHT AND LEGAL ISSUES ARGUED WHERE BOTH CRAWFORD AND McCRAY'S NAMES APPEARED ON THE JOINTLY FILED PLEADING. ALL THIS IS CLEARLY SEEN IN THE ORDER THAT WAS INITIALLY SPOLIATED BY THE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO PREVENT THE JUDGES FROM HEARING THIS CASE THAT IS NOW REPLACED. THE SAME ORDER THAT THE LYING CASE MANAGER MS. WALKER STATED WAS NOT WITHIN HER POSSESSION BUT SOMEHOW IN FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. SHE NOW RETURNS THIS S.C. SUPREME COURT FINAL ORDER SHE LIED AND SAID SOMEHOW SHE DID NOT HAVE IT. IT IS NOW AGAIN PLACED BACK INTO APPENDIX 1. THEN THE CONSPIRING AGENTS INITIALLY SPOLIATED, DESTROYED TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW AND JUST THE REQUIRED ORDERS, BUT ALSO "KEY", "ESSENTIAL" EVIDENCE THAT WOULD SUBSTANTIATE THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN THESE CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES. RULE 12(4) PROVIDE: "PARTIES INTERESTED JOINTLY, SEVERALLY, OR OTHERWISE IN A JUDGMENT MAY PETITION SEPARATELY FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI; OR ANY TWO OR MORE MAY JOIN IN THE PETITION. WHEN TWO OR MORE JUDGMENTS (AS IN THE STATE CASES) ARE SOUGHT TO BE REVIEWED ON A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SAME COURT (ei. S.C. SUPREME COURT) AND INVOLVE IDENTICAL OR CLOSELY RELATED QUESTIONS (EMPHASIS ADDED)[AS IT PERTAINS TO THE CRAWFORD AND McCRAY CASES], A SINGLE (EMPHASIS ADDED) PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI COVERING ALL THE JUDGMENTS SUFFICES". THIS IS WHAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU IN REGARD TO THE STATE PETITION, WHICH APPLIES ALSO TO THE FEDERAL PETITION THAT IS SOON TO BE FILED REGARDING CASE 20-7073 AND 21-6275.

AS FOR RON SANTA McCRAY BEING A PARTY IN CASE 20-7073? RON McCRAY IS NOT A PARTY UNDER THAT CASE. HE IS A PARTY UNDER CASE 21-6275 FOR WHICH WE ARE SEEKING A STAY JOINTLY UNTIL REVIEW OF

CASE 20-7073 IS POTENTIALLY HEARD BECAUSE A RULING IN THAT CASE WOULD HAVE DIRECT IMPACT AND CONSEQUENCES ON CASE 21-6275. YOU ARE INCORRECT ABOUT RON SANTA McCRAY NOT BEING A PARTY IN THE CASE THAT PRODUCED THE APPEAL UNDER CASE 21-6275. RON SANTA McCRAY'S NAME APPEAR ON THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT. THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE IN AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION SEPARATED HIM FROM THE CASE WHICH WE JOINTLY OBJECTED AND TIMELY SOUGHT 4 DISTINCT APPEALS OF THE MAGISTRATE'S ORDERS UNDER RULE 73(c). THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND FEDERAL JUDGE IN FRAUD IGNORED THE 4 NOTICES OF APPEAL AND ONLY SENT THE APPEAL UP FOR CRAWFORD THOUGH BOTH NAMES APPEARED ON THE APPEAL DOCUMENTS JOINTLY AND McCRAY EVEN SENT SOME IN INDIVIDUALLY BUT HIS RIGHT TO APPEAL WAS STILL IGNORED WHICH PROMPTED HIM TO MOTION TO INTERVENE IN THE CASE UNDER 21-6275 TO PROTECT HIS ACQUIRED INTEREST. THIS IS ONE OF THE ISSUES INTENDED TO BE PLACED WITHIN THE INFORMAL BRIEF. DID THE DISTRICT COURT HAVE JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THE FINAL ORDER WHEN THE CASE WAS TIMELY SOUGHT LEAVE TO APPEAL UNDER RULE 73(c) BY BOTH OF US 4 TIMES BEFORE THAT COURT ISSUED A FINAL ORDER?, AND DID THE DISTRICT COURT ABUSE THEIR DISCRETION SEPARATING McCRAY FROM THE CASE WHEN HIS NAME APPEARED ON THE ORIGINAL COMPLAINT AND HE SIGNED THE COMPLAINT ON THE NEXT PAGE DUE TO THERE BEING ROOM FOR ONLY ONE SIGNATURE IN THE SPACE THE DOCUMENT PROVIDED? THEREFORE, IT IS INDISPUTABLE THAT RON SANTA McCRAY IS INDEED A PARTY IN CASE 21-6275 CONCEALED BY FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND HIS NAME CAN APPEAR ON A PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO STAY CASE 21-6275 PENDING RULING OF CASE 20-7073 WHICH WOULD DIRECTLY IMPACT CASE 21-6275 FOR WHICH HE IS A PARTY. SINCE IN ACTS OF FRAUD THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGES CIRCUMVENTED RULING AND SENDING THE CASE UP AT THE TIMES WHEN APPEAL WAS SOUGHT UNDER RULE 73(c). ALL THAT IS REQUIRED IS THAT THE PETITIONERS SEND COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER WHICH WAS SPOLIATED, ALONG WITH THE OTHER REQUIRED ORDERS IN THE INITIAL FILING WHICH MS. WALKER IS FULLY AWARE OF BECAUSE ALL INDICATIONS POINT, DUE TO THE ADDITIONAL LIES TOLD BY HER, THAT SHE PLAYED A DIRECT PART IN THE SPOLIATION AND DESTRUCTION OF THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS TO ALLOW HER TO ARGUE THE

