

Exhibit 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Meghan Kelly)	Civil Action No.: 1:21-1490 (CFC)
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.)	
Swartz, et.al)	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S TWENTY FIFTH AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

Comes now Plaintiff Meghan Kelly, I declare and affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

I. Meg injured left eye ball

1. I am injured. I had a burning rash on my face for over a week to about a month. I placed a wash cloth on my face more than a week ago. Whatever rash I had on my face spread to my left eye ball. When I woke up with the wash cloth over week ago, I noticed the wash cloth stunk badly. The washcloth smelled like sitting wet laundry stinks if left in the washing machine too long. My eye also began to hurt. After three or four days I noticed a broken blood vessel and a rash on the white of my eye ball. I was worried it may be a bacterial or fungal infection instead of allergies since it spread from my cheek to my eye, despite cleaning my face well at least twice daily. Attached, please find pictures I took on Thursday, April 20, 2023 (Exhibit A).

2. I either have an allergic reaction in my eye ball or a fungal or bacterial infection, per the attached pictures taken April 20, 2023. It still hurts and has spread toward the color of my eye ball.

3. I went to the doctors on Friday April 21, 2023 because I did not want to go blind should it be fungal or bacterial, especially since the wash cloth stunk and it spread from my cheek to eye ball. I do not blindly trust any man. The bible teaches Cursed is the one who trusts in man. *Citing, Jeremiah 17:5*

4. The doctor did not test me for bacteria or fungus. She said it was allergies and dry eye. She indicated it was not viral. I told her I oppose drugs to conceal pain and to combat symptoms. They have dangerous side effects. She asked me to give her a pain indicator on a scale of 1 to 10. I said I am not doing that. That speculating scale is subjective, and fickle, not mathematically precise, and I do not want prescriptions to fight pain.

5. I rejected allergy and dry eye drugs with side affects I am not willing to risk. I oppose compelled care, and I do not blindly trust doctors. So, I remain concerned about maintaining my vision.

6. Doctors make more money the worse off you are. I recall with horror listening to public radio where a patient lamented their eye hurt after eye surgery. The doctor told the patient, "pain is a sign of healing." After the patch was removed the doctor discovered ants ate the eye ball eye ball. If you click on the link, you will see a different news provider sharing the story. <https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna10051154>

7. I believe God made our bodies to feel pain to help us live by addressing the pain as an indicator something wrong even if it is to avoid pollutants or allergens. For me, I do have allergies that close up my throat, cause wheezing, cause post nasal drip causing diarrhea, dizziness, give me rashes and weak in the knees. Allergies are no joke, especially breathing in dust, pollen, pollutants and the like. My ears get hot, my vision goes black to regular and I collapse when I breathe in allergens or contaminants some-times. Blindly trusting in vulture-like dumbered down by training doctors does not help. I believe people will go to hell for blindly telling me and others to go to professionals who exploit my condition and the needs of others for profit. When people blindly say go for a walk, they do not know it could heal some and harm

others too. I hate getting sun damage too. My sister had skin cancer in her early 20s and I am at risk for skin cancer too.

8. I used to wear masks and eye goggles outside, even swimming goggles, when performing yard work before the pandemic made it acceptable to mask and glove up. So, I am glad I can wear a mask and gloves while not looking dorky. I attribute the fact I have not had covid 19 to masks, gloves and social distancing. The flappers in the 1920s wore glamorous gloves because they were being smart not fashionable after the Spanish flu. Similarly the Queen of England wore gloves to protect her hands from germs. I wish someone would make man gloves look princely, powerful and cool. So, men could wear washable protective gloves that reduce the spread of disease towards others.

II. Religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare

9. I have sincere religious objections against compelled care, and do not eliminate my free will by going to the doctors where I am free to deny opinions or medications. I believe people sin when they blindly do what they are trained to do like thoughtless machines, told to do or required without thinking things out under the facts of each case to discern what is right, not what pays the bills. I believe people go to hell for refusing to use their brains to discern truth and for unconcern. Please see *Ezekiel Chapter 9* to confirm even children will be destroyed on the last day for their absence of love due to unconcern. See *Matthew Chapter 13* to confirm the cares for providing for your own do not excuse people from sin for what they failed to do, how they failed to love, but will be used to damn them for making their love for their kids, parents, self or own an idol driving out love for God and others. See also, *Matthew 25:42-45* (“42 For I was hungry and you gave me nothing to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me nothing to drink, 43 I was a stranger and you did not invite me in, I needed clothes and you did not clothe me, I was sick

and in prison and you did not look after me.');

Matthew 10:37-38, (““Anyone who loves their father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; anyone who loves their son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.”).

