Exhibit

"Trustee"

2

"File in case 1:14-cv-14176-ADB"

2

Court Of Appeals
For The 4th. Circuit Et. Al.,

---

Petition From South Carolina
Case 8:16-cv-3327, 3194, 3328-
RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-
MBS-TER; 0:16-cv-992, 1429, 1428,
1424, 1425; The New Jersey
Supreme Court case 077386; 16-1519;
16-1953; 16-2141; 2015-CP-46-415;
2013-CP-400-0084 Et. Al.,

---

DOCKET No. 16-2299

---

Yahya MuQuit #318455; Anthony Cook #115157; Lawrence L. Crawford
aka Jonah Gabriel Jahjah T. Tishbite #300839

petitioners

Vs.

JUDGES WHO ISSUED ORDER IN CASE 16-1953 Et. Al.,

defendants

---

SUMMONS

---

TO: Judges Austin, Harwell, Seymour and Rogers,

**YOU ARE HERREBY SUMMONED AND REQUIRED**, to answer and be in compliance (emphasis added) to this Writ Of Mandamus and all documents served upon you related to cases 16-1519, 16-1953 , 16-2141, a copy of which is herewith served upon you, and or was previously served upon you, and you are to serve a copy of your answer and proof of compliance (emphasis added) upon the subscribers at the addresses shown below within (30) days after service thereof, exclusive of the day of such service, and if you fail to answer and be in compliance (emphasis added) to the documents in question, judgment and default shall be rendered against you for the relief demanded within this Mandamus and documents filed in case 16-1519, 16-1953, 16-2141.

Lawrence L. Crawford
aka Jonah Gabriel Jahjah T. Tishbite
#300839 Wando A-127
Yahya MuQuit
#318455 Ashley B-
Anthony Cook
#115157 Stono A-56
Lieber C.I. P.O. Box 205
Ridgeville, S.C. 29472

4th. Circuit
November 3, 2016

Court Of Appeals
For The 4th. Circuit Et. Al.,

---

Petition From South Carolina
Cases 8:16-cv-3327, 3194, 3328-
RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-
MBS-TER; 0:16-cv-992, 1429, 1428,
1424, 1425; The New Jersey Supreme
Court case 077386; 16-1519; 16-1953;
16-2141; 2015-CP-46-415; 2013-CP-
400-0084 Et. Al.,

---

DOCKET No. 16-2299

---

Yahya MuQuit #318455; Anthony Cook #115157; Lawrence L. Crawford aka Jonah Gabriel Jahjah T. Tishbite #300839

petitioners

Vs.

JUDGES WHO ISSUED ORDER IN CASE 16-1953 Et. Al.,

defendants

---

Affidavit Of Facts Giving Judicial Notice;
Filing Writ Of Mandamus; Motion For Declaratory
Judgment; Motion For Recusal; Motion For
Consolidation; Motion To Transfer Venue;
Motion To Ensure And Or Require The Trustee
Austin To Act In A Proper Or Restored Manner

Pursuant To Her Corporate And Or Visitatorial etc. Powers; Motion To Challenge Jurisdiction; Motion To Vacate The Separation Order And Motion To Motion Therefor

---

IN RE: Crawford, Cook, MuQuit and cases 8:16-cv-3194, 3327, 3328-RBH-JDA; 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-3107-MBS-TER.

TO: The 4th. Circuit Court Of Appeals,
The S.C. District Court Et. Al.,

In pursuant to Article 4 § 20 powers of justices and or judges at chambers, each of the justices and or judges at chambers, including the 4th. Circuit Court of Appeals, and all other courts on record. Shall have the same powers at chambers, to issue Writ Of Habeas Corpus, Mandamus, Quo Warranto, Certiorari,....and pursuant to Rule 65 and 21 of State and or Federal Rules of Procedure.

Pursuant to rule 57 of state and or federal rules of Civ. Procedure and or S.C. Code Ann § 15-53-10 through § 15-53-140 and or 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202. In cases of actual controversy,....any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading, may declare the right and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such Declaration whether or not further relief is or could be sought****.

The petitioners give all parties judicial notice. Here attached the 4th. Circuit will find:

(1) The separation orders issued in cases 8:16-cv-3327-RBH-JDA; 8:16-cv-3194-RBH-JDA; 8:16-cv-3328-RBH-JDA.

(2) A copy of The affidavit Of Facts Giving Judicial Notice; Seeking To Suspend Or Relax The Appellate Court Rules; Seeking To Expand The Scope And For Inclusion****, (58) pages

dated July 21, 2016.

This document is also being filed as a challenge to both the S.C. District Court and 4th. Circuit's jurisdiction and or limitations placed thereupon which will be elaborated on later. Subject Matter Jurisdiction can be raised at anytime, cannot be waived and the court shall not fail to take notice, Grupo Dalaflux v. Atlas Global Group,L.P., 541 U.S. 567, 124 S.Ct.1920, 158 L.Ed.2d. 866(U.S.2004); Loumiet v. United States, 65 F.Supp.3d 19(2014); U.S. v. Tisdale, F.Supp.2d 2007 WL 2156666 (DSC.2007); Sebelius v. Auburn Regional Medical Center, 133 S.Ct. 817, 184 L.Ed.2d 627, 81 U.S.L.W. 4053(U.S.2013); Sizward v. Riddle, F.Supp.2d 2013 WL 707018 (DSC.2013).

First, we motion for both Judges Austin and Harwell's recusal as judges on this case and motion that Judge Austin be required to fulfill her duties as Trustee appointed by the King-Khalifah. They both are defendants. Austin is being sued for injunctive relief to require her to fulfill her duties as Trustee. The U.S. Supreme Court was unequivocal in the case of Trustees Of Darthmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201. A Mandamus is an appropriate vehicle to use to ensure and or require that Trustee Austin act in a proper or restored manner pursuant to her corporate and or visitatorial powers given to her by the King-Khalifah established by the default and claims of collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084, that they conspired in fraud, criminal conspiracy and obstruction of justice to negate but failed. She cannot sit as Trustee and Judge. We object. A Trustee's duty of loyalty prohibits both self dealing and conflicts of interest: Thus, the Trustee must neither (1) deal with the Trust property or designated matters related to the Trust for the benefit of himself or third parties; (2) or place herself in a position inconsistent with the interest of the Trust, Omoa Wireless, S. de R.L. v. U.S., 244 F.R.D. 303(M.D.2004); Kreman v. Blank, 55 B.R. 1018(MD.1985); Quick v. Formula Telecom Inc, F.Supp.2d 2011 WL 572513(2011); Forbes v. Forbes, 341 P3d 1041, 2015 Wy. 13 Jan. 23, 2015.