INJUSTICES SHE PRESENT NOW TO PREVENT THE CASE FROM MOVING FORWARD. WE OFFICIALLY MOTION THAT ANY OTHER ORDER NEED BE REPLACED BY US BE WAIVED AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN ALL REQUIRED ORDERS ELECTRONICALLY DUE TO THE FAULT NOT BEING THE PETITIONERS BUT ON AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE SUPREME COURT WHO HAVE SOMEHOW BEEN COMPROMISED BY THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WHO ARE POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS. THIS IS SOUGHT UNDER RULE 22 APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES, SPECIFICALLY, JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR.

IN ADDRESSING THE CLERK'S CONCERN ASSERTING RULE 29.1. MS. WALKER AGAIN IN ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE IS MISREPRESENTING THE SUPREME COURT RULES AND FACTS OF THE PLEADING. THE PLEADING WAS NOT FILED UNDER RULE 29.1. FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI. THE REQUEST WAS FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION. THIS WAS FILED AS AN APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22 WHICH PROVIDE: AN APPLICATION TO AN INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE SHALL BE FILED WITH THE CLERK, WHO WILL TRANSMIT IT PROMPTLY (EMPHASIS ADDED) TO THE JUSTICE IF THE INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE HAS AUTHORITY TO GRANT THE SOUGHT RELIEF WHICH IN FURTHER ACTS OF OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE YOU FAILED TO DO. THE JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR HAS THE AUTHORITY TO GRANT THE RELIEF OF US SEEKING AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION INTO YOU AND YOUR COHORTS COMPROMISING THE INITIAL FILING AND HINDERING, OBSTRUCTING AND MAKING THE ATTEMPTS TO DEFEAT THE DUE COURSE OF JUSTICE IN VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. 1985(2) AND 1985(3) AND DENY THE PETITIONERS THE EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS. YOU CANNOT PREVENT JUDGE SOTOMAYOR FROM INVOKING HER DISCRETION TO GRANT THE RELIEF FOR THE SOUGHT INVESTIGATION AND YOUR REMOVAL AS A CASE MANAGER ON THIS CASE DUE TO THE OVERWHELMING DAMAGE YOU CAUSED IN THIS CASE MS. WALKER WORKING WITH THE DEFENDANTS TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. RULE 22 REQUIRES A JUSTICE DENYING THE APPLICATION FOR THE RELIEF SEEKING OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION AND YOUR REMOVAL MUST NOTE THE DENIAL THEREOF. NOT YOU THE CLERK. THE CLERK OR CASE MANAGER DOES NOT HAVE JUDICIAL POWER. YOUR ACTIONS VIOLATE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE AND

IS ILLEGAL. RULE 22 SAYS AN APPLICATION CAN BE MADE BY A LETTER TO THE JUSTICE WHICH YOU HAVE IN THE FORM OF THE LETTER TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR WHICH YOU WERE REQUIRED TO FORWARD IT TO HER PROMPTLY WHICH YOU UNTIL THIS PRESENT DATE HAVE FAILED TO DO FURTHER PROVING AND ESTABLISHING YOUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND VIOLATE YOUR OATH OF OFFICE OPENING YOU UP TO SANCTIONS AND YOUR REMOVAL FROM THIS CASE WHICH THE PETITIONERS MAKE UNDER RULE 22. RULE 29.1 APPLIES TO PETITIONS FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI. NOT APPLICATIONS TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22. YOU ARE REQUIRED TO FORWARD THE PLEADING TO JUDGE SOTOMAYOR UNDER RULE 22. PLEASE DO SO AND GET OFF THIS CASE. THE STATE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORAI IS ONLY ARGUING THE STATE CASE MATTERS, EVEN THE RIGHT TO TRANSFER THOSE STATE CASES PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407. THE MATERIALLY DISTINCT AND DIFFERENT ISSUES SOUGHT TO BE PLACED BEFORE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT RELATED TO CASES 20-7073 AND 21-6275 HAVE NOT BEEN PLACED BEFORE THE COURT YET NOR ARE WE TRYING TO DO SO VIA THE STATE PETITION. WE HAVE MOTIONED FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE FEDERAL PETITION DUE TO THE INJUSTICE CAUSED BY YOU MS. WALKER AND YOUR CONSPIRING PARTIES. RON SANTA McCRAY IS LEGALLY A PARTY AT BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL LEVEL AND CASES. WE SEEK THAT THIS PLEADING BE FORWARDED TO JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR PURSUANT TO APPLICATIONS TO INDIVIDUAL JUSTICES UNDER RULE 22.