10. On April 25, 2023, the pain in my left eye ball increased, a style formed on my top left lid, and the rash appeared to increase while the red decreased. I began to worry about bacterial infections blinding my eye ball. So, I scheduled an appointment with a different doctor. I noted I had allergies. This doctor did not test me for bacteria or fungus but said she would prescribe 1. Medicine that would reduce the pain with a steroid and 2 antibacterial drugs which would fight bacteria or 2. An antibiotic she would note as not needed. So it may not be covered by prescription.

11. The doctor prescribed the steroid one. She said it was safe for even babies. I know some drugs babies and children receive are stronger than those prescribed to adults. Kids heal more completely and quickly than adults and older people. Older people like me often do not heal completely but are left weaker the rest of their life due to injuries and poisonous prescribed drugs.

12. I am not taking the steroids because I believe people will go to hell for seeking comfort temporally only to harm their bodies which are Gods not their own. 1 *Corinthians* 3:17 (“Do you not know that you yourselves are God’s temple, and that God’s Spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God’s temple, God will destroy him; for God’s temple is holy, and you are that temple.”); See, 1 *Corinthians* 6:19-20, “Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, who is in you, whom you have received from God? You are not your own; 20you were bought at a price. Therefore honor God with your body.”).

13. I was upset she did not note allergies in my chart either.

III Judges and Justice in the courts are our hope of a hero, not businesses veiled as philanthropists, experts, or professionals who exploit need to serve greed. We need judges to judge, not experts or their work science or technology to judge

14. With regards to the courts improving care requires judges to discern whether professional care is harmful or healing. This must not be left to the experts. I desire the courts to exercise more judgment instead of allowing professionals to be above the law, or to be deemed to opine to the standard of care the law defers to. You judges are special. You do not need to be perfect to do good, but no good can happen if you are too scared to try to exercise your power to guide misguided people, professionals, scientists, and self-puffed experts and entities who sacrifice people to serve business greed.

IV. Harmful healthcare schemed to create waste to create more debt control, more need to serve business and alleged charitable position, power and profit

15. There is a lot of healthcare proposed years ago which soon will be implemented that will harm people to intentionally create waste to gain debt control of people and governments. See the Fourth Industrial Revolution attached at DI 3, Also see this book I attach hereto called, *Shaping The Future of The Fourth Industrial Revolution*, by Klaus Schwab, published in 2018. I believe workers and those who defer to harmful healthcare in our past will go to hell, for being blinded by money. They did not see clearly how they harmed others to gain knowledge or profit. See, Exhibit C regarding rather recent harmful practices. Not knowing is guilt to God, should people not be made clean. I believe people go to hell for refusing to use their brains to care to discern lusts from love. I believe many people will go to hell since that is what Jesus teaches. *Matthew 7:13-15*. I believe Court correction may save souls from harm here and hell for eternity. *Matthew 23:23, Amos 5:15, Ezekiel 3, Ezekiel 18, and Ezekiel 33*. One attorney drafted the attached at Exhibit D regarding safeguarding humans from mad experiments conducted today against the military, vets and population, just as such wicked tests and

experiments were conducted by our doctors and the Nazi doctors during World War 2 and other times. I thought the attorneys' analysis would be beneficial to use against the harmful care schemed ahead. I lost the case title and attorneys' name. I believe people go to hell for seeking to feel better instead of be better. I believe people are misguided and enslaved by sin by seeking happiness instead of laying down their desires for gratification to do what is right. I seek to be holy, not enslaved to money for other Mens' material gain. I am against human sacrifice, even sacrifice of my body for mere man, when I am God's now man's.

