

App A

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

Ms. Meghan Marie Kelly
Attorney at Law
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

Ms. Meghan Marie Kelly
Attorney at Law
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001
OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

**Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

October 7, 2024

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

Ms. Meghan Marie Kelly
Attorney at Law
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

Re: Meghan Kelly
v. United States District Court for the Eastern District of
Pennsylvania
No. 23-7360

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Scott S. Harris", written in a cursive style.

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

**Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

October 7, 2024

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

Ms. Meghan Marie Kelly
Attorney at Law
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

Re: Meghan Kelly
v. Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.
No. 23-7372

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Scott S. Harris", written in a cursive style.

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

App B

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Application Number _____

Related Petition No. 23-7360

Related Application No. 23A144

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner •

V

Eastern District Court of Pennsylvania

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

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

September 19, 2024

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

Pro Se, not represented by
counsel

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

US Supreme Court No 283696

QUESTION PRESENTED

I. Whether the Court must recuse Justice Jackson since 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 Swart 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 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. Is it in the interest of justice to postpone a decision on this appeal beyond the conference date 9/30/2024 given the grave magnitude of the issues presented a court should decide, including but not limited to: Whether the court the US Supreme Court call witnesses to prevent due process violations occurring against me a party in a case by non-party person, Senator Whitehouse, to protect my First Amendment right to petition fairly in accord with the 5th Amendment and to preserve the impartiality of the courts to protect due process so this Court's members do not favor outcomes that reduce the threats to their seats, their family or their beneficial interests as opposed to applying the impartial application of the law to the facts of each case, given the issue is unusual. Trial courts usually call witnesses not appellate courts, but all courts must uphold due process and the right to petition fairly in accord with US Amend I, V, not by threats or force by outsiders made with intent to affect the outcome of the case.

III. Whether the Court must in the interest of justice grant Meghan Kelly time to examine and present the issues as to whether Congress's power must be limited in terms of impeachment and investigation so as not to violate her and other claimants rights to a fair

proceeding under US Amend I, V, by threatening judges to affect the outcome on live issues in my cases unfairly or their wives, given Congress's members in recent times has also threatened parties David Weiss, Justices Alito and Thomas and their wives, a NY Judge by subpoenaing his kid where all of our cases relate to suing a President or with regards to David Weiss his son where Congress seeks to use that information for political reasons unrelated to the impartial application to the rule of law in violation of Article I and III.

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-iii
Parties.....	iv
Related Cases.....	ix-v
Table of Contents.....	vi.
Appendix.....	vii
Table of Authorities.....	vii-viii
Statement of Case	1-2
Argument.....	2-15
Conclusion.....	15

APPENDIX

Exhibit 1. 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.....1-15

Exhibit 2. 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

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Books and other references

Amos 5:15.....	10
Federalist 10.....	15
Federalist 78.....	10-11
Isaiah 14.....	13
Jeremiah 31.....	13
John 2:16.....	12
Matthew 23:23.....	10
The origins of "Justice must be seen to be done", <i>Bar and Bench - Indian Legal news</i> . Retrieved 11 September 2023.....	13
Sirach 8:14.....	13

CASES

<i>Blassingame v. Trump</i> , 87 F.4th 1 (D.C. Cir. 2023).....	12
<i>Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.</i> , 556 U.S. 868, (2009).....	14
<i>Clinton v. Jones</i> , 520 U.S. 681 (1997).....	11
<i>Fischer v. United States</i> 64 F. 4th 329 (2024).....	9
<i>In re Murchison</i> , 349 U.S. 133, (1955).....	13-14
<i>Nixon v. Fitzgerald</i> , 457 U.S. 731, 755-56 (1982).....	12
<i>Marbury v Madison</i> , 5 US 137 (1803).....	12
<i>R v Sussex Justices</i> , ex parte McCarthy, [1924] 1 KB 256, [1923] All ER 233, Datar, Arvind (18 April 2020).....	13
<i>Salazar v. Buono</i> , 559 U.S. 700, 130 S. Ct. 1803, 176 L. Ed. 2d 634 (2010).....	9
<i>Snyder v. United</i> 603 U.S. ____ (2024).....	9
<i>Trump v US</i> , USSC Case No. 939.....	9-15
<i>Trump v. Vance</i> , 591 U.S. 786, (2020).....	12