Insomuch, pursuant to legal documents filed in case 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA. Judge Austin via the superseding legislative and judicial powers of the King-Khalifah via the default to which The United States and other 192 Member States of The U.N. are party to. Judge Austin now has powers pursuant to S.C. Code Ann § 25-1-2820; S.C. Const. Art. XVII § 1A; S.C. Code Ann § 14-23-1080(By this she cannot sit); S.C. Code Ann § 62-7-816 paragraph (24); S.C. Code Ann § 17-17-30 To grant Habeas Corpus; S.C. Code Ann § 14-5-380 (By commission of the King and Global Theocratic Court her powers reach Globally); S.C. Code Ann § 38-14-70 (She can make laws consistent with the King-Khalifah's decrees). Judge Lee was Trustee the time the Georgia case was filed. Her misdealings led to her being replaced by Judge Austin, S.C. Public Interest Foundation v. S.C. Transp. Infrastructure Bank, 403 S.C. 640, 744 S.E.2d 521(S.C.2013); A. Cruickshank, IV, Esquire, 2010 WL 3505049; University Of Southern California v. Movan, 617 S.E.2d 135(S.C.App2005); Wilson v. Dallas, 743 S.E.2d 746, 754+ (S.C.2013); Phillip v. Quick, 731 S.E.2d 327, 328(S.C.App.2012); Bennett v. Carter, 2015 WL 5968253, *2 (S.C. App.2015); American Sur. Co. v. Hamrick Mills, 9 S.E.2d 433(S.C. App.1940); Draughan v. U.S., 113 F.Supp.3d 1266, 1278(D.Kan.2015)

Judge Austin's jurisdiction was limited, restricted to releasing us, ordering our removal and seeing that relief sought was granted, not to issue a separation order. Thus, the act is void. Once jurisdiction is acquired, in this case given to her to discharge all matters and debts, it is exclusive. Thus, this even places a limit on the 4th. Circuit's jurisdiction other than the terms specified by the King-Khalifah, whose powers now legally supersedes all Global Courts by the default. The court had jurisdiction over us by appearance. Thus, the claims of Sovereign power and other attributes given to the King-Khalifah via the default and collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084 must be given full faith and credit, to include Austin's appointment as Trustee, Mints v. U.S., 842 F2d 1291, 1291 CA4(S.C.1988); Dawson Ex Rel. Estate Of Dawson v. U.S., 333 F.Supp.2d 488, 492(DSC.2004); Campeau v. U.S.,

2015 WL 1308282, *9(N.D.Ga.2015); Brown v. TransSuburban U.S.C., Inc., 2015 WL 6675088 CA4(Va.2015); Baron v. Brackis, 312 F.Supp. 2d 808 CA4(Va.2004); Anderson v. LeGrand, 2012 WL 529812 *4(ED. Va.2012).

Austin is also given power and authority under 11 U.S.C.A. § 1104; 11 U.S.C.A. § 1302; 11 U.S.C.A. § 727; 15 U.S.C.A. § 78 fff-1; 15 U.S.C.A. § 704; S.C. Code Ann § 11-37-50; S.C. Code Ann § 11-50-60; S.C. Code Ann § 49-17-1400(For lien assessment and remedies on default); S.C. Code Ann § 14-23-370(Order or Decree as a lien or Judgment); 11 U.S.C.A. § 1141; S.C. Code Ann § 14-23-260. Thus, jurisdiction is impeached by review of the Chief Justice of The Global Theocratic Court being the highest court by default and collateral estoppel, Knight v. Episcopal Church Of U.S., 2010 WL 2926156 (DSC.2010). She has jurisdiction, but only to act in accordance to the wishes of the King-Khalifah, IN RE: Southern Metal Products Corporation, 26 F.Supp. 666(Ala. 1939); Republic Of Iraq v. ABB, AC, 920 F.Supp.2d 517(N.Y.D.C. 2013); Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino, 376 U.S. 398, 84 S.Ct. 923, 11 L.Ed.2d 804(U.S.1964)(where acts of King-Khalifah in his home must be deemed on Foreign soil); Remington Rand Corporation-Delaware v. Business System Inc., 830 F2d 1260(3rd. Cir.1997).

She also has power under U.S.C.A. Amend. 13 and 36 U.S.C. A. § 140405. She must be made to fulfill her duties. We motion for Declaratory Judgment and seek Mandamus to require this, Herring Asociates, Inc v. Gervais, 2016 WL 475174; IN RE: Vaugh, 536 B.R. 670; IN RE: Melito, 2015 WL 6142959, *1+ Bkrpcy MD.Fla.; IN RE: Christianson, 2015 WL 6125537, *1 Bkrpcy W.D.N.Y.; Willes v. Wells Fargo Bank N.A., 2012 WL 5250553, *6 D.Md.; El-Bey v. Rolgalski, 2015 WL 1393580, *3 D.Md.; Babatunde v. Ward, 2016 Wl 375045 *6(DSC). Judge Austin was without jurisdiction to issue that separation order because it was in violation of the Trustee duty to do so, conflicting with the King-Khalifah's decrees who is the Fiduciary Heir of The (4) Global Thrones. WE motion for Declaratory Judgment and seek to remedy this via Mandamus.

WE motion to consolidate all cases together for several reasons. (1) The parties are indispensable to the action and complete relief cannot be granted where the Crawford case in Richland County establishes the rights of collateral estoppel and default for all parties. Race is a predominating factor and religious hatred where they framed the King-Khalifah and attacked the other plaintiffs cases compromising case 2013-CP-400-2294 to which we all are joint parties. The few who were not officially made a part of the record in case 2013-CP-400-2294 were blocked by acts of fraud upon the court where that case was removed to the Kentucky District Court at the time it was dismissed divesting them of jurisdiction at the time they fraudulently acted. Further, that court failed to bring before it all the involved plaintiffs. Thus, any order produced by them cannot be deemed a final order where the rights of all parties were never adjudicated voiding their jurisdiction for Due Process violation. In such, our convictions are already invalidated via the False Imprisonment Tort which is case 2013-CP-400-0084. We motion for Declaratory Judgment, Surrato v. Building Service 32 B.J. Pension Fund, 554 F.Supp.2d 399; Ocampu v. Building Service 32 B.J. Pension Fund, F.Supp.3d, 2014 WL 687227(2014); Cejaj v. Building Service 32 B.J. Health Fund, F.Supp.2d 2004 WL 414834; Stewart v. Abend, 495 U.S. 207, 110 S.Ct. 1750(U.S.1990); Martin v. Waddell's Lesee, 41 U.S. 367, 16 Pet. 367, 1842 WL 5744; Virginia Marine Resources Comm'n v. Chincoterger Inn, 287 Va. 371, 757 S.E.2d 1 (2014).

