

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, Disciplinary Counsel Kathleen M. Vavala; David A. White, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, Office of Disciplinary Counsel, Board on Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware, Preliminary Investigatory Committee, Attorney General Delaware

Emergency Application to the Honorable Justice Samuel A. Alito, Junior pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (f) to stay the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Case Number Case Numbers 22-8037 and 22-2079 proceeding Pending on the completion of two decisions of this United States Supreme Court on writ of certiorari the Third Circuit Reciprocal Disciplinary Case and the Delaware Disciplinary case relating to material issues in this Civil rights case or pending a review of the entire Court on whether a stay should be granted

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Pro Se, not represented by
Counsel
US Bar 283696
(301) 493-6693
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Third Circuit abused its discretion by denying my Motion to stay the civil rights proceeding pending this Court's determination relating to civil rights violations against me by Defendants for petitioning the Delaware Supreme Court 1. for an exemption from bar dues for all attorneys facing hardship, paying the dues since the Court required I petition individually, and separately petitioning for relief for all attorneys similarly situated in order not to compel the Court to violate the Equal Protections Clause since other attorneys faced hardship, 2. in a Delaware religious Freedom Restoration Act case *Kelly v Trump* US Supreme Court Number 21-5522, 3. years of ignored petitions regarding religious beliefs that were ignored and thus denied, which I may not discuss herein, and the subsequent Delaware Lawyer Discipline law suit brought against me about 9 days after I filed this Civil rights case in retaliation with political-religious-poverty animus for my private-religious-political petitions, containing my private-religious beliefs in the speech in my private petitions, given procedural due process violations in both *Kelly v Trump* and the Delaware Disciplinary Matter, and ongoing reciprocal disciplinary cases, which may be stayed by this Court's finding, until the Delaware State Court parallel discipline decision and Third Circuit of Appeals parallel discipline decision is determined by the US Supreme Court or until a writ of petition for Certiorari is denied, or the time for appeal has tolled under the extraordinary circumstances to:

- i. prevent duplicity of potentially conflicting decisions in parallel disciplinary cases in the 1. State of Pennsylvania, 2. District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania, 3. Disciplinary case in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, 4. Delaware District Court 5. Appeal of the Delaware Disciplinary Matter, 6. And the civil rights case which is the

subject of this petition, all relating to the same subject matter, based on the Delaware Supreme Court's decisions, setting precedent for other reciprocal cases to continue under the extraordinary facts of my case, where the Delaware's decision may be overturned or affirmed, unless this court reverses the Third Circuits Order denying a stay.

- ii. prevent potentially needless unaffordable costs relating to duplicated litigation on the same issues from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, creating an obstacle so great as to deny me access to the courts to defend my license and exercise of fundamental rights, given my poverty and religious objection to debt,
- iii. prevent a government compelled violation of my religious belief against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in defense of the exercise of fundamental rights and license(s) by increase in needless, duplicative costs,
- iv. prevent government compelled involuntary servitude in exchange with access to the courts to defend my licenses and liberties from being taken away for my religious beliefs in Jesus reflected in my speech contained in my private petitions,
- v. prevent the risk of loss of my fundamental rights to religious belief, religious exercise of beliefs, political and religious speech, association and the right to privately petition to the courts to address grievances to safeguard my exercise of religious belief without state persecution but for disagreement with my religious-political speech contained in my petitions, before the Delaware Courts.
- vi. prevent the chilling of the exercise of First Amendment liberties by the public or other professionals who may fear reprisal in the form of the loss of their license or being deemed mentally disabled but for their exercise of individual liberties merely