<i>Williams v. Pennsylvania</i> , 579 U.S. 1, (2016).....	14
---	----

CONSTITUTION

US Const. Amend I.....	1-15
US Const. Amend V.....	1-15
US Const Amend. IV.....	1-15
US Const. Amend. VI.....	1-15
US Const Amend XIII.....	1-15
US Amend. XIV.....	1-15
US Art I.....	1-15
US Art III.....	1-15

Executive orders sought to find unconstitutional in *Kelly v Trump* establishing gov religion

E.O. 13798.....	9
Ex. Or. No. 13198, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021.....	9
Ex. Or. No. 13199, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, May 3, 2018....	9
Ex. Or. No. 13279, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No. 13559, November 17, 2010.....	9
Ex. Or. No. 13559 Nov. 17, 2010.....	9
Ex Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018.....	9
Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021.....	9

Statutes:

28 USC 201.....	9
28 USC 666.....	9
42 U.S.C. ch. 21B § 2000bb, et al. Religious Freedom Restoration Act.....	9

US Supreme Court Rules

Rules 18.....	1
Rule 21.....	2
Rule 25.....	1
Rule 33.2.....	2

I. STATEMENT OF CASE

I, Meghan Kelly, Esq., pro se pursuant to Rules 18 and 25, US Amend (“Am”) I, V rights (“rt(s)”) to Equal Protections (“EP”) to petition (“pet”), with fair opportunity to be heard pursuant to US Am I, V, and any other law respectfully move this Court (“ct”) for leave to file this application based on intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect of the outcome of my case not previously available that give rise to new and different legal issues and arguments I was not able to proffer before. 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 pet, suing, or prosecuting the President (“Pres”), 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. 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. However, I object in advance to any amicus briefs or friends of the Ct briefs as a violation of my right to a fair proceeding by lobbyists who diminish my individual right to petition fairly and the underlying rts I seek to safeguard from capricious elimination by government agents' pleasure in violation of EP. US Amend I, V.

Pursuant to my rts to petition fairly under US Amend I, V, I respectfully request this Ct recuse Justice Jackson in this matter based on her rendering a decision on issues on my case

against me outside of this Article III Court showing she cannot be fair herein, and I respectfully seek time to file a supplemental brief since poverty and limited resources have caused a substantial burden upon my access to the courts. I do not willingly relinquish my rights including the deprivation of my license to practice law but for my exercise of fundamental rights not limited to my right to petition to defend them, especially my religious belief in Jesus Christ. Given the magnitude of the issues including protecting the right to petition in accordance with DP before an impartial and fair not threatened forum for both public and private petitions this Court must allow me time to discern how to ask it to please save itself and the rule of law that founded, maintains and sustains these United States. The petition coupled with DP is the source of the Court's power to uphold the rule of law. This court hurts itself by degrading its own authority by depriving both public and private people, including me as applied the right to petition fairly in accordance with our democratic republic created with the passage of the bill of rights into a more just fair union of states than a republic. I incorporate herein in its entirety the petition for IFP and petition for writ of Cert. in No 23-7360 as if restated herein.

Prior to shutting off my telephone because of expense, I talked with people at this Court's office and asked them how do I file this petition for a recusal for Justice Jackson before this Court. They had to look into it. They directed me to file it as another brief. So, I submit one original and 10 copies and serve opposing counsel in accordance to the Rules 21 and 33.2.

II. ARGUMENT

Meghan M. Kelly, pro se, pursuant to her 1st Amendment right to petition fairly in accordance with the 5th Amendment declares and avers as follows to move this Honorable Court to please recuse the Honorable Justice Jackson from partaking in the determination to grant writ of certiorari, and any other matter in this case since she cannot do so fairly:

Per the attached article I incorporate herein as reference Justice Jackson spoke in an interview after submission of my petitions for writ of certiorari. She gave her judicial opinion on an issue in my cases showing she will reject my arguments unfairly since they are before her and under her review now, which violates my right to petition fairly under US Amend I, V, by a judge who does not even care to consider my arguments in violation of due process before rejecting or accepting my petitions for writ of certiorari in cases, Numbers 22-7360, 23-7372.