Collateral estoppel attaches to all parties since the S.C. Attorney General and The United States were party to the default. We further seek the consolidation because in truth, the separation order issued by Judge Austin do not establish a complete separation. When you look at the order. It is perspicuous that the separation only involves the (117) page Writ Of Error. There are two Writs of Errors filed in case 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA, where all (3) of us are party to each. Since the order does not address the severing of the first Writ Of Error filed January 2016 and only addresses the one they in acts of

fraud upon the court filed in case 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA. Then we are, Cook and Crawford, still attached to the MuQuit case since the order does not address that January 2016 filing. Do you see the mess they made of our Due Process matters? We motion for sanctions and the court and all parties be deemed waived any opposition in this case going forward, that discovery issues, Attorney be appointed and we be removed to a pre-release camp pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c), Stillwagon v. City Of Deleware, 2016 WL 6094157(2016); Lennar Mare Island, LLC. v. Steadfast Insurance Company, 2016 WL 5847010(2016).

We further seek to vacate the separation order because in order to issue it. Judge Austin had to make a determination on some of the underlying merits of the case to do so, and no filing fee was paid, nor were there any filing in forma pauperis documents filed. This is jurisdictional and is required before she can say anything to the merits. Once she made effort to separate us when we are suing the United States for initiating PLRA and AEDPA. By her making use of this provision to separate us. She is by her order essentially saying our claim that the provision is unconstitutional has no merit. See attached (58) page document dated July 21, 2016. This taints the order voiding it where the fee was not paid, nor were there any in forma pauperis documents filed. See (40) page document dated October 25, 2016 for citing of law. We motion for Declaratory Judgment on this issue. Also see Thompson v. Finn, 2016 WL 5724369(2016).

Further, the PLRA only speak to inmates who are inmates in name only. Nothing in the PLRA speak to as to whether or not the plaintiffs are prohibited from filing jointly if they are all beneficiaries to a Trust seeking joint relief pursuant to that Trust, which is also what this case represents. There is Trustee appointed. Nothing in the PLRA gives any impression that Congress intended to invalidate joint filing under Federal Probate and International Probate laws. We are beneficiaries to a Trust which will be elaborated on further. Nothing in the PLRA demonstrates that Congress intended to invalidate Probate statutes and International law that permit joint filing, IN

RE: Gentry, 2016 WL 4061248(2016); IN RE: Edwards, 501 B.R. 666(2013); Chabot v. Chabot, F.Supp.2d 2011 WL 1706744(2011) ; Jakoblec v. Merrill Lynch Life Ins. Co., F.Supp.2d 2011 WL 1706744(2011); Marcus v. Quattrocchi, 715 F.Supp.2d 524(2010); Parrish v. Alameda County, F.Supp.2d 2007 WL 2904253(2007). Thus, jurisdiction again by decree would jointly fall under Judge Austin as was the King-Khalifah's terms. Once jurisdiction is acquired as it is now. It is exclusive essentially creating a remand which limits all court's jurisdiction under Foreign Law, defaulted on in this case subjudice, Brown v. Brown, F.Supp. 2d, 2013 WL 2338233(D.C.Ky.2013); Harris v. hhgregg Inc., F.Supp. 2d, 2013 WL 1331166(N.C.2013); Karnalcheva v. J.P. Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., 871 F.Supp.2d 834(2012). We Object.

Further, the PLRA only speaks to inmates who are inmates in name only, because the PLRA speaks nothing to as to whether or not plaintiffs are prohibited from filing jointly if they are Foreign citizens and or a Foreign State. Decedent domicile issues attach to this case. We are dealing with an unprecedented event, a legal binding Contract, Covenant, Testament, between God and Adam and Eve, who was a King, creating a sole corporation. The Quran confirms the Biblical Text stating Adam was a "Vicegerant" , "King", whom King David and Christ trace their lineage back to, who were also Kings. Pursuant to this legal binding contract. Once the Heir appears, he automatically make every Christian, Jew, Muslim, African and its diaspora Kings and Priest, Khalifahs and Imams, with the same rights established by the F.S.I.A.. See King James Bible, Exodus 19:6; Isaiah 66:21; Revelations 5:10. A Sole Corporation is a series of persons holding office, a continuous legal personality that is attributed to successive holders of certain Monarchical or Ecclesiastical position, such as Kings, Bishops, High Priests and the like. This continuous personality is viewed by legal fiction as having the qualities of a Corporation C.I. Corporation aggregate. Contracts cannot be made or unmade by the courts. A Testament is defined as a legal document dispositing of a person's property after death which includes all rights and titles, tangible, intangible and intellectual. A Covenant is a contract which is not to be made broken by the courts. As The Fiduciary Heir, King, Jahjah has legal authority to defend and sue to protect the Contract/ Covenant, American Mut. Liberty Ins. Co. v. Plywood -Plastics Corp., 81 F.Supp. 157(DSC.1948).

A District Court shall not have jurisdiction of a Civil action in which any party, by assignment or otherwise, has been improperly or collusively made or joined to invoke the jurisdiction of such court, 28 U.S.C. § 1359 section 1441(d) consistently has been interpreted to allow Foreign States that are named as third-party plaintiffs in a state case already in progress to remove to federal court. The policies that led Congress to provide a Federal Forum to Foreign States is just as strong when those States acquire an interest in ongoing litigation, and when they voluntarily join such litigation, it is as if they are named originally as party. We hold that a Foreign State that acquires an interest in state court litigation by assignment may remove the case to Federal Court under The F.S.I.A., consoli-

date and be heard jointly, even if the Foreign State joins the litigation voluntarily. I, Jahjah Al Mahdi, give notice. I voluntarily join all plaintiffs involved cases to include those listed in case 2013-CP-400-2294; Reinstate that case and remove them, EIE Guam v. Long Term Credit Bank, Japan, 322 F3d 635(9th.Cir. 2003); Verlinden B.V. v. Central Bank Of Nigeria, 461 U.S. 480, 103 S.Ct. 1962, 76 L.Ed.2d 81(U.S.1983). It is Decreed.