- because the State disagrees with their First Amendment beliefs, or their petitions or their attempt to hold the government, including government agents of both state and federal government to the limits of the Constitution.
- vii. prevent harm to my health and life. My health has diminished. I require time to maintain my health and life, in light of my specific permanent weakness related to a past surgery in my youth, which Defendants and all courts in related litigation have been apprised of, even the Delaware Chancery and Supreme Court. Without time to accommodate my weaknesses my health will diminish further, jeopardizing my life. (Citing, US Amendments I, V, XIII).
- viii. There is a reasonable probability that four Justices will consider the issue sufficiently meritorious to grant certiorari or to note probable jurisdiction; (2) a fair prospect that a majority of the Court will conclude that the decision below was erroneous; and (3) a likelihood that irreparable harm will result from the denial of a stay.
- ix. The public, the Court and the Defendants are not prejudiced by the stay. In addition, in my other appeal and on the record below in this case, I indicate my belief the courts are in danger. I believe my appeal for the Third Circuit matter may stifle the plans to eliminate courts, before a far worse scheme is implemented. I must be afforded an opportunity to provide evidence of my belief. It is the mere opportunity to be heard I seek to protect not the guarantee. Nevertheless, I attach some documents alluding to banks taking over the Courts, to ultimately take over governing. There are real plans for this Supreme Court's harm. It is a national emergency to eliminate the impartial rule of law to be reigned by bribes or extortion or violence. That is how I see the other two branches misbehaving by giving money

to fuel war under the guise of money as savior or violence under the lie forced control by violence grants freedom. It is through words of truth and justice in the courts that we may maintain these United States.

- x. The public is harmed if a stay is not granted.
- xi. The balance of the equities require a stay to prevent the loss of my fundamental rights because I had the courage to imperfectly defend them in the Delaware Courts.

LIST OF PARTIES

The parties are listed on the caption.

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. The Original disciplinary case in Delaware Supreme Court matter No. 22-58. Reciprocal disciplinary cases Eastern District of PA matter No 22-45, Third Circuit Court of Appeals No. 22-3372, Delaware District Court No. 22-341, PA Supreme Court No 2913, DD3. DC and the US Supreme Court have refrained from discipline, DC based on jurisdiction. *Kelly v Trump* Chancery Court No. 2020-0809, Delaware Supreme Court No. 119-2021, US Supreme Court No. 21-5522, *Kelly v Democrats* Chancery Court No 2020-0157, **US Supreme Court No. 22-6584.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....1

JURISDICTION.....1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....1-36

I. Plea to the Honorable Justice Samuel Alito, Junior.....1-6

II. Background of the DE-Disciplinary Matter and DE Civil rights Case, summary of the argument, with argument a stay is required to preserve my life and health.....6-19

III. Extraordinary Circumstances warrant a Stay.....19-22

IV Case law shows federal courts have no discretion to dismiss a parallel case. but are required to stay. A stay is required because I asked for money damages, nominal damages and equitable relief like voiding Kelly v Trump not available in the state Forum.....22-24

V. A stay is required to prevent increased potentially needless costs from creating an obstacle to my access to the Courts in defense of my first amendment rights, and the compelled violation of my religious belief against indebtedness, duplicity of judgments, and potentially conflicting judgments coming before this honorable court, loss of my 14th amendment property interest in my license and loss of my private right to exercise First Amendment right to private religious belief, private religious exercise, private exercise of m right to petition, private right to associate and other harm.....24-29

VI. Factor 1, Interest of the Court.....29

VII. Factors 2, 3, and 4, Defendant’s Interests, third parties’ interests and the public’s interest.....29-32

VIII. Factor 5, Prejudice against me is Great, Irreparable injury which may be prevented by a stay, balance of equities favor granting me a stay by overturning the Third Circuit’s Order.....32-33

IX. Time is required in the interest of national security to protect the Courts by preventing their self-regulation or third-party regulation in a different appeal.....33-36

X. CONCLUSION.....36

TABLE OF APPENDICES

February 9, 2023 Order by the Third Circuit Denying my Motion by Appellant to Stay Appeals pending Supreme Court Review of This Court’s January 6, 2023, Order and to File Reply Brief 30 Days After. (Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI”) 3DI.....1

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Petition for Writ of Certiorari before judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (e) to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Case Number Case Numbers 22-8037 and 22-2079 to vacate a denial of a stay pending this Honorable Court’s determination or denial of writ of certiorari of before the Third Circuit Reciprocal Disciplinary Case and the Delaware Disciplinary case, dated February 6, 20231, 3

