

No. 22-7695

Related Application No. 22A981

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In the Matter of Meghan Kelly in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v

Office of Disciplinary counsel, aka Pennsylvania Disciplinary Counsel
On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Western District of PA,
Case Number 2913 DD3

**PETITION FOR A REHEARING ON DENIAL OF A WRIT OF CERTIORI
LIMITED TO INTERVENING CAUSES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING
EFFECT CONCERNING MY ARGUMENTS WHICH MAY VITIATE MY RIGHTS
SHOULD THE COURT NOT HEAR THIS REHEARING**

October 10, 2023

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Pro Se, not represented by
counsel
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302)493-6693
US Supreme Court No 283696

QUESTION PRESENTED

Should this Court grant my request for a rehearing under Rule 44.2 because intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect have arisen relating to my arguments in the petition at Question IX, pages 6-14, wherein I argued this court must limit discipline of the US Supreme Court justices to the purview of the Constitution to 1) cases and controversies, 2) and impeachment, without waiver of the 5th Amendment right to self-incrimination in order not to violate my fundamental 1st Amendment right to petition to defend my religious beliefs as a party of one based on retaliation for correcting judicial mistakes or misconduct including:

1. Some of the US Supreme Court justices spoke to the press on their positions on ethics and regulation of the US Supreme Court.
2. On September 4, 2023, Senator Whitehouse petitioned Chief Justice Roberts to discipline Justice Alito but for sharing his opposition to regulating the US Supreme Court through a code of conduct or disciplinary rules.
3. Since I filed the petition the news have been marketing attacks against this US Supreme Court to entice them to bend to the partial whims of the public instead of the impartial Constitutional application of the rule of law.
4. Should the court succumb to temptations will allow for an overthrow of our government if left unstopped.
5. There is a four part attack against the courts. There is a real plan to eliminate the authority of the US Supreme Court.
6. This case or my other cases may be the only means in an actual case or controversy this Court may have to save itself to save the judiciary branch the only branch that

safeguards individual liberty from being sacrificed by mob rule through the vote. I
believe you are in danger.

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

CASES DIRECTLY RELATING TO THIS CASE

Kelly v Swartz, et al, Delaware District Court No. 21-1490, and Third Circuit Court of Appeals Matter No 21-3198. US Supreme Court filings Kelly v Swartz et al 22A747, Kelly v Swartz et al. 22-6783, Kelly v Swartz et al. 23A100.

Kelly v Trump Chancery Court No. 2020-0809, Delaware Supreme Court No. 119-2021, US Supreme Court No. 22-5522

Kelly v Democrats Delaware Chancery Court No 2020-0157.

The Original disciplinary case in Delaware Supreme Court matter No. 22-58 and IMO Meghan Kelly Number 541 regarding to appointment of counsel where I was denied copies or access to the filed pleadings. US Supreme Court application 22A476 Kelly v DE Office of Disciplinary Counsel.

Reciprocal disciplinary case Eastern District of PA matter No 22-45, Third Circuit Court of Appeals No. 22-3372.

Reciprocal Disciplinary case I believe is stayed Delaware District Court No. 22-341.

Reciprocal Case in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals 22-8037. Reciprocal disciplinary case before the US Supreme Court Kelly v Third Circuit Court of Appeals No. 22-6584 and application No. 22A478.

PA Supreme Court No 2913 DD3, US Supreme Court filing Kelly v Pennsylvania Office of Disciplinary Counsel US Supreme Court Numbers 22A981, 22-7695 DC and the US Supreme Court have refrained from discipline, DC based on jurisdiction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Question presented.....	ii, iii
Parties.....	iv
Related Cases.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
Appendix.....	vii-viii
Table of Authorities.....	ix
Statement of Case:.....	1-12

APPENDIX

April 26, 2023 letter and some exhibits not all exhibits thereto including:

Letter to Chief Justice Colm F. Connelly from Meghan Kelly regarding Running motion to allow complaint to be amended to reflect the facts, witnesses eliminated by state, concealed the fact they retired during proceeding, did not allow me to gather discovery from them to hide this fact. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Table of Contents of Exhibits and electronic data, # 2 Exhibit A doctored up praecipe Oct 5 2020 I did not know she wrote on it, # 3 Exhibit B Ltr to DE Supreme Court, July 12, 2021 regarding staff told me to cross off, # 4 Exhibit C Praecipe with address crossed off, # 5 Exhibit D Praecipe with switched address sheets, # 6 Exhibit E Letter to Master Patricia Griffin regarding I am not an attorney advocate in the case, # 7 Exhibit F Letter to Assigned Vice Chancellor, # 8 Exhibit G Ltr October 30, 2020, regarding removal, immunity remove, # 9 Exhibit H Letters to Courts requesting waiver of notary requirements, President Trump has covid 19, # 10 Exhibit I Letter from the Court notary requirements, # 11 Exhibit J Letter to Master regarding disparate treatment by court based on religion, political association and poverty, # 12 Exhibit K Letter to Master regarding Chancery Court staff misled me to almost miss the appeal deadline., # 13 Exhibit L Email to David Weiss and opposing counsel regarding Dr. Bunting, Judge Smalls regarding out of state animus and other concerns.....2-3

A-4 *Kelly's Motion to the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms from unlawfully pressuring me to forgo or impede my case to protect my free exercise of religion*, and exhibits thereto, , including December 1, 2020 letter to Master Patricia Griffin of the Chancery Court regarding my belief I received disparate treatment by the court's staff based on religious belief, political association or poverty; emails, Internal Exhibit, Oct 19, 2020 letter to Patricia Griffin regarding I am acting as a party not as an attorney, DE-Lapp threatening email, Internal Exhibit, letter dated May 21, 2020, (3DI 121-11, DI 4).....3

A-5 *Kelly's motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the Honorable Justice Collins J. Seitz*, and related exhibits thereto, proof of payment of bar dues, emails to Mark Vavala confirming he did not incite the investigation, Internal Exhibit Letter from the Court in response to my request for exemption of bar dues for all attorneys facing hardship, dated February 5, 2021; attachment relating my concerns relating to recent US Supreme Court cases I disagreed with. (3DI-121-12, DI 4).....3

9/4/23 petition by Senator Whitehouse's to discipline Justice Alito.....3, 4-7, 9-12

Letter to DE Supreme Court Justice regarding impartiality of judges based on place of origin, firm size or the amount of money it brings to the state.....7

Exhibits showing belief of danger based on partnerships between not only church and state but government backed and condoned foreign and private partners inciting private attacks based on perceived religious or political association or beliefs, including, Email to Bo at the Delaware Department of elections, forwarding an email to Jesse Chadderon at the democrat's office where I was concerned about a neighbor threatening me for my sign because he previously threatened to ram my car if I park it on my parents side lot, and he allegedly threatened to use his

gun should someone at the board of the development come onto his property to inspect it without authorization, pictures of substance thrown at my car, Police report concerning 2 bullets shot into the home of Greg Layton hitting the wall above the dining room table as he and his wife sat there but for his political beliefs incited by Trump-religion, some of my signs I created which caused outrage and attacks, excluding Impeach [Trump] Serve your country not your seat, excluding Impeach [Trump] No one is above the law, No one is below the law and signs I created

.....7

Exhibits on an Agenda to Eliminate people in the law to eliminate the government that restrains entities from getting as much as they can for as little unrestrained from the just rule of law from oppressing, killing, stealing or destroying human life, liberty or health for the bottom line, and exhibits therein including

