

No. 23-7360

Related Application No. 23A144

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Esq. Petitioner

V

Eastern District Court of Pennsylvania

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari of Third Circuit Case No 22-3372

Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire's Petition for a rehearing on Order dated October 7, 2024

Meghan Kelly, Esquire, pro se
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
US Supreme Court No 283696

QUESTION PRESENTED

I. Whether the United States Supreme Court must reopen consideration of my petition for writ of certiorari since it failed **to consider my Motion to recuse Justice Jackson** denying my a right to a fair and impartial forum by allowing a judge who ruled against me in advisory opinions on September 1, 2024 to partake in a judicial conference September 30, 2024 where this Court did not consider *Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly's Motion/Application to Recuse the Honorable Justice Jackson and to postpone the conference date for the writ of Certiorari for Third Circuit pending a supplemental brief for the EDPA appeal No. 7360.*

II. Even if the Court considered the recusal, and rejected it, whether the Court violated due process by allowing her to partake in the Oct 7, 2024 decision since she publicized arguments against my case around or on September 1, 2024 she opined in public on her decision against me in two separate cases pending before her, including this case and another case, *Kelly v Swartz et al*, showing she cannot be fair on the issues as to whether the disciplinary rules against federal judges and the proffered disciplinary rules and proceedings against this United States Supreme Court violate my right to a fair proceeding as applied and per se since the courts are tempted to violate my Constitutional rights they are charged to uphold to prevent professional harm to their own persons by unjust threats that are used to commandeer a no longer free and impartial lower courts but threatened federal courts which jeopardize this highest court.

II. Even if the Court allegedly considered my petition to recuse Justice Jackson, whether this Court violated due process by failing to recuse Justice Jackson given she rendered an advisory decision against me on issues pending before the court on tv on or about September 1, 2024 unfairly preemptively denying my arguments I presented to the US Supreme Court,

including the legal issue of whether disciplinary rules and proceedings against US Supreme Court members violate my right to a fair and impartial forum as applied, to a court partial towards selfish interests of evading discipline and impeachment instead of impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law to uphold my legal rights and claims or the public's or other private parties rights before an impartial not partial, threatened, retaliatory forum by stating she did not see any reason to treat USSC differently to allow discipline of her peers she may not agree with.

III. Whether this Court's staff committed a clerical error by failing to distribute *Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly's Motion/Application to Recuse the Honorable Justice Jackson and to postpone the conference date for the writ of Certiorari for Third Circuit pending a supplemental brief for the EDPA appeal No. 7360*, prior to conference depriving me of meaningful access to the courts by vitiating my first Amendment right to petition without due process in accord with the 5th Amendment which must be cured by reopening this case to consider the unaddressed motion, recusing Justice Jackson, and addressing issues in this petition for rehearing explicitly and by reference. US Amend I, V.

IV. Whether this Court committed clerical error by failing to allow this USSC to make a legal determination on my motion for a stay in this case pending a determination of whether Richard Abbott may represent me, by failing to docket it, then disbaring Richard Abbott to prevent me from arguing harm but for my petitions, and whether this Court may consider the state disparate treatment against attorney's private petitions based on viewpoint to reinstate Richard Abbott or afford any relief it deems just since I am prejudiced by denial of my choice of attorney in retaliation for my attempt to defend it.

V. Whether this reciprocal lawsuit initiated per original state's, Delaware's retaliation against Meghan Kelly for her private religious-political beliefs contained in her private religious freedom restoration act lawsuit against former President Trump and current President Biden where she averred her belief the Attorney generals may bring lawsuits under 18 Sections 201 or 666 to prevent the overthrow of these United States by preventing the Government's private and foreign partners from controlling the government to eliminate the government to eliminate the rule of law which founded, maintain and sustains these United States from a very real scheme to eliminate the rule of law by eliminating the Constitutionally vested power of the petitioners under the 1st, 5th and 14th Amendments of the right to petition coupled with fair opportunity to be heard and the courts power to hear cases under Article III, given the US Supreme Court has diminished state and federal attorney generals authority to protect all the government not merely the President by defense, and petitioners such as me thereby depriving itself of the power to hear cases to save itself by denying both petitioner and public petitioners access to the courts to restrain the President based on viewpoint of speech and association of Defendant the President in violation of the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component.

VI Is the president above the king above the God without Constitutional restraint by his official government authority unbalanced by the people's Constitutional legal checks the petition coupled with due process (US Amend I, V, XIV), the Attorney General's legal check to prosecute and defend all and protect the entire government not merely the Pres and other branches from a schemed overthrow a President ignorantly, indifferently or intelligently aids in by misguided official conduct in need of judicial and petitioner's guidance to maintain the rule of

law, that founded these United States, not the lie of misguided lawless people the consent of the people.

VII. Whether the new and additional Congressional attacks against Justice Alito relating to his wife's exercise of 1st Amendment right to speech, private petition and association relating to flags, where law makers exceed the limits of their constitutional authority to threaten to investigate, discipline or impeach to control the outcome of issues in my live cases regarding the Constitutionality of forcing the Court to adopt disciplining rules or perform disciplinary proceedings against the US Supreme Court member Justice Alito under the threat of impeachment so as not to foreseeably vitiate my 5th Amendment right to a fair and impartial not threatened and biased court towards avoiding punishment by Congress who acts as a witness without a case or controversy on issues I am petitioning in case and made with the express intent of Congressmen to affect a lawsuit Trump v US, No 939.

VIII. Whether the new and additional Congressional attacks against Justice Alito relating to his wife's exercise of 1st Am right to speech, private petition and association relating to flags, where law makers exceed the limits of their constitutional authority to threaten to control the outcome of Trump v US, No 939 by requiring recusal of Justice Alito and foreseeably threatening punishment for failing to recuse which foreseeably prejudices the outcome of my petitions to overturn the orders below for failure to recuse Phipps and Scirica violates my right to a fair and impartial forum and Due Process under US Amend I, V, not partial towards the US Supreme Court's private interest in protecting its members by ruling in favor of those who defend the court against congressional attacks by granting Trump immunity from criminal prosecution.

IX. Whether this Court should grant my supplemental brief given the new threats against Justice Alito's wife for the exercise of the first Amendment right to associate and speech moved my heart since I understand what is like not to feel secure in your own home based on exercise of Constitutional fundamental rights which caused me to change my previous arguments in light of this new information in order to assess the legality of my new and different Constitutional arguments.

X. I previously argued below the US Supreme Court should only be disciplined within the purview of the Constitutional limits of 1. a case and controversy or 2. Impeachment. I now contest the Constitutionality of impeachment, and seek the court limit Congress's implied investigatory power, or at least the Constitutional authority of Congress to abuse its government authority to threaten the Court unrestrained from affecting the outcome of petitioner's 1st Amendment right to petition fairly in accord with 5th Amendment right to due process to prevent deprivation of my asserted right to fairly be heard without outside threats of Congress to control the outcome on issues and cases which foreseeable prejudice my case.

XI. Whether Congress's authority to impeach must be restrained and limited so as to protect private petitioners right to petition fairly, including my right as applied and the US Attorney General, and even petitioner Trump in 939.

XII. Whether immunity violates the Constitutional legal check of petitioner Meghan Kelly and the US Government to petition fairly in accord with U Amend I. V, without partiality towards a President and bias against petitioners before deprivation of life, liberty or property interest of petitioner Meghan Kelly and the interest of the US Government.

XIII. Whether the US Supreme Court violated the Constitution by eliminating checks to balance Trump's power, namely the law makers authority to draft criminal laws to protect

Constitutional rights of people congressional check, the US Attorney Generals' power to enforce criminal law upon the President to protect the Constitutional rights of the people and the institution of the government from an attempted coup, while also eliminating my check upon the President through the petition wrongfully due to bias, not the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law. The US Supreme Court appeared to give the opposite ruling of those who bullied and attacked the court while ruling in favor of those Republicans in office who defended the Court against required recusals, impeachment, discipline and disciplinary rules, by unconstitutionally holding Trump is absolutely immune from prosecution of crimes for official conduct, and presumptively immune from other conduct in violation of Equal Protections and the Constitutional rights of the victims of a President harms.