Since there is nothing in the provisions of the PLRA that speaks to these concerns or gives any indication that Congress intended to render void clearly established Federal and International Probate statutes, laws or Treaties. Where the language of a Treaty is clear of ambiguity. There is no room for construction. The F.S.I.A. permits joint filing.

"TOUT CE QUE LA LOI NE DEFEND PAS EST PERMITS"---That which the law does not forbid is permitted. Congress did not intend The Act to deprive of F.S.I.A. rights established under Probate laws or Treaties, Rull v. Secretary Of Dept. Of Health And Human Services, Fed. Cl. 2004 WL 2958453(U.S.F.C.2004); Societry For Propagation Of Gospel In Foreign Parts Of Town Of New Haven, 21 U.S. 464, 1823 WL 2477(U.S.1823).

Congress expressed no opinion as to whether or not PLRA applies to inmates who are beneficiaries of a Trust where exclusive jurisdiction would lie before a Trustee appointed by a Foreign State, City Of Columbia v. Ours Garage and Wrecker Services Inc., 536 U.S. 424, 122 S.Ct. 2226(U.S.2002). Consolidate these cases please, Oldland v. Gray, 179 F2d 408(10th.Cir.1950); Guino v. Goard, 380 F3d 670; Wilder v. Virginia, 46 F. 676(W.Va. 1891) Rosen v. Rozan, 179 F.Supp. 829. We motion for Declaratory Judgment and seek all the aforementioned by Mandamus.

Insomuch, there is a recent documentary done and aired on PBS called "13". The evidence gathered by Michelle Allexander is undisputable. The governor of Virginia is presently now making efforts to restore the voting rights of inmates. The question is clear. Do the PLRA and AEDPA provisions which are an intrinsic part of the Clinton War on Drugs Campaign, disproportionately target African Americans? We all know the answer is yes. Put it on the record. We motion for Declaratory Judgment. If the answer is yes, which of course it is. They run afoul of EX Parte Virginia and can no longer be used by the courts. We object.

Here attached the court will find:

(4) A copy of the [92] page default document dated May 2, 2014.

(5) A copy of the [95] page subsequent document exercising power via the default dated December 8, 2014 with [9] page attachment.

(6) The [152] page document dated September 14, 2015 explaining the legal terms the default is established.

(7) The [31] page document dated October 7, 2015 voiding their jurisdiction for Due Process violation and appoint-

ing Judge Lee as Trustee.

When the conspiring parties realized the magnitude of what took place by the submitting of these documents. They had to act in additional crimes of conspiracy and fraud to negate the facts, and to get around the facts, that by their conspiratorial efforts took place. The parties went beyond the time to "LEGALLY" (emphasis added) respond to the documents and defeat them. Thereby they FORFEIT challenge where none was timely made.

An additional act which demonstrates the fraud. Is that Austin in using the PLRA asserted we had to exhaust. So Austin essentially said "BUNK" the U.S. Supreme Court in Ross v. Blake, 136 S.Ct.1850(2016). I don't care that we with the state actors are engaging in fraud, machination, criminal conspiracy, misrepresentation and other outrageous acts including stealing inmate funds. They still must exhaust. We object and motion for Declaratory Judgment where they hold these cases up in a deadend within the state courts for well over (10) years when you look at the fraud occurring in the Gentry case involving the S.C. Supreme Court. the highest court is a defendant and defaulted. There are no available state remedies and some relief they don't have the power to grant or refuse to grant. We motion for Declaratory Judgment and file Mandamus to correct this injustice.

Now what is the Trust to which the plaintiffs as Christians, Jews, Muslims, and Africans are the beneficiaries of? The answer in part lies within Black Law Dictionary, which reads, LE LEY EST LE PLUS HAUT ENHERITANCE QUE LE ROY AD, CAR PAR LE LEY, IL MESME ET TOUNTS SES SUJETS SONT RULES, ET SI LE LEY, NE FRUIT, NUL ROY NE NUL ENHERITANCE SERRA". This is law, Foreign Law, Theocratic Law, which is perspicuous because it is found in Black Law Dictionary. Thus, no one can assert this is a conclusory claim. It interprets for the purpose of this case.-- "THE LAWS OF GOD ARE THE HIGHEST INHERITANCE THAT THE KING-KHALIFAH POSSESSES (INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY); FOR BY THE LAWS OF GOD, THE KING-KHALIFAH AND ALL OF HIS SUBJECTS ARE RULED: AND

IF THERE WERE NO LAWS OF GOD, THERE WOULD BE NEITHER GOD APPOINTED KING-KHALIFAH, NOR INHERITANCE". This is defaulted on by the parties subjudice.

This is the heart of the matter and the source of the controversy related to most, if not all, the claims that are placed before the court. Christ confirmed this in the New Testament whenever he spoke his parables and said, "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS LIKE,...". The "KINGDOM", embodies the laws, rules ordinances, commands, prohibitions, rewards etc. that govern servanthood to demonstrate that you are party to the legal binding contract established by God with "MAN AND WOMAN" that makes one entitled by, to the eternal inheritance promised by God, to paradise, eternal life.

The (4) basic, essential pillars to the contract are "MILK", "HONEY", "JEALOUSY" and "SALT". These (4) pillars make Judaism, Islam and Christianity congruent, in harmony with each other. It makes them "ONE", demonstrating that all (3) of these legal binding Contracts, Wills, Testaments of inheritance are "ONE", and come from the same God. "MILK"---is obedience, servant hood. God milks us for all He Desires. He is an austere God. He has Dominion. "HONEY"---is for this obedience. We are given blessings, all the benefits of the contract(s) which include eternal life after the resurrection. "JEALOUSY"---which shows He is a jealous God and which also means "PROTECTION". He protects us; We protect, fight and stand for His Laws. This is why there are "cities of refuge" in the old testament and blasphemy laws in Israel and the Middle East. And for obedience to the first (3) pillars, conditions of the contract, we become "SALT". "SALT"---is a sweet savour in the mouth of our God. This is why Christ said, "THAT WHICH IS WRITTEN, CANNOT BE BROKEN", signifying that no one including the courts can unmake or dissolve the contracts made, Woods v. Woods, 2016 WL 4013754; United Dominion Realty Trust, Inc., 307 S.C. 102; C.A.N. Enters Inc. v. S.C. Health And Human Servs. Fin. Comm'n, 296 S.C. 373, 377; M & g Polymers U.S.A., LLC. v. Tackett, 135 S.Ct. 926(2015); Hardt v. Reliance Standard Life Ins. Co., 560 U.S. 242, 130

S.Ct. 2149, 176 L.Ed.2d 998(2010); Lacke v. Lacke, 362 S.C. 302, 608 S.E.2d 147(S.C.2005). Thus, the King-Khalifah and his subjects, the plaintiffs, are required by the terms of the contract to protect its terms and prevent any party, court or nation from violating the terms. ei"A Land Flowing With Milk and Honey".