RESPECTFULLY,
RON SANTA McCRAY

Ron Santa McCray

JONAH THE TISHBITE

[Handwritten signature]

DECEMBER 22, 2021

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

December 15, 2021

Lawrence L. Crawford
#300839
Lee CI
990 Wisacky Hwy
Bishopville, SC 29010

Dear Mr. Crawford:

1 The above-entitled petition for a writ of certiorari was postmarked November 30, 2021 and forwarded to the Clerk by Justice Sotomayor on December 14, 2021. The petition is returned herewith for the following reason(s):

2 The petition indicates that it seeks review of an order of the Supreme Court of South Carolina dated August 6, 2021, and that the order is attached under appendix A. However, no such order is attached. Appendix A, which was taped together upon receipt, includes a judgment of the Richland County Court of Common Pleas dated November 16, 2020 in case no. 2006CP4003567, and an order of the South Carolina Court of Appeals dated May 15, 2021 in case no. 2020-001667. Lawrence Crawford appears to be the only plaintiff and appellant, respectively, in each case.

3 The Clerk's records indicate that, on August 31, 2021, this Office received a submission postmarked August 26, 2021, which contained documents entitled: "Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Notice Seeking Leave to Petition for Writ of Cert; Motion for Leave to Seek Petition for Writ of Cert Jointly; Motion for an Extension of Time." The submission was construed, principally, as an application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of order(s) of the Supreme Court of South Carolina dated August 6, 2021, in case nos. 2020-001667, 2020-00974. We do not currently have the aforementioned order(s) in our possession as this Office does not retain copies of documents that are returned unfiled, and they are not included within the submission returned herein.

4 On September 15, 2021, the Clerk returned the documents received August 31, 2021, and stated: An application to extend the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari cannot be combined with any other filing. Please be advised that the Rules of the Court make no provision for the filing of an "affidavit of facts giving judicial notice", "notice seeking leave to petition for writ of cert", or "motion for leave to seek petition for writ of cert jointly." No motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari under Rule 12.4 is required."

5 Moreover, the petition indicates that a petition for a writ of certiorari seeking review of United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit case nos. 20-7073 and 21-6275 are currently pending before this Court. No such petition(s) has been docketed. Our records indicate that a petition seeking review of no. 20-7073 was returned for corrections on September 15, 2021, and November 17, 2021. To date, a corrected petition has not been filed.

6 Attached as appendix G to the current submission appears to be a petition for a writ of certiorari dated October 7, 2021, seeking review of 1) the judgment of the fourth circuit in no. 20-7073, of which rehearing was denied on April 9, 2021, and 2) the fourth circuit's order dated September 21, 2021 in no. 21-6275. The Clerk has no record of receipt of this petition until now. Please be advised, however, that you cannot seek review of both of these orders in a single petition because the jurisdictional deadline to file for review of the first fell prior to the entry of the second. A second judgment sought to be reviewed cannot be added upon resubmission of a petition that is returned for corrections as happened on September 15, 2021. If you wish to separately seek review of the September 21, 2021 order of the fourth circuit in no. 21-6275, please promptly submit such a petition with a declaration of timely filing pursuant to Rule 29.2. However, while you may seek review of that order specifically, the case appears to still be pending before the court of appeals.

Also returned herewith is a document entitled "motion to advance the cause," postmarked November 16, 2021, and received November 23, 2021, as well as related correspondence forwarded from Justice Sotomayor on December 14, 2021.


7 Additionally, as stated in previous correspondence, it is unclear whether Ron Santa McCray is actually a party to the judgment(s) sought to be reviewed. It is impossible for the Clerk to make such a determination without copies of the orders required by Rule 14.1(i). As it pertains to the related fourth circuit cases, it appears that Mr. McCray is not a party to no. 20-7073, but has motioned to intervene in no. 21-6275. Please be advised that only parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is sought to be reviewed are deemed parties entitled to file documents in this Court, and that each petitioner must include a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and declaration of indigency if the docketing fee is not paid.

8 Please clarify and correct these ambiguities and deficiencies and resubmit the documents as soon as possible. Unless the corrected petition(s) are submitted to the Clerk within 60 days of the date of this letter, the petition(s) will not be filed. Please be advised that any document required or permitted to be presented to the Court or to a Justice must be filed with the Clerk, not addressed to a Justice. Rule 29.1.

A copy of the corrected petition(s) must be served on opposing counsel.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "EW", written over the printed name "Emily Walker".

Emily Walker
(202) 479-5955

Enclosures

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

ORDER

Pursuant to Rule 245, SCACR, and *Key v. Currie*, 305 S.C. 115, 406 S.E.2d 356 (1991), we decline to entertain the following matters in this Court's original jurisdiction:

