

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

In the Matter of a Member of the Bar of the) Supreme Ct. No. 58, 2022
Supreme Court of the state of Delaware) Misc. 541,
Meghan M. Kelly, respondent.) Board Case No. 115327-B

Respondent’s reply to ODC’s Corrected Response to Respondent’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Board on Professional Responsibility

Respondent, Meghan Kelly, pro se this June 7, 2022, files this reply, contemporaneously, with *Respondent’s Meghan Kelly’s Motion to exceed the word limit in my Reply to ODC’s Corrected Response to Respondent’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Board on Professional Responsibility*, incorporated herein in its entirety by this reference, and *Respondent’s Meghan Kelly’s Motion to be excused from the notary and affirming requirements in Delaware Court pleadings*, incorporated herein in its entirety by this reference.

I Introductory Arguments

The ODC’s factual characterizations, legal arguments by Kathleen Vavala (“KV” or “Kathleen”), and the Office of Disciplinary Counsel (“ODC”) asserted below, and in the *ODC’s Corrected Response to Respondent’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation (“KV”) of the Board on Professional Responsibility* (“Board”), and the Board’s findings, in this fixed, unfair partial proceeding brought in conspiracy by the Delaware Supreme Court, Chancery Court agents, ODC and Board, (collectively, and individually “State”) to conceal Court agents’

unconstitutional interference with the “due process” adjudication of *Kelly v Trump*, and thereby in interference with my personal-religious-political-speech; personal-religious-beliefs; personal-religious-political-exercise; and personal-religious-political-petitions has punished me and violated by constitutional protections by selective disparate treatment against me, for the exercise of fundamental rights, as a party of one, as an indigent individual with religious-political beliefs in God as savior and the state as civil authority curbed by the first amendment from “establishing religion.”

The State’s findings must be rejected as a matter of law as an abuse of discretion, clearly erroneous findings of fact, an errant conclusion of law, and an improper application of law to facts.

The hearings and actions taken against my professional license in retaliation for my exercise of Constitutional rights are in violation of the First Amendment, the Procedural and Substantive Due Process Clause and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. They must be rejected as by “rule of law” rather than personal vendetta for my personal-religious-political speech contained in the petitions. (US Amend I, XIV)

The State denied me of substantive and procedural due process rights in this disciplinary proceeding.¹ The record shows clear and convincing evidence that the proceedings were brought, with religious-political animus, in retaliation against me for filing *Kelly v Trump* and for petitioning the court regarding bar dues to safeguard my liberties.²

The state abused its discretion by 1. Vindictive prosecution, which constitutes a violation of due process, and by Selective prosecution, which constitutes a denial of equal protection.

I have a right to petition the courts when I believe a transgression has been committed against me by the establishment of government religion by President Trump.

I uphold my oath by requesting government agents, judges, presidents and members of congress to adhere to rule of law by allowing me to exercise my Constitutional rights. The steps taken to orchestrate this proceeding circumvent due process protections and, thereby, manifest selective; targeted; unjust persecution.

¹ Objxn

² Id.

I include, restate and incorporate by this reference my Objections to the Report, the exhibits referred therein, and the Memorandum of Law (“MOL,” at DI 31), and all arguments and points made in each and every one of these documents, filed on May 21, 2021, are restated in this reply. DI. 26-50 (“Objxn” and “-” or “-Ex-” for specific exhibits therein).

I incorporate herein in its entirety, by this reference *Respondent’s Motion for a free copy of the record of the Board and Before the Delaware Supreme Court* [(hereinafter also referred to as, “Court”)], *which is required for Appeal*, filed on May 10, 2022. D.I. 55-56.

I incorporate herein in its entirety by this reference *Respondent’s Motion for an extension of Time under Rule 15(b)(i) and (iii)*, filed on May 16, 2022. DI 62-72.

II. Background: The Court made insidious attacks, through its arms and agents in retaliation for my exercise of fundamental rights in petitioning the Court in *Kelly v Trump*, to interfere with, and affect the outcome, and sought to conceal such attacks by eliminating witnesses participating in the attacks, eliminating pleadings, and eliminating me by defaming my character, as not credible, disabled.

The State brought this petition against me to conceal state misconduct, and to retaliate against me for the exercise of Constitutionally protected activity based on disdain towards me for my religious-political-beliefs, poverty, and to conceal Court agents' misconduct.³

I filed a RFRA lawsuit against President Trump seeking to dissolve the establishment of government-religion to alleviate a substantial burden upon my free exercise of religious beliefs, without government incited persecution as a Christian, Catholic, Democrat, living in Trump territory, in Sussex County, Delaware.⁴

I do not believe my former law firm would have hired me back if I sued the popular president. So, I put off seeking to rejoin my former real estate settlement law firm, in order to safeguard my free exercise of religious beliefs without government incited private economic, social or physical persecution.⁵

Since, I was not working for pay, I petitioned the Delaware Supreme Court for relief from attorney dues for all lawyers facing economic hardship or unemployed during the global pandemic.⁶ My request was not granted. Id.

³ (ObjxA-H-2, N, including internal exhibits, P, including internal exhibits, K-including internal exhibits, DI 62-72); MOL.

⁴ . (Objxn-A, DI 62-72, Ex-C)

⁵ (DI 62-72, Internal-Exhibit C, which includes pleadings in Kelly v Trump, Objxn-E)

⁶ (Objxn-E-F, K-internal exhibits 20-24)

I had planned on rejoining my former law firm, after *Kelly v Trump* was complete. However, I decided to hold off until the conclusion of the disciplinary proceeding granting me my active law license. I halted communications with my potential employer around August of 2021. I believe I emailed the last communication with my potential employer to Disciplinary Counsel Patricia Swartz, in response to her questions on the date of the hearing.

The State seeks to compel me into permanent poverty by demeaning my reputation as disabled by wrongly bringing this disciplinary proceeding against me for my religious-political speech contained in my petitions.

Nothing was normal during *Kelly v Trump*. Court staff appeared to seek to sabotage my case, based on my political-religious beliefs and/or indigency, by 1. misleading me to almost miss my deadline to appeal, 2. Appearing to disparage me based on religious-political beliefs or/and poverty, 3. instructing me to write off the Attorney General's address, which impeded service, and 4. By writing on a praecipe, causing confusion, and needless pleadings.⁷

To worsen matters, the Delaware Supreme Court appeared to cause its arms to attack me to get me to forgo my lawsuit.⁸ DE-Lapp's letter indicated the relief requested from the DE Supreme Court, relating to bar dues, as the source of its

⁷ (Objxn-B-D, K-internal-exhibits-2-7, 27-29, DI 62-72.