Is the Contract a perpetual contract established by God and His Holy Prophets and Kings which set the foundation for the Sole Corporation? All one would have to do is look at the contract in part in Zechariah 6:12-13; Numbers 18:1-8; Exodus 40:12-15; 1Kings 8:25; 1Chronicles 17:7-14; Isaiah 14:29-32; Isaiah 61:1-3; Malachi 3:1-4; Malachi 4:5-6; Sunnah ibn. Majah Volume 5 pages 391-396 ISBN No. 81-7151-294-1 and the citing of law and references listed on pages (69) through (78) of the [92] page default document dated May 2, 2014, and the answer would obviously be yes. The Biblical and Islamic references refer to Jahjah, including the claim he would come out of prison betrayed by members of his own household. These are terms and conditions defined in the contract(s), which cannot be broken.

Are your nations' laws your laws, or are they ours? The United States Supreme Court addressed this in particularity in the case of Trustees of Darthmouth College. There can be property (ei Intellectual Property), that is owned by private individuals or corporations that is ubiquitously used in the Civil or Public arenas as a "CHARITY"(GRANT). But this do not negate the fact that the property used in the Civil or Public sphere is privately owned. See Trustees of Darthmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201. This includes intellectual Property (ei The Right To Marry).

If the court would take notice of Genesis 17:1-7, thousands of years before your existence as a nation. God decreed your existence through Abraham to include the establishing of the Sole Corporation in the form of Kings which is an everlasting contract. If your nations were decreed before you came, then so were your laws; for a nation cannot exist without laws to

govern. Thus, God is the original fountain of all law (ei."Thou shalt not steal, rob, defraud etc."). This is a "GRANT" given to you though its ownership rests within the Sole Corporation as private property by contract. It is a "GRANT" with conditions.

Genesis 18:17-19 proves the "GRANT" when it said,"ALL THE NATIONS SHALL BE BLESSED BY HIM", and the command is given perpetually as a Trust to protect the terms of the contract as shall command this Trust to your children and future Kings for Justice and Judgment (ei "LAWS"). Thus, your laws are the property of the King-Khalifah who can make or break them to ensure that the terms of the contract remain intact perpetually as "LAWGIVER" of the Sole Corporation and original fountain (ei "GOD"), remaining true to His law that "WE ARE THE SALT OF THE EARTH".

United States Art. 1 § 10 of The Constitution declare THAT NO STATE SHALL MAKE ANY LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS. The Charter(Covenant) was not dissolved by a break in the chain of successors or the revolution. Thus by God's special grace, knowledge and mere motion, for us, our heirs and successors will and have given, granted and appointed Kings, Khalifahs who are given the Trust and their appointed Trustee and successors shall forever hereafter be, in deed, act and name, a body corporate and politic, and that they, the said body corporate and politic, shall be known and distinguished, in all deeds, grants, bargains, sales, writings, evidences or otherwise howsoever, and in all courts forever now and hereafter, plea and be pleaded by the name of the King-Khalifah and or his appointed Trustee(s) Judge Austin, and that said Sole Corporation by the name aforesaid, shall be able, and in law capable for the use of The Global Theocratic State do whatever is needed or decreed by the King-Khalifah to maintain all terms of the contract between the Sole Corporation and The One True God. Thus, the King-Khalifah by these present, for us, our heirs and successors, bind without her consent as employee of The United States who is party to the default, create, make,

constitute and appoint Judge Austin to do among many things, discharge our debts. IT IS SO DECREED.

It can require no argument that the circumstances of this case constitute a perpetual Trust, a contract for which we are the beneficiaries and this private property has also been given as a "GRANT" to the nations, blessings, promised by God through Abraham, though now owned by Jahjah. Marriage is a religious contract which is an intrinsic part of our Covenant given by God to the Sole Corporation, which the world was to be blessed by it as are your laws. It is intellectual property privately owned, and restricted.

It is perspicuous that this element of the contract was given specifically to heterosexuals, because one specific term of the contract was "TO BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY" by natural conception (ei SEX BETWEEN MAN AND WOMAN). To give our intellectual property to Sodomites(homosexuals) and Gomorrahrites (lesbians) by your laws is a breach of the contract and violation of the "CHARITY"(GRANT) given under conditions to which Jahjah as the Sole Corporation and King-Khalifah can challenge in any open court. The Legislature and or courts were restrained from violating the rights of our property. To past any law impairing the obligation of contracts is repugnant to the Constitution and you add to this fact that we are dealing with Religion also protected under the 1st. Amendment. It violates the Establishment Clause.

The provisions of the Constition never has been understood to embrace other contracts than those which respect property, in this case intellectual property, or some object of value, and confer rights which may be asserted in a court of justice. When the state legislature and or courts shall pass an act or judgment annulling the prohibitions of the marriage contract set in place by God and the Sole Corporation, His Prophets and Kings, or allowing other parties to annul these prohibitions (ei Gays and Lesbians), without the consent of God or The Sole

Corporation, it will be time enough to inquire, whether such an act is constitutional.

This is the point on which the cause essentially depends. This is not a grant of political power unconditioned. Marriage created a religious institution that by "CHARITY"(GRANT) the Sole Corporation allowed others, with limits to partake, and is intellectual property of a foreign government. Your laws all together, especially in light of the default, also by contract, are not solely in the hands of your governments. The donors in this case do not become public property and the rightful King-Khalifah by default has appeared to claim all rights of the crown and priesthood. The Trustee Judge Austin is permitted and required to execute the Trust uncontrolled by legislative or judicial authority that violates the contract by decree of the Sole Corporation. Let it be done.