1. *Lawrence Crawford v. State of South Carolina*, In re: Seeking Leave from the S.C. Supreme Court to Address the Blocking of Filing Application for Forensic D.N.A. Testing, dated June 29, 2020; In re: To Appealing the Final Order from Case 2020-001667 via Supplement Invoking the S.C. Supreme Court's Original Jurisdiction under Case 2020-000974, dated May 24, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2020-000974.
2. *Ron Santa McCray v. State of South Carolina*, Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Petition for a Writ of Certiorari; Notice and Motion to Act Pro Se; Motion for a Stay; Motion and Notice and a Reset on Any Timetable to Submit Brief and Other Related Documents and Motion to Motion therefor, dated November 20, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court, the S.C. Court of Appeals, the Berkeley County Common Pleas Court, the Chief Administrative Judge of Berkeley County, the S.C. Attorney General et. al., dated December 2, 2020; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Petition for Petition and or Motion to Amend the Caption of the Initial Filing; Petition to Invoke the S.C. Supreme Court's Jurisdiction; Petition for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief; Petitioner and or Motion to Challenge the Relevant Court(s) Jurisdiction and Recall the Remittitur Out of Time and Motion to Motion Therefor, dated December 2, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court with Exhibit, dated December 8, 2020; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court, the S.C. Attorney General, the Berkeley County Common Pleas Court, the Berkeley County Chief Administrative Judge, the 9th Circuit Solicitor's Office et. al. with Exhibit, dated February 23, 2021; Letter to the S.C. Supreme Court with Exhibit, dated March 1, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to Supplement the Pleading Due to New Ruling Coming out of the S.C. Supreme Court and Motion to Motion therefor, dated April 3, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to Supplement the Pleadings under this Case and Motion to Motion therefor with Exhibit, dated April 24, 2021; Affidavit of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Motion to File Objections as to Why the

Conditional Order Should not Become Final in Case 2019-CP-08-1992; Renewing the Petition to Invoke the S.C. Supreme Court's Original Jurisdiction; Renewing the Notice Seeking Leave to Appeal the Conditional Order Seeking Review under Torrence v. S.C. Dept. of Corrections; Motion to Challenge the Berkeley Common Please Court's Jurisdiction due to Continued Acts of Fraud upon the Court and Unconstitutional Action and Motion to Motion therefor, dated May 16, 2021; Letter and Exhibit received May 27, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2020-001615.

3. *Matthew Jamison v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to Chief Justice Beatty, received December 15, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001631.


4. *Glen K. LaConey v. Richland County Sheriff Leon Lott and the Richland County Sheriff's Department; Alan M. Wilson and the Office of the Attorney General; Joshua Koger, Jr., Esquire; William A. Hodge, Esquire; Clifton B. Newman; R. Know McMahan; Robert M. Madsen, Esquire; Jason Scott Chehoski, Esquire; Jocelyn Newman and Lori Pelzer, a.k.a. Lori L. Washington*, Petition for Original Jurisdiction, dated June 18, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000649.


5. *Karreem T. Wiley v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to Chief Justice Beatty, dated December 20, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001704.


6. *London Wooden v. State of South Carolina*, Letter to the Supreme Court, received December 29, 2020. Appellate Case No. 2020-001705.

7. *Travis Lee Hamrick v. 7th Judicial Circuit General Sessions Court of Spartanburg, South Carolina*, Notice of Petition for Writ of Mandamus, dated January 4, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000016.

8. *Darrell Williams v. State of South Carolina*, Notice of Motion for Original Jurisdiction in State Supreme Court, dated January 8, 2021; Motion in Support of Notice for Original Jurisdiction, dated January 8, 2021. Appellate Case No. 2021-000054.



C.J.


J.


J.

cc:

Lawrence L. Crawford

Ron Santa McCray

Matthew Jamison

Glen K. LaConey

Karreem T. Wiley

London Wooden

Travis Lee Hamrick

Darrell Williams

Lori Pelzer

The Honorable Clifton Newman

The Honorable Jocelyn Newman

The Honorable Knox McMahan

Alan Wilson, Attorney General

Sheriff Leon Lott

The Honorable Amy Kathryn West Cox

Dan Goldberg, Esquire

H. Thomas Morgan Jr., esquire

William A. Hodge, Esquire

Jason Scott Chehoski, Esquire

Joshua Koger Jr., Esquire

Robert M. Madsen, Esquire

Robert David Garfield, Esquire

John Cannon Jr

John Cannon Jr
_____ J.
_____ J.

Columbia, South Carolina

August 6, 2021

NO. _____

14

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 OF THIS DATE OF DECEMBER 19, 2021, AS
REQUIRED BY SUPREME COURT RULE 29 WE HAVE SERVED THE ENCLOSED
MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF
TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073
DUE TO ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF

JUSTICE;****, ON EACH PARTY TO THE ABOVE PROCEEDINGS OR 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 ATTORNEYS 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. HEADQUARTERS 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 DECEMBER 19, 2021

RESPECTFULLY,

RON SANTA McCRAY



JONAH THE TISHBITE



NO. _____

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

MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION; MOTION FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
FOR CASE 20-7073 DUE TO ACTS OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND
OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE; MOTION FOR A NEW CASE MANAGER;
MOTION FOR A STAY OF CASE 21-6275 IN THE 4TH. CIRCUIT
AND MOTION TO MOTION THEREFOR

IN RE: CASES 20-7073; 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT AND CASES

2020-0001615, 2020-000974 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT.

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

HERE THE COURT AND PARTIES WILL FIND:

(1) EXHIBIT, "LOCAL RULE 45". THIS IS A COPY OF THE LOCAL RULE 45 NOTICE ISSUED BY THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DATED DECEMBER 6, 2021 FILED IN CASE 21-6275.