XIV Can the Court protect its own institution by limited Congressional authority to prevent threats that affect the outcome of cases and controversies in my case and other cases by limiting Congressional authority to impeach and investigate so as not to violate a petitioners right to petition in a fair and impartial forum not threatened to force outcomes in case unfairly in violation of separation of Article I powers from Article III powers to preserve petitioners rights and claims from unfair government infringements. US Am I, V.

XV. Whether immunity by case law vitiates other Constitutional checks such as the government's check upon all via the US Attorney Generals by criminal proceedings which appear presumed by the Constitution in violation of the constitution.

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page, although there is an issue as to whether the Court below may be a party in a case which I presented in my Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

CASES DIRECTLY RELATING TO THIS CASE

Kelly v Swartz, et al, Delaware District Court No. 21-1490, and Third Circuit Court of Appeals Matter No 21-3198. US Supreme Court filings Kelly v Swartz et al 22A747, Kelly v Swartz et al. 22-6783, Kelly v Swartz et al. 23A100, and 23-7372.

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

Kelly v Democrats and Delaware Department of Election, et. Al. Delaware Chancery Court No 2020-0157.

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

Reciprocal disciplinary case Eastern District of PA matter No 22-45, Third Circuit Court of Appeals No. 22-3372, Supreme Court No.23-7360.

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

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

PA Supreme Court No 2913 DD3, US Supreme Court filing Kelly v Pennsylvania Office of Disciplinary Counsel US Supreme Court Numbers 22A981, 22-7695

DC and the US Supreme Court have refrained from discipline, DC based on jurisdiction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Question presented.....	ii-vii
Parties.....	viii
Related Cases.....	viii
Table of Contents.....	xi
Appendix.....	xix
Table of Authorities.....	xx-xxi
Statement of Case:.....	1
Argument.....	1-15
Conclusion.....	15

APPENDIX

Appendix (hereinafter “App.”)

App A **Order,** Envelop and Letter notice of Order denying petition for writ of certiorari in Kelly v EDPA dated Oct. 7, 2024, and Letter notice of Order denying petition for writ of certiorari in Kelly v Swartz dated Oct. 7, 2024.....1-15

App B Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly’s Motion/Application to Recuse the Honorable Justice Jackson and to postpone the conference date for the writ of Certiorari for Third Circuit pending a supplemental brief for the EDPA appeal No. 7360, dated 9/19/2024, and exhibits thereto including **Exhibit 1 thereto.** Article, *Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson says she's open to an 'enforceable' Supreme Court ethics code, “A binding code of ethics is pretty standard for judges, and so I guess the question is 'Is the Supreme Court any different?'" Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson said in a CBS News interview.* By Alexandra Marquez, and **Exhibit 2 thereto.** Letter to Third Circuit and Third Circuit Judicial Complaint with some exhibits thereto not all to show this Court disciplinary proceedings against federal judges does not uphold the impartial rule of law but only destroys and threatens no longer independent judges to eliminate freedom for business. Wherein I noted the proceedings are unfair even to the judge I complained about.....1-15

Exhibit 8 to App B Agenda to eliminate the law.....1-15

App C Petitioner Meghan Kelly moves this Court to recuse Four Judges, Judge Hardiman, Judge Phipps, Judge Honorable Montgomery-Reeves, and Judge Scirica in Third Circuit 22-3372, dated June 8, 2023
.....1-15

App D Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Motion to recuse the Honorable Peter J. Phipps twice a nominee to US Supreme Court by President Trump to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5th dated February 14, 20231-15

App E Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Motion for Reconsideration of Order dated June 20, 2023 and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for a new panel to consider my Motion for a Rehearing on Denial of her Appellate Brief in civil rights case Kelly v Swartz et al. dated June 30, 2023 (regarding Judge Scirica recusal needed).....1-15

App F Appellant’s letter regarding conflicts of interests with Judge Phipps beyond his reward by appointment of a judicial position in exchange with reciprocal punishment for suing Trump with favoritism toward opponent, dated February 15, 20231-15

App G Petitioner Meghan Kelly motion for a caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica, regarding judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent non-lawyers and non-judges from practicing law or taking the place of people judges without government

authority, somehow using the rules to uphold the rule of law from nonlawyers lawyering and non-judges judging in place of judges to eliminate the courts as schemed 6/09/2023.....1-15

App H Petitioner Meghan Kelly motion for a Second caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica to move him for judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent judges from speaking engagements on behalf of political think tanks such as the lobbyists at the Federalist Society, dated June 15, 2023, and exhibits attached thereto.....1-15

App I Petitioner Meghan Kelly Affidavit in Support of Recusal of Judge Phipps, and Judge Scirica, dated July 4, 2023 and exhibits thereto.....1-15

App J Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Motion to recuse the Honorable Judge Anthony J. Sirica to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5th, dated June 8, 2023, and exhibits thereto..... 1-15

App K Article, The Conversation, Academic rigor, journalistic flair, *Why the British abandoned impeachment – and what the US Congress might do next*, By Eliga Gould, Published Feb. 12, 2021, Updated: February 15, 2021.....1-15

App L 5 proposed articles of impeachment Meg Kelly proffered and contacted 541 federal law makers that made no difference.....1-15

App M. Wikipedia on Roger Williams, founder of providence which became RI. He supported separation of church and state. Thomas Jeferson cited his words about the wall between church and state.....1-15

App 1 Meghan Kelly’s 208th Affidavit regarding inter alias concern petitioners are threatened by line of question of US Supreme Court Justice Gorsuch on 18 USC 201 and congress calling US AG Merrick Garland to chill his right to fairly petition to prosecute or not and defend rights, without threat by congressional interference and punishment of Garland to force him an AG to prosecute or to interfere with cases in contravention of US Amend I, V and exhibits thereto; Including

- Email dated May 13, 2024 regarding the elimination of the rule of law and problems with the manner money is created based on violating *Ezekiel* 18:13, the Babylon way, albeit not as troublesome as the new manner money is schemed to be created and utilized to allow for the overthrow of these US after 2050
- Email, including regarding opposition to mental healthcare manipulation by profiteering cohorting self-proclaimed experts as schemed by the 4th Industrial Revolution plans and religious belief people go to hell for deferring to science, experts, professionals unrestrained by the law to prevent human sacrifice and enslavement
- Fabian Window shows the lawless one’s plan through misguided people

- Picture from phone showing I made Drafts in emails to Lisa Nesbitt I thankfully did not send regarding PA appeal. In a later affidavit I indicate I talked with Lisa and she said not to send the emails to her to correct failure to file or return documents in another matter
- Email to Lisa Nesbitt I noted she kindly corrected Robert Meek's denial of a petition for writ of cert for matter No 23-7372, where I sought to see if she would help me fix another deprivation of an opportunity to be heard in the same civil rights appeal, by Robert Meek's rejection of docketing *Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Emergency Application to the Honorable Justice Samuel A. Alito, Junior to stay or pause the time to appeal the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit 21-3198 to discern whether Richard Abbott may represent me as counsel in the civil rights case*
- Meg's rejected unfiled Petition to the Honorable Samuel A. Alito, Junior to stay or pause the time to appeal the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit 21-3198 to discern whether Richard Abbott may represent me as counsel in the civil rights case, US Supreme Court No. 23-7372 for the civil rights appeal Kelly v Swartz, et al, dated February 7, 2024, and the following exhibits thereto including,
 - Email to opposing side asking stance on application
 - Richard L Abbott's Response in Opposition of Discipline, Case No. 23-524 in the DE District Court dated January 5, 2024
 - Meg Kelly's letter to Delaware Supreme Court Justice Henry DuPont Ridgely concerning Judges disparately treating attorneys based on firm size, or place of origin, and examples where judges demeaned people based on place of origin, especially PA, but Maryland too.
 - Letter by the US Supreme court denying pages for appeal in Kelly v Swartz, dated January 8, 2024
 - Letter by US Supreme Court granting time to cure the defect in exceeding 40 pages in Kelly v Swartz, dated January 12, 2024
 - Proof of mailing and certificate of service of the rejected application, and proof of filing
 - Email dated February 7, 2024 to Robert Meek forwarding the Emergency Application o the Honorable Justice Samuel A. Alito, Junior to stay or pause the time to appeal the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit 21-3198 to discern whether Richard Abbott may represent me as counsel in the civil rights case, mailed 2/7/2024
 - Series of emails including other filings not docketed by this court and messages to check upon status of emergency application
 - Letter dated February 12, 2024 from Robert Meek rejecting my emergency application received February 15, 2024
 - Email to Robert Meek addressing the reasons for the rejection, the questions Robert asked, and why I believed there was an error in rejecting the application
 - Email to DE State AG Ryan Costa, opposing counsel in civil rights case and DE chair to federalist party where I address a constitutional concern of lack of impartial trial court by actual judges in disciplinary proceedings.....1-15