- Obituary of Richard Goll, a Delaware attorney who was exploited by an out of state real estate company practicing law without a license
- Newspaper Article I drafted in the Coastal Point on a proposition on how to resolve the fact non attorneys are practicing law without a license
- Article by the Venus project *How can laws be eliminated* regarding a new system to replace governments after 2050
- Excerpts from the Book *Shaping the Fourth Industrial Revolution* By Klaus Schwabb, Founder of the World Economic Forum and Chairman with Nicolas Davis, Copywrite 2018, Published in the United States by Currency, an imprint of the Crown Publishing Group, a division of Penguin Random House LLC.....
- Excerpts from the Fourth Industrial Revolution by Klaus Schwabb.....
- Article by World Government Summit Could an AI ever replace a judge in court?, dated 2017
- Article Robot justice: China's use of Internet courts By Tara Vasdani This article was originally published by The Lawyer's Daily (<https://www.thelawyersdaily.ca/>), part of LexisNexis Canada Inc
- Excerpts from The Great Narrative for a Better Future, by Klaus Schwabb and
- and Exhibit 43 which includes
 1. Coastal Point, Guest Column, Representative candidate says health is wealth, By Meghan Kelly, Esq., Candidate Delaware House of Representatives, 38th District,
 2. Document, "Your Health is your Wealth You are Priceless. Not a price tag! Kelly seeks Federal Consideration of Health Care Proposal,
 3. Meghan Kelly's teaching certificate, which goes to credibility. I learned psychology and behavior theories like BF Skinner's. I also am licensed to teach health so I know something about health.
 4. Meghan Kelly's redacted law school transcript to show she took a course Health Care Finance and the course Law and Medicine while attending Duquesne School of Law.
 5. Meghan Kelly's redacted undergraduate college transcript to show she took relevant courses related to
 - a. History of Western Medicine
 - b. Economics

- c. Medieval Philosophy
- d. Psychology courses

6. Evidence of surgery that requires I drink water, rest and eat so I do not faint or die due to dehydration when I have my period. I lose five pounds every month. This is still a challenge. I must assert my right to live because many people serve Satan by not wanting to be inconvenienced to care to adapt to safeguard my life, or the lives and health of others.)..... 8-10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Bible

2 Timothy 2:23.....	4
Amos 5:15.....	4
Matthew 6:24.....	9
Bible Matthew 7:3-5.....	4
Matthew 23:23.....	4

Case Law

<i>Ex Parte McCordle</i> , 74 U.S. 506 (1868).....	5-6
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i> , 5 U.S. 137, 177, 2 L. Ed. 60 (1803).....	5-6

Constitution

US Amend I.....	1-4
US Amend V.....	1, 9-12
US Art III.....	3

US Supreme Court Rules

Supreme Court Rule 44.1	1
-------------------------------	---

STATEMENT OF CASE

I, Meghan Kelly, Esq., pro se pursuant to Rule 44 respectfully move this Court for a rehearing on its decision denying my Petition of writ of certiorari to vacate a PA judgement dated 2/28/2023 (“petition”) placing my license on inactive retired disabled and requests a rehearing and I incorporate herein by reference the petition and the Motion for leave to file in forma pauperis filed with the Petition for writ of Certiorari (hereinafter “Petition”) herein by reference in its and aver:

1. Rule 44.2 limits a rehearing to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.
2. Since I filed the petition intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect have arisen relating to arguments in petition at Question IX, pages 6-14, wherein I argued against regulating the US Supreme Court by judicial disciplinary rules or a Code of conduct by requesting this court must limit discipline of the US Supreme Court justices to the purview of the Constitution to 1) cases and controversies, 2) and impeachment. Accordingly, I argue the Court must permit me and other attorneys to petition Courts to correct mistakes and misconduct without discipline or other retaliation for petitioning to safeguard fundamental rights and claims.