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan M Kelly’s Motion to stay the Proceeding until the conclusion of the appeal of this Court’s Order at 3DI 131 Order denying a stay. I further move the Court, for good cause for permission to file the “Reply to Opposing Counsel’s Brief” motion 30 days after the stay is lifted Petition for Writ of Certiorari before judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (e) to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Case Number Case Numbers 22-8037 and 22-2079 to vacate a denial of a stay pending this Honorable Court’s determination or denial of writ of certiorari of before the Third Circuit Reciprocal Disciplinary Case and the Delaware Disciplinary case, submitted February 7, 2023 (3DI 138)1, 2

Appendix 1-a Constitutional and statutory provisions involved.....1-7

Appendix A Order by the Third Circuit Judge the Honorable Peter S. Phipps denying Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly in 21-3198 and 22-2079 to Stay Appeals while Appellant Petitions the Supreme Court of the United States to Review the State-Court Disciplinary Decision and the Third Circuit’s Reciprocal Disciplinary Decision, dated January 6, 2023 (Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI”) 3DI-131).....1

Appendix B Order in the District Court denying my Motion for a stay and Second Motion for a Stay, dated December 28, 2022 (Delaware District Court Docket item (hereinafter “DI”) DI 106).....1, 18

Appendix C Plaintiff’s Motion to amend the complaint pursuant to FRCP 15(a)(1) and FRCP 15(a)(2) to include additional parties, eliminate a party, include additional facts and include additional requests for relief, dated January 24, 2022 (DI 43)....7, 8, 10, 18, 21, 22, 24

Appendix D Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Opening Brief moving the Third Circuit Court of Appeals to vacate the Delaware District Orders (D.I. 16-17, 30-31, 59-60), filed October 22, 2022. (3DI-98).....7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24, 31

Appendix E Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Motion to recuse the Honorable Thomas Hardiman and the Honorable Tamika Montgomery-Reeves from participating in this case to preserve Due Process rights under the 5th Amendment, filed January 3, 2023. (3DI-128)8

Appendix F Plaintiff’s Motion to amend her motion for re-argument, filed November 9, 2021. (DI 21).....7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 21, 22, 26

Appendix G Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend Exhibit G to Complaint to add missing page, filed November 18, 2021. (DI 23).....7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 21

Appendix H Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend findings of facts and alter the order dated December 22, 2021, based on New findings of fact, to prevent clear error of facts, clear error of law, and to prevent manifest injustice, dated January 10, 2022, filed January 11, 2022. (DI 34)
.....7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 21, 22

Appendix I Plaintiff’s **Second** Additional Motion pursuant to FRCP R. 52(b), 59 (e) and 60 (b)(1)(2)(6) to amend findings of facts and alter the order, dated December 22, 2021, based on New Findings of Fact, to prevent Clear error of facts, Clear error of Law, and to prevent manifest injustice, dated January 18, 2022, filed January 19, 2022. (DI 39) (excluding the voluminous exhibits therein of records in the Delaware Disciplinary Proceeding)..7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 21, 22

Appendix J Plaintiff Meghan M. Kell’s 3rd Emergency Motion pursuant to FRCP R. 52(b), 59 (e) and 60 (b)(1)(2)(6) and 65 (Excluding Exhibits of emails to Defendants and Disciplinary Orders or entrees in the Delaware Disciplinary Matter) (DI 36)...8, 10, 16, 21, 22

Appendix K Letter to Chief Judge Connelly attaching documents showing procedural due process violations in Kelly v Trump and in the Delaware Disciplinary matter, requesting to amend the Complaint as a matter of right with additional changes of new information since he did not render an order on my January 24, 2021 Motion to amend the complaint as a matter of right before service to Defendants, The DE Disciplinary Rules 12 and 13 are unconstitutional per se by silencing free speech of the accused at the threat of additional punishment to protect the State not the accused and as applied, doctored praecipe/concealing elimination of key witness by retiring or terminating Chancery Court staff Arline Simmons and Katrina Krugar. (DI 58)
.....7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 35