16. I have religious objections to deferring to partial professional's examinations, opinions and treatment. I do not ever blindly defer to the judgment of doctors. I believe they harm more than they heal. I believe people go to hell for teaching other people not to use their brains, to instead blindly give into temptation to rely on compartmentalized and controlled by dumbed down training experts. I believe people sin for blindly doing what they are trained to do, told to do, what the standards require without using their brains to analyze the potentially harmful effects towards others. When people kill, steal and destroy other precious people through harmful science and healthcare without court correction because the courts defer to the professionals, partial lawless lusts reign, not the impartial rule of law.

17. I believe people sin for telling others to blindly trust man's work, studies, science and technology instead of encouraging people to independently critically think and analyze professional's opinions and advice. This makes man god reflecting the image of the devil as outlined in *Isaiah* Chapter 14, committing idolatry regardless of wicked secular purpose of worship of comfort and material gain at the cost of sacrificing souls. I believe people sin for serving money in place of God as savior. Jesus teaches you can only serve one money or God. I choose God. *Matthew* 6:24. I believe those who choose money as guide and savior are blinded

from seeing clearly to love God and others as self, misleading them to harm others on their own way to hell should they not repent.

18. The professionals, charities and private businesses and organizations have become the secular religion of greed and material gain at the cost of human sacrifice which conflicts with my religious beliefs. I observe in horror as professionals have become demi-gods and are worshipped and praised as all knowing guides in place of God in fields of study.

20. I believe people sin for using people for statistics and science to gain knowledge or material gain because it teaches people within governments and entities to look at people as products to exploit not people to respect unearned required.

21. I believe judges commit sin, (aka commit lawlessness based on lusts) when they allow the so-called experts be the judges by deferring to their opinions. Deferring to professionals allows their work and studies to be above court correction and above the law, even when professionals normal standardized care harms people. (See, *Isaiah* 10:1-3, “Woe to those who enact unjust statutes and issue oppressive decrees, to deprive the poor of fair treatment and withhold justice from the oppressed of My people, to make widows their prey and orphans their plunder. And what will ye do in the day of visitation for judgment, and in the desolation which shall come...to whom will ye flee for help? and where will ye leave your wealth?”) I am a Christian, I seek guidance through the holy spirit of people within the Bible, through the holy spirit revealing understanding of God’s word through me too, through Jesus and through God the Father. (See, *John* 14:16, Jesus said, “And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another advocate to help you and be with you forever— the Spirit of truth.”). In the Bible at *Romans* 1:25, God through the holy spirit explained, “They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen”.

Accordingly, trusting in man and man's work, technology and research, studies or science in place of God and in place of using your own brain to critically discern what is right is sin. I believe people mislead people for teaching others to blindly trust professionals, products, science, technology or experts. It makes people and their work demi-gods in place of using your own free will to discern what is right in the eyes of God by critically examining all opinions and speculating answers.

22. It is my religious belief judges sin by refusing to independently think things out to discern truth to uphold the Constitutional limits on government and **private entities** to safeguard individual people and their individual liberty, as opposed to **blindly relying** on professionals, professional work, or other judges' precedent for procedural defects in case law.

V. We have a Democratic-Republic where the courts are special and safeguard individuals and individual liberty from being sacrificed under the guise of common good but in reality to serve the mob reign of lawless lusts and material gain by human sacrifice of life and liberty. Courts give us freedom and democracy.

23. I am no fan of Roman law, which I studied in law school, nor am a fan of Plato. I believe Plato's theories exploits the people and misleads men in our age, especially his teachings concerning a republic controlled by conniving, not smart "philosopher kings" speculating men claiming to be experts, professionals, scientists, aka speculators or the like who are the letter of the law when the courts defer to their standards, and above the law, same as the lobbyists, and Nongovernment government organizations, like the World Economic Forum or corporations, groups or entities are today. I disagree with judges and others who claim we have a Republic. You see I believe we have a Democratic-Republic in that the executive and legislative branches give us elected representation by the vote. However, I believe we have a Democracy through the judicial branch. The judicial branch safeguards freedoms and individuals from being sacrificed to the mob reign of lusts by the vote in the other two branches. The judicial branch is most

important, and should exercise more authority over experts and the other two branches to place checks on lawless lusts that sacrifice people for material gain.