3. Question IX of the petition asks this court:

“IX. Whether this Supreme Court may limit the Constitutional check upon its own branch, the judiciary, to cases and controversies and impeachment, to preserve the rule of law, by allowing petitioning to its own Court regarding injuries claimants allege were caused by the US Supreme Court or its members including the injury I allege Justice Alito caused herein by denying my assertion of the First Amendment right to petition wherein I made an application for additional time, an accommodation, which has compelled me by government compelled force to waive claims and to draft a petition under duress without adequate time to sufficiently plead the important issues I address to protect and preserve the Court and the Constitutional law, not to destroy the members or the Court in the face of attacks to the institution meant to eliminate the rule of law I seek to preserve and defend.” (Emphasis intended).

4. Should the Court hold judges may be corrected in cases and controversies which is within the purview of the Constitutional limits this, Court must permit me to petition and protect my 1st Amendment right to petition Courts to correct court mistakes and misconduct without retaliation as Justice Alito appeared to do by denying me time based on my pleadings where I disagreed with his reasoning in certain cases within a case and controversy. See, No. 22A981

5. By extension, the Court must protect and not punish my exercise of the right to petition in the original disciplinary court for which this disciplinary petition arises by overturning the PA Disciplinary Order placing my license on inactive disabled but for my private 1st amendment rights of religious beliefs contained in my speech in my Delaware petitions in Kelly v Trump, and for my petitions to correct judicial misconduct or mistakes.

6. This reciprocal case arises based on my petitions in Kelly v Trump to the Chancery Court and the Delaware Supreme Court to correct judicial misconduct or mistakes. I petitioned the Chancery Court to stop its staff from disparately treating me based on disdain for my religious-political beliefs or poverty. The staff wrote on a subpoena, dated 10/5/20 confusing the court and I, and directed me to cross off local counsel's address on a subpoena for an amended complaint dated 10/12/20 to prevent service to local counsel. Then the staff member misled me to cause me to miss an appeal date. (See, Exhibit 4/26/22 letter and attachments thereto)

7. The Chancery Court would not accept any documents from me without notarized signature. Since Trump had covid at the time, I drafted a letter requesting relief from the notary requirements under the impression it may endanger my health, the court's health and the notaries who sign off on Trump's signature. The Delaware Supreme Court sent back a letter indicating

the courts waived notary requirements for all during the pandemic. The DE Supreme Court copied the Disciplinary Board member in the letter, attached hereto, dated 10/21/20. Id.

8. During Kelly v Trump the Delaware Supreme Court incited the Delaware Disciplinary Counsel, DE-Lapp another arm of the Court and Court of Common Pleas Judge Kenneth S. Clark to attack me to cause me to forgo my case. Judge Clark threatened me in a store BJ's in an attempt to cause me to forgo my case Kelly v Trump.

9. I petitioned the Delaware Supreme Court regarding the state attacks to cause me to forgo my 1st Amendment right to petition, I attach hereto as A-4. I discovered Judge Seitz incited the petition. So, I moved for his recusal as outlined in the attached exhibit A-5.

10. After Kelly v Trump was over I discovered the entire Court incited the state attacks against me. I also discovered the Delaware Supreme Court through staff attorney Robinson fired the Court staff I complained about, and secretly sealed A-4 and A-5 during Kelly v Trump to conceal incriminating information against the Delaware supreme Court and necessary for my claims and defense in all lawsuits relating to this matter. I care about the staff. I did not want them to get punished. I merely sought to preserve my right to religious exercise of beliefs. After the case I noticed the DE Supreme Court did incite the attacks by copying the Disciplinary Board in a letter dated 10/2/20 attached to the 4/26/22 letter as an Exhibit hereto.

11. Since I filed the petition Justice Alito spoke in the news indicating the US Supreme Court may not be regulated. While I agree with Justice Alito, I think the better way to place a check on the other two branches is within the Supreme Court's power in cases and controversies. Art III.

12. To my horror on 9/4/22 Senator Whitehouse filed a petition, attached hereto and incorporated herein to discipline Justice Alito for opposing regulating the US Supreme Court

publicly. I am so scared the entire court may succumb to public fickle pressure to eliminate Constitutional rights by allowing regulation of a no longer impartial court. I believe this will expedite the scheme to eliminate the courts down the line that restrains entities from enslaving, oppressing, killing, stealing and destroying human life, liberty and health to sustain power, position, profit under the guise of sustaining the world.