(2) EXHIBIT, "DEFERMENT". THIS IS A COPY OF THE ORDER DATED OCTOBER 28, 2021 FILED IN CASE 21-6275 WHERE THE 4TH. CIRCUIT DETERMINED THAT THEY WOULD DEFER ANY RULING AND OR REQUIREMENT IN CASE 21-6275 UNTIL THE APPEAL OF CASE 20-7073 WAS HEARD IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

(3) EXHIBIT, "JUDGE SÓTOMAYOR". THIS IS A COPY OF THE (4) PAGE LETTER DATED DECEMBER 2, 2021 THAT WAS SENT WITH THE REPAIRED SUBSEQUENT PLEADING AFTER THE INITIAL PLEADING WAS COMPROMISED, AND PORTIONS SPOILIATED BY POTENTIAL MEMBERS, AGENTS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY NATURE OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT SURROUND THIS CASE. THIS LETTER WAS SENT WITH THE REPAIRED SUBSEQUENT FILING TO THE INITIAL FILING BY CERTIFIED MAIL NUMBER 7021 0950 0001 0779 5166 WHICH THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE CONFIRMED AND OR INDICATED BY THEIR 800 NUMBER WAS DELIVERED TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ON DECEMBER 6, 2021, BUT EMILY WALKER WHO SHE SAYS HER NAME IS, THE PRESENT CASE MANAGER, INDICATED TO THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER, LENEAU CRAWFORD, OVER THE TELEPHONE, HAS NOT BEEN FORWARDED TO HER BY THE PROCESSING DIVISION OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

THOUGH THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS IN QUESTION WERE IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT'S POSSESSION FOR ALMOST TWO WEEKS NOW.

(4) EXHIBIT, "INITIAL 20-7073 PETITION". THIS IS A COPY OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI OF CASE 20-7073 THAT WAS RETURNED TO THE PETITIONERS AS PART OF THE SCHEME, PLOT, AND COMPROMISED INITIAL PLEADING, MIXING THE FEDERAL DOCUMENTS WITH THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA DOCUMENTS IN ACTS OF MACHINATION, FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE TO JUSTIFY THEIR RETURN. THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WAS ALREADY PREVIOUSLY SERVED A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT.

THE PETITIONER(S) UNDER CASES 2020-0001615 AND 2020-000974, CRAWFORD AND McCRAY ARE OFFICIALLY MOTIONING FOR AN INVESTIGATION BECAUSE ALL POINTS TO THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WHO ARE VERY POWERFUL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS COMPROMISING AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO PREVENT THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT FROM EVER HEARING THESE CASES. WE RESPECTFULLY DEMAND AND OR REQUEST AND MOTION FOR AN OFFICIAL FULL INVESTIGATION BY AN INDEPENDENT SOURCE TO GET AT THE BOTTOM OF WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THESE CASES INVOLVED.

THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI IN CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND MOTION FOR A STAY ON CASE 21-6276 DUE TO EGREGIOUS ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT OCCURRED HERE, SEEKING TIME TO RESET ONCE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT RULES ON WHETHER OR NOT THE PETITIONER(S) ARE ENTITLED TO A COMPLETE AND FULL INVESTIGATION INTO WHAT IS POTENTIALLY CRIMINAL ACTIVITY RELATED TO THE HINDERING AND OBSTRUCTING THE HEARING OF THESE CASES INVOLVED.

THIS IS WHAT OCCURRED. THE PETITIONERS SENT INTO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT AS WAS INSTRUCTED BY PRIOR CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SUPREME COURT, A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073

AND 21-6275 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT WHICH WAS SENT TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN ONE MAILING. IN ANOTHER SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT MAILING ABOUT (3) DAYS LATER AND APART. THE PETITIONER(S) SENT IN MAILING SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI OUT OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THAT STATE'S SUPREME COURT RELATED TO BOTH CASES 2020-001615 AND 2020-00974.

THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS, POWERFUL POLITICAL FIGURES THAT THEY ARE, THEN SOMEHOW COMPROMISES AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BY GETTING THESE COMPROMISED EMPLOYEES, PROBABLY IN THE PROCESSING DIVISION, TO COMPROMISE OUR INITIAL PLEADING. THEY ACCOMPLISHED THIS BY TAKING THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT PROCEEDING AND THEN SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, THE INITIAL STATE PETITION SENT, ALONG WITH THE S.C. SUPREME COURT FINAL ORDERS IN APPENDIX 1 BECAUSE WITHOUT THE ORDERS THE CASE CAN'T BE HEARD. THEN THE CONSPIRING AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES WITHIN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, TO PREVENT AND OR HINDER THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUDGES FROM EVER HEARING THE CASE. THE CONSPIRING PARTIES THEN SPOLIATED, DESTROYED, "KEY", "CRUCIAL" EXHIBITS AND OR EVIDENCE, ABOUT (5) APPENDICES LISTED WITHIN THE STATE SUPREME COURT PETITION, EVIDENCE THAT WOULD HAVE CLEARLY PROVEN THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND PARTIES INVOLVEMENT IN SUBSTANTIAL CRIMINAL ACTIVITY VIOLATING THEIR OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE U.S. CONSTITUTION VIOLATING PROVISIONS OF 5 U.S.C. §§ 3333, 3331 AND 7311 OF STATUTORY CODE OF LAW.