App 2 120th Affidavit averring Richard L Abbott got into trouble because the Judge was frustrated with his allegedly super wealthy client who previously retained other attorneys for ongoing Home Owner Association disputes to cut down trees or shrubs as they grew so other people's beach view would be less obstructed verses privacy of home dwellers.

- Newspaper Article from the DE News Journal about the case Richard L Abbott was punished for called *Judge: Rehoboth Bat beach fight one of nastiest*, by Maureen Milford, dated June 26, 2025 where vice Chancellor Glascock noted his disdain about the dispute based on being upset with the animosity between the clients
- Notice mailed to opposing counsel to DE US AG Kathleen Jennings through agent Ryan Costa regarding the civil rights case
- Letter by US Supreme Court of Notice the petition for writ of cert for the civil rights case Kelly v Swartz was filed on May 2, 2024, Waiver form, and envelop Kathleen Jennings, DE AG C/O Ryan Costa to show these items were sent to civil rights opponent, head of DE's federalist association Ryan Costa on behalf of DE AG Kathleen Jennings per instructions of opponents counsel.....1-15

App 3 210th Affidavit and exhibits thereto relating to documents in Kelly v Trump concerning how the Attorney Generals may use the criminal statutes 18 USC sections 201 and 666 to dissolve the corruption partnerships and monetary backing in a forced slave economy neither free nor fair that allows for the overthrow may be dissolved to prevent the overthrow, including:

- Article Reuters, *Iran's hardliner President Ebrahim Raisi killed in helicopter crash*, by Parisa Hafezi and Yomna Ehab, dated Mon May 20, 2024
- Article Associated Press, AP, *Slovak prime minister's condition remains serious but prognosis positive after assassination bid*, by Lefteris Pitrikis, dated May 19, 2024
- Diocese of Wilimngton Press release, *Bishop Malooly responds to "The Keepers."*
- DE online, News Journal, Ex-Delaware bishop named as Catholic official who covered up clergy sex abuse in Baltimore:Report, by Esteban Parra dated May 5, 2023
- The Keepers Wickepedia, (New neighbor was on this tv show)
- Email dated May 19, 2024, sent opposing counsel request for disciplinary proceeding to be open called and the attached
- Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for good cause, 1 Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 9, to Unseal the Record, 2. to declare self-regulation of attorneys, other Professions, and judges unconstitutional, making business above the law, by making the dictates of professionals, or bureaucrats within agencies, as opposed to laws enacted by congress people, checked by the vote of the people, the law, and 3. in lieu of and in the alternative, eliminate the secret trial requirements of professionals before Boards, including the Board on Professional Responsibility, requiring the choice of an open or confidential forum left to the accused professional, instead of requiring a secret proceeding, concealing the accused's defense, to the advantage of the accuser state, in violation of equal protections, and due process 1st and 14th Protections. where I noted the plan to eliminate judges Page ID 47102

- Exhibit A thereto Letter to Colm F Connelly regarding self-regulation is lawlessness with partiality to self not the impartial application of the law to protect all equally, pages 4-5 discussing the importance of judges at the threat of elimination of the same to eliminate the rule of law that founded, sustains and maintains the United States
- Turned in my tags because I could not afford car insurance
- Proof I suspended my insurance
- Proof I am eligible for EBT because the state forces me not to work in my occupation of choice
- Email to Chris regarding agenda to control to eliminate judges
- Proposed Order on my Motion submitted to DE Supreme Court Meghan Kelly's Motion for good cause, 1 Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 9, to Unseal the Record, 2. to declare self-regulation of attorneys, other Professions, and judges unconstitutional, making business above the law, by making the dictates of professionals, or bureaucrats within agencies, as opposed to laws enacted by congress people, checked by the vote of the people, the law, and 3. in lieu of and in the alternative, eliminate the secret trial requirements of professionals before Boards, including the Board on Professional Responsibility, requiring the choice of an open or confidential forum left to the accused professional, instead of requiring a secret proceeding, concealing the accused's defense, to the advantage of the accuser state, in violation of equal protections, and due process 1st and 14th Protections.
- Certificate of service via email and mail to Disciplinary Counsel Kathleen Vavala
- Docket No 22D03109 showing US Supreme Court seals disciplinary matters in secret proceedings
- Article CNN *Netanyahu's son discusses gas deal, prostitutes in strip club* recording By Ian Lee, CNN, January 10, 2018
- Emails to opposing counsel 18 USC sections 201 and 666 and comparing Robert Biden to Prime Minister of Israel's son who also exploited woman as property to buy and sell not people
- Exhibit D, DE Supreme Court Motion in Kelly v Trump previously wrongly sealed Appellant's Unopposed Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to accept her waiver of a speedy decision, where I denote on page 10 I seek the US AG use 18 USC section 201 to eliminate corruption to preserve the impartial rule of law not biased to serving self.
- A-4 Motion sealed wrongfully and sealed as an Exhibit (Page 10 refers to 18 USC section 666 I desired US AG to use to save these United States) 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 and exhibits thereto including
- A-5 Motion sealed wrongfully and sealed as an Exhibit, Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to Require the Recusal of the Honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz in this matter, please note checks in balance arguments on pages ID 47207-47210 regarding placing checks upon Trump, and exhibits thereto

- Petition for writ of certiorari Kelly v Trump US Supreme Court No. 21-5522 page 8 where I aver Attorney Generals may use 18 USC 201 to save these United States to prevent the overthrow
- Facebook noting my neighbor's kid may have been in danger. This since has been resolved. She is okay now.
- Pictures of Cheri's two brothers, Jonathon and Jeremy Watts with me at University of DE when I was younger. Jeremy used to work on top secret cyber contracts
.....1-15

App 4 215th Affidavit regarding protecting the people’s legal check upon the government petition coupled with due process and the importance of preserving the Attorney Generals check upon the government, Meg’s 5 articles of impeachment mattered not, Brilliant new legal argument by District Court Carlotto W Reeves concerning a people’s legal check the jury albeit not as powerful as the legal check of petition coupled with due process with attachments thereto including

- *Green v Thomas*, 3:23-CV-126-CWR-ASH (S.D. Miss. May. 20, 2024) Opinion
- Exhibit 7 dated September 22, 2020, 5 proposals to impeach former President Donald J Trump drafted by Meg Kelly
- *Jamison v McClendon* Case 3:16-cv-00595-CWR-LRA (S.D. Miss. August 4 2020)1-15

App 5 212th Affidavit regarding Protecting Justice Alito’s wife’s freedom of speech via flags Alito was criticized of, exhibits thereto

- Notice of vacancy Defendant Kathleen Vavala rewarded as assignment to superior court judge
- Article, *The New York Times*, *Lawmakers Dial Up Pressure to Recuse From Elections Cases*, by Zach Montague, May 24, 2024
- Article, *Brennan Center For Justice by Michael Waldman*, *Alito and His Upside Down Flag Make the Case for Supreme Court Term Limits*, dated May 22, 2024.....1-15

