

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	Case No.: 24-4419
	)	
Plaintiff-Appellee	)	
	)	
v.	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE
	)	TO FILE PRO SE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
STEVEN CLARK LEFEMINE,	)	AND ACCOMPANYING
	)	PRO SE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
	)	
Defendant-Appellant	)	
	)	

**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE PRO SE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
AND ACCOMPANYING PRO SE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF**

COMES NOW Appellant, Steven Clark Lefemine, pursuant to the Court's Order (ECF No. 28, [January 15, 2025](#)), and hereby requests leave to file a pro se supplemental brief, accompanied by the pro se supplemental brief. COURT ORDER: "Upon consideration of appellant's motion to relieve counsel, the court denies the motion without prejudice to appellant seeking leave to file a pro se supplemental brief, accompanied by the pro se supplemental brief." (ECF No. 28, [January 15, 2025](#))

Reasons for making the motion contained in the accompanying pro se supplemental brief.

Appellant is 69 year old male who has lived in South Carolina since August 1982. The most important defining factor of Steve Lefemine's life today is his Christian faith. By the grace and mercy of God, He drew me to faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and He has forgiven me of all my sin. I am a saved, born-again Christian by grace alone, through faith alone, in the Lord Jesus Christ Alone. I believe the Word of God. Jesus Christ is my Lord and Saviour.

APPELLANT'S STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL

The District Court rendered an unjust verdict and sentence during appellant's FACE Act prosecution.

1. God's Law is the rightful, just basis for man's law
2. Human life begins at conception; A human being exists at conception
3. Every human being has a Creator God-given, inherent, unalienable right to life as a natural "person" which should rightly be recognized in law as legal personhood
4. As stated by Virginia Delegate George Mason in the 1787 Constitutional Convention: "By an inevitable chain of causes and effects, Providence punishes national sins by national calamities."
5. The origin of the FACE Act was to protect the so-called "right" to "abortion"; after *Dobbs*, there is no federal constitutional right to "abortion"; the federal FACE Act should be repealed
6. The application of the FACE Act in this case was inconsistent with Congress' findings and intent