AFTER SPOLIATING, DESTROYING, COMPROMISING THESE CRUCIAL, ESSENTIAL PORTIONS OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PROCEEDING, THE CONSPIRING PARTIES THEN TAKE THE PLEADING SENT IN FOR SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORAI FOR THE FEDERAL CASE UNDER 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT, AND SUBSTITUTE, PUT THEM IN PLACE OF THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PLEADING AND OR WRIT OF CERTIORARI, TO PRETEND THAT THIS IS HOW THEY WERE SENT TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO JUSTIFY THEIR RETURN AND ALLOW THE 4TH. CIRCUIT

TO ISSUE THE RULE 45 NOTICE TO MAKE IT LOOK LIKE THE FAULT WAS THE PETITIONERS FAILURE TO PROSECUTE.

THE S.C. SUPREME COURT STATE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS SENT BACK TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT AFTER REPAIRING THE ACTS OF SPOILIATION AND DESTRUCTION OF COURT DOCUMENTS. AS OF THIS DATE MS. EMILY WALKER POSSIBLY CONSPIRING WITH THESE INDIVIDUALS, HAS FAILED TO ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THE NOW RESENT STATE SUPREME COURT PLEADINGS REPAIRING THE SPOILIATION AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY. IT IS THE PETITIONER(S) POSITION THAT IF THE PETITIONER(S) SENT IN THE FEDERAL PLEADING SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI RELATED TO CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT NOW. THE CONSPIRING COMPROMISED AGENTS AND OR EMPLOYEES NOW WITHIN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT, WILL SEE THIS AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO CRIMINALLY REPEAT THE INJUSTICE AND MIX THE PLEADING AGAIN AND SPOILATE ESSENTIAL LEGAL DOCUMENTS AND PRETEND THAT THE DEFICIENCY WAS CAUSED BY THE PETITIONER(S). THUS, THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT UNTIL AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION IS CONDUCTED AND THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ACKNOWLEDGE ON THE COURT RECORD THAT THE S.C. STATE SUPREME COURT PLEADING IS IN THE HANDS OF A NEW AND PROPER CASE MANAGER NOT WORKING FOR THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE, AND IS NOT TAMPERED WITH AND THE CASE IS ALLOWED TO MOVE FORWARD FOR RULING BY THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT JUDGES AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THEY WOULD GRANT THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

ONE OF THE SPECIFIC REASONS THAT THE PETITIONER(S) FEEL THAT THE CASE MANAGER EMILY WALKER, ALL INDICATIONS POINT TO HER INVOLVEMENT, IS BECAUSE WHEN THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER AND SISTER, LENEAU CRAWFORD AND YAH DINA OVERSTREET-U-DEEN CALLED THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT TO OFFICIALLY COMPLAIN ABOUT THE INJUSTICE DONE TO THE PETITIONER(S) AND ASK FOR AN INVESTIGATION. THE PETITIONER(S) BROTHER ASKED MS. WALKER IF SHE EVEN RECEIVED THE PETITIONERS' MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE AND OR TO EXPEDITE THE

HEARING OF THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM THE S.C. SUPREME COURT. THEREUPON, MS. EMILY WALKER, IF THIS IS HER NAME, INFORMED THE PETITIONER'S BROTHER AND SISTER YAHDINA THAT THERE WAS NO SUCH THING AS A MOTION OR MECHANISM IN THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PROCEDURES OR RULES THAT CAN BE INVOKED TO SEEK AND OR ALLOW THE PETITIONERS TO REQUEST OR MOTION TO EXPEDITE THE HEARING OF THE CASE. IT IS PERSPICUOUS FROM THE CASES OF DOES 1-3 v. MILLS, --S.Ct.--, 2021 WL 5763094 (MEM)(U.S.2021) AND WHOLE WOMAN HEALTH v. JACKSON, 142 S.Ct. 415 (MEM) 2021 WL 4840468 THAT SUCH A MECHANISM TO SEEK TO EXPEDITE HEARING OF A PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI DOES EXIST. MS. EMILY WALKER BLATANTLY, CRIMINALLY, LIED TO THE PETITIONER'S FAMILY MEMBERS DEMONSTRATING HER POTENTIAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY OF THE PARTIES BEING CHALLENGED. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION THAT A NEW CASE MANAGER BE ASSIGNED TO HANDLING THE PETITIONER(S) CASES. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR A STAY ON CASE 21-6275 UNTIL THE INVESTIGATION CONCLUDES AND THE APPEAL OF CASE 20-7073 IS HEARD. THE PETITIONER(S) MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO SUBMIT THE PETITION SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI REGARDING CASE 20-7073 OUT OF THE 4TH. CIRCUIT ONCE THOSE MATTERS ARE INVESTIGATED AND REMEDIED.

RESPECTFULLY,
RON SANTA McCRAY

Ron Santa McCray

JONAH THE TISHBITE

[Handwritten signature]

DECEMBER 18, 2021.

EXHIBIT, "LOCAL RULE 45".

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
1100 East Main Street, Suite 501, Richmond, Virginia 23219

December 6, 2021

RULE 45 NOTICE

No. 21-6275, Lawrence Crawford v. Warden Nelson
9:20-cv-02139-TLW-MHC

TO: Lawrence Crawford

DEFAULT(S) MUST BE REMEDIED BY: 12/21/2021

Please take notice that the court will dismiss this case for failure to prosecute pursuant to Local Rule 45 unless the default(s) identified below are remedied within 15 days of the date of this notice through receipt of the requisite form(s) or fee in the appropriate clerk's office. Forms are available for completion as links from this notice and at the court's web site, www.ca4.uscourts.gov.