App 6 216th Affidavit Justice Alito’s letter responses to Congress’s improper attacks made with the intent to affect outcome in live cases, the County and State’s corrupt laws in DE under the lie of helping the farmers they are forcing them into foreclosures. A neighbor committed suicide in my development as he lost his farm1-15

App 7 224th Affidavit Regarding new Constitutional arguments to limit impeachment and investigatory power of Congress so as not to infringe upon my 1st Amendment right to petition fairly instead of unfairly by a threatened forum, and FRE 614.....1-15

App 8 211th Affidavit Regarding reason to protect kids from harmful surgeries with the caveat of sustaining their precious lives and liberties of kids used as lab rats in sex changes in US v Jonathon Krrmetti, and Trump’s foreseeable future lawless abuse of position to serve himself at the people’s expense, unrestrained by law since he seeks to diminish the authority of US and state attorney generals.....1-15

App 9 223rd Affidavit regarding congressional abuse of investigatory and impeachment powers to control other government agents impeding on separation of powers between Article I, Article II, and article III.....1-15

App 10 228th Affidavit State and County intentionally causing foreclosed farms to recoup them to sell or grant them to NGOs, 80 Trillion in government Pensions will not be paid per BIS, they were written off in debt swaps and tax breaks, 30 30 agenda, concerns of government

backing of private partners it colludes with and is unable to govern and guide, with exhibits thereto News article about Elon Musk's Tesla compensation plan.

App 11 229th affidavit Musk seeking to get his way in DE Chancery Court by extraneous extrajudicial threats made with the intent to harm, extort the court to harm its business, with attachment thereto headnotes for Trump v US, Case No. 939.....1-15

App 12 **231st Affidavit** Discussing the bad evil lawless words of research and science to save the world by making what is natural unnatural to get patent power and profit streams out of created pain to control the world under the lie of caring for it, news articles regarding impeaching Justice Alito and controversy about flags and alleged conflicts of interests which are for the parties to petition or not concerning due process not the mob, not congress, and not the court, but the petitioner's right to assert potential conflicts or not, impeding on the legal power to petition depriving people of due process by taking choice away by commandeering to control a no longer fair but threatened court.....1-15

App 13 235th affidavit additional misconduct by State discovered July 23, 2024 and additional concerns.....1-15

App 14 Meghan Kelly's Brief in support to her exceptions on Master Patricia Griffen's Order in Kelly v Trump where I alluded Trump would run for office and manipulate the courts to continue in his establishment of government religion by eliminating freedom for business, making no one free everyone and everything for sale to exploited by those with powers, connections or wealth unrestrained by law by government collusion to prevent human sacrifice or enslavement in a stakeholder interest where humanity will be the enemy instead of the treasure, dared Dec 5, 2020 in Kelly v Trump, Vice Chancellor Fioravanti did not file it until Jan 6, 2021.....1-15

App 15 Series of affidavits regarding DE Supreme Court not publicizing my pleadings, or providing documents to me where I am a party despite a court order to do so in 22-58 not limited to, 235th Affidavit regarding cases where claimants, their counsel, their special counsel or judges or their family are threatened by law makers abusing their investigatory power to violate the right to petition under the 1st Amendment in accord with due process under the 5th Amendment applicable to the federal gov and the 14th Amendment applicable to the state, not of concealment of documents in a case against me, not granting me copies or knowledge of what was filed despite the fact I am the party case NO 541, State Court did not adhere to its order to grant me copies via email No 58, State Court refused to publish my pleadings it secretly sealed, purported to make them available but it is not available to the public, Lexis published two pleadings noting there is no order to seal them when I provided Court stamped copies, despite the fact they are not available on public record, the DE Supreme Court refuses to make them public and exhibits thereto, Exhibit D an Order allowing me to self represent while I had shingles less than two weeks before the alleged hearing where I did not receive notice at all on the date in accordance

with the local rules which prejudiced me as the Board sat on my pleadings moving to perform discovery, time, objecting to lack of notice and more, Email from the Clerk of Court confirming the court would not give me pleadings or inform me of documents in a case against my person 541, other emails, Court deprived me of pleadings in two cases not one, 541 and 58, Clerk of Court said she would give me filings in accord to the rule she did not adhere to 2 or more years later, then she left the court for two weeks, came back and waited another week and submitted some additional docs for 541 not 58 via email, I sent her a memory stick in 2021, but she emailed, email to opposing counsel and non-party David Weiss concerning lobbyists and congress using threats to inhibit live cases, David Weiss's case against Robert Biden aka Hunter Biden, 236th Affidavit, proof my pleadings were not public but sealed and unavailable to Westlaw, and Lexis, March 3, 2022 letter, an order granted me permission to drop off my paper, but the court refused to docket it in bad faith unless I found a way to scan it in despite the fact the law library and Del Tech denied me access to the scanner disparity to prejudice my case, 237th Affidavit, Lexis and Westlaw could not see what was and appears to remain sealed on my case, I provided the docket and the court stamped pleadings wrongly sealed and lexis gave them searchable references based on me not the court, Westlaw would not agree, the court would not agree to publish the wrongly sealed documents in Kelly v Trump, 239th affidavit
 see.....1-15

App 16 Lexis published the following filed in Kelly v Trump even though they could not see the public docket, because I provided it to them with the docket items not available to the public, Kelly v. Trump, 2021 DE S. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 422, Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to Rein in Its Arms through Its Agents from Unlawfully Pressuring Appellant to Forgo or Impede Her Case to Protect by Relief It Deems Just.....1-15

App 17 letter filed in Kelly v Swartz April 21, 2022 not limited to Defendants' obstruction to my access to the courts by the state to cause me to forgo my case, opposition to self-regulate, and assertion of 1st Am right to religious beliefs and exercise of religious beliefs.....1-15

App 18 April 26, 2022 letter regarding Court fired two court staff to cover up deprivations of due process, and constitutional arguments and move for the right to amend the complaint to include Constitutional arguments.....1-15

App 19 DE previously wrongly sealed APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT TO REQUIRE THE RECUSAL OF THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE COLLINS J. SEITZ, JUNIOR IN THIS MATTER in Kelly v Trump, dated May 28, 2021, excluding exhibits in writeable form.....1-15

App 20 Even though not available to public Lexis published Kelly v Trump document, *Appellant's Motion for Recusal of Chief Justice Seitz*, 2021 DE S. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 423

App 21 APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT TO REQUIRE THE RECUSAL OF THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE COLLINS J. SEITZ, JUNIOR IN THIS MATTER in Kelly v Trump, dated May 28, 2021, dated including exhibits1-15

App 22 APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT TO REIN 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 in Jelly v Trump, May 25, 2021 including exhibits.....1-15

App 23 Police investigation announced April 20, 2020, Proof two bullets were shot into a Greg Layton’s home above his and his wife’s head at the kitchen table as they were sitting based on Greg’s political speech in DE, to show I was rightly concerned about being taken out or killed in DE, especially since people talked about shooting me based on political religious speech.....1-15

App 24 Showing Greg was sued for alleged political speech.....1-15

App 25 Proof Trump was going to run for office like my attached brief at App 14 averred, by the establishment of an entity in 12/7/2020 in Fl under agent Robert Brilliance, Trump 2024, LLC, registered 04062296, prior to the Jan. 6, 2021 attempted coup, and a second entity created under agent Robert Brilliance, in FL Trump 2024, L.L.C., registered L20000381189, prior to the Jan. 6, 2021 attempted coup, called Trump 2024 L.L.C., and a third entity established 11/7/2020 in Idaho called Trump L.L. C., registered 4062296, **it is unusual that the entity’s registered agent Robert Brilliance is in FL while the entity is formed out of state in Idaho, possible to evade service**1-15