I am so distraught Judge Jackson is giving an advisory opinion unfairly on an issue in my case. It violates my right to a fair instead of a fixed proceeding ruling against me. Per the attached news article, titled, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson says she's open to an 'enforceable' Supreme Court ethics code..., Justice Jackson stated,

“Supreme Court Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson said she is open to proposals to implement an "enforceable code" of ethics for justices and lamented the court's presidential immunity decision in an interview that aired Sunday.

"A binding code of ethics is pretty standard for judges, and so I guess the question is 'Is the Supreme Court any different?'"

Jackson asked in an interview on "CBS News Sunday Morning" about her new memoir, adding, "I guess I have not seen a persuasive reason as to why the [Supreme] Court is different than the other courts."

In two cases before Justice Jackson and the United States Supreme pending for a determination 9/30/24, I proffered reasons why Disciplinary proceedings against members of the US Supreme Court violate my right to a fair proceeding as applied before a biased forum biased towards evading punishment by adhering to regulatory requirements instead of the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law. In my application to Justice Alito in one of those two cases, 23A144. I indicated and repeat herein:

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

17. Two of my cases that may be rejected or accepted before this Court Kelly v Swartz et al and this case relate to the question as to whether the United Supreme Court and judges in general should be corrected within the purview of the Constitution limits of 1) cases and controversies and 2) impeachment without waiver of their 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination by self-regulation or congressional or third party regulations that make them partial to those who control their seats instead of the impartial application of the constitutional protections to the rule of law, which violates the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component as applied to me a party of one with unique religious beliefs in impartiality and against attorney and judicial regulation I outlined Constitutional arguments in the case below and in the civil rights case.

18. It is more effective for the court to let their opinions speak for themselves than to allow judges, even Supreme Court justices to give into temptations of the fickle fads to present mere advisory opinions of whoever buys the spot light by defending the court against regulations in public or by the press. My cases should be used for the court to save itself or not. Let the opinions speak for themselves.

19. The courts are the only branch that safeguard individuals and individual liberty from being sacrificed by the mob under the vote or otherwise

20. Protecting the impartiality of the courts from the temptation to be partial towards regulations as opposed to the impartial application of the Constitutional law violates the 5th Amendment Equal protections Clause towards claimants like myself as applied to me as a party of one in both Federal/State Judicial and Lawyer Disability or disciplinary proceedings should be extended to the US Supreme Court to prevent the end of life-time limits and to prevent regulation. I seek to extend this based on my unique religious beliefs on required impartiality and justice in the courts as a party of one.

21. Safeguarding the impartiality of the courts means correcting the courts when they violate the laws to serve their own personal interests as the Delaware Supreme Court violated my First Amendment rights when I filed petitions regarding the courts' own procedural due process violations and violations of my First Amendment private rights to petition, religious belief, exercise of belief, and association via the 14th Amendment when it sealed the attached documents hereto to cover up its own misconduct. 3DI 46-Ex B, C, D.

22. I have Constitutional arguments contesting the Constitutionality of disciplinary proceedings and certain Delaware Disciplinary rules based on my unique religious beliefs that may give me standing to extend the same to my opposition of regulating Federal judges outside the purview of Constitutional limits, including but not limited to arguments contained in motions on the record. I reserve leave to make additional Constitutional arguments against the Disciplinary proceedings and rules. 3DI-43-8 through 3DI 43-10.

23. On the record below in this case and the civil rights case I moved to recuse Judge Phipps and Scirica per the attached motions and amended Motion and caveats I attach hereto and incorporate herein. (3DI-43 attached hereto as Petitioner Meghan Kelly moves this Court to recuse Four Judges, Judge Hardiman, Judge Phipps, Judge Honorable Montgomery-Reeves, and Judge Scirica.) (3DI-44 See, Petitioner Meghan Kelly motion for a caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica and Motion for Judge Scirica for 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.

(3D-49, not attached 3DI-50, not attached, Motion for reargument on denial of recusal and required affidavit.)

