

Leihinahini Sullivan #09779122

Victorville Camp FCI Med, I

PO Box 5300

Adelanto, CA 92301

In The Supreme Court of the United States

Leihinahini Sullivan,
Pro Se - Petitioner,

vs.

United States of America,
Respondent.

No. 25-6100

Motion for Reconsideration of
Exhibit 1 As Case Is In Response
to Criminal Matters 1:17-cr-00104-
JMS-KJM & 1:21-cr-00096-JMS; Ex. 1.

Motion for Reconsideration

It is axiomatic that pro se filings should be liberally construed. See Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). "In practice, this liberal construction allows courts to recognize claims despite various formal deficiencies, such as incorrect labels or lack of cited legal authority." Wall v. Rasnick, 42 F. 4th 214, 218 (4th Cir. 2022).

I am respectfully asking the Supreme Court Case No. 25-6100 be reconsidered by this Honorable Court as it is response to criminal matters for the District Court of Hawaii 1:17-cr-00104-JMS-KJM & 1:21-cr-00096-JMS, so reversal of Exhibit 1 or reconsideration of Exhibit 1. I make this under the penalty of perjury that it is true and correct.



March 4th, 2026, Adelanto, CA.

Exhibit 1

**Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

January 20, 2026

Ms. Leihinahina Sullivan
Prisoner ID #09779122
Victorville Camp FCI Med I
PO Box 5300
Adelanto, CA 92301

Re: Leihinahina Sullivan
v. United States
No. 25-6100

Dear Ms. Sullivan:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*). Justice Jackson, dissenting: I respectfully dissent from the order barring this incarcerated petitioner from filing future *in forma pauperis* petitions in noncriminal matters. See *Howell v. Circuit Court of Indiana*, 607 U. S. ___ (2026) (Jackson, J., dissenting).

Sincerely,



Scott S. Harris, Clerk

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**