App 26 Present sense impression about people talking about shooting me based on political religious speech, dated Nov. 18, 2019, prior to filing Kelly v Trump but I care more about the establishment of gov religion by the gov through Trump misleading people to harm others, die to be damned to hell since he teaches the way to hell, sin, as Godly1-15

App 27 Pictures of someone had thrown substance at my car but for my political religious beliefs on stickers.....1-15

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Articles and other references *In Congress's Contempt power and the enforcement of congressional subpoenas: Law, History, Practice and procedure*, in Congressional Research service dated May 12, 2017, Todd Garvey.....14-15

Kelly v. Trump_ 2021 DE S. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 422 and 423.....4

CASES

Alviso v. United States, 6 Wall. 457.....11

Becker v. Montgomery, 532 U.S. 757, 767 (2001).....10

Cerame v. Bowler, Civ. 3:21-cv-1502 (AWT), at *4 (D. Conn. Aug. 29, 2022).....5

Doe v. Indian River Sch. Dist., 653 F.3d 256, 259, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 16121....9

Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada, 501 U.S. 1030, 1054 (1991).....2

Gondeck v. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 382 U.S. 25 (1965).....10

In re Discipline of Harding, 104 P.3d 1220, 1225 (Utah 2004).....5

In Greene v. McElroy, 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959).....5

In re Sawyer, 360 U.S. 622 (1959).....5-6

Isaacs v. Caldwell, 530 S.W.3d 449, 455 (Ky. 2017).....11

Mullin v. Sussex County, 861 F. Supp. 2d 411, 415, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67571, *1..10

Ohio ex rel. Eaton v. Price, 360 U.S. 246 (1965).....10

Phillips v. Negley, 117 U.S. 665.....11

Salazar v. Buono, 559 U.S. 700, 130 S. Ct. 1803, 176 L. Ed. 2d 634 (2010).....9

St. L. S.F.R.R. v. Spiller, 275 U.S. 156 (1927).....11

Sinclair v. United States, 279 U.S. 263, 295 (1929).....13-14

The Palmyra, 12 Wheat. 1.....11

<i>United States v. Finnell</i> , 185 U.S. 236, 249 (1902).....	11
<i>U.S. v. Mohawk</i> , 20 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1994).....	12
<i>Wetmore v. Karrick</i> , 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907).....	11

CONSTITUTION

US Const. Amend I.....	1-15
US Const. Amend V.....	1-15
US Const Amend. IV.....	5, 6
US Amend. XIV.....	5, 6, 14
US Art I.....	7, 13
US Art III.....	7, 13

Executive orders

E.O. 13798.....	2, 12
Ex. Or. No. 13198, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021.....	2, 12
Ex. Or. No. 13199, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, May 3, 2018....	2, 12
Ex. Or. No. 13279, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No. 13559, November 17, 2010.....	2, 12
Ex. Or. No. 13559 Nov. 17, 2010.....	2, 12
Ex Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018.....	2, 12
Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021.....	2, 12

DE Disciplinary Rules

Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 9 (d) (3).....	5
--	---

Supreme Court Rules

Rule 25.....	1
Rule 26.....	1
Rule 29.....	1, 7
Rule 44.....	1, 2

I. STATEMENT OF CASE

I, Meghan Kelly, Esq., pro se pursuant to Rules 44, US Amend (“Am”)I, V rights (“rt(s)”) to meaningful access to the courts, Equal Protections (“EP”) pursuant to the 5th Amendment’s EP component, to petition (“pet”), with fair opportunity to be heard pursuant to US Am I, V, and any other law, not limited to Rules 18 25 and 29, respectfully this court may find or not applicable not limited to 18 and 25, in the interest of justice move this Court (“ct”) based on intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect of the outcome of my case, including clerical error I was not able to proffer before fairly in accord with due process. I seek to somehow protect the ct's function from being vitiated, the US Attorney General's check (“AG”) and my legal power to balance and check the gov by pet coupled with due process (“DP”) without vitiation of my rts/claims based on viewpoint of speech in pet, suing, or prosecuting the President (“Pres”), or petitioning gov to prevent deprivations and new DP or EP issues. I believe there is a scheme to eliminate the rule of law to allow for an overthrow by vitiating the power of the cts, and the petitioners including the AGs from using the rule of law to be replaced by a far worse oppressive system of control which will eliminate every freedom and the governments after 2050, with no rule of law to restrain those with power, connections, or wealth to control a no longer free but slave people. I preserve the issues. (See, App. B Ex 8)

Should I be unable to afford to defend the same in this appeal I waive my right to be heard and allow the US Solicitor General to defend the same without me should poverty cause a substantial burden on my access to the cts. I oppose amicus briefs on DP unfairness grounds to any participation of third parties, who diminish individual liberty by reign of collective mob lusts to be controlled by those who entice their desires not free to do what is right by laying down the vein desires of men to unconditionally love. Attached hereto, I resubmit herewith my Pet to file

in forma pauperis with the required affidavit again with objections to debt on religious grounds US Am I, V, and file it herewith. I incorporate from the record the unaddressed Pet to file in forma pauperis, the unaddressed Supplemental Brief, and Pet for writ of certiorari and all exhibits thereto into this petition for rehearing. I incorporate all the attached hereto into this petition on all pages. App A-App M include the fact I averred below my constitutional objections to regulating the US Supreme Court by disciplinary proceedings and sought to recuse Judges Phipps and Scirica, and included two caveats this Court may rule on instead of congress.

App 1-App 27 includes evidence of Congress's abuse of investigatory and impeachment authority to commandeer the court by threatening judge's family, USSC members, or threaten parties such as David Weiss to influence cases, including issues in my cases in violation of the right to petition fairly in accord with the 5th Am as applied to me, and endangering other public and private people's 1st Am rt to pet fairly. US Am. V. The Numbered Apps also show the State has infringed upon my right to meaningful access the courts, concealed my petitions, failed to make them publicly available and failed to provide documents a court order required in a timely fashion, while completely denying me access to the record in a case where I am a party, No 541, alleging it deprives all parties of a public record in quasi-criminal cases in violation of an accused's right to a public proceeding.

II. ARGUMENT

This appeal also relates to Delaware's punishment of me disparately in contravention of the 1st Am for private speech outlined in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act petition petitions, where my religious belief is material to the issues therein, based on subject matter grounds of disagreeing with my religious belief, and viewpoint in petitions. *Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada*, 501 U.S. 1030, 1054 (1991) ("At the very least, our cases recognize that disciplinary rules governing the legal profession cannot punish activity protected by the 1st Am, and that 1st

Am protection survives even when the attorney violates a disciplinary rule he swore to obey when admitted to the practice of law”)

New information arose or was discovered relating to the misconduct, fraud or bad faith of the Delaware Supreme Court justices acting in their personal capacity to abuse the color of the law to conceal and shield themselves from liability for violating the law, which is the source of this reciprocal disciplinary case. I am threatened by the state and not safe. Please help me.

Threats will continue. I do not want to be taken out, eliminated or killed but for the wicked pride and sinful vanity of those who wield power who give into temptation to lose it, their pensions, pay, the rule of law that sustains their seats from a schemed overthrow.

The State (DE) denied me of access to the courts and by stealth confiscating my law library card when I went through the courthouse scanner to prevent meaningful opportunity to petition and gain authority to defend my cases, including access to legal research to effectively draft this petition, on or about 10/16/24. The state agents colluded to confiscate my law library card to create an obstacle to my meaningful access to the courts and denied me parking for the law library previously permitted based on the partial whims of the Ct to obstruct my ability to petition against its members to affect the outcome of cases and future cases.

The state sent me an application for a new card, and the next day said state said it would preemptively deny the application. I did not apply under the threat of entrapment of selectively targeted lies of new proceedings to target me to eliminate my 1st and 5th Am rts to fair access to other courts. Per the attached exhibits the State denied me access to the courts previously allegedly because I did not have the card they took. So, they will likely deny me access again. Even when I had the card, the court simply denied me access, and the State Ct denied me permission to park in the state lot with intent to obstruct my access to the law library based on

viewpoint of speech contained in my petitions, for petitioning to restrain the state to purview of the Constitutional limits on 10/16/24.