20. In the motions I alerted the Court below I seek to move the Court to not only declare certain Delaware Disciplinary Rules and the proceedings unconstitutional, but also argued against regulating federal judges including the US Supreme Court. My main arguments for recusing Judge Scirica relate to the fact I seek to move the court to declare judicial federal rules he drafts and attorney rules unconstitutional, and the state rules which mirror the rules he chairs unconstitutional. I placed affidavits on the record from my civil rights case in the case below to show I have continuously objected to regulating the US supreme Court or ending life time appointments during good behavior. 3DI-58, not attached hereto as too voluminous.

21. I believe the courts are being set up to fall by those who entice the judges with attacks. I have particular concern that Justice Kavanaugh is specifically in danger. 83 complaints against him were published on the 10th Circuit's web site. Should regulations be compelled upon this court the same as those forced upon lawyers and state judges, ex post facto Constitutional arguments would likely not apply to character of judges. They do not apply in other disciplinary proceeding. All of those 83 arguments will likely be used against Justice Kavanaugh and regulations will be used to control a no longer free or impartial court. I believe all of the Supreme Court justices are schemed to fall. Once the head is cut off the body, the District and Appellate courts will fall too. (Not attached 3DI-)

22. I believe the courts are in danger. That means we are all in danger since the court is the only branch that protects individual liberties and individuals from being sacrificed to the apparent majority's whims of the majority through the vote.

23. My cases may allow the courts to prevent the danger with particular flexibility in this case to come up with a solution since there is no opposing counsel. The Appellant is the Eastern District Court of PA in name only. This Court may disagree with some of my arguments including my arguments against federal judges politicking, but you may use the fact you disagree to create law binding on all of us including Congress. This case gives you the authority within the law not mere ever changing fickle public opinion or perception to preserve these United States.

24. While I seek to preserve the courts to preserve the rule of law, I require time to narrow my voluminous claims and asserted rights in this case. I need time to figure it out, and may need the court to use this very case to prevent regulation of the US Supreme Court to sustain the rule of law from schemed lawlessness down the line. I should not forgo my own claims merely to argue how to preserve the courts by preventing judicial regulation.

25. I do not seek to cause the danger to the courts by seeking to sue the members of the Delaware Supreme Court, and the arms of the Delaware Supreme Court in my civil rights case, nor do I seek to destroy the courts when I petition against mistakes or misconduct. Instead, I seek to uphold the integrity of the courts by requiring they uphold Constitutionally asserted rights to uphold the rule of law from schemed overthrow.

26. "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)

27. Attorneys must be permitted to petition the courts to safeguard the Constitutional rule of law by breach of even the judiciary within the purview of the Constitution of 1. Cases and controversies such as mine or 2. Impeachment without retaliation for upholding the rule of law.

28. I have to ask you what you may not want to do to please allow lawyers to correct the three branches of government within cases or controversies without reprisal for exercising the First Amendment right to petition. Otherwise, how may this Court give an opinion on regulating the US Supreme Court, federal courts and attorneys if they will not hear attorneys, including me, petitioning the court to do so on Constitutional grounds.

29. Judges must not give into temptations to be controlled by those who entice their desires for security by attacks by presenting advisory opinions in the news that will likely be twisted to be used against them. Please allow opinions to speak for themselves with binding authority upon the other two branches.

30. I need time to ask you to exercise your authority to draft such an opinion. I am scared I may run out of stamps and money to petition only to allow the courts to be eliminated down the line. I ran for office in 2018 since out of state title companies practiced law without a license and messed up the chain of deeds and took advantage of my esteemed deceased colleague Dick Goll, Esq . I learned there is a real plan to eliminate people judges and people staff by unelected lobbyists who control the other ignorant or indifferent branches. We need your help to save the world by saving your own seats the correct way lawfully. That means I must argue judges must be corrected by lawyers in court at times to safeguard the impartial application of the rule of law that we all respect from degeneration.

31. Per the Motion to reopen the case below, not attached hereto, the courts retaliated against me for petitioning against judicial mistakes including placing pleadings in another case not only on my civil rights case but another pro se claimant's medical records on my Eastern District of PA case too. I have unique standing to argue the courts must be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional requirements of cases and controversies like mine to preserve not destroy the courts.