13. Please grant me the opportunity to exercise the First Amendment right to petition on this issue in this case where I argue the Federal courts and federal judges may only be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits of 1. Cases and controversies and 2. Impeachment, without vitiating my claims and remedies by hastily responding to Whitehouse.

14. Whitehouse makes frivolous arguments concerning the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act which do not apply to the US Supreme Court.

15. I also find it quite hypocritical that Senator Whitehouse submitted his complaint to the press in many multiple forums while he seeks to punish a Justice for speaking out on a matter of public importance to the press. (*See, Bible Matthew 7:3-5*)

16. The Courts should not to be used by the Congressmen or presidents to gain partial political favor by such horse and pony shows under the guise of creating impartiality. It makes a mockery of the practice of law. As a Christian with unique standing based on justice in the courts as an exercise of my religious belief, I respectfully request you do not entertain such foolish arguments. *See*, the following Bible verses, *Amos 5:15* (Justice in the courts is a command); *See, Matthew 23:23* (Justice, and mercy are greater laws, preempting laws than laws relating to money or material things); *See, 2 Timothy 2:23* (“Don’t have anything to do with foolish and stupid arguments, because you know they produce quarrels.”)

17. The Judiciary is the only branch that gives us freedom by giving us democracy in our democratic republic. The courts protect individuals and individual exercise of liberty from being sacrificed to the conformity of the perceived majority through the vote.

18. The other two branches give us a Republic in our democratic republic and by nature are partial and politically biased requiring ethical standards which are not required to tame the impartial courts.

19. I should be afforded the opportunity to make such arguments in an actual case and controversy in order that my liberties, license and life is not sacrificed for the whims of the masses or marketed majority in two cases without Congressional overreach vitiating my rights.

20. Whitehouse's argument, "the bill would update judicial ethics laws to ensure the Supreme Court complies with ethical standards at least as demanding as in other branches," overlooks the purpose of restraining inherently partial branches as opposed to maintaining the impartial branch by maintaining its independence of the fickle fads of the masses.

21. Congress does not tell us what the law is as Whitehouse appears to seek to do in violation of separation of powers. "It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases, must of necessity expound and interpret that rule." *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 177, 2 L. Ed. 60 (1803).

22. Further, there may be no active alleged case as Whitehouse alleges as I seek this Court to rule in two additional cases that the US Supreme Court may not be disciplined outside the purview of the Constitution. Should Whitehouse seek to pass laws regulating this Court they should be rendered void as outside the scope of his and Congress's Constitutional power or jurisdiction.

This Court in *Ex Parte McCardle*, 74 U.S. 506 (1868) held:

“The appellate jurisdiction of this court is conferred by the Constitution, and not derived from acts of Congress; but is conferred "with such exceptions, and under such regulations, as Congress may make;" and, therefore, acts of Congress affirming such jurisdiction, have always been construed as excepting from it all cases not expressly described and provided for.”

23. “By words of the Constitution, equally plain, that judicial power is vested in one Supreme Court. This court, then, has its jurisdiction directly from the Constitution, not from Congress.” The jurisdiction being vested by the Constitution alone, Congress cannot abridge or take it away.” Id at 507.

24. It is not fair that Congress may be above the law, and separation of powers issues, and eliminate my right to petition the court in a case or controversy about the same issue where my remedy may be lost. *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 147 (1803) (“It is a settled and invariable principle, that every right, when withheld, must have a remedy, and every injury its proper redress”)

25. Please abstain from addressing Whitehouse’s complaint with a mere advisory opinion unless it is a decision not to prosecute. It may be used against you to discredit or impeach you down the line. Please give a real opinion on the issue in my case, even if you disagree with me.