⁸ DI 62-72, Objxn-E-G, K-internal Ex-20-26-29.

interference with my law suit. Id. (**Exhibit A, B, C**) The Clerk of Court confirmed the entire court reviewed my petitions relating to attorney dues, evidencing the entire Court incited the interference in *Kelly v Trump*.

Further, Sussex Court of Common Pleas Judge Kenneth S. Clark, interrogated me at the arms of the court's request in public at BJ's, located in Millsboro. He demanded I come to his chambers for filing *Kelly v Trump* to obstruct, impede or cause me to forgo my lawsuit. Id.

Other parties are not threatened by Court agents wearing the cloak of government authority to obstruct, impede or cause claimants to forgo cases whose religious-political beliefs they disagree with. Minorities like myself, whose religious-political beliefs do not conform to the mainstream are still afforded Constitutional protections for exercise of fundamental rights relating to their diverse, tightly held religious-political beliefs, including speech defending such rights in petitions.⁹

I petitioned the Delaware Supreme Court concerning the disparate treatment. The Delaware supreme Court ruled my case was frivolous, and indicated my petitions relating to disparate treatment need not be addressed.

⁹ *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644

The Court's disagreement with my religious beliefs is an impermissible reason to deem me disabled. "Courts have no business addressing whether sincerely held religious beliefs asserted in a RFRA case, [including mine] are reasonable." *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 682. The government may not determine what is and what is not an acceptable religious belief.¹⁰ My God is the arbiter of my life, regarding religious beliefs, not the government, even when the government deems my religious beliefs wrong or a disability.

The Courts misguided conclusion that my case is frivolous is not a permissible reason to deem me disabled. Other lawyers have their cases and their clients' cases kicked out as frivolous and they are not disciplined or deemed a danger to society. My religious-political beliefs is the ODC's admitted reason for their claim for disability and for disciplining me. (**Exhibits E, F**)

On August 23, 2021, the ODC sent me a threatening letter by email, interfering with my active case, but for my petitions, before I appealed the Delaware Supreme Court's decision to the United States Supreme Court, admitting my Delaware Supreme Court and Chancery Court religious-political pleadings, as

¹⁰ *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872, 887, 110 S. Ct. 1595, 108 L. Ed. 2d 876 (1990). ("the First Amendment forbids civil courts from" interpreting "particular church doctrines" and determining "the importance of those doctrines to the religion.")

the reason for their attack.¹¹ (**Exhibit E**). The ODC's attack was "unconstitutional on its face and as applied." *Hill v. City of Scranton*, 411 F.3d 118, 122 (3d Cir. 2005). Should they have any legitimate concerns, which the record shows none, the ODC should not have interfered with my First Amendment exercise of petitioning the courts, to affect the outcome or pressure me to forgo the case, in violation of US Amend I and XIV. *Id.* at 125-126.

On October 25, 2021, I filed a lawsuit to enjoin the ODC for retaliating against me for exercising fundamental rights, and for damages for emotional relief.¹² On November 1, 2021 the US Supreme Court denied my writ of certiorari.¹³

On November 4, 2021, Delaware Supreme Court sealed my Delaware Supreme Court petitions in *Kelly v Trump* relating to disparate treatment, without notice and an opportunity for me, a party to be heard, and without valid cause.¹⁴

I did not have access to the sealed documents, through public record, nor did the ODC, the public, or the federal courts, which prejudiced me to the benefit of the State.¹⁵ Third Circuit Judge Bright's, concurring in part and dissenting in part

¹¹ Objxn-K-Internal-Ex-5-7.

¹² Objxn-H

¹³ Objn-K-Ex-1.

¹⁴ (DI 62-72)

¹⁵ (*N. Jersey Media Grp. Inc. v. United States*, 836 F.3d 421, 434 (3d Cir. 2016), "We have previously recognized a right of access to judicial proceedings and judicial records, and this right

in *U.S. v. Wecht*, 484 F.3d 194, 221, 226 (3d Cir. 2007) indicated sealing documents without notice or opportunity for a party to be heard without valid reason was enough to remove a judge from a case.

In my case the Delaware Supreme Court, sua sponte, sealed documents to assist the ODC's prosecution of me by concealing relevant material to my defense, evidencing the entire court's apparent bias against me and the Court's partiality to the state.

“When a court considers the imposition of a seal, it must make particularized findings on the record, giving notice on the docket of such consideration and rejecting alternatives to closure.” *U.S. v. Wecht*, 484 F.3d 194, 224 (3d Cir. 2007); See *United States v. Criden*, 675 F.2d 550, 560 (3d Cir.1982).

In my case, the Delaware Supreme Court did not make any such findings, and clearly sealed the four docket items in *Kelly v Trump*, Delaware Supreme Court No 119, 2021, DI 16, 21, 40, 41, to benefit the government to my detriment, showing clear prejudice against me, in violation of the procedural and substantive

of access is beyond dispute.” *Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg*, 23 F.3d 772, 780-81 (3d Cir. 1994) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 98 S.Ct. 1306, 55 L.Ed.2d 570 (1978) (recognizing that, in the context of criminal proceedings, the press has a historically-based, common law right of access to judicial records and documents). That right is rooted in common law and predates the Constitution. *Bank of Am. Nat'l Tr. & Sav. Ass'n v. Hotel Rittenhouse Assocs.*, 800 F.2d 339, 343 (3d Cir. 1986).

due process clause applicable to the state pursuant to the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

Nothing was normal in *Kelly v Trump*. The State and ODC attacked and retaliated against me for my religious-political speech contained in my petitions, reflecting my religious-political beliefs.¹⁶ The State has a history of ignoring my religious-political petitions, disparately treating me based on religious view point.