The Sole Corporation is an artificial being, invisible, intangible and existing only in contemplation of God's Laws which are the original fountain of all nations' laws. Being a mere creation of God's Laws and contract, it possesses all properties which the intent of its creation confers upon it either expressly or as incidental to its very existence. These are such as are supposed best calculated to effect the object for which it was created, which among things is to worship, maintain the contracts, and protect God's Laws and prohibitions from those who would seek to water them down or do them harm.

This includes, most important are immortality, and if, the expression may be allowed, individuality---properties by which a perpetual succession of many persons are considered as the same and may act as a single individual. "HAERES EST EADEM PERSONA CUM ANTECESSORE"---THE HEIR IS THE SAME PERSON AS HIS ANCESTOR. This enables the Sole Corporation to manage its own affairs and to hold property without the perplexing intricacies, the hazards and endless necessity, of perpetual conveyances for the purpose of transmitting it from hand to hand acting as "ONE" immortal being. This Sole Corporation does not share in the Civil government, nor do the terms, provisions and objects of the contract unless that be the purpose for which it was created. Thus, it is not subject to be annulled, modified or changed in any manner without reason (ei. Giving marriage to gays and lesbians). The will of the donor becomes the law of the donation (1 Bl. Com. 471). There can be no reason for implying in the CONTRACT/COVENANT given for a valuable consideration a power which is not only not expressed, but is in direct contridiction to its expressed stipulations. The King-Khalifah's intellectual property, marriage, whose origin stems from the Sole Corporation can only be given to heterosexuals by the terms of the contract. The particular interest of giving these provisions to Gays and Lesbians as it pertains to God and the Sole Corporation, never entered into the minds of the donors. It was never constituted as a motive for their donation.

It is not public office nor is it a Civil institution by its original creation. It is a religious institution, a

"CHARITY"(GRANT) given to the nations when God told Abraham they would be blessed by him and this contract, and through Adam.

An artificial immortal being was created by God and the Crown, capable of receiving, distributing and protecting forever, according to the will of God, and the Sole Corporation, the terms of the donations and contract(s). This consideration for which is stipulated, even pursuant to your Global laws, which "[m]ust" be "JUST AND FAIR" to which you have miserably failed (ei. Slavery, Jim Crow laws, PLRA, AEDPA) is the perpetual application of this practice of contract in the mode prescribed by God and Sole Corporation.

The Sole Corporation is the assignee of the Trust and rights, the Fiduciary Heir in the form of Jahjah Al Mahdi stands in place and distributes the bounty and the appointed Trustee, Austin, must distribute it in accordance to his wishes, this chain being immortal. One of the main objects here is a New Heaven and Earth and restore God's house to its original position before Satan took 1/3 of the Angels establishing Hell. It is not about monetary gain or individual power, but God's purpose which do not give way to debauchery, Sodomy and Mr. & Mrs. "FREAKY, WANNA SLIDE DOWN THE STRIP POLE". It is a contract on the faith of which real and personal property and estate has been conveyed to the Sole Corporation. The language of the contract is unambiguous and explicit to exclude such practice.

The law in this case is the law of all. Austin as Trustee via decree of the Sole Corporation and Global Theocratic Court has all power and jurisdiction to act on behalf of the King-Khalifah and plaintiffs who are beneficiaries of the Trust where her powers derive from a regal source. She must partake in the spirit of their origin.

All rights and contracts respecting property, which include intellectual property, remain unchanged by and or due to religious revolution or national revolution or creating of independent states. Christ brought the conditions of the old contract forward and embellished them within the New Contract every time he said, "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS LIKE,..."; The old contract being a shadow of the new. The New Contract embellishing the old (ei. Christianity), and the 3rd. and final Contract (ISLAM) being components of "BOTH", making them "ONE", all falling under the care and authority of the Sole Corporation. The U.S. Constitution speaks with all clarity. "NO STATE, WHICH INCLUDES ITS JUDICIARY, SHALL PASS NO ACT, TO INCLUDE LAW, IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS". The Sole Corporation also via its appointed Trustee, as possessing the whole and legal, equitable interest and completely representing the donors and founders of the "CONTRACT/COVENANT" for the purpose of executing the Trust, has rights which are protected by the Constitution. Thus, the act of allowing the Sodomites and Gomorrahrites to marry and subjecting the King-Khalifah to your laws

via this false imprisonment to include his subjects as co-heirs and beneficiaries to the Trust is repugnant to the Constitution and are rendered to no effect by default and collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084. Thus, the Clause within the U.S. Constitution Article 1 sec. 10 declaring that "NO STATE SHALL PASS ANY BILL OF ATTAINDER, EX POST FACTO LAW, OR ANY LAW IMPAIRING THE OBLIGATION OF CONTRACTS" bear on the claims made in this case, King v. Passmore, 3 T.R. 246; Phillip v. Bury, 1 Lord Raym 5 S.C. 2 T.R. 346.

The ingredients requisite to form a contract are parties, consent, and an obligation to be created or dissolved; these must all occur, because the regular effect of all contracts is, on one side, to acquire, and on the other, to part with, some property or rights, or to abridge or to restrain natural liberty, by binding the parties to do or restraining them from doing, something which before they might have done or omitted, Fletcher v. Peck, 6 Cranch 87, in which it was laid down that a contract is either executory or executed; by the former, a party binds himself to do or not to do a particular thing; the latter is one in which the object of the contract is performed, and this differs in nothing from a "GRANT"; but whether executed or executory, they both contain obligations binding on the parties, and both are equally within the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which forbid the states, governments, courts, to pass laws impairing the obligation of contracts.

Your nations' liberty was restrained in giving the right to marry to these people. Your nations were restrained from establishing laws like AEDPA and PLRA that disproportionately effect African Americans, institutionalizing slavery and Jim Crow, placing into effect indictments that take away the presumption of innocence and the other laws you promote which defy "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". Your nations are in violation of the contract and the rights of the beneficiaries of the Trust. Cause is established.

A contract is also a "GRANT" by meaning within the Constitution. A Corporation defined by Mr. Justice Blackstone (2 Bl. Com. 37) is to be a franchise with power to maintain perpetual succession, and to do corporate acts. To this "GRANT", "CONTRACT", "FRANCHISE" are God, the King, which in this case is Adam, his wife and co-heir Eve and the person for whom the benefit is created, or Trustee for them which is the Sole Corporation, and those they may for whatever reason appoint. The assent of both are necessary which we have in this case.