26. Justice is not a matter of popularity or sustaining positions by the will of the people. There is no social contract. The Constitutional law limits both public and private behavior to prevent people and entities from enslaving, killing, destroying human life, health or liberty of others for material gain, convenience, productivity without a meeting of the minds. These limits on law protect us from slavery too.

27. Justice is a matter of truth, and often is unpopular. The Court is charged to safeguard even unpopular exercise of religious beliefs which do not conform to the acceptable beliefs of the majority, even mine. My religious beliefs contained in my speech in my petitions is the reason for the original disciplinary order and this reciprocal case, per DE ODC at Petition 7, not attached.

28. The reason why I became a lawyer is my religious faith in Jesus Christ. In *John* 7:24, Jesus commands, “Stop judging by mere appearances, but instead judge correctly.”

29. See the letter I attach hereto and incorporate herein regarding CLEs wherein I confronted the courts regarding the place of origin and wealth bias and partiality by Delaware Judges and asked a Judge to correct it.

30. I note retired Delaware Judges Slights and Smalls both demeaned me because I was born in PA. Judge Slights told me to go back to PA, and Judge Smalls called me a Philadelphia lawyer in my first appearance in court ever. I was so upset I made a bumper sticker when I ran for office about it which I attach hereto and incorporate herein with a number of other documents showing my life and property was threatened based on religious-political beliefs contained in speech but for Trump’s establishment of government-religion. Albeit no one made a police report when I told an officer that people talked about shooting me. The police report contained in the documents was mere threats from a neighbor who previously threatened to ram my car if I placed it in a different place on my own property. I was scared because he cursed me out before, and at a development meeting he threatened to use his gun should any of the development committees’ members come on his property without permission. (See, Exhibits showing belief of danger based on partnerships between... attached hereto and incorporated herein.)

31. The Intervening circumstances also relate to my arguments in my Petition pages 6-14 wherein I named one of two sections on those pages “Meghan Kelly believes the Courts are in danger, and believes upholding the Constitution and the Constitutional limits upon the checks upon the court **without waiver may preserve the rule of law from schemed demise to prevent the dissolution of the United States**” (emphasis intended)

32. I believe the courts are in danger. Not only has Senator Whithouse attacked the courts by feigning the need to regulate the courts to make them partial puppets since I submitted the petition, the news also has been publishing and marketing more criticism against Supreme Court justices to compel the court to give into temptations to regulate the courts which I believe will be used to eliminate the Court.

33. I am aware of different ways the US Supreme Court is being attacked by design to be supplanted to be eliminated. I incorporate the exhibits attached hereto to evidence non-attorney and non-judges are practicing law or judging in place of the judiciary branch. (See *Exhibits on an Agenda to Eliminate people in the law to eliminate the government that restrains entities from getting as much as they can for as little unrestrained from the just rule of law from oppressing, killing, stealing or destroying human life, liberty or health for the bottom line* (hereinafter referred to as “Agenda Exhibits”))

34. I am so scared the entire court may succumb to public fickle pressure to eliminate Constitutional rights by allowing regulation of a no longer impartial court. I believe this will expedite the scheme to eliminate the courts down the line that restrains entities from enslaving, oppressing, killing, stealing and destroying human life, liberty and health to sustain power, position, profit under the guise of sustaining the world.

35. This Court safeguards its position by actually striving to uphold the Constitutional application of the law to protect individuals and individual liberty from being sacrificed to serve what I believe is the mark of the beast spoken of in Revelation business greed through charities, not for profits, governments or businesses. See, *Matthew 6:24* (You can only serve one master God or money)

36. I seek to preserve my opportunity to petition this court regarding the same issues Senator Whitehouse seeks to commandeer the court about outside of the purview of a case or controversy or impeachment to stealthily set up the judges to judge where there is no jurisdiction at this time to address the issues or. What you opine in Whitehouse's alleged petition may be used against you to eliminate the impartial rule of law by eliminating the courts by foreseeable impeachments compelled by alleged violations of regulations that preempt and eliminate the impartial application of the Constitutional Rule of law. See US Amend V about self-incrimination. Please do not waive the 5th inadvertently.