This summer, the State also denied me access to the records in my own cases per the numbered petitions and refused to make public items it previously in bad faith sealed to cover up state's 1st Am violations applicable to it via the 14th Am in Kelly v Trump. Neither Westlaw or Lexis had access through the public docket. I provided the docket the concealed evidence with Court stamps to Lexis. Lexis noted there was no order to seal them, and the Clerk's deceptive statement that she unsealed them. Lexis published them per my request attached hereto at Kelly v. Trump_ 2021 DE S. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 422 and 423.

The USSC committed clerical error by failing to allow this USSC to make a legal determination on my motion for a stay filed 2/7/24 in this case pending a determination of whether Richard Abbott may represent me, by failing to docket it, then disbaring Richard Abbott to prevent me from arguing harm but for my petitions, prejudicing me by substantially burdening my fair access to the courts and vitiating my 1st Am right to pet without 5th Am due process by allowing a clerk to act as a judge in place of a judge because it refused to docket cases where I preserve my 1st Am right to 5th Am fair access to other proceedings. There is a high probability if the undocketed proceeding was presented to the USSC, the Ct may have been persuaded not to disbar Richard Abbott. In fact, the Ct appeared to disbar Richard Abbott to cover up its staff's mistakes causing manifest injustice.

Per the attached pet for a stay attached hereto App 1 and App 2, I moved USSC to stay this proceeding pending a determination of whether Richard Abbott can represent me in the civil rights case. I asserted and reassert my right to unimpeded fair access in other courts. I stated:

“In DE there is prejudiced based on place of origin and firm size. I drafted a petition concerning this problem I submitted to a DE Supreme Court Justice I attach here

and incorporate herein. Abbott recognized big firms and government attorneys who aggressively defend clients in a similar fashion as he was alleged to do are not admonished as he appeared to be.

So, Richard rightly exercised his right to petition to prevent disparate treatment against him. I live in Delaware. Delaware Judicial prejudice and favoritism based on place of origin, wealth, firm origin and firm size status as Richard's alleged small firm size unfortunately exists by the government through its judicial agents in DE. My first case ever, I filled in for another attorney before retired Judge Smalls of the Court of common pleas. The opposing counsel had an attorney filling in too. Yet, Judge Smalls called me a Philadelphia attorney as if that is a bad word, even though I am from DE to admonish me for filling in. The other counsel received no criticism. It was wrong. Judge Slight told me to go back to Pennsylvania after a CLE when I answered a question correctly and appeared to steal his thunder during the CLE. He said that meanly after class and made my former colleague Stephanie Noble have big deer eyes and scurry off.

Richard Abbott and I both were denied the asserted right to perform discovery, call witnesses and cross examine our accusers because the Court fired them in my case and hid that fact, and I had no idea Abbott had 17 or so subpoenas quashed. *In Greene v. McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959) the US Supreme Court held, "this Court will not hold that a person may be deprived of the right to follow his chosen profession **without full hearings where accusers may be confronted and cross-examined.**" Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 9 (d) (3) provides Abbott and I the right to call witnesses and cross examine them. We also have a 6th Amendment right to cross examine witnesses and a 1st Amendment right to petition to do so and a 14th Amendment state right to a fair proceeding. Nevertheless, there is a split in the circuits and states. See, *In re Discipline of Harding*, 104 P.3d 1220, 1225 (Utah 2004), ("Direct and cross-examination of the witnesses is not required in the quasi-administrative setting"); But see, *Cerame v. Bowler*, Civ. 3:21-cv-1502 (AWT), at *4 (D. Conn. Aug. 29, 2022) (This court grants right to confrontation under the 6th Amendment. "Both the disciplinary counsel and the respondent "shall be entitled to examine or cross-examine witnesses.") I think it imperative for the US Supreme Court to resolve the split(s) so professionals including lawyers and judges are not deprived of Constitutional freedoms.

Since Abbott faced similar deprivations. he is more suitable to asserting my claims because he understands my positions. In a lengthy opinion the State averred Abbott's speech in asserting and not waiving his Constitutional rights of procedural due process and Equal Protections was a reason for the discipline. I can't see what he averred in the state disciplinary case. They are sealed and are secret. Nevertheless, the state seemed to impose discipline but for his exercise of petitioning to defend himself. What was more outrageous is the state's improper partiality to itself the government including the courts in contravention of the 1st, and 14th amendment Equal Protections component in the exercise of Abbott's right to petition the courts applicable to the state via the 14th. The State Court lamented Abbott did not apologize for asserting his Constitutionally protected 1st Amendment right to assert Constitutionally protected defenses. Abbott and other attorneys as myself should not be compelled to exchange Constitutional liberties we professed to uphold in exchange for a license to buy and sell. Abbott's speech is protected.

The US Supreme Court appeared to protect speech of another attorney whose discipline this Court reversed for publicly decrying the unfairness of a proceeding against her client. Whereas Abbott defended himself in secret or before forums whose duty is to protect the Constitutional right to petition without condemning and chilling people's exercise of this most important right under which every other right is protected. The US Supreme Court *In re Sawyer*, 360 U.S. 622 (1959) reversed discipline and held,

"While actively participating as one of the defense counsel in a protracted and highly publicized trial in a Federal District Court in Hawaii of several defendants for conspiracy under the Smith Act, petitioner appeared with one of the defendants at a public meeting and made a speech which led to charges that she had impugned the impartiality and fairness of the presiding judge in conducting the trial and had thus reflected upon his integrity in dispensing justice in the case. These charges were preferred by the Bar Association of Hawaii before the Territorial Supreme Court; that Court referred the charges to the Ethics Committee of the Bar Association, which held a hearing, and found the charges sustained. The Territorial Supreme Court, upon review of the record, also sustained the charges, and ordered that petitioner be suspended from the practice of law for one year. The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit affirmed. Held: The record does not support the charge and the findings growing out of petitioner's speech, and the judgment is reversed. Pp. 623-640, 646-647." The Court further held:

"HN[3] Speculation cannot take over where the proof fail. HN[4] Lawyers are free to criticize the state of the law. HN[5] A lawyer's criticism of the rules of evidence does not constitute an improper attack on the judge who enforces such rules and presides at the trial. HN[6] Permissible criticism of the law may be made by a lawyer as well as to a lay audience as to a professional. HN[7] Without impugning the judiciary, a lawyer may criticize the law- enforcement agencies of the government and the prosecution, even to the extent of suggesting wrongdoing on their part. HN[8] The public attribution of honest error to the judiciary is no cause for professional discipline, even though some of the audience may infer improper collusion with the prosecution from a charge of error prejudicing the defense. HN[9] "An attorney is not guilty of professional misconduct by saying that the law is unfair or that judges are in error as a general matter, even if he is counsel of record in a case pending at that time." Id.

Should the Courts reverse Abbott's discipline I would like him to represent me in this matter should it go forward, and he would agree in light of my religious beliefs. I assert my 1st and 6th Amendment rights to self-represent in quasi criminal cases where I am indicted based on my religious beliefs in Jesus and related Constitutionally protected rights. However, this is a civil rights case I brought, and is not a case brought against my person. Jesus said let the holy spirit be my advocate when brought to the court as distinguished from me bringing the case to defend my belief in Jesus.:

USSC violated my rt to pet and DP by not docketing the motion preventing any consideration before vitiating of my rts, including the 1st Am rt to pet. US Amend I, V. Then

USSC sought to cover up its errors to argue no harm by disbaring Richard Abbott to prevent foreseeable arguments since he cannot represent me if this USSC disbars him. Then, USSC removed my case manager to cover up prior deprivations which degrades the administration of justice by cover ups instead of corrections to improve the administration of justice.

