

The Supreme Court of the United States

Kwame A. Askia

v. Case No. 23-6015

United States

Motion request for Rehearing in case no. 23-6015 based on violation of Rule 44.

In addition to many known wrongfully manufactured errors, coupled with several oversights with respect to the Government's one count argument, the violation of Rule 44 stands at the top of the list.

According to Rule 44, a defendant has a right to have proper legal counsel.

Based on the exclusion of exculpatory evidence proving innocence and Rule 44, many basic legal rights were denied the defendant, Kwame A. Askia, all of which were known by the lower courts making the violation of Rule 44 of greater importance and significance.

Therefore, the Government was allowed to expand its negative impact of purposefully denying one of the most fundamental legal pillars.

By plan or accident, challenges to the constitutionality of Case No. 23-6015 have been wrongfully and illegally impacted.

The lack of acknowledgement of Rule 44 makes the violation of Rule 44 a turning point in the constitutionality and proceedings of the above case.


The lack of adequate counsel has been a continuously denied constitutional right to the defendant, Kwame A. Askia, starting at the lower courts, including the United States Court of Appeals for the 8th Circuit, resulting in exculpatory evidence of innocence being excluded.

In the interest of following proper protocol with respect to the violation of Rule 44, the defendant believes that the appropriate corrective action to remedy the current legal situation is the granting of a rehearing and comprehensive vacating of the wrongful lower court verdict based on the legal principles cited in Rule 44 and the promises of the US Constitution.

Kwame A. Askia
Pro Se

askialearning@gmail.com

916 345 6344
January 20, 2024



Page 2

RE: Askia v. United States
Petition for Rehearing
No: 23-6015

This petition for rehearing is presented in good faith as well as sound merit and not for delay. This brings a point of clarity to the lack of constitutionality to Rule 44. This is a brief distinct and limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented and supporting foundation for this petition and rehearing request.

Kwame A. Askia
Pro Se

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'K' followed by a horizontal line and a loop.