32. Since I petitioned the Court against judicial mistakes or misconduct in this case and the civil rights case, argued against judicial regulation, seek to sue the Delaware Supreme Court members my two cases may be used to determine and limit correction of the US Supreme Court and inferior courts to the purview of the Constitution.

33. There really are lobbyists who seek to eliminate the courts to eliminate the rule of law that restrains businesses and entities from enslaving, killing, stealing or destroying life, health or liberty under the guise of the common good. See, Exhibit A and B for example. The digital economy is a mere transitional step in a far more sinister plan. Upon information and belief, economic conditions will worsen by intentional design to allow Central banks and banks to recoup real estate, cars and property upon default of loans, and the new carbon credit debt scheme. Once entities the government owes recoup resources, the entities who control most resources will control governments to eliminate the governments by eliminating the rule of law down the line.

34. I need time not only to ask you to save my liberty, licenses, life and potential eternal life from temptations, I also need time to ask you to save the rule of law by saving the courts without waiving my arguments to save myself.

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants this application."

I assert my Constitutional rights, including my First Amendment right to petition fairly before the US Supreme Court in accord with Due Process under the 5th Amendment. Thus, I must request the court recuse the Honorable Justice Jackson in my case since she cannot fairly hear the matters in either Kelly v Swartz or in the Kelly v Eastern District Court of PA since she stated on TV to the entire world **“I guess I have not seen a persuasive reason as to why the [Supreme] Court is different than the other courts.”** Meaning she has not read my arguments against disciplinary proceedings against the US Supreme Court **or she unfairly makes her judicial determination while denying me a fair opportunity to be heard in my cases pending before the US Supreme Court now.**

I oppose any judicial discipline outside of the purview of the Constitutional limits of 1. Cases and controversies and 1. Impeachments. In Exhibit 2, please see a judicial complaint to see how injustice will result. This is to show you how they do not work.

I intend to file a supplemental brief in the Third Circuit Appeal of Kelly v Eastern District Court of PA No. 23-7360 to alter my arguments to limit Congress's powers to impeach and subpoena so as not to violate my First Amendment right to petition fairly as applied, or Article I and Article III separation of powers. I request time by this court to allow me to do so please. In the alternative, I allow the Ct to rule on this issue should I be without means to file a supplemental brief to prevent manifest injustice.

To provide background on how Congressmen violate my right to DP is they seek to force by threat to commandeer the court to enact Judicial disciplinary rules to control its no longer independent and impartial forum. The powers of gov are to preserve the Const liberties of the people, not to be misused by the force to eliminate them as Sen Whitehouse seeks to do.

In my petitions in multiple cases, including this case I previously averred attorney/judicial disciplinary rules impede on my right to a fair and impartial forum to a threatened bullied court partial towards those who abuse impeachment power to control no longer free and independent Supreme Court justices. I previously asked this court to limit USSC correction within the purview of the Constitutional limits of 1. A case and controversy under Art III a 2. Impeachment, without waiver so as not to vitiate my right to a fair and impartial forum under the 5th Am. I now must ask the Court to consider limiting the scope of Congress's power to call witnesses, threaten or to impeach the Court too for failure to recuse in Trump v US No 939 or otherwise so as not to foreseeably affect the outcome of not only Trump v US but my case to diminish my right to petition with fair opportunity to be heard on the issue of whether judicial disciplinary rules violate my right to due process. It is for claimants to assert or waive rights including the right to a fair proceeding not political partial non-parties like Whitehouse.

However, I am having a difficult time of coming up with a legal authority for this Court to call in Senator Whitehouse as a witness to prevent or consider due process violations in my case, and to limit him and other Congress members from abusing their power to affect the outcome of issues in my case. I understand I may make legal arguments in the appeal also at conference on 9/30/2024 in Kelly v Swartz in the Delaware District Court should it be remanded back below to the Delaware District Court, and the Court under FRE 604 and other legal authority may call in non-party witnesses to prevent fraud.