17

This is not the first time, the State through its arm has retaliated against me for its own lawless lusts, convenience, at the exchange of sacrificing Constitutional liberties, including the right to petition. Objxn-D, H, at paragraphs 277-299. I lost more than two million dollars in expected income, but for, the retaliation by the arms of the Court, for petitioning the State through its arms or the Court regarding concerns while taking the Delaware Bar. *Id.*

III. The Board and Court's violations of substantive and Procedural Due Process in Disciplinary Matter eliminate subject matter jurisdiction and make their judgments void as a matter of law

¹⁶ . Objxn-Ex B-H2, K

¹⁷ MOL Objxn-Ex-H, Objxn-Ex-N-internal-exhibits 1, 2to Exhibit 6, 3 to exhibit 6, 4 to exhibit 6, 5 to exhibit 6, 6 to exhibit 6, 8 to exhibit 6, Exhibit 7-9.

Nothing was normal in my disciplinary case either. I was not treated like other lawyers or other plaintiffs. I was disparately treated based on my poverty, and personal-religious-political beliefs, as a party of one, and was selectively punished for exercise of Constitutional liberties.¹⁸

The State in bad faith prevented and obstructed discovery, to conceal witnesses were removed from the Chancery Court to impede their testimony from aiding in my defense, and to conceal relevant records were sealed by the Court to favor the ODC.¹⁹ The United States Supreme Court held, "the suppression by the prosecution of evidence favorable to an accused upon request violates due process where the evidence is material either to guilt or to punishment." *Moran v. Burbine*, 475 U.S. 412, 466 (1986). Concealing the fact two witnesses were removed from the Chancery Court to prevent their favorable testimony in my defense, and government concealing of petitions favorable to my defense, violates my Due Process rights to a fair proceeding, by bias towards the State.

The Board's findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence and should not be adopted. The record shows substantial evidence the Board was objectively biased towards the ODC, not fair, and prejudiced against me. The

¹⁸ Objxn-K- 8-9, FF, GG, D.I. 55-56.

¹⁹ *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963); *United States v. Bagley*, 473 U.S. 667 (1985); *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97 (1976); *Moore v. Illinois*, 408 U.S. 786 (1972)." *Moran v. Burbine*, 475 U.S. 412, 467 n.59 (1986)

Board denied me of basic Equal protection, procedural and substantive due process rights afforded to similarly situated respondents based on disdain for my religious-political-exercise of fundamental rights and poverty. US Amend I and XIV. I was denied an opportunity to be heard, to prepare and present my case, denied adequate time to perform discovery, denied adequate notice which I at no time waived.²⁰

The Board gave me 18 days, when the DLRDP Rule 9(d)(3) required, they provide me with notice “at least 20 days in advance of the hearing date,” which prejudiced me. *Id.* The Board denied me of an opportunity to subpoena and cross examine witnesses with first-hand knowledge, to conceal the fact the State eliminated two potential witnesses from the court. *Id.*

The state rushed the proceeding and intentionally caused foreseeable emotional distress, in hopes to make me physically ill to use it against me, like heartless monsters. *Id.*

I at no time sat on my rights, but fought for my life and liberty to worship God through the practice of law, and as a citizen without government persecution but for my exercise of fundamental rights. *Id.*

The state denied my 1st and 6th Amendment rights, applicable to the state via the 14th Amendment, to represent myself at the inception, causing me to file

²⁰ Objxn, Ex-M-P-Q-R-R-1-S-T-U-U2-V-W-X-AA-BB-CC-DD-EE-FF-GG-HH, DI 55-56

pleadings.²¹ The Board ignored, and did not address my motions objecting to insufficient notice, by its failure to provide at least 20 days-notice of the hearing, as required by the rules of Disciplinary procedure, Rule 9, which prejudiced my case, motivated by their animosity towards my religious-political beliefs and exercise. Objxn-Ex-M,N, W. I filed objections to the appointment of Counsel, moved for opportunity to perform discovery and postpone the hearing until fair reasonable due process was granted in a motion dated, December 18, 2022. That was ignored. Objxn-Ex-N-M-N-O-P. On December 29, 2021, I filed a letter with the Court requesting relief since the hearing was two weeks away, and I had not even been granted 6th Amendment permission to represent myself to perform discovery or prepare, at the time. Objxn-Ex-P.

It was not until December 30, 2022, the Court granted me the right to self-represent, less than 13 full days before the hearing, with no opportunity to prepare my defense of religious-political petitions, speech, association, beliefs against state persecution, but for my belief in Jesus. Ex-P-2.

I was so physically and emotionally exhausted that I fell ill with the shingles. After the reprieve, the small battle of self-representation won, I noticed

²¹ Objxn-Ex-N. Mark 13:11 “Whenever you are arrested and brought to trial, do not prepare beforehand about what to say. Just say whatever is given you at the time, for it is not you speaking, but the Holy Spirit.”

my rash, pain, lethargy and weakness. Yet, I filed a motion the next day, that was ignored by the Board dated December 31, 2021, to prevent medical and mental examinations, dated December 31, 2021, Ex-Q, and another one dated on or about January 31, 2022, incorporated herein, Ex-X. Physical and mental examinations are against my religious beliefs, and the Court must not maliciously violate my religious beliefs in bad faith.

I followed up with the Board numerous times on the status of my motion to perform discovery, objection to insufficient notice, and postpone the hearing so as not to prejudice me, and at no time sat on my rights. Ex-K-L-M-N-O-P-Q-R-R-1,R-2-S-T-U-U2-V-W-X. I filed additional motions to postpone the hearing so as not to deny me a fair reasonable opportunity to prepare and present my case, perform discovery, cross examine witnesses. Id. I was denied basic due process rights, and substantive due process rights, based on my religious-political exercise of fundamental rights, in violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendment, motivated by the state's disdain towards my personal religious-political beliefs, exercise, speech and petitions demonstrating my faith in Jesus. Id.

I appealed to the Delaware Supreme Court and was denied procedural and substantive due process rights, based on the fact the Court appeared to render a verdict before granting me an opportunity to be heard, motivated by disdain to discriminate me based on my religious beliefs by disparate treatment, unusual to

those of other claimants before the court. Ex-R, Ex-R-1, Ex-S, Ex-T, Ex-U, Ex-U-2, Ex-V.