24. This Court knows I have religious objections to compelled, dumbed down by training examinations and care by healthcare and mental healthcare professionals. The standards punish professionals for using their brain to critically care to think about how treatments and diagnoses mislead patients to harm and enslavement to their desires to be controlled not free by those who entice their desires for material gain not good. I especially oppose drugging up sick and old people by making them easier to tend like vegetables because I believe drugs inhibit their faculties during the most important time of their lives that determines whether people will have eternal life or damnation, the end. God can remember people's sins no more if they repent, but if people cannot use their free will to live for God because they give into temptation of making doctors or comfort or desire to be out of pain their God, I fear they may go to hell. I do not want anyone to go to hell despite the fact most people will per *Isaiah* 10:20. Courts exercising more authority may save some people from giving into temptation from hurting themselves and others for the convenience, avoidance of costs and profits of those who exploit needs to serve greed and gain not good. I believe the courts may save lives and eternal lives if they just used their own brains as opposed to relying on the professionals who have conflicts of interests.

25. I believe most of the teachings by mental health professionals, behavioralists, psychologists and others teach the way to hell by enticing people to give into temptations to control people by desires, aka sins, by reward and avoidance of harm and other conditions. As a follower of Jesus I seek to lay down my desires to be free in Christ by thinking, in order to know, in order to love to overcome lusts.

VI. In *Jacobson v. Massachusetts* the Court was wrong about vaccines and erred in its illogical analysis of a republic and freedom when a republic eliminates freedom by control

by the mob reign of lusts of those Plato deem as philosopher kings. We have a Democratic-Republic where Courts grant us a democracy and are the only institutions that safeguard freedom from making citizens for sale slaves to foreign and private partners by economic, social or physical force

26. *In Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, 197 U.S. 11, 35 (1905), a case regarding compelled vaccines, I am horrified the court reasoned irrational logic by stating,

“In a free country, where the government is by the people, through their chosen representatives, practical legislation admits of no other standard of action; for what the people believe is for the common welfare must be accepted as tending to promote the common welfare, whether it does in fact or not. Any other basis would conflict with the spirit of the Constitution, and would sanction measures opposed to a republican form of government.

While we do not decide and cannot decide that vaccination is a preventive of smallpox, we take judicial notice of the fact that this is the common belief of the people of the State, and with this fact as a foundation we hold that the statute in question is a health law, enacted in a reasonable and proper exercise of the police power.”

VII. Contracts Clause will be used to overthrow the government because it protects private and foreign partners, contractors, instead of government workers pay, pensions and the people’s social security should the law not be overturned to preserve government seats to preserve the United States by caring for its government workers and the people.

27. This illogical thinking is the opposite of a free country. It is compromised slave country by allowing the mob reign of lusts through the vote eliminate individual freedom under the lie of the common good. This illogical thought also eliminates collective control to enslavement to those outside entities who entice the collective representative interest to control a no longer free, but puppet government by reward and avoidance of harm of outlines interests or goals. This same thinking will be used to control a no longer free people, but a bank owned and bought people under the global schemes which allow central banks to take over governing. These banks gain more the worse off the people are in.

28. There will be a change of hands of resources from the people, to the government, to those the government owes, the private partners. The private partners should not be protected by the Constitution’s provisions, but should be limited by it as government agents receiving

money for a government function. Limiting government contractors and partners is required to safeguard the freedom of the people. You see that is not the law, private partners are protected by the Contract Clause, whereas I argue as agents of the government receiving money to perform a government function they should not be protected but limited by the Constitution. See,

29. The government employees' pay, pensions and social security have limited property interest that may arguably be safeguarded from elimination without procedural due process, but it may be reduced or eliminated for a rational legitimate government use or changed by accord and satisfaction.

30. The real way to safeguard the schemed overthrow of the government which is schemed at some unknown flexible time is to prevent the overthrow is by changing case law to no longer protect those who will cause the overthrow, the government's private and foreign partners, including the federal reserve, who are wrongly protected by the contract's clause to protect government employees pay, pensions and everyone's all the individuals' social security instead.