Informal opening brief must be received in the Court of Appeals clerk's office.

T. Fischer, Deputy Clerk
804-916-2704

EXHIBIT, "DEFERMENT".

FILED: October 28, 2021

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-6275
(9:20-cv-02139-TLW-MHC)

LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD, a/k/a Johah Gabriel, a/k/a Jahjah T. Tishbite

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

WARDEN NELSON; S.C.D.C.; DIRECTOR BRYAN STIRLING; THE S.C.D.C
MUSLIM CHAPLAINS; MS. FOX

Defendants - Appellees

ORDER

The court defers consideration of the motion for judicial notice pending review of the appeal on the merits.

For the Court--By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

EXHIBIT, "JUDGE SOTOMAYOR"

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

RON SANTA McCRAY
\$353031 COOPER B-59
LIEBER C.I. P.O. BOX 205
RIDGEVILLE, S.C. 29742

IN RE: POTENTIAL ACTS OF SPOILIATION, OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND
THE COMPROMISING OF THE INITIAL PLEADING THAT WAS SENT TO THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT SEEKING PETITION FOR WRIT OF
CERTIORARI FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT RELATED TO CASES
2020-001615 AND 2020-000974 OF THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION
CASES AND THE SEEKING OF AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION.

TO: THE HONORABLE JUDGE SOTOMAYOR AND HER OFFICE,

MA'AM. THIS IS SUBSEQUENT CORRESPONDENCE TO THE
PREVIOUS ONE SENT. JUDGE SOTOMAYOR THE PETITIONER(S) PRAY THAT
YOU AND YOUR OFFICE DO NOT CONSTRUE THIS AS ANY ATTEMPT TO
CIRCUMVENT THE NORMAL FILING PROCESS BEFORE THIS HONORABLE COURT.
THIS IS NOT THE CASE HERE. THE PETITIONERS TOOK THE NORMAL AND
PROPER STEPS TO FILE BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ONLY
TO FIND TO OUR COMPLETE SURPRISE AND DISMAY, THAT THE POLITICALLY

POWERFUL DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE HAVE SOMEHOW COMPROMISED THE EMPLOYEES AND OR PROCESSING DIVISION OF THIS COURT DUE TO THE EXCEPTIONAL AND EXTRAORDINARY NATURE OF THE CLAIMS BEING MADE WITHIN THIS CASE, DEFAULTED ON BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AT THE STATE LEVEL GIVING ALL CLAIMS VERITY. AS THE PETITIONERS AFORE STATED, ALL INDICATIONS POINT TO DOCUMENTS AND PLEADINGS BEING POTENTIALLY COMPROMISED, SPOLIATING VALUABLE EVIDENCE AND EXHIBITS THAT SERVE TO PROVE ALL CLAIMS MADE INVOLVING PEOPLE OF SUCH POLITICAL POWER, SUCH AS HENRY McMASTER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WHO WAS ONCE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, THAT THE INITIAL STATE PETITION AND ABOUT (5) EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT WERE COMPROMISED, SPOLIATED BY EMPLOYEES OF THIS COURT. THE PETITIONERS' INTENT HERE IS ONLY TO ENSURE THAT THERE IS NO FURTHER TAMPERING WITH THIS CASE VIA CRIMINAL ACTS OF CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE INSULT JUDGE SOTOMAYOR WAS NOT MERELY AGAINST THE PETITIONERS AND THE INMATES OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA. THE INSULT WAS ALSO DIRECTLY LEVIED AT THE HONORABLE JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT IN AN ATTEMPTED USURPATION OF THE HONORABLE JUDGES REVIEWING AUTHORITY IN CLEAR VIOLATION OF THE SEPARATION OF POWERS CLAUSE. THE PETITIONERS ARE FORCED TO SEND THESE PLEADINGS TO YOUR OFFICE IN HOPES OF GETTING AID FROM YOU AND YOUR STAFF JUDGE SOTOMAYOR TO ENSURE THAT THE PLEADING IS PROPERLY FILED AND NOT MOLESTED OR COMPROMISED IN ANY WAY.

ATTACHED THE HONORABLE U.S. SUPREME COURT WILL FIND IS A DUPLICATE COPY OF THE FINAL ORDER FROM CASE(S) 2020-001615 (RON SANTA McCRAY) AND 2020-000974 (LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD) CASES OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT. CAN YOUR OFFICE PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE REQUIRED FINAL ORDER FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT THAT WAS INITIALLY SPOLIATED IN NOW PLACED BACK IN APPENDIX--A OF THE DOCUMENTS JUST SENT TO YOUR OFFICE BY CERTIFIED MAIL? THE SUPREME COURT WILL ALSO FIND A DUPLICATE OF THE MOTION TO ADVANCE THE CAUSE THAT MAY HAVE ALSO BEEN SPOLIATED, COMPROMISED, BY AGENTS OF THIS COURT, FILED TO SEEK TO MOVE THE CASE UP ON THE DOCKET WITH ALL EXHIBITS LISTED THEREIN

AND LISTED WITHIN ITS ATTACHMENTS. IF THESE EXHIBITS AND OR ATTACHMENTS ARE NOT PRESENT? THE FILING HAS SOMEHOW BEEN COMPROMISED BY AGENTS OF THIS COURT AGAIN. THE PETITIONERS ARE CONCERNED WITH THE STATEMENT MADE BY MS. WALKER TO OUR FAMILY MEMBER IN A RECENT PHONE CALL WHERE SHE ALLEGED THERE IS NO SUCH MECHANISM TO ADVANCE A CASE ON THE DOCKET WHEN THE CASE LAW CITED GIVES INDICATION OTHERWISE, AS WELL AS RECENT NOTIFICATION GIVEN BY NPR BEING DONE IN THE TRUMP CASE.