The State ignored and denied me an opportunity to be heard on various motions and appeals, including but not limited to pleadings dated December 18, 2021, December 31, 2022, January 13, 2022, January 15, 2022, objecting to due process violations, moving to postpone the hearing, to call witnesses, and objecting to the insufficient notice sent out notice 18 days prior to the scheduled hearing. Ex-P-Q-R-R-2-S-T-U-U-2-V-W. I had no time to subpoena witnesses, or even to discover the fact the state eliminated witnesses through terminating their employment in the Chancery Court, and I moved the Board and the Court to grant me time, specifically mentioning Arline Simmons as witness. I at no time waived my insufficient notice argument.

Kathleen, did not participate in the proceeding until after the hearing took place. Her recital of the DRPC rules to mislead the court is in vain. I was not afforded the protections of the rules, and at no times waived my Constitutional rights to a fair proceeding. The voluminous exhibits the Board ignored, deeming them as irrelevant, are relevant to show in fact the Board denied me an opportunity to be heard on the assertions and pleas contained therein, in defense of my exercise of fundamental rights. The exhibits show I did not sit on my rights or waive them.

Contrary to Kathleen's assertion, having only been granted the right to represent myself 13 days before the hearing date, I was not afforded with ample time to provide a list of witnesses to call 10 days in advance of the hearing, as required under DLRDC (12)(h) as I faced other complications including but not limited to the lack of a phone, computer malfunctioning, the shingles, and vulture attacks. See D.I. 55-56. I did not even discover Arline Simmons, a witness I motioned to call, could not be served at the Chancery Court until after the hearing. Objxn-Ex-U. I had insufficient time to effectuate discovery, as I fought to represent myself so as not to violate my religious beliefs. The Board ignored and indirectly denied my requests for time for an opportunity, while rendering an informal, unappealable order in email form. Obxn-M-U2.

The hearing was postponed for 8 days, for a reason I did not assert, my illness, which did not afford me enough time to prepare, research, perform discovery, fully recover, or to subpoena witnesses to notice opposing counsel 10 days in advance. DLRDP (12)(h). Objxn-Ex-R-1. The Board ignored and rendered no orders on other motions, and rendered an E-mail determination, to obstruct formal appeal on January 18, 2022, in the fixed proceeding against me. Objxn-Ex-U-2.

I attempted to require the Board cancel the hearing, in advance, to prevent incurring costs as I was still not feeling well. I was so sick and exhausted and

emailed the Board to cancel the hearing. I had no time to prepare, could not sleep, and truly felt sick, but was concerned the State may think I had the plague, Covid-19. Objxn-Ex-EE. I attended the hearing without being afforded an opportunity to prepare, and present my case, call witnesses, perform discovery or even to be human to care for my recovery because I did not want to be held in contempt. I made a special appearance preserving my objections to improper notice, lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to the Delaware Supreme Court's apparent participation in inciting the case, and to object on substantive and procedural Due process and Equal Protections grounds for the disparate treatment against me during the proceeding, and in inciting the proceeding. Objxn.-MOL.

The State knew I was exhausted, recovering from the shingles, lacking of sleep, without being afforded a fair opportunity to prepare and present my case. They did not care about me, or my personal health or my lack of a fair opportunity to present my case for my sake. They appeared to hope I would get sick to use it against me.

I attended the hearing by phone since I had no working computer. Objxn-Ex-GG, D.I. 55-56. Upon receipt of the transcript, I objected, and I object again as the transcript does not accurately reflect my testimony. The reporter placed words that I did not say in my mouth. Objxn-Ex-AA, BB, CC. It appeared the state set me

up. I filed corrections, which in no way make the transcript completely accurate.

Id.

Kathleen, did not participate in this action until after the hearing. She relies on the inaccurate transcript I object to, and demeans me for my lack of a working computer and poverty, as evidence of disability. I am so poor I did not have a phone until sometime in January 2022. My computer did not work at the time of the hearing, and my backup computer also malfunctioned. My confusion as to why the computer was not working was absolutely genuine, and not evidence of a disability.

Kathleen's bad faith, or at best ignorant, attacks display her cold heartless indifference towards the substantial burden poverty has placed upon my defense of exercise of fundamental rights in this case.²² "[A]t all stages of the proceedings the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses protect [indigent persons] from invidious discriminations" *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 370 (1996) "Because this case implicates the [Constitutionally protected] right of access to the courts," and other fundamental rights, the government's disparate treatment towards me, based on poverty, is still unconstitutional under a strict scrutiny basis test. Citing, *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004).²³

²² *Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie*, 239 F.3d 307, 317 (3d Cir. 2001);

²³ *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 370 (1996); *Murray v. Giarratano*, 492 U.S. 1, 18 (1989)

The Record shows the Court denied me an opportunity to be heard, until it was too late, until violations of my First Amendment rights already occurred. Objxn-Ex-R2, V. The Delaware Supreme Court also indicated it made a determination on my defenses before affording me an opportunity to be heard by deeming my claims for an opportunity to prepare and present a case, perform discovery and call witnesses, as frivolous before their assertion, preventing a fair and impartial opportunity to be heard at the hearing, preventing discovery, colluding with the state in the fixed proceeding against me. Objxn-Ex-V It is notable that both the Board and the court waited until two or three days prior to the hearing to address any matter while ignoring motions, leaving them unanswered.

The proceeding must be dismissed as the Board and the Court both violated my substantive and procedural due process rights in the Board proceeding in bad faith, with objective partiality towards the government, and prejudice against me.

The Third Circuit held, "A judgment may also be void if a court "acted in a manner inconsistent with due process of law."²⁴

IV The Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction for apparently inciting the prosecution, and concealing beneficial evidence in bad faith to prejudice me with partiality to the government to fix the proceeding against

²⁴ *Constr. Drilling, Inc. V. Chusid*, No. 03-3786, 2005 WL 1111760, at *3 (3d Cir. May 11, 2005). See Respondent's Exhibits to the Hearing ("R-Ex") Exhibits 35, 37 Part 2, 42, R 44

**me in violation of the Procedural and Substantive Due Process Clause
pursuant to the State under the First and Fourteenth Amendments**

The record shows the Delaware Supreme Court through its agents participated in inciting the proceedings against me, acting as witness, prosecutor and judge, and by concealing evidence by 1. inciting the Court's arms to attack me in *Kelly v Trump*, and the present disciplinary proceeding, 2. collaborating with the Chancery Court and directing Delaware Supreme Court employee Mrs. Robinson to sign off on the departure information of one or two of the former Chancery Court staff workers with information material to my state case, who appeared to lose their jobs, while preventing my opportunity to perform discovery or subpoena the two concealed witnesses, and 3, by eliminating some of the petitions for which the Defendants allege to bring the State action against me, placing them under seal, without notice to me a party, and without lawful reason, such as sensitive information relating to social security or bank accounts, to cover up the Court's and State's lawless acts, with knowledge these petitions are relevant to my defense and the federal proceeding.