Appendix L Letter to Honorable Chief Justice Colm F. Connelly regarding Office of Disciplinary Counsel Patricia Swarts, with new and additional evidence of Defendants bad faith and harassment, dated December 4, 2021, filed December 6 2022, excluding attachments. (DI 29). Since the Third Circuit allowed me to plead by citing the record, I merely cited it in the appellate court.....8, 10, 14, 16, 21, 22

Appendix M Appellant Plaintiff Meghan M Kelly’s Motion to stay the Proceeding until the conclusion of the originating disciplinary proceeding, until final non-appealable determinations are made or the time of appeal has lapsed. I further move the Court, for good cause for permission to file the “for cause” motion 30 days after the stay is lifted, dated January 4, 2023. (3DI-129).....8, 14, 21

Appendix N (3DI-126) Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Motion for additional time to file a brief in reply to Defendant’s Answer in the amount of 45 days, dated, January 1, 2023.....8

Appendix O Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Motion for permission to exceed the word limit and page limit in her writ of certiorari On Appeal from the Delaware Supreme Court, Case No. 2022, 58, dated January 23, 2023. (3DI 133, DI 113).....8

Appendix P Petition of writ of certiorari filed on appeal for the Third Circuit disciplinary matter No. 22-8037, filed but not accepted or rejected yet. No. 22-6584. (3DI 133, DI 113)....8, 18

Appendix Q Letter by PA ODC opposing a stay. (3DI-91-3, page 2).....8

Appendix R A-4, Appellant’s motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to Reign in its arms through its agents from unlawfully pressuring appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion by relief it deems just, Internal Exhibit 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).....8, 10, 14, 16, 21, 31

Appendix S A-5, Appellant’s Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this matter, 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. (3DI-121-12, DI 4).....10, 14, 16, 21, 31

Appendix T Letter dated January 7, 2021, first letter regarding bar dues, the second letter is attached to App S, dated February 5, 2021. (3DI 126-9, 3DI 126-10, 3DI 126-1110, 14, 16, 21, 31

Appendix U Letter regarding My second Motion for a stay in the district Court pending a determination on the appeal of the Delaware Disciplinary matter or until the time for appeal had lapsed, and my incorrect assumption that the Third Circuit’s case was stayed pending a determination by the Delaware District Court on a Rule 60 motion (3DI 93-1 Pages 1 and 2).....8, 16

Appendix V (PA Supreme Court refused docketing denying opportunity to be heard on letter and motions) Respondent Meghan M. Kelly’s Motion pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 105 for permission to file unconfirming documents and to compel the acceptance of rejected documents upon the date of their submission, with allowance for opposing counsel to respond, dated December 19, 2022 (3DI-123-2).....9, 20

Appendix W (PA Supreme Court refused to docket, denying opportunity to be heard) Respondent Meghan M Kelly’s Second Motion for a stay due to circumstances increasing prejudice and harm, new facts arising necessary to my defense of reciprocal order, and additional questions that require answers in order to defend myself in response to the reciprocal order in the alternative a continuance of 6 months.....20

Appendix X First email to the grievance committed asserting right to live under the ADA where I noted “This Court has notice I could not stand at the post office due to severe dehydration related to a surgery. I assert my right to live by seeking an accommodation. It appears I attempted to file it with the court correctly, but it remains undocketed. This Court has notice of my medical records, but it is more concerned with costs and convenience than justice. Justice is not a matter of business and barter or exchange, but a matter of truth under the law. Claimants without means or with limited ability should be afforded access to the courts without denial of an opportunity to be heard by the court’s failure to docket the items. I thank you for your consideration and getting back to me. Have a good day”.....20.

Appendix Y additional emails denied accommodations by the ADA officer..... 20

Appendix Z Docket Kelly v Trump, in the Delaware Supreme Court, where I circled the four docket numbers missing one or more items sealed in secret from the record (3DI-121-7, DI -65-1)10, 16, 31

Appendix AA Email to lexis representative regarding 4 items necessary to my defense are not available on Court Link on lexis. (3DI-93-2)10, 14, 16, 31

Appendix BB (3DI 121-8) Lexis docket of Kelly v Trump missing four items, showing the court accesses docket date of preliminary hearing10, 14, 16, 31