THE PETITIONERS, WITH ALL DUE RESPECT, ARE STILL DEMANDING THAT A FULL INVESTIGATION OCCUR TO DETERMINE HOW IN THE WORLD DID OUR INITIAL FILING GET COMPROMISED AND SPOLIATED THE WAY IT DID WITHIN THE HONORABLE SUPREME COURT, INSULTING THIS COURT'S INTEGRITY. MS. WALKER CLAIMED THAT THIS IS HOW THE INITIAL FILING WAS SENT TO HER ABSENT THE LEGAL DOCUMENTS THAT WERE COMPROMISED. THIS MAY MEAN THAT BEFORE THE INITIAL PLEADING REACHED HER, POSSIBLY IN PROCESSING, THE CASE WAS FRAUDULENTLY COMPROMISED AND LEGAL DOCUMENTS CRIMINALLY SPOLIATED. IT WOULD BE ONE THING IF THE CLAIM WAS SOMEHOW THAT THE PETITIONERS FORGOT TO SEND THE STATE PETITION ALONE, THOUGH WITH ALL CERTAINTY THAT STATE PETITION WAS INDEED SENT WITH THAT INITIAL FILING. IT WAS MORE THAN THIS. THE ACTS OF SPOILIATION WERE CRIMINALLY SELECTIVE, TARGETING KEY EVIDENCE AND PROOF, LEGAL DOCUMENTS THAT SERVED TO PROVE THAT THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WAS PROPERLY SERVED, APPEARED IN A BACK DOOR MANNER WITHIN THE STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS AND THEN DEFAULTED ON ALL CLAIMS MADE AT THE STATE LEVEL. THE CONSPIRING DEFENDANTS HAD MEMBERS EMPLOYED BY THIS COURT TO SPOLIATE EVIDENCE OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE S.L.E.D. INVESTIGATIVE FILE POSSESSING EVIDENCE OF ACTUAL INNOCENCE OF THE PETITIONER CRAWFORD. THEY SPOLIATED THE FILING IN FORMA PAUPERIS DOCUMENT RELATED TO CASE 2020-001667 OUT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS TO JUSTIFY SENDING THE REMITTITUR TO THE LOWER COMMON PLEAS COURT TO THWART U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. THEY SPOLIATED THE ORDERS FROM THE LOWER COURT THAT WERE APPENDIX--A NOW REPLACED TO PREVENT U.S. SUPREME COURT REVIEW. THE ACTS WERE

EGREGIOUS, MALICIOUS, CRIMINAL AND TARGETED AND A VIOLATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OATHS OF OFFICE TO UPHOLD THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION SUBJECTING THEM TO CRIMINAL PENALTIES UNDER 5 U.S.C. §§ 3333, 3331, 7311 AND OTHER FEDERAL LAWS AND OR STATUTES.

THE ACTION ON THE PART OF THESE CONSPIRING INDIVIDUALS SPIT IN THE FACE OF "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". THE PETITIONERS RESPECTFULLY SEEK THAT THE PLEADING BE FILED WITHOUT ANY FURTHER ACTS OF FRAUD, CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE. THE PETITIONER(S) RESPECTFULLY DEMAND THAT AN OFFICIAL INVESTIGATION OCCUR BY AN INDEPENDENT PARTY DUE TO THE EXTRAORDINARY AND EXCEPTIONAL NATURE OF THIS CASE, AND SEEK THAT YOU AND YOUR OFFICE ASSISTANCE IN GETTING AT THE TRUTH OF THESE MATTERS. THE PETITIONERS ARE SEEKING WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT MA'AM. CAN YOU AND YOUR OFFICE ASSIST US TO ENSURE THAT THESE DOCUMENTS ARE PROPERLY FILED FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW, NOT COMPROMISED, AND WE SEEK THAT THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY AS TO THE CASE NUMBER THAT IS ASSIGNED BEFORE ANY JUDICIAL REVIEW OCCURS. THE PETITIONERS ALSO IN AN ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION SEEK THAT THE CASE MANAGER, MS. WALKERO, ASSIGNED TO THIS CASE BE REPLACED. TO ENSURE DELIVERY OF THIS PLEADING. THE PLEADING IS BEING SENT CERTIFIED MAIL BY ROBBIE MITCHELL ANOTHER INMATE TO THIS CASE SUBJUDICE. THE PETITIONERS THANK YOU IN ADVANCE. STILL REMAIN,

RESPECTFULLY,


LAWRENCE L. CRAWFORD



RON SANTA McCRAY

Ron Santa McCray

DECEMBER 2, 2021



LAWRENCE L CRAWFORD

#300839 F2B Rm 1260

LEE CTR 990 WISKEY HWY

Bishopville, SC 29010

RECEIVED
JAN 24 1999
SC Court of Appeals

SC Court of Appeals

P.O. Box 11629

Columbia, SC

29211