Eliminating truth or evidence guarantees injustice. It is my religious belief courts exists to correct and guide those misguided by business greed, profit, position, and power, who sacrifice the lives, health and liberty of others for material gain, essentially selling souls to gain the world, only to lose their own

eternal soul by the sin against the holy spirit, hardness of hearts from caring to think, to know, to love others unless it affects them.

Eliminating evidence hides the truth, or diverse views, allowing only the government-backed private partners' and public views to be protected under the Constitution.

The State seek to eliminate me, just as they cover up wrong doing by eliminating witnesses, forcing them to lose their jobs, under the deception of looking after them, only to look after the mere appearance of justice, not actual justice, and by concealing and sealing my pleadings. The Delaware Supreme Court justices do not care to uphold the fundamental rights of those in my class of one, of a person with unique religious-political beliefs which do not conform to the majority's, the individuals within the ODC and/or the judges on the Delaware Supreme Court.

Eliminating people who petition the Court, as "mentally disabled" for thinking the Court would care to help someone who is poor, or who believes in Jesus Christ or diverse political views in that I seek to care for humanity not control them through money, is disparate treatment based on protected view point, in violation of the Equal Protections Clause applicable to the State pursuant to the First and Fourteenth Amendment. US Amend I, and XIV.

The Delaware Supreme Court incited the State's petition, and concealed my religious-political petitions in bad faith with partiality towards the ODC. Joann and the Clerk of Court at the Delaware Supreme Court admitted that the Court sealed two motions, and Exhibits A-4, and A-5, in *Kelly v Trump*, relating to the Court and its agents' disparate treatment towards me. None of the sealed documents contained sensitive information.²⁵ **(Exhibits F, G)** This was not for my protection or the protection of the parties, but was to cover up Court misconduct, just as the state seeks to eliminate me to conceal government misconduct by labeling me disabled, disparaging my reputation, to deem me not credible.²⁶

The Delaware Supreme Court participated in eliminating potential material witnesses by having an agent sign off on the departure forms for two Chancery Court employees, Arline Simmons and Katrina Kruger. The Court colluded to conceal two people with first hand-knowledge of the facts of this case, despite my motion to subpoena one.²⁷

I want the court to stop eliminating documents and witnesses, and do not want the court to eliminate the clerk who raised her voice at me on June 2, 2022, while confirming there was no motion to seal petitions. The court staff who yelled

²⁵ DI 62-72

²⁶ . Objxn-K-Ex-31 See letters of recommendation on my behalf concerning my reputation.

²⁷ Objxn-Ex-T-U-U-2-V.

at me in the Chancery Court are gone, no longer employed with the Court, and that breaks my heart.

Covering up mistakes by eliminating those who make them is not correction but concealment, allowing it to be ignored not lovingly corrected. The State seeks to eliminate me to conceal its own wrongs instead of learning from them.²⁸

The State's elimination of four sealed and concealed docket items and the elimination of two material witnesses from availability through process by service to the Chancery Court is relevant to my defense of retaliation, discriminatory motive, discriminatory purpose, with a discriminatory outcome made to chill my religious-political speech by demeaning my character as disabled, and threatening my bar licensure's status for exercising political-religious speech, contained in petitions, or outside the petitions, which the government disagrees with, based on religious-political viewpoint.

The Court must dismiss the Petition and Board's recommendation because of its own unclean hands, to uphold actual justice, not the mere marketing and appearance of an illusion in this case. Justice is not a business. The exercise of Constitution liberties is not for sale. Otherwise only the wealthy, well connected, and powerful have something to exchange. Leaving the poor, including me, not

²⁸ Objxn-MOL

free, but for sale, having only our own soul to sell in exchange by indebtedness, which violates my religious beliefs, to exercise what are not liberties, freedom of conscience, belief, speech, association, exercise and petition.

V. The Delaware Supreme Court lacks subject Matter Jurisdiction for procedural and substantive due process violations in causing the petition and for maliciously violating my due process rights during the Board proceeding.

The Delaware Supreme Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction by its 1st and 14th Amendment substantive and procedural Due Process violations based on its prejudicial treatment in inciting the petition, and disparate treatment during the proceeding.

The Court disregarded my religious beliefs against appointment of counsel, requiring I file multiple pleadings to fight against government compelled violations against my religious beliefs.²⁹ The Court disregarded my motion concerning the ODC's fraud, committed in bad faith by lying, seeking to commit fraud, concerning receipt of my answers.³⁰ The Record shows the Court denied me an opportunity to be heard, until it was too late, until violations of my First

²⁹ Objx-Ex-I-P-2

³⁰ Objxn-Ex-L

Amendment rights already occurred.³¹ The Delaware Supreme Court also indicated it made a determination on my defenses before affording me an opportunity to be heard by deeming my claims for an opportunity to prepare and present a case, perform discovery and call witnesses, as frivolous before their assertion, preventing a fair and impartial opportunity to be heard at the hearing, preventing discovery, colluding with the state in the fixed proceeding against me. It is notable that both the Board and the court waited until two days prior to the hearing to address any matter while ignoring motions, leaving them unanswered.

VI. The State abused its discretion by Vindictive prosecution

The record shows no legitimate objective reasons to bring the petition against me, or to deem me disabled or a danger to the public as an attorney with an active license to practice law. The State brought the petition against me with animus, to cover up state lawless acts, and to punish me for my religious-political speech and beliefs contained in my petitions.