Appendix CC (3DI-121-4) Chart of file and serve showing the Court sealed items in Kelly v Trump to prevent material evidence in my favor on due process grounds hiding it from the US Supreme Court too in bad faith collusion with the Office of Disciplinary Counsel..10, 14, 16, 31

Appendix DD Letter to the PA Supreme Court regarding time required to sustain health, others issues computer repairs needed, printer repairs needed, and internet outage (3DI-119-2) .20, 26

Appendix EE Exhibit 43, noted objection to healthcare, Federal proposal to reduce the costs of healthcare, newspaper article I wrote to improve state healthcare when I ran for office, college and law school transcript, health record showing bad care received, making me weak requiring accommodation to prevent death. (3DI 126-4, pages 2-12, DI 4).....20, 26

Appendix FF Facebook posts present sense impression someone talking about shooting me for my religious political beliefs contained on stickers on my car (3DI-100-29).....26

Appendix GG *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*, by Klaus Schwab, 2016 version, excluding additional pages of the 2017 updated version published by Portfolio Penguin, which may be found at

https://www.academia.edu/38203483/The_Fourth_Industrial_Revolution_pdf?fbclid=IwAR1koMak7N40mbSf9wSGt8XzdhAJgafnbmobfn70FB4nbqcafl_hsN-RnQ (3DI 121-15, page 1-2) Discussing eliminating lawyers by automation.....34

Appendix HH *Covid-19: The Great Reset*, by Claus Schwab and Thierry Malleret, Portfolio Penguin Publishing, published 2020, by Forum Publishing, which may be found at https://carterheavyindustries.files.wordpress.com/2020/12/covid-19_the-great-resetklaus-schwab.pdf Discussing the schemed elimination of the fiat currency to scheme to eliminate judges and the rule of law by the rule of automation by the lie technology knows best. (3DI 91-6, pages 3-6, 3DI 91-5, pages with writing, 3DI-105, plain pages the entire book DI 3).....34

Appendix II *Covid-19: The Great Reset*, by Claus Schwab and Thierry Malleret, Portfolio Penguin Publishing, published 2020, by Forum Publishing, which may be found at https://carterheavyindustries.files.wordpress.com/2020/12/covid-19_the-great-resetklaus-schwab.pdf. (3DI-105-14, filed December 2, 2022) This talks about elimination of politicians. I do not have time to pull all of the references to elimination of government officials in all materials at the WEF.....34

Appendix JJ excerpts from the *The Great Narrative (The Great Reset) Paperback* – December 28, 2021,by Klaus Schwab (Author), Thierry Malleret, Forum Publishing regarding

Central Banks taking over the authority of the Courts (emphasis intended because the Court is in trouble) (3DI-95-5, 95-6).....34

Appendix KK (3DI-121-14, pages 1-5) *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., printed December 15, 2022, by save PDF print.....35

Appendix LL, Article by Bank of International Settelements (hereinafter “BIS”), the global money changer who makes money out of nothing, and gains more the worse off humanity is in, in terms of debt control and profit on interest who on or about **December 5, 2022**, indicated state, local and federal **pensions will not be paid**. They were written off as tax breaks in debt swaps, and another article indicating the same.....34

Appendix MM Excerpts of the book, *Creature of Jekyll Island, a Second look at the Federal Reserve*, by Edward Griffin, 7th printing 1998, 3rd Ed., by American Media, to show the Great Depression was created unnaturally by the Federal; Reserve and other banks. This book appears to have the theory wars are instigated to create debt to create banks profit, and the environmental and biological concerns can do the same by unjust decrees that do not protect the environment and lives of humanity. Instead, unjust decrees such as fines and material rewards taken out of others pockets, create debt for profit by increasing desperate conditions. So wrong doers may get as much as they can get for as little as they can get without restraint in the form of just rules of law. (DI 4-9).....34

Appendix NN Letter to Delaware Supreme Court, dated August 29, 2022, with footnotes showing how the private federal Reserve coining federal reserve notes enslaves the government and the governments people in violation of US Amend XIII, with attachments showing the more debt, the worse off the country is in the more profit and power the shareholders of the Federal Reserve, commercial banks get in their business transactions despite not collecting shares at the Federal Reserve as shareholders (3DI91-4).....34, 35