The issues are complicated since I desire this court to subpoena Senator Whitehouse to limit his and other law makers Congressional power so as not to continue to impede upon my right to petition fairly on the same issues he seeks to force the Court to rule on by threat towards members of the courts, their wives or parties. Whitehouse threatened sanctions against judges

and congress has threatened their wives to affect the outcome of a Trump case, and in my case, he commandeers the court to rule against me on issues in my two cases pending before this court. Congressman Jordan subpoenaed a NY Judge's kid to affect the outcome of a Trump case. Congress subpoenaed a party in a President Biden's son Robert Biden's case to affect the outcome of a case to use against President Biden in favor of President Trump. State agents attacked me and removed and concealed my pleadings and evidence in my favor to influence the outcome of a case where I sued President Trump and sought to substitute current President Biden for the same or similar conduct that substantially burdens my free exercise of religion by the establishment of government religion in violation of US Am. I and the RFRA.

In recent cases Congress appears to abuse its power to violate the rights of other claimants to petition fairly in matters of national importance relating to President Trump.

¹Congress has threatened and bullied the court joined in by executive backing by Biden which affects my right to petition before an impartial not threatened, or defensive or unduly retaliatory forum. I should not be unfairly punished for asserting my rights to petition fairly because outside threats are occurring against the forum court with a pending decision on my case, the USSC.

Can the US Supreme Court call witnesses to prevent due process violations occurring against me a party in a case by non-party person, Senator Whitehouse, to protect my First Amendment right to petition fairly in accord with the 5th Amendment and to preserve the impartiality of the courts to protect due process. So this Court's members do not favor outcomes that reduce the threats to their seats, their family or their beneficial interests as opposed to applying the impartial application of the law to the facts of each case. I need time to make an

¹ In recent cases this Court reduced the power of state and US Attorney Generals from prosecuting gov officials under 18 USC Sections 201 and 666. In Kelly v Trump I cited these very two statutes as a tool AG's may use to prevent the overthrow. June 26, 2024, the U.S. Supreme Court held 6-3 in Snyder v. United States that a federal statute, 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B), does not criminalize "gratuities" to state and local officials

argument this court should be allowed to call Whitehouse even sua sponte without me so long as opposing counsel may question him too.

I ask this court to please postpone a decision on this appeal beyond the conference date 9/30/2024 given the grave magnitude of the issues presented a court should decide, and petitioners should be afforded to argue in an actual case and controversy before an impartial forum. It should **not** be decided by the other two branches by force and threat which eliminates freedom by commandeering the only branch that protects our freedoms from both private and public entities. The issue is unique since trial courts usually call witnesses, but DE Chief District Court Judge Justice Colm F Connelly called non-party witnesses to prevent fraud on the court in DE Attorney Jimmy Chong's case. So, this court may be able to do so too. The issue is unusual. I do not have access to legal resources beyond google at this time. I do not even have access to a phone to call the law library, but it is necessary for the court to discern to preserve the rule of law that sustains these United States from a schemed overthrow. I need a fair opportunity to petition please. US Amend I, V.

Poverty creates a substantial obstacle so great as to deny me access to the courts to effectively appeal. My phone is turned off at this time, and I request time to sustain the necessities of life too so as not to harm my life for the capricious whims of government agents who rule and do not serve which reflects the image of lawlessness unrestrained by the Constitution as the rule of law to prevent human sacrifice of life and health for material gain.

I face loss of 1st Am rts and other irreparable injury if I am not afforded an opportunity to fairly supplement my case.² This reciprocal case arises based on DE Sup Ct's malicious intent to

² As a Christian I believe business greed unrestrained by the just rule of law or love written on our hearts is lawlessness leading to loss of eternal life on judgment day should people not be made clean of being the darkness. As a Christian "Justice in the courts" is a command by God. Citing Amos 5:15. Jesus Christ says "justice, mercy and faithfulness are more important laws." Matthew 23:23. If God says protecting the rule of law by protecting the only

cover up its own misconduct in inciting attacks against me to cause me to forgo 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 Donald J. 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 Constitutional ("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.³

There really is a scheme to overthrow the gov. The Ct recently errantly removed the authority of the AGs to protect the entire government, and vitiated my rts as applied in a series of cases. By removing those with power to enforce the rule of law petitioners, including their advocates US Attorney Generals and special counsel's authority access to the courts the ct removes its own authority and the rule of law. I seek to supplement the record to amend my arguments based on new threats to the rule of law that occurred after filing my brief, but require means and time.