If the Ct considered my arguments for a stay USSC likely may not have disbarred Richard Abbott for requiring the gov adhere to and not violate the Constitutional limits to prevent abuse for partial subjective whims. I am prejudiced at the loss of possible unique representation and ask this Ct to please reconsider restating his license, or any relief this Ct may grant to prevent manifest injustice. I petition to correct and protect not destroy the courts.

I appeal the 10/7/24 Order. No ruling was made for the 1. IFP motion 2. the recusal of Jackson or 3. the petition to defer conference required for a fair consideration and to permit me the asserted 1st Am rt to supplement this case pending research which shows she partook in this case in violation of my right to a fair unbiased uncompromised proceeding. I assert USSC cure deprivations of my asserted not waived 1st Am rt to pet in accord with due process under the 5th Am, any meaningful or fair opportunity to be heard by denial of meaningful access to the courts per the attached blanket denial of the petition, without consideration of the recusal, the IFP Motion or the motion to defer conference to allow meaningful opportunity to be heard before vitiating my asserted 1st Am right to pet and notice and fair opportunity to be heard, causing an unfair blanket denial of my pet for writ of Certiorari in violation of US Amend I, V.

On or about 9/18/24 I filed an application with USSC to recuse Justice Jackson and to defer consideration in the Kelly v Swartz, the civil rights case (“civ rts”) by postponing conference 9/30/24, to allow me to draft a supplemental brief in this case. On 9/19/24, I filed an application to Justice Alito for the same relief with this honorable Court to recuse Jackson and

defer the conference scheduled for 9/30/24 to allow me time to make supplemental arguments to prevent this Court from being an unfair threatened forum to hear my petitions from Congressional abuse of investigatory and impeachment powers which violate my 1st and 5th Amrts to pet fairly as applied, and lately infringes upon other cases to affect the outcomes in violation of the separation of Art I Art III powers. USSC received both petitions on Mon. 9/23/24. USSC delayed in docketing the supplemental brief for this case until late Wed 9/25/24. USSC never filed the application for the civ rts related case. I called 9/25/24 to indicate the application was still not filed for civ rts case, when App B was for this case. Clerk Donald Baker told me it was still being considered, give it time. Near closing time Thursday 9/26/24, Donald Baker said it was still being considered not rejected or accepted. Friday 9/27/24 was the last business day before the Monday 9/30/24 conference in both cases. So, on 9/26/24 I drafted and boxed up and early morning 9/27/24 mailed out *Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Petition to Recuse the Honorable Justice Jackson and to postpone conference date for the Writ of Certiorari for Third Circuit pending a supplemental brief for EDPA appeal No. 23-7360*, similar to App B.

I wanted the Ct to defer the civil rights case until after I pled in this quasi-criminal case where I am afforded more Const liberties as an accused instead of a Plaintiff in the civ rts case. USSC received the 9/27/24 filing within the purview of the Rule 29 and case law that allows petitions to be accepted after 3 days of mailing date with proof of receipt the USSC received it **the next business day** early morning prior to conference on 9/30/2024. I did not receive notice in accord with DP of acceptance or rejection of the two submissions in the civ rights case despite the two items being received physically prior to conference time on 9/23/24 and early 9/30/24.

For this EDPA case, the supplemental brief was never distributed to the members to allow meaningful opportunity to be heard prior to the conference. I was deprived of DP vitiating

my asserted 1st Am rt to pet fairly in accord with 5th Am. I was denied access to the courts by the clerical error in **not distributing the motion prior to conference**. I respectfully request this Court kindly cure the defect by examining the undistributed motion docketed, to uphold the right to petition in accord with DP. US Am I, V.

The delay in docketing, not docketing of items, and failure of the staff to distribute material prior to conference prejudiced me and vitiated my First Am rt to pet and 5th Am right to be heard fairly and fully before vitiating my 1st Am rights causing irreparable harm. My right to a fair, unobstructed access to the courts to alleviate a substantial burden upon my free exercise of religion is a constitutional right which must be cured to prevent manifest injustice caused in bad faith with the staff's intent to vitiate 1st Am rights without DP by acting as judges in place of judges and wrongly obstructing access to the cts to act as their own judges in contravention of DP. "Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary all have a duty to support and defend the Constitution." *Salazar v. Buono*, 559 U.S. 700, 130 S. Ct. 1803, 176 L. Ed. 2d 634 (2010) "There is no 'de minimis' defense to a First Amendment violation." *Doe v. Indian River Sch. Dist.*, 653 F.3d 256, 259, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 16121. "The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury." *Mullin v. Sussex County*, 861 F. Supp. 2d 411, 415, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67571, *1. I will continue to suffer government threats by the state if the USSC does not help me by upholding the Constitutional limits from government overreach. I am standing up for my personal freedom to worship Jesus according to the dictates of my conscience, even if no one else shares the same beliefs, without government persecution.

USSC not only failed to give me a fair or any opportunity to be heard with regards to two submissions in the civ rts case that remain unconsidered for acceptance or rejection, but USSC

did not consider my motion to recuse Justice Jackson on this case and deprived me of DP by allowing her consideration in this case as applied since she rendered an advisory opinion against me on TV on or about 10/1/24 showing she cannot be fair or impartial. App B. Even if USSC considered recusal her participation violated my right to a fair proceeding. The Court violated due process by allowing Jackson to partake in the 10/7/24 decision since she publicized arguments against my case on TV to foreseeably, unfairly, incite mass disapproval against my position based on viewpoint of speech contained in petition subjecting her colleagues with whom she disagrees to discipline too. The Cts have no legal power to petition in place of the parties, making a mockery of this USSC and all federal cts. You hurt yourself by misbehaving. It is not okay. There is an attack against you and the rule of law to eliminate lawyers and judges. See App B Exhibit 8. I am trying to preserve the courts and the legal right to petition in accord with due process which grants this Ct authority, not the consent of the people which is legal fiction a lie.

On 0/1/24 Jackson opined in public on her decision against me in two separate cases pending before her, including this case and another case, Kelly v Swartz et al, showing she cannot be fair on the issues as to whether the disciplinary rules against federal judges and the proffered disciplinary rules and proceedings against this United States Supreme Court violate my right to a fair proceeding as applied and per se since the courts are tempted to violate my Constitutional rights they are charged to uphold to prevent professional harm to their own persons by unjust threats that are used to commandeer a no longer free and impartial lower courts but threatened federal courts which jeopardize this highest court.

I sought to cure defects in the past for violation of my access to the courts before vitiation of my 1st Am right to pet and underlying fundamental rts and claims my 1st Am right to pet without DP by depriving me any opportunity to be heard and a total deprivation of my 1st Am rt

to petition at all. The staff erased evidence disparately in the electronic record to prevent the USSC from curing defects to cover up the staff's errors depriving me of fundamental rights acting as their own judge in contravention of due process. USSC also sent me someone else's denied pro se petition by mistake, which may have unfairly vitiated another parties' rights to notice. So, I asserted my rights before USSC to prevent their preemptive deprivations to cure clerical errors. Should USSC 1. reject the Application and Supplemental brief in the civil rights case or to cure the defect in the lack of the judge's consideration by failure to distribute or 2. even docket two pleadings in the civil rts case, and the failure to distribute the supplemental brief I requested and repeat my request for notice and an opportunity to correct any deficiencies of my good faith submission. *See Becker v. Montgomery*, 532 U.S. 757, 767 (2001).

“Interest in finality of litigation, as expressed in predecessor to **Rule 44**, must yield where interests of justice would make unfair strict application of that **rule**.” *Gondeck v. Pan American World Airways, Inc.*, 382 U.S. 25 (1965). “Real purpose, as well as intended effect, of predecessor to Rule 44 was violated when minority of four Justices who dissented from ruling of Supreme Court on constitutional question caused re-examination of question by voting to note probable jurisdiction in subsequent case involving precisely same question.” *Ohio ex rel. Eaton v. Price*, 360 U.S. 246 (1965). Poverty creating an obstacle to fairly appeal this case effectively and state obstacles to research with intent to affect the outcome of this case, I ask this USSC at a later time sui sponte to reopen the civ rts pet, should its outcome herein similarly like the Ohio case affect that case and reserve my right to petition to **cure clerical errors** causing deprivations when I have meaningful access to the courts and am no longer in danger or threatened by new attacks of the State Court and its agents which has been done as recently as 10/16/24.