Appendix OO Article *It’s Not Your Imagination — The Supreme Court is Less Efficient*, Posted by Dr. Adam Feldman on January 23, 2023, <https://empiricalscotus.com/2023/01/23/its-not-your-imagination-the-supreme-court-is-less-efficient/>34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Book, Bible

Amos, 5:15.....33

Deuteronomy 23:19.....33-34

Deuteronomy, 15:1.....33-34

Deuteronomy 15:2.....33-34

Exodus 22:24-26.....33-34

Exodus 22:25.....33-34

Ezekiel 18:13.....33-34

Isaiah 10:22.....5

Leviticus 25:36-37.....33-34

Luke 13:23-28.....5

Matthew 6:12.....33-34

Matthew 6:14-15.....33-34

Matthew 6:30-33.....33-34

Matthew 10:8.....33-34

Matthew 16:26.....33-34

Matthew 6:24-34.....15

Matthew 7:13-15.....5

Matthew, 18:21-35.....33-34

Matthew, 23:2333

Proverbs 28:833-34

Romans 13:8.....26

Case Law

Abbott v. Mette, No. CV 20-131-RGA, 2021 WL 327375 (D. Del. Jan. 31, 2021), report and recommendation adopted, No. 20-CV-131-RGA, 2021 WL 1168958 (D. Del. Mar. 26, 2021), aff'd, No. 21-1804, 2021 WL 5906146 (3d Cir. Dec. 14, 2021).....23, 24

Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie, 239 F.3d 307.....27

<i>Air Line Pilots Assn., Int'l v. UAL Corp., Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P 95209, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶ 5209, 114 Lab. Cas. (CCH) ¶ 2027, 897 F.2d 1394, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) ¶ 95209, Fed. Sec. L. Rep. (CCH) P95209, 133 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2863, 114 Lab. Cas. (CCH) P12027, 1990 U.S. App. LEXIS 3764 (7th Cir. 1990).....</i>	2,3
<i>Alexander v. Ieyoub, 62 F.3d 709 (5th Cir. 1993).....</i>	23
<i>Boyd v. Farrin, 575 Fed. Appx. 517 (5th Cir. 2014).....</i>	23
<i>Brindley v. McCullen, 61 F.3d 507 (6th Cir. 1995).....</i>	23
<i>Carroll v. City of Mount Clemens, 139 F.3d 1072 (6th Cir. 1998).....</i>	23
<i>Crane v. Fauver, 762 F.2d 325 (3d Cir. 1985).....</i>	22, 23
<i>Deakins v. Monaghan, 484 U.S. 193, 108 S. Ct. 523, (1988).....</i>	22, 23, 24
<i>Harris v. McRae, 448 U.S. 297 (1980).....</i>	27
<i>Hammond v. Baldwin, 866 F.2d 172 (6th Cir. 1989).....</i>	16
<i>Hilton v. Braunskill, 481 U.S. 770 (1987).....</i>	32
<i>Inc. v. Lopez, CIV. No. 14-1223 (PG) (D.P.R. Oct. 27, 2015).....</i>	16
<i>In Re Murchinson, 349 US 133 (1955).....</i>	16
<i>Jones v. Prescott, 702 Fed. Appx. 205(5th Cir. 2017).....</i>	23
<i>Kalniz v. Ohio State Dental Bd., 699 F. Supp. 2d 966 (S.D. Ohio 2010).....</i>	24
<i>Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343 (1996).....</i>	23, 27, 28
<i>Lewis v. Beddingfield, 20 F.3d 123 (5th Cir. 1994).....</i>	18
<i>May v. Anderson, 345 U.S. 528 (1953).....</i>	24
<i>Maraan v. Off. of Ohio Disciplinary Couns. for Supreme Ct. of Ohio, No. 1:18CV645, 2021 WL 3173311, (S.D. Ohio July 27, 2021).....</i>	24
<i>Meyers v. Franklin Cty. Court of Common Pleas, 23 F. App'x 201, 206 (6th Cir. 2001).....</i>	24
<i>McCool v. Gehret, 657 A.2d 269 (Del. 1995).....</i>	16
<i>Murray v. Giarratano, 492 U.S. 1 (1989).....</i>	24
<i>New York Times Co. v. Jasclevich, 439 U.S. 1331, 99 S. Ct. 11, (1978).....</i>	2
<i>Night Clubs, Inc. v. City of Fort Smith, 163 F.3d 475 (8th Cir. 1998).....</i>	24
<i>Nimer v. Lichfield Twp. Bd. of Trustees, 707 F.3d 699 (6th Cir. 2013).....</i>	23