VIII. Contracts Clause to kill the Government and enslave a no longer free but bank owned people in a global new world order

31. Look at this horrific case law that sets up private partners to recoup assets from the government by increasing worse conditions where people lose their homes and cars and assets under the false blame it is the government's fault, when the private partners are the villains, not the saviors. Courts traditionally viewed pensions as mere gratuities that could be taken away at will, much like a conditional gift, which obviously solved any problem of paying out non-existent funds. See, e.g., *Lynch v. United States*, 292 U.S. 571 (1934); See, *Weinberger v. Salfi*, 422 U.S. 749, 772 (1975); ("Like **Social Security**, and unlike most private pension plans, railroad retirement benefits are not contractual. **Congress may alter, and even eliminate,**

them at any time.”); Also see, *Frisbie v. United States*, 157 U.S. 160, 166 (1895) (“The pension granted by the government is a matter of bounty. “No pensioner has a vested legal right to his pension. Pensions are the bounties of the government, which Congress has the right to give, withhold, distribute, or recall, at its discretion. *Walton v. Cotton*, 19 How. 355.” *United States v. Teller*, 107 U.S. 64, 68.

In, *Austin v. United States*, Civil Action No. 16-cv-02756-KLM, at *15-16 (D. Colo. Nov. 26, 2018) the Court explained:

Benefits for retired military personnel—and for **civilian retired federal employees**, for that matter—depend upon an exercise of **legislative grace, not upon principles of contract, property, or "takings" law**. See *Zucker v. United States*, 758 F.2d 637, 640 (Fed. Cir.1985) (explaining that federal workers' "entitlement to retirement benefits must be determined by reference to the statute[s] and regulations governing these benefits, rather than to ordinary contract principles"); see also *Bell v. United States*, 366 U.S. 393, 401 (1961) ("A soldier's entitlement to pay is dependent upon statutory right."); *Kania v. United States*, 227 Ct. Cl. 458, 650 F.2d 264, 267-68 (1981) ("Thus it has long been held that the rights of civilian and military public employees against the government do not turn on contract doctrines but are matters of legal status even where compacts are made."); *Shaw v. United States*, 226 Ct. Cl. 240, 640 F.2d 1254, 1260 (1981) (stating "the law is well settled that, 'public employment does not, . . . give rise to a contractual relationship in the conventional sense'" (citations omitted). In other words, Congress—and only Congress—can authorize the benefits that a retired federal employee, whether civilian or military, is entitled to receive. See *Frisbie v. United States*, 157 U.S. 160, 166 (1895) ("Pensions are the bounties of the government, which [C]ongress has the right to give, withhold, distribute, or recall at its discretion. Congress, being at liberty to give or withhold pensions, may prescribe who shall receive, and determine all the circumstances and conditions under which any application therefore shall be prosecuted. No man has a legal right to a pension The whole control of that matter is within the domain of congressional power." (citations omitted)).

In *Matsuo v. United States*, 586 F.3d 1180, the Court held,

Without a right to government employment in the first place, which plaintiffs don't argue exists, federal employees can have no judicially **enforceable interest in pay at a particular rate.** "The whole control of [federal employees' pay] is within the domain of congressional power" Citing, *Frisbie v. United States*, 157 U.S. 160, 166, 15 S. Ct. 586, 39 L. Ed. 657(1895).

In *Schism v. United States*, 316 F.3d 1259, 1272 (2002), the Court stated,

“In a bonus pay case that, ‘the rights of the affected service members must be determined by reference to the [relevant statutes and regulations] rather than to ordinary contract principles’)The doctrine that statutes are the exclusive source of law governing the compensation rights of members of the military for pensions as well as pay appears in Court opinions as early as 1856.”

In *Puglisi v. United States*, 564 F.2d 403, 410 (Fed. Cir. 1977) the Court uses a rational basis argument to reduce retirement to federal employees who received a military retirement too,

“Congress, wanting to limit the total government compensation receivable by any one person, reduced the retirement pay of regular officers holding federal civilian jobs, with a view toward bringing their total compensation more in line with that of retire reserve officers in such civilian positions. This was neither wholly unreasonable nor invidious.”

In *United States v. Teller*, 107 U.S. 64, 68 (1882) the Court held,

It was competent for Congress to pass this act. No pensioner has a vested legal right to his pension. Pensions are the bounties of the government, which Congress has the right to give, withhold, distribute, or recall, at its discretion. *Walton v. Cotton*, 19 How. 355. Therefore, the contention of the relator that, having received the pension of seventy-two dollars under the general law, he is also entitled to the pension of fifty dollars granted him by the special act, is without ground to rest on.