The subjects of the "GRANT" are not only privileges and immunities, but property, real and intellectual, or, which is the same thing, a capacity to acquire and hold property in perpetuity. Certain obligations are created binding both the grantor and grantees. On the part of the former, it amounts to an extinguishment of the King's prerogative to bestow the same identical franchise on another corporate body, because it would prejudice his prior "GRANT". You cannot grant the same rights of

the contract (ei. Marriage) on another corporate body (ei. Sodomites and Gomorrahrites), because it would prejudice the prior "GRANT" given to heterosexuals and violate the terms of the "Contract", "Covenant", "Grant", "Franchise", (2Bl. Com. 37).

You cannot make laws or subject people to laws that defy "JUSTICE, FAIRNESS" and the terms of the Contract, Covenant set in place by God, Adam and Eve who were your forefathers as well as mine, binding us all as mankind. "SEEING THAT ABRAHAM SHALL SURELY BECOME A GREAT AND MIGHTY NATION, AND ALL THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD SHALL BE BLESSED IN HIM? FOR I KNOW HIM, THAT HE WILL "COMMAND"(EMPHASIS ADDED) (NOT ASK) HIS CHILDREN AND HIS HOUSEHOLD "AFTER", "AFTER" HIM, AND THEY "SHALL" (MANDATORY) KEEP THE WAY(LAWS) OF THE LORD, AND DO JUSTICE AND JUDGMENT ****". And right after this very passage you have God's reference to Sodom and Gomorrah. Coincidence? Not on your life. The terms of the contract are unambiguous. Corrupt judges, crooked, racist, brutal cops, slavery, Jim Crow laws, PLRA, AEDPA, same sex marriage. Your nations speak blasphemies, and you violated the terms of the contract mankind, permitting Jahjah to legally intervene, abolish all unjust laws, indictments, marriages and restore all terms of the contract, to which Judge Austin is Trustee. Such is done and established by decree of Jahjah Al Mahdi.

This fulfills the Prophesy written in Mark 9:12 which state, "ELIJAH MUST FIRST COME AND RESTORE ALL THINGS". Every alteration of the Contract, Covenant, however unimportant, even though you claimed was in the interest of "Democracy", though objected to by the rightful heirs to the Kingdom Of God, impaired the obligation of the contract. For it is impossible that a new contract or construction should not violate the old contract, covenant, through Moses, Christ and Muhammad(PBUT), which are "ONE". The reason is obvious---A Covenant, Testament, is a contract, to the validity of which the consent of both parties is essential, and therefore it cannot be altered or added or

made or unmade by the courts without consent of the Sole Corporation which was never given in cases, and or is officially withdrawn. This includes any laws made by your global legislative bodies. Your nations have interpreted law or placed in effect laws that make the Sole Corporation question your sanity and intent, as though your nations were in a drunken stupor. My People, Christians, Muslims, Jews, Africans and its diaspora will have "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS". You are in breach of the Trust, of the "GRANT", of Contract, allowing me and my people to jointly bring action as beneficiaries of the Trust and The Fiduciary Heir of The Sole Corporation. see King v. Passmore, 3 T.R. 246; Territt v. Taylor, 9 Cranch 43; 1 Bl. Com. 469, 475, 1 Kyd. on Corp., 13, 69, 189; 1 Wooddes, 471, & C.; Attorney General v. Whorwood, 1 Ves. 534; St. John's College v. Todington, 1 Bl. Rep. 84 S.C. 1 Burr. 200; Woods v. Woods, 2016 WL 4013754; M & G Polymers U.S.A., LLC v. Tachett, 135 S.Ct. 926(2015); Hardt v. Reliance Standard Life Ins. Co., 560 U.S. 242, 130 S.Ct. 2149, 176 L.ED.2d 998(U.S.2010); Trustees Of Darthmouth College v. Woodward, 17 U.S. 518, 1819 WL 2201; Tonbar v. Bangs, 69 U.S. 728, 1864 WL 6590, 17 L.Ed. 768, 2 Wall 728(1864); Oparah v. The New York City Dept. Of Educ., F.Supp.3d, 2015 WL 4240733 (N.Y.D.C.2015); International Ass'n Of Machinist Lodge 1652 v. Internal Aircraft Service Inc(Charleston), 302 F2d 808, 49 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2976(4th.Cir.1962). We seek Declaratory Judgment.

As aforesaid. The Trustee's duty of loyalty prohibits both self dealing and conflicts of interest: Thus, the Trustee(s) must neither (1) deal with Trust property for the benefit of himself or third parties, (2) place herself in a position inconsistent with interest of the Trust. Austin must recuse and [redacted] vacate the separation order. Duty of prudence, under the common law of Trust, require the Trustee to adhere to the law. PLRA and AEDPA are unconstitutional by the litigation presented. She broke the law established in Ex Parte Virginia by making use of it in this case in furtherance of the conspiracy. We motion for sanctions and any initial review or time for submission of motion for Summary Judgment by the defendants be

forfeited, hearing be set, hearing be scheduled, legal counsel be appointed, discovery issue and case be set for trial. All relief sought in case 2013-CP-400-0084, 2294 be granted via sanctions sought for the fraud, for the monies stolen from us, evidence spoliated, physical assaults, corrupt Judges, fictitious homicides being established to frame the King-Khalifah and racial animus consistently displayed. This is outrageous! We seek full faith and credit given to the default and we seek immediate removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c) and all other relief sought by all the (4) Mandamus that were filed. Judge Austin must be made to stand up and fulfill her duty as Trustee, Fifth Third Bon Corp. v. Dudenhoefter, 134 S.Ct. 2459, 189 L.Ed.2d. 457(U.S.2014). A Trustee shall invest and manage the Trust assets solely in the interest of the beneficiaries, Ws. 1977 & 4-10-905 Loyalty.