The record does not support I am suffering from a physical or mental condition adversely affecting my ability to represent others in the practice law. I am reasonably and foreseeably emotionally distressed by the State's unconstitutional application under the color of the DLRDP, as applied to me for

³¹ Objxn-Ex-R, R-1, R-2, S,

my exercise of religious-political speech, petitions, exercise, association and beliefs.³²

The state discriminates against me by seeking to take away my active license to practice law based on disdain for my personal-religious-political petitions reflecting my beliefs, speech, association and exercise, essentially persecuting me for all these fundamental rights in violation of my substantive and procedural Due Process rights. The ODC admits it brings this petition based on my religious-political petitions per its August 23, 2021 letter and religious beliefs it finds illogical, per the petition at number 7, is “evidence of the prosecutor's retaliatory motive to prove actual vindictiveness.” (Exhibit D and E, attached hereto).³³

The District Court held in *U.S. v. Roberts*, 280 F. Supp. 2d 325, 30-31 (D. Del. 2003)

The Due Process Clause... "protects a person from being punished for exercising a protected statutory or constitutional right." *United States v. Goodwin*, 457 U.S. at 372. The Supreme Court has held that "while an individual certainly may be penalized for violating the law, he just as certainly may not be punished for exercising a protected statutory or constitutional right." *Goodwin*, 457 U.S. at 372; *Blackledge v. Perry*, 417 U.S. 21, 28-9 (1974). To punish a defendant because he has done what the

³² *State v. Holloway*, 460 A.2d 976, 978 (Del. Super. Ct. 1983) “Though the law itself be fair on its face and impartial in appearance, yet, if it is applied and administered by public authority with an evil eye and an unequal hand, so as practically to make unjust and illegal discriminations between persons in similar circumstances, material to their rights, the denial of equal justice is still within the prohibition of the constitution.”

³³ Citing, *U.S. v. Reynolds*, 374 F. App'x 356, 361 (3d Cir. 2010), Objxn-Ex-P-internal-Exhibit-A, Ex-P-Internal-Exhibit-A-part 2, Ex-H.

law permits is a due process violation. *Bordenkircher v. Hayes*, 434 U.S. at 363; *United States v. Andrews*, 633 F.2d 449, 457 (6th Cir. 1980); *States v. Paramo*, 998 F.2d 1212, 1220 (3d Cir. 1993).

The government did not meet its burden by providing, objective legitimate reasons for its conduct. The government's justification is pretextual. Actual vindictiveness has occurred in my case. Id

The Third Circuit held, “it is an elementary violation of due process for a prosecutor to engage in conduct detrimental to a ... defendant for the vindictive purpose of penalizing the defendant for exercising his constitutional right to a trial,” as I exercised in *Kelly v Trump*. *U.S. v. Paramo*, 998 F.2d 1212, 1219 (3d Cir. 1993).

The Court must presume vindictive prosecution that deprived me of due process in this case, requiring dismissal of the petition against me, since ODC admitted it prosecutes me in retaliation for my personal-religious petitions and personal-religious beliefs. (**Exhibits E, F**)³⁴

The Third Circuit in *U.S. v. Paramo*, 998 F.2d 1212, 1220 (3d Cir. 1993), held, “The presumption of vindictiveness is a prophylactic rule designed to protect a defendant's due process rights where a danger exists that the government might

³⁴ *United States v. London*, No. 15-1206, at *5 (3d Cir. Aug. 31, 2018); *United States v. Stafford*, No. 19-3833, at *14 (3d Cir. Dec. 20, 2021); *U.S. v. Reynolds*, 374 F. App'x 356, 361 (3d Cir. 2010) “Prosecutorial vindictiveness may be found when the government penalizes a defendant for invoking legally protected rights.”); *United States v. Hollywood Motor Car Co.*, 458 U.S. 263, 273-74 (1982).

retaliate against him for exercising a legal right.” See *Bordenkircher*, 434 U.S. at 363, 98 S.Ct. at 667-68; *United States v. Esposito*, 968 F.2d 300, 303 (3d Cir. 1992)

The District Court in *United States v. Figueroa*, Criminal No. 14-00672 (SRC), at *16 (D.N.J. Apr. 26, 2021) cited the Third Circuit while holding,

“A presumption of vindictiveness can only be adopted "in cases in which a reasonable likelihood of vindictiveness exists[,] that is when "the situation presents a reasonable likelihood of a danger that the State might be retaliating against the accused for lawfully exercising a right." *United States v. Esposito*, 968 F.2d 300, 303 (3d Cir. 1992).

Here, the ODC admits to be retaliating against me for lawfully exercising my rights, by my religious beliefs, reflected in my speech, contained in my petitions, in violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendment, with no other objective reasonable evidence on the record to sustain a judgment of disability, evidencing actual animus to rebut its animus. **Exhibits A, B**; *United States v. Esposito*, 968 F.2d 300, 303 (3d Cir. 1992); *U.S. v. Korey*, 614 F. Supp. 2d 573, 582 (W.D. Pa. 2009).

“Vindictive prosecutions in response to a defendant's exercise of protected statutory and constitutional rights are...prohibited.” *Anderson v. Metzger*, Civil Action No. 16-174-CFC, at *17 (D. Del. Dec. 14, 2018); See *United States v. Goodwin*, 457 U.S. 368, 372 (1982).³⁵

³⁵ *U.S. v. West*, 312 F. Supp. 2d 605, 617-18 (D. Del. 2004); Citing, *United States v. Schoolcraft*, 879 F.2d 64, 67 (3d Cir. 1989).

Kathleen's vain arguments by repeating DLRDP Rules that applied to other proceedings, but not mine, or pointing to the Board's bad faith conclusions based on its own partial participation in the fixed proceeding against me where the Board denied me equal protection and substantive and procedural due process rights fails as a matter of clear error of law. US Amend I, XIV.

Kathleen claims "the religious provisions of the US and Delaware Constitutions do not prohibit the Court acting through the Board, from proceeding with disability action against [me] based upon [my alleged] incapacity to practice law." KV-Pg-32 The US Constitution certainly does prohibit this disability proceeding, in my case. Since the state claims my religious-political petitions, displaying religious-exercise, religious-speech, religious-association and religious-beliefs is the insidious reason for a claim of disability. The Court through its arm, the Board, does not have subject matter jurisdiction to regulate my exercise of fundamental rights, including the right to bring personal-religious-political petitions, when the Court disagrees with my religious-political beliefs under the sham of respondent's practice of law. This Court may not regulate religious speech and religious beliefs under the shield of regulating business, the profession. The Courts must not sell fundamental rights, in exchange for professional licenses, making those who work for money less free by government backed private

partners, sacrificing individual liberties, the free exercise of religious belief in Jesus, in exchange for the right to buy and sell.