In *Soberal-Perez v. Heckler*, 717 F.2d 36, 43 (2d Cir. 1983), the Court held, “Plaintiffs’ interest in the receipt of social security benefits is protected by the due process clause of the fifth amendment. *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. at 332, 96 S.Ct. at 901.”

In *Wyman v. James*, 400 U.S. 309, 330 n.8 (1971)

Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603, is not in accord with that tradition. There we upheld the right of Congress to strip away accrued social security benefits. Nestor, an alien, came to this country in 1913. From the enactment of the Social Security Act until 1955 Nestor and his employers contributed payments to the fund. In 1955 Nestor became eligible for old-age benefits. One year later he was deported for having been a member of the Page 330 Communist Party between 1933 and 1939 — a time when it was perfectly legal to be a member. In 1954 Congress passed a law which provided for the loss of social security benefits for anyone deported for having been a member of the Communist Party. Like the law providing for deportation for membership this law, too, was fully retroactive. Thus Nestor was deported after he had retired based on a law condemning membership in the Communist Party at the time when it was legal to be a member, and stripped of his retirement income based on a law which was triggered by that deportation. We upheld the constitutionality of the 1954 law by a 5-4 majority. The majority stated Nestor's property had not been taken without due process because Nestor had no property

rights; his interest was "noncontractual" and could "not be soundly analogized to that of the holder of an annuity." 363 U.S., at 610. The majority then went on to hold social security benefits were only protected from congressional action which is "utterly lacking in rational justification." *Id.*, at 611. If it was unconstitutional in *Speiser* to condition a tax exemption on a limitation on freedom of speech, it was equally unconstitutional to withhold a social security benefit conditioned on a limitation of freedom of association. A right-privilege distinction was implicitly rejected in *Speiser* and explicitly rejected in *Sherbert*. Today's decision when dealing with a state statute joins *Flemming* as an anomaly in the cases dealing with unconstitutional conditions.

32. The property interest in federal pay, pensions and social security are insufficient and does not eliminate reduction or non-pay of such property interest for a legitimate government interest.

In *Cook v. Principi*, 318 F.3d 1334, 1351-52 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Court held,

It is well established that recipients of statutory entitlements such as Social Security disability benefits have a property interest protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. See *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 332, 96 S.Ct. 893, 47 L.Ed.2d 18 (1976) ("[T]he interest of an individual in continued receipt of [Social Security disability] benefits is a statutorily created property interest protected by the Fifth Amendment.") (citing *Richardson v. Belcher*, 404 U.S. 78, 80-81, 92 S.Ct. 254, 30 L.Ed.2d 231 (1971); *Richardson v. Perales*, 402 U.S. 389, 401-402, 91 S.Ct. 1420, 28 L.Ed.2d 842 (1971); *Flemming v. Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603, 611, 80 S.Ct. 1367, 4 L.Ed.2d 1435 (1960); cf. *Arnett v. Kennedy*, 416 U.S. 134, 166, 94 S.Ct. 1633, 40 L.Ed.2d 15 (1974) (Powell, J., concurring in part); *Roth*, 408 U.S. at 576-78, 92 S.Ct. 2701; *Bell v. Burson*, 402 U.S. 535, 539, 91 S.Ct. 1586, 29 L.Ed.2d 90 (1971); *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254, 261-62, 90 S.Ct. 1011, 25 L.Ed.2d 287 (1970)). For the same reasons property interests were found in these cases, a veteran's interest in the continued receipt of service-connected death and disability benefits is also a property interest. The statutory entitlement to such benefits is set forth in 38 U.S.C. §§ 1110, 1121, 1131, and 1141, and these sections provide an absolute right to benefits to qualified individuals. 38 U.S.C. § 1110 (2000) (providing for wartime disability compensation); 38 U.S.C. § 1121 (2000) (providing for wartime death compensation for designated heirs and dependents); 38 U.S.C. § 1131 (2000) (providing for peacetime disability compensation); 38 U.S.C. § 1141 (2000) (providing for peacetime death compensation for designated heirs and dependents).