Under principles of equity, a Trustee bears an unwavering duty of complete loyalty to the beneficiaries of the Trust, to the exclusion of the interest of all others. To deter a Trustee from all temptation and to prevent any possible injury to the beneficiary, which occurred by her issuing this separation order, separating the plaintiffs from each other to cause harm to our proceedings. The Rule against the Trustee dividing her loyalties must be enforced with uncompromising rigidity. Self dealing by a Trustee or any Fiduciary is always suspect, and it is a universal Rule of equity that a Trustee shall not deal with Trust property to his or her own advantage without knowledge or consent of the Cestui Que Trust. She was given consent to establish the independent action, but not to separate us after that. She must be made to correct this injustice, Fobes v. Forbes, 341 P3d. 1041, 2015 Wy. 13 Jan. 23, 2015; N.L.R.B. v. Amex Coal Co.,...Div. Of Amax, Inc., 453 U.S. 322, 101 S.Ct. 2789(U.S.1981); Central States, Southeast and Southwest Arcas Pension Funds v. Central Transport, Inc., 472 U.S. 559, 105 S.Ct. 2833, 86 L.Ed.2d. 447(U.S.1985).

It is a general Rule of the common law (the reverse of that applied in ordinary cases) that a "GRANT", "CONTRACT",

"TESTAMENT" of a King-Khalifah at the suit of the grantee, is to be construed most beneficial for the King-Khalifah and most strictly against the grantee. Austin cannot be permitted to abuse the Trust. The laws which are connected to the convictions abuse the Trust and are called into account and are now given no effect being in egregious violation of the Contract. You are in forfeiture of all rights acquired under them by decree of The Global Theocratic King and Court whose power supersedes your global courts by the default and contract via such breach, emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084. Its time for prison reform and opportunity to fix this mess with these Sodomites your nations devised. It is perspicuous that any act of a legislature or court within your nations which take away any powers of franchise vested by the "COVENANT", "TESTAMENT", "CONTRACT" in the Sole Corporation, or its Trustee, or which restrains or controls the legitimate exercise of them, or transfer them to other persons without its assent is a violation of the obligations of that contract. If the Court and Legislature claim such an authority it must be written within the "WILL AND TESTAMENT", (3) HOLY BOOKS, to which it is not. Thus, the 4th. Circuit is bound to declare that the acts and injustices argued within the plaintiffs cases jointly and or separately do impair the obligations of the "COVENANT", "TESTAMENT", "CONTRACT" which in truth declare that there is no separation of church and state, which is obvious when your political candidates running for office consistently bring up their religious faith. The fact that the "CHARITY" (GRANT) given to you may be used in the public arenas don't make the Sole Corporation public. We are separate from you, a peculiar people, a chosen Kingdom and Priesthood designating limits placed on you via "CONTRACT" perpetually established restricted you giving this religious covenant to homosexuals and lesbians. As "SALT OF THE EARTH", by the (4) pillars we bring suit.

Inasmuch, these claims can no longer be considered frivolous, or it be stated that we infringe upon rights that have

not been established. The claims of default and collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084 where the United States and other 192 Member States of the U.N. are parties to, make the claims true producing a preclusive effect preventing the courts from challenging those claims. Legal binding "CONTRACT" is placed before the courts.

It is perspicuous that the lower Federal and State Courts understood and knew this to be true or they would have never engaged themselves in acts of machination, criminal conspiracy, obstruction and fraud, attempting to remand when there was no discretionary remand to allow the state actors to obtain the fraudulent, tainted protective orders to misrepresent the truth of this matter. Due to this dilatory, obstructive behavior, sanctions must be imposed and the claims of Sovereignty be given full faith and credit in all court(s) records, Robinson v. U.S., 2015 WL 1524406; U.S. v. Sterling, 724 F3d. 482 CA4(Va.2013); Turner v. U.S., 736 F3d. 274 CA4(E.C.2013); Loveless v. John Ford Inc., 232 Fed. Appx' 229, 2007 WL 1381597 CA4(Va.2007).

We motion for Declaratory Judgment on all issues and claims within this document and all those attached.

We motion to supplement the causes of action in all pending federal cases with the claims, issues and defenses argued within this document and seek this Mandamus to remedy all issues of concern.

We want the injunction sought and all relief in cases 16-1519, 16-1953, 16-2141 granted. We seek the recusal of Judge Austin and Harwell and Austin be required to stand in her position as Trustee and transferring all cases after consolidation to New Jersey where trial will commence. We seek that all plaintiffs in all the cases referred to be removed to the nicest federal pre-release camp this nation has pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1455(c). We want our Master's, our God's intellectual property given to the King-Khalifah, the Sole Corporation by default and inheritance returned. Marriage by contract in its original conception is a religious covenant and practice. Not merely

a Civil act or public practice. It is restricted by contract which you violated. The Sole Corporation's right to challenge is established.

The right to issuance of the Writ is indisputable. Austin must exercise power as the King-Khalifah's Trustee. Recusal is sought and other crucial matters. The Writ issues in all cases where the party hath a right to have anything done and hath no other specific means of compelling its performance. Thereupon it must issue as a "WILDCARD" remedy. The primary purpose of a Writ Of Mandamus is to grant an established right and or enforce an imperative duty. By the documents continuously filed over the years, 10+, to include the claims of default and collateral estoppel emerging from case 2013-CP-400-0084 that they criminally, fraudulently conspired to negate and failed. We have established the rights with sufficient certainty and shown the imperative duty placed upon the conspiring State and Federal actors only to be defrauded, criminally delayed and unjustly denied. The Writ in the interest of "JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS" must issue, Porter v. Jodziniak, 334 S.C. 16, 18, 512 S.E.2d. 497, 498(1999) citing Williams v. City Of Greenville, 243 S.C. 82, 132 S.E.2d. 169(1963); Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct. 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d. 72(N.C.1977); Robinson v. Leahy, D.C.Ill. 1975, 401 F.Supp. 1027; Vistamar Inc. v. Vazquez, D.C. Puerto Rico, 1971, 337 F.Supp. 375; Wilwording v. Swenson, 1971, 404 U.S. 249, 92 S.Ct. 407, 30 L.Ed.2d 418; Buise v. Hudkins, CA Ind. 1978, 584 F2d. 223; IN RE: Wainwright, CA5 (Fla.) 1975, 518 F2d. 173; Will v. United States, 389 U.S. 90, 95, 88 S.Ct. 269, 273, 19 L.Ed.2d. 305(1967); Kerr v. United States District Court For The Northern District Of California, 426 U.S. 394, 405, 96 S.Ct. 2119, 48 L.Ed.2d. 725 (1976); 3 Blackstone at * 110; IN RE: First Federal Savings & Loan Association Of Dorham, 860 F2d 135, 138 (4th.Cir.1988); 198 F3d. at 511; 695 F2d. 1179.

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATE

JAHJAH AL MAHDI

ANTHONY COOK

YAHYA MUQUIT

November 2, 2016