Kathleen's wrongly asserts the Court has the authority to order the examination of my person, in violation of my religious beliefs and exercise, while the State ignored my motions relating to religious objections to health examinations and mental health examinations. Objxn-K, paragraphs Obxn-Q

There is no legitimate interest or compelling interest somehow more important than my exercise of fundamental liberties, narrowly tailored to uphold such interests in this partial proceeding to compel me to violate my religious beliefs and exercise by such examinations. Mental and physical examinations are against my religious beliefs and exercise. Id.

Kathleen's citation to an abrogated case *Middlesex*, merely related to procedural due process concerns relating to lapse of time, is distinguished from my case. *Middlesex Cnty. Ethics Comm. v. Garden State Bar Ass'n*, 457 U.S. 423, (1982); *Abrogation Recognized by Harmon v. Department of Finance*, 3rd Cir.(Del.), April 27, 2020; *Citing, Sprint Communications, Inc. v. Jacobs*, 571 U.S. 69,(2013), *Malhan v. Sec'y U.S. Dep't of State*, 938 F.3d 453, 462 (3d Cir. 2019).

My case relates to the State's prosecution against me for my exercise of genuinely held religious-beliefs, religious-political speech, religious-political-

association, and the right to petition the courts when I believe there has been a grievance against me by a government agent, no matter my poverty, religious beliefs, or political orientation.

Kathleen's arguments that a determination against me would not impede on my religious worship fails too. The practice of law is a religious exercise, not done for mere pay. *Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23*. I ran for office to draft just decrees and drafted 5 proposals to impeach President Trump, without pay, to help the oppressed in accordance to God's will which teaches justice with mercy, not money, saves lives and eternal lives, by correction to prevent condemnation.³⁶

The Court's transfer of my license to disability inactive violates my free exercise of religion, as punishment for my personal-religious-exercise, speech, association, petitions, and beliefs.

My Constitutionally protected religious-political beliefs are in issue as the source of the vindictive prosecution against me brought to punish me for the exercise of religious liberties which the state, and government backed private partners' and professions, disagrees with. I am being persecuted for believing in

³⁶ Objxn B-2, K-Ex10-11, Objxn-Ex-N, *Tate v. Cabbage*, 210 A.2d 555, 557, 1965 Del. Super. LEXIS 67, *1, 58 Del. 430, 433, ("It is no business of courts to say that what is a religious practice or activity for one group is not religion under the protection of the First Amendment. Nor is it in the competence of courts under our constitutional scheme to approve, disapprove, classify, regulate, or in any manner control sermons delivered at religious meetings.")

Jesus Christ and my personal political beliefs. It is my religious-political belief that the government and the courts are in danger of being overthrown by the elimination of the dollar, a planned, preventable, reversible, economic crash to eliminate the governments' function by a takeover by private partners through a collective group of private central banks, including the Federal Reserve.³⁷

KV asserts my political-religious beliefs and concerns by the pleas relating to the World Economic Forum's Founder's plan to crash the global economy were not relevant to the proceeding, and wrongly asserts I admit my concerns about lawlessness are not relevant, is misleading. My religious-political beliefs are in issue and are relevant, as the source of insidious government persecution against me and my property interest in my license to practice law. My pursuit of justice and just decrees are relevant, as I corrected myself on the record. (See transcript 46, 42-44) My love for others beyond my own, and my concern at compelled, controlled oppression, injustice and unjust decrees show I am an aide, not a danger to the public. 46. The record shows my conduct, caring for others, and standing up for those without opportunity are relevant in how my conduct as an attorney is beneficial to the public, not a threat to society. Id. There is evidence the Great depression was planned unnatural by bankers who gain more profit and debt control the worse off the government and the people are. Objxn-Ex-K-internal-Ex-

³⁷ Objxn-B-2, K-Ex-12-13-14-15-16-17-18-19

18. I showed the Court evidence of a planned elimination of the dollar, and a planned by design economic crash, which this Court has the authority to prevent or reverse, no matter what some misguided expert opines. Objxn-Ex-K-Ex 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, and Objxn-GG.

Although the State seeks to destroy my life, by taking away my liberty under the threat of government persecution for exercising fundamental rights, and my ability to buy and sell for not worshipping what I believe to be the mark of the beast, the profession, business greed, this court is my hope of a hero of a planned elimination of the dollar, global economic crash, and way of government. I alerted the Court on how to prevent or reverse the crash. Objxn, page 47, 51-52; Objxn-F, G, H, GG. I should not be disciplined for my religious-political beliefs and speech, even if this State rejects my religious-political beliefs and personal religious concerns.

The State abused its discretion by Selective Prosecution

I have met my burden of proving by clear evidence the State abused its discretion by selective prosecution “to overcome the regularity that attaches to decisions to prosecute,” which is not rebutted by the record.³⁸ Kathleen’s and the

³⁸ United States v. Wood, Criminal Action No. 20-56 MN, at *4-5 (D. Del. July 20, 2021); Citing, United States v. Taylor, 686 F.3d 182, 197 (3d Cir. 2012)

Board's vain assertions," rests upon clearly erroneous findings of fact, an errant conclusion of law, and an improper application of law to fact."³⁹

"Although prosecutors enjoy wide discretion, they may not prosecute based on a defendant's "race, [political affiliation] or other arbitrary classification."
United States v. Gist, 382 F. App'x 181, 183 (3d Cir. 2010).

A "selective-prosecution claim is not a defense on the merits to the criminal charge itself, but an independent assertion that the prosecutor has brought the charge for reasons forbidden by the Constitution." *United States v. Armstrong*, 517 U.S. 456, 463 (1996).

The United States Supreme Court in *United States v. Armstrong*, 517 U.S. 456, 464-65 (1996) held,

a prosecutor's discretion is "subject to constitutional constraints." *United States v. Batchelder*, [442 U.S. 114, 125](#) (1979). One of these constraints, imposed by the equal protection component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, *Bolling v. Sharpe*, [347 U.S. 497, 500](#) (1954), is that the decision whether to prosecute may not be based on "an unjustifiable standard such as race, religion, or other arbitrary classification," *Oyler v. Boles*, [368 U.S. 448, 456](#) (1962). A defendant may demonstrate that the administration of a criminal law is "directed so exclusively against a particular class of persons . . . with a mind so unequal and oppressive" that the system of prosecution amounts to "a practical denial" of equal protection of the law. *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, [118 U.S. 356, 373](#) (1886).