<i>Packwood v. Senate Select Comm. on Ethics</i> , 510 U.S. 1319 (1994).....	5
<i>Pease v. Rathbun-Jones Eng. Co.</i> , 243 U.S. 273 (1917).....	17
<i>Pryor v. Brennan</i> , 914 F.2d 921 (7th Cir. 1990).....	27
<i>Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co.</i> , 517 U.S. 706 (1996).....	23
<i>Schweiker v. McClure</i> , 456 U.S. 188 (1982) reversed on other grounds;.....	16
<i>Sprint Commc'ns, Inc. v. Jacobs</i> , 571 U.S. 69, 77 (2013).....	23
<i>Tate v. Cabbage</i> , 210 A.2d 555, 557, (1965).....	21
<i>Tennessee v. Lane</i> , 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004).....	27
<i>Tumey v State of Ohio</i> , 273 US 510 (1927).....	16
<i>United Church of the Medical Center v. Medical Center Comm'n</i> , 689 F.2d 693 (7th Cir. 1982).....	16
<i>Utica Packing Co. v. Block</i> , 781 F.2d 71, 77 (6th Cir. 1986).....	16
<i>Ward v Village of Monroeville</i> , 409 US 57 (1972).....	11
<i>Watkins v. Ohio Dep't of Educ.</i> , No. 2:21-CV-04482, 2022 WL 672565 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 7, 2022).....	23, 24, 25
<i>Williams v. Hepting</i> , 844 F.2d 138 (3d Cir. 1988).....	23
<i>Withrow v. Larkin</i> , 421 U.S. 35 (1975).....	16.
<i>Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Stroud</i> , 179 F.3d 598 (8th Cir. 1999).....	24

Procedural Rules

Supreme Court Rule 23.....	19
----------------------------	----

Publications Statutes

8 U.S.C. § 201.....	34
28 U.S.C. § 1254.....	1
28 U.S.C. § 2101(e).....	1
31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k).....	34
42 USC §1983.....	6, 12, 13, 17, 18
42 USC §1985.....	1, 6, 7, 12, 13 17, 18
42 USC §1988.....	6, 10, 13 17, 18
42 USCS § 2000bb 1-4 Religious Freedom Restoration Act (“RFRA”).....	1, 6, 12

US Constitution

U.S. Cons. Amend. 1.....6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 ,32, 33,34
U.S. Const. Amend. V.....6, 7, .8, 10, 11, 17, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 32, ,34
U.S. Const. Amend VI.....6, 8, 11, 5, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31
U.S. Const. Amend. XIII.....4, 6, 11, 14,15, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 , 33, 34
U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1,....6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14-15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34

US President’s Executive Orders

Executive Orders by President Bush, Junior

Ex. Or. No. 13198, 66 Fed. Reg. 8497, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 1401, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021.....12,13
Ex. Or. No. 13199, 66 FR 8497, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, 83 FR 20715, May 3, 2018.....12, 13
Ex. Or. No. 13279, 67 FR 77141, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No.13559, 75 FR 71319, November 17, 2010.....12, 13

Executive Orders by President Obama

Ex. Or. No. 13559, 75 Fed. Reg. 71319, Nov. 17, 2010.....12, 13

Executive Orders by President Trump

Ex. Or. No. 13798, 82 Fed. Reg. 21675, May 4, 2017.....12, 13
Ex Or. No. 13831, 83 Fed. Reg. 20715, May 3, 2018.....12, 13

Executive Orders by President Biden

Ex. Or. 14015, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021.....12,13