37. Should this Court waive its members 5th Amendment rights against self-incrimination by regulations or a code of conduct Equal protections under the 5th Amendment component will be violated by this Court by the government compelled and required partiality towards mere regulators, regulations or codes of ethics to sustain justices' seats instead of the impartial application of the Constitutional rule of law that limits the government from bartering away citizens' Constitutional rights or lives to sustain judicial seats.

38. This Court would certainly be set up to fall by those who may lie to win at all costs should this Court give into temptation to self-regulate or otherwise agree to a code of ethics.

39. There is evidence of a plan of a slow overthrow of the rule of law to overthrow the government. I ran for office in 2018 because non-attorneys practiced law without a license, harmed the public and took advantage of esteemed colleagues including my esteemed deceased friend Dick Goll, Esq. Nonlawyers lawyering and non-judges judging is a problem. Please consider granting my opponent and other disciplinary counsel the power to restrain non-attorneys from lawyering. I believe preventing regulating this Court is part of the solution to a plan to eliminate it to eliminate the rule of law.

40. Lobbyist like Sebastain Thrun on the 2nd day of the 2018 World Government Sommet (“WGS”) talked about eliminating people judges and people lawyers. The Venus Project and the World Economic Forum (WEF) lobbyists also allude to elimination of people judges to rulers who control the resources including technology with no courts to restrain you. (See exhibits)

41. Upon information and belief there is not only a plan to eliminate fiat currency to the Private Central Banks digital currency, but this is a mere transition to far more sinister plans after 2050 to eliminate all currency to allow utter control by those who control the resources including technology without the just rule of law by people judges or love written on the hearts of men (since entities and collective associations have no heart to love by compelled collaboration driving out unconditional love by conditional conforming)from restraining them from enslaving, killing, stealing or destroying human life, health or liberty for profit, pleasure, power, position, aka business greed, aka the mark of the beast.

42. Without people judges and people staff, we are not free to seek to safeguard liberties, we are for sale slave cattle. Without you there is no freedom or Constitutional law restraining the government and the government backed private and foreign partners who should

be deemed government agents not protected under the contracts clause but limited by the Constitutional restraints on government agents to prevent enslavement of a no longer free people to alleged debt owed to government partners. There was no meeting of the minds by the people to contract their souls to what I see as death in hell by making mammon savior and God.

Matthew 6:24. The lie of social contracts and the new social contract the World Economic Forum preaches must not be used in the courts. Laws restrain the conduct of man whether they agree to it or not.

43. We are in great peril. Please help us by examining how you may preserve the courts under my unique arguments even if you disagree with me and destroy me. Please use my case to consider how to save yourselves to save the world please, not Senator Whitehouse's complaint please.

44. There are 4 different tactics to eliminate the courts.

1. Marketed peer pressure, which this court must not give into temptation to chill free speech even critical or at times wrong speech. Should this Court give into temptation to become defensive, such behavior will be used to attack not protect the court as indication of eliminating Constitutional freedoms, freedom of speech, and freedom to think of conscience. US Amend I.

2. Elimination of judges' authority to judge by allowing banks to judge in place of judges, above reproach by the courts.

3. Elimination of judges to judge as non-judge entities such as businesses, not for profits and charities above court correction, essentially above the law since the other two branches refuse and collude in allowing entities to be unrestrained by drafting and enforcing just decrees to prevent non-lawyers from lawyering and non-judges from judging.

4. Automation that will be used to implement a new global system where the will of those who control the resources and the technology will compel their dictates upon the people to eliminate their freedoms to exercise Constitutional liberties by the dictates of their conscience free choice by the compelled, conditional collective collaborative forced choice by those who control the resources, not the government.

45. The government backed partners are the problem, not the government. There will be more marketed attacks against the government.