See, *Robinson v. Sullivan*, 905 F.2d 1199, 1202 (8th Cir. 1990) ("Judge Robinson also contends that rescission of his earned quarter of social security coverage diminished his **compensation as a federal judge in violation of Article III**, section 1, of the Constitution. Under *United States v. Will*, 449 U.S. 200, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d 392 (1980), once a federal salary increase becomes effective, any attempt to rescind that increase violates the Compensation Clause. *Id.* at 224-26, 101 S.Ct. at 485-86. Judge

Robinson urges us to extend Will to eligibility for retirement insurance benefits on the ground that judicial compensation consists of a package of benefits, which now includes social security benefits. He asserts that social security benefits, like judicial salary increases, are congressionally-controlled statutory creatures that, once effective, are protected by the Compensation Clause. ”)

Robinson v. Sullivan, 905 F.2d 1199, 1202 (8th Cir. 1990), the Court reasoned,

“In *O'Malley v. Woodrough*, 307 U.S. 277, 282, 59 S.Ct. 838, 840, 83 L.Ed. 1289 (1939), the Supreme Court held that the duty to pay taxes, shared by all citizens, does not diminish judges' compensation within the meaning of the Compensation Clause. Likewise, social security retirement insurance benefits are earned and paid as part of a general social welfare plan and not specifically as judicial compensation. Retroactive application of the Omnibus Act exemption simply prevented retirement pay that Judge Robinson received in early 1986 from being categorized as wages subject to FICA tax. Accordingly, we conclude that the Omnibus Act exemption did not diminish Judge Robinson's compensation within the meaning of the Constitution.

VIII Compensation Clause Protections may be eliminated

33. Federal Judges may not be concerned with their federally employed staff or social security for the elderly, but they should be concerned. Congress, lobbyists and professors are talking about eliminating federal judges protection of life time tenure. It is reasonable to conclude they may eliminate the guarantee of pay to be partial and bank owned and bought by the central banks through regulations. This would create partial unjust decrees in courts. Should someone with standing change case law to eliminate the Contract Clause's protections for private and foreign partners to protect the people's social security, pay and pensions, we may be able to prevent the overthrow of the government by private and foreign partners.

32. “The Constitution's Compensation Clause guarantees federal judges a “Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.” U.S. Const., Art. III, § 1.” *United States v. Hatter*, 532 U.S. 557, 560 (2001).

33. My arguments in my previous affidavit, wherein I disagreed with the Supreme Court's elimination of individual Constitutional freedoms to serve the alleged Constitutional

rights I argue private and foreign partners should not have may also help safeguard the United States.

34. I thought it was neat when 8 federal judges brought a lawsuit and the US Supreme Court held, ““The Compensation Clause prevents the Government from collecting Social Security taxes, but not Medicare taxes, from federal judges who held office before Congress extended those taxes to federal employees. Pp. 565-578.” *United States v. Hatter*, 532 U.S. 557, 558 (2001)

35. Maybe judges may seek to save federal pay, pensions and social security, as judges, to prevent the overthrow of the government by private and foreign government partners.

36. This artificial schemed indebtedness is used to control a no longer free but for sale government too. Debt is against my religious beliefs. I care about safeguarding the Courts. You judges are capable of reflecting the image of God by laying down your interest to love and care for people to prevent oppression, harm and death. I believe in safeguarding the possibility not the guarantee of justice in the courts by safeguarding you, even if you disagree with me, and think my religious beliefs are weird.

Jury Duty and other

37. On April 19, 2023, this Honorable Court called me to jury duty. I sent this Court the attached request to be excused from jury duty and to be excused from registration by filling out forms due to my religious objection to affirming in and swearing. (Exhibit E)

38. My neighbor passed away per Exhibit F, and I will need time to grieve.

39. My phone was reactivated, but I have still had a difficult time making calls.

40. This affidavit is getting too long. I must start drafting another one to update you on other matters.

41. I am exhausted. My mother returned to Florida today. I love her, but I was not able to address the lawsuits. I required time to spend with her and my sisters' family visiting from their home in Hawaii.

Thank you for your time.

Dated 4/26/23

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan M. Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693, Not acting as a lawyer

Under religious protest as declaring and swearing violates God's teachings in the Bible, I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct under the penalty of perjury.

Dated: April 26, 2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan Kelly (signed)