³⁹ *United States v. Gist*, 382 F. App'x 181, 183 (3d Cir. 2010)

The Record shows a colorable basis (1) I have been singled out for prosecution while “persons similarly situated, [based on religious-political lawsuits deemed frivolous] have not been prosecuted [by the ODC,]” for the same type of conduct, and (2) the State's discriminatory prosecution of me has been invidious and in bad faith, that is, deliberately based upon impermissible considerations including religion, poverty, political-affiliation and religious-political protected speech contained in petitions, to prevent me from exercising fundamental rights of religious-political-petitions, religious-political-beliefs, religious-political-exercise, religious-political-association, and religious-political-speech.⁴⁰

The State’s prosecution against me is made in retaliation for my personal-religious-political-petitions, reflecting personal religious-political-beliefs, including religious-political-speech and association in *Kelly v Trump* and for bar dues. The application of the DLRDP, as applied to me, violates my First Amendment fundamental liberties, applicable to the state pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment, against me, as a party of one, as an indigent, lawyer with personal, unique religious-political beliefs under the Equal Protections Clause. proceeding against me to punish me for my religious-political beliefs.

⁴⁰ *U.S. v. West*, 312 F. Supp. 2d 605, 618 (D. Del. 2004); *State v. McGuinness*, ID 2110001942, at *4 (Del. Super. Ct. Apr. 13, 2022); *Albury v. State*, 551 A.2d 53, 61 n.13 (Del. 1988);

The record clearly shows the State had a discriminatory purpose, to selectively prosecute me for my religious-political exercise of fundamental rights.

I found no evidence of any other party or member of the Bar indicating anyone has ever been prosecuted for a RFRA claim, to alleviate a substantial burden upon exercise of religion. I am solely selectively being prosecuted.

My transfer to disability would have a discriminatory effect by chilling me, and potentially other professionals from exercising fundamental rights, which the majority or the profession as a whole may disagree with, thereby stifling freedom of thought, critical thinking, and debate, dumbing down professionals and experts by the mob reign of professional trained lusts replacing the hope of the impartial rule of law.⁴¹ Deeming me disabled for suing the President of the United States, shows that the State believes the powerful are protected by the law, but the poor or those with religious beliefs in God, not worship of money as savior, are not. Other indigents and others with religious beliefs the State rejects, may be chilled from exercising their free speech, religious beliefs, religious exercise right to petition out of fear of being be deemed disabled, or similarly economically persecuted, for assuming the Constitutional protections afford them equal rights too. Deeming me as disabled for suing the government to dissolve the establishment of government

⁴¹ *United States v. Schoolcraft*, 879 F.2d 64, 68 (3d Cir. 1989).

religion which has placed a substantial burden upon my exercise of religious beliefs because the state disagrees with my belief in God as savior not what I believe is the mark of the antichrist, the profession as God or guide, its purpose to gain money, business greed or money as savior, shows the state protects religious viewpoints which conform to its will, rendering free will, and freedom to believe to only those who believe in like matter with the State or its government backed partners, such as the Disciplinary counsel who appears to care about sacrificing the Constitutional law to serve the profession's appearance, profit and prestige, not the public. I believe what they fight for is lawlessness, sacrificing constitutionally protected liberty, lives and health to serve their profession, essentially sacrificing other people's souls to serve their own conditional interest with no unconditional love in them like a pack of wolves pretending to be shepherds.

Those who serve money, or whose focus is on making money and the economy and jobs, serve greed, not their country, misleading their people to harm by controlling the people instead of caring for them by protecting their liberty.

True justice, is laying down conditional interests, in comfort, costs, convenience, to serve, by choosing to independently think, caring to know, in order to love, protecting even those you may be correcting by improving the world, not condemning it.

The State abused its discretion in seeking to prosecute me for my religious-political petitions. The State engaged in selective and vindictive prosecution with animus and bad faith by seeking to deem me mentally disabled, to deem my faith in God as guide, not money as guide, as a disability, and to conceal the State misconduct against me in this proceeding.

The record clearly provides evidence of discriminatory effect and discriminatory intent. Objxn, MOL. *United States v. Bass*, 536 U.S. 862 (2002)

I am not disabled for asserting the President and the courts adhere to the Constitutional rule of law by seeking to dissolve the establishment of government religion. Neither the courts, nor the president is above the law, nor should a citizen, I, be adjudicated as mentally disabled, but for, the conduct of bringing a lawsuit against government agents when I believe the agents committed a grievance against me. Winning or losing is not the standard. Otherwise half the parties would be deemed mentally disabled. I believe this court erred as a matter of law in deeming my material arguments to dissolve executive orders, which establish government religion based not on freedom, but bartered business, as frivolous in *Kelly v. Trump*, 256 A.3d 207 (2021) for the reasons contained in the attached Order. (Exhibit H).

The Disciplinary proceeding is brought, in part, to suppress free speech to cover up State misconduct, by defaming my character and reputation as uncredible, and to discriminate against me based on my religious-political viewpoint, with no important interest unrelated to the suppression of free speech, and my exercise of fundamental rights, and without using the least restrictive means narrowly tailored to meet any legitimate interest.⁴²

The Board of Professional Responsibility's ("Board") Report ("Report") must be rejected, and the Delaware Supreme Court must dismiss this petition. The ODC failed to present and the Board failed to find by clear and convincing **evidence** I am incapacitated from continuing to practice law. The Board's findings in this fixed, sham proceeding in partial colluding forums must be rejected as a matter of law, and as a matter of fact to prevent manifest injustice.

Further the State fails to achieve a compelling or overriding government interest narrowly tailored, using the least restrictive means, to meet that interest to discipline me for the exercise of Constitutionally protected conduct, including but not limited to my religious-political petitions, religious-political speech, religious-political association, religious-political beliefs and religious-political exercise by

⁴² *Wayte v. United States*, 470 U.S. 598, 599 (1985); *United States v. O'Brien*, 391 U.S. 367 (1968); *Arcara v. Cloud Books, Inc.*, 478 U.S. 697, 707 n.4 (1986); *Nieves v. Bartlett*, 139 S. Ct. 1715, 1721, 1722, 1729 (2019)