USSC held in *St. L. S.F.R.R. v. Spiller*, 275 U.S. 156 (1927) “Errors by court “due to mistake of the clerk **may be corrected after expiration of the term at which the judgment was entered.**” (“emphasis intended”). Per *United States v. Finnell*, 185 U.S. 236, 249 (1902), “The clerk is a ministerial officer, and, without statutory authority, can exercise no judicial functions.” The Clerk and staff had no legal authority to deny my petitions in place of the Ct, then to be the judge of their own case of their own alleged errors, by failing to docket pet to cure clerical errors or failing to distribute petitioners to allow for their meaningful full and fair consideration before vitiating my rts with no opportunity to be heard by the members of the Ct. USSC held in *Wetmore v. Karrick*, 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907) “The judgment of dismissal... having been entered **improvidently through a mistake or oversight** as to an entry of record, the Mass court **did not thereby lose jurisdiction**, and had the power to vacate the dismissal and restore the case to the docket after the term.” See, *The Palmyra*, 12 Wheat. 1; *Alviso v. United States*, 6 Wall. 457. *Rice v. Railroad Co.*, 21 How. 82, distinguished. *Also see, Isaacs v. Caldwell*, 530 S.W.3d 449, 455 (Ky. 2017). USSC in *Wetmore v. Karrick*, 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907), further held, “In almost every case in which the rule is laid down by this court that judgments cannot be vacated after the term, **judgments of dismissal by mistake are excepted.**” See *Phillips v. Negley*, 117 U.S. 665. Thus, Statute of limitations is no bar.

I am deprived of the 1st Am access to the cts when the Ct does not docket colorable pleadings by mistake and when they distribute them last minute without meaningful opportunity to be heard or distribute them at all as applied to App B attached hereto even if it is docketed. I am prejudiced by an unfair deprivation of my fundamental rights outlined in the Supplemental Brief by denial of access to the courts. Accordingly, I sought to ask the Ct to cure the defects, and consider my arguments herein and therein. “[Extreme delay in the processing of an appeal

may amount to a violation of due process." *U.S. v. Mohawk*, 20 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1994).

I argue it does violate DP as applied to me.

This case arises based on DE's punishment to chill my right to petition based on viewpoint of speech and association of the parties where it deemed my religious beliefs in Jesus to be a disability. The DE Sup Ct incited a disciplinary case against me to cover up its own misconduct in inciting attacks against me to cause me to forgo RFRA lawsuit *Kelly v Trump* in violation of my rt to pet fairly and in retaliation against me for my private exercise of petitioning to sue former President Trump under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and the 1st Am Free exercise and establishment clause provisions to alleviate a substantial burden his establishment of gov religion by a course of conduct and certain executive orders caused upon my free exercise of religious belief. I am punished in this case for suing Trump based on viewpoint of speech by petitioning to restrain a President's conduct within the purview of the Const and statutory limits, where the President is unfairly deemed above the law by immunity and the people a President harms, including me as a party of one, are rendered below the law's protection. US Am I, V, IV. The Constitutionality of Presidential immunity by case law conflicts and vitiates other Constitutional checks such as the government's check upon all via the US Attorney Generals by criminal proceedings which appear presumed by the Constitution. USSC Erred as a matter of law in *Trump v US No 939*.

I also desired an opportunity for USSC to consider the new impending threats to an impartial proceeding in my case where congress threatened Justice Thomas and Alito of impeachment such as AOC and disciplinary suits Whitehouse letters. Congress threatened Justice Alito to recuse in an active case *Trump v US 939*, to affect the outcome which is undue influence. Congress's recent threats of impeachment and public ridicule of Ct members to affect

the outcome of cases despite the Spch and debate cl violate my rt to pet fairly. The threats were made to commandeer the ct to compel it to adopt disciplinary proceedings against its members an issue I oppose in my own cases. I am unfairly deprived of DP by a fair not threatened retaliatory forum because I preserved for the record my Constitutional objections to disciplinary proceedings against this USSC on DP grounds appearing before an unfair, defensive retaliatory forum. I seek to remove those threats even when I preserve my right to petition to correct errors.

This is not fair to me since I seek to recuse Phipps and Scirica on more distinguished grounds where Phipps stands to pecuniary benefit by a more likely seat on the USSC should the court deny my requests for relief, and Scirica benefits by preserving his hard work I seek to dismantle and destroy by ruling against me to prevent against judicial disciplinary rules he chairs. Per exhibits I oppose judicial disciplinary codes especially against the USSC on Constitutional grounds this Ct has thus far refused to consider only to harm itself.

Congress through its attorney Todd Garvey even conceded this USSC may limit its investigatory power to protect the superseding rights 1st and 5th Am right to pet. coupled with DP in cases and controversies so as not to threaten and commandeer the Courts. Art I, Art III. *In Congress's Contempt power and the enforcement of congressional subpoenas: Law, History, Practice and procedure*, in Congressional Research service dated May 12, 2017 at page 4 distorted dicta but noted the arguments against its distorted premise to control the cts by Citing Sinclair v. United States, 279 U.S. 263, 295 (1929), holding, "It may be conceded that Congress is **without authority to compel disclosure for the purpose of aiding the prosecution of pending suits;** but the authority of that body, directly or through its committees to require pertinent disclosures in aid of its own constitutional power is not abridged because the information sought to be elicited may also be of use in such suits." Id

The intent is the Constitutional issue and I as a pet have standing to allege malice. Gov attacks against Alito and his wife were made intentionally to deprive me of a fair forum to foreseeably affect the outcome on issues in my case in violation of US Am I, V and so Congress's powers must be limited not limitless. USSC gave into temptation to deprive petitioners of rts by enacting a code of conduct and Jackson considers enacting disciplinary proceedings that violate my rt to DP as applied. Per the attached 5 articles of impeachment and the fact even John Adams and John Jay noted impeachments do not work, and England got rid of impeachments because commandeering the court by threats violates DP and does not uphold a fair and impartial forum, I ask USSC to consider whether the implied investigatory and statutory impeachment powers must be limited or removed so as not to deprive public and private petitioners of DP. I desire to afford the Solicitor General a way to preserve her power and the US AGs power and my Constitutional legal power to pet coupled with 5th Amt DP fairly to be heard, EP as a class who sues or prosecutes the president, and 1st Am rt to pet without vitiation based on 1st Am viewpoint of speech in petition against the President as neither above the law nor below the law. Congress and the Cts must also be bound not immune from Const limits too.

USSC errantly removed the authority of the AGs to protect the entire government in recent cases, and vitiated my rts as applied. By removing those with power to enforce the rule of law petitioners, including me, their advocates US AGs and special counsel's authority and access to the courts the ct by petitioners, including me, this USSC removes its own authority and the rule of law. I ask this Ct to restrain Congress's investigatory and impeachment powers, and Justice Jackson's participation in this petition for rehearing and to recuse her for reconsideration of the petition for writ of certiorari, the petition for IFP, and the Motion at App B.

Conclusion: Wherefore I pray this Court grants just relief.

Dated

Oct. 25, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,

Meghan Kelly

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire *pro se*

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

302-493-6693

US Supreme Ct Number 283696

Under Religious objection I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct

Dated:

Oct. 25, 2024

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan Kelly (signed)

CERTIFICATION BY PRO SE PARTY (RULE 44)

I certify that the Petition for Rehearing from Denial of Certiorari is presented in good faith and not for delay and is restricted to the grounds specified in Supreme Court Rule 44.

Dated: Oct. 25, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939,
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com,
US Supreme Court Number 283696

Under Religious objection I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

Dated: Oct. 25, 2024

Meghan Kelly
(printed)
Meghan Kelly
(signed)