On 7/1/24, this Ct held *inter alias* the Pres. is "absolutely immune" from criminal prosecution for conduct in his official capacity in violation of EP by affording government

forum that may grant it as opposed to the mark of lawlessness called the mark of the beast by ruling by temptations, threats like naughty Alexander Hamilton's federalist 78, or economic force, than it is important to me. Hamilton is wrong. Hamilton said a lie when he said the courts are the weakest branch. Fed 78. Laws saved my eternal life, and should the courts grant just decrees this court may save lives, eternal lives and the government from dissolution for a time of lawlessness harming humanity and misleading many to hell. These are my religious beliefs not meant to offend but meant to express the dire situation. I believe the world is in. We need you to be the hero. I need a fair opportunity to ask please.

³ *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681 (1997) ("Doctrine of separation of powers does not require federal courts to stay all private actions against President of the United States until he leaves office. U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 3, § 1 et seq.")

unchecked deference.⁴ This Ct ruled other conduct is presumed immune.⁵ The Ct further held the Pres powers stem from the Const or an act from Congress, while failing to note the Pres is limited by both the Const and acts of Congress, especially criminal laws drafted to protect fundamental rts of the people the 1st Am rt to petition and fair oppty to be heard before vitiation

⁴ The Ct also erred in Nixon v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 731, 755-56 (1982) (“In view of special nature of president of the United States's constitutional office and functions, president has absolute immunity from damages liability for acts within “outer perimeter” of his official responsibility.”). The Ct was wrong at Id. At 56-57 (“rule of absolute immunity for the President will not leave the Nation without sufficient protection against misconduct on the part of the Chief Executive.”). There remains the constitutional remedy of impeachment.³⁹ In addition, there are formal and informal checks on Presidential action that do not apply with equal force to other executive officials. The President is subjected to constant scrutiny by the press. Vigilant oversight by Congress also may serve to deter Presidential abuses of office, as well as to make credible the threat of impeachment.⁴⁰ Other incentives to avoid misconduct may include a desire to earn reelection, the need to maintain prestige as an element of Presidential influence, and a President's traditional concern for his historical stature.” This Ct was further wrong at Id. at 757. (“The existence of alternative remedies and deterrents establishes that absolute immunity will not place the President “above the law.”⁴¹ For the President, as for judges and prosecutors, **absolute immunity merely precludes a particular private remedy for alleged misconduct in order to advance compelling public ends.**”). Elimination of religious freedom to make my church a business when Jesus teaches damned to hell are those who make worship a business should they not repent from being the evil. See, John 2:16 Those who worship by business are not welcome in Jesus's father's house, meaning heaven. My private exercise of belief is substantially burdened in that my own church has given into temptation of President's executive orders and now worships the mark of the beast misleading parishioners to hell. That is not okay. Separate religion and state. People should worship or not by the dictates of their conscience, not the dictates of the government backed churches who corrupt religion by government backing by money or otherwise eliminating individual liberty by collective conditional force misleading humanity to hell by removing the freedom to unconditionally love by compelled conditional collective compliance. I believe every government employee who creates jobs, serves the budget, or economy commits lawlessness leading to not only eliminating Constitutional liberties but God's law leading to sealing their foreheads, hands and hearts for death in hell should they not repent. I understand the manner money is coined is to enslave and oppress tempting the government to sustain the pain or create it like the Chips acts to maintain power, positions and profit streams into infinity if left unrestrained by the just rule of law to restrain and tame the beast sin instead of sacrificing the people's lives and liberties to feed it. The misbehavior needs to be corrected not protected. DC Ct is wrong in Blassingame v. Trump, 87 F.4th 1 (D.C. Cir. 2023) (“President's actions do not fall beyond outer perimeter of official responsibility merely because they are unlawful or taken for forbidden purpose; rather, President's official immunity insulates all of his official actions from civil damages liability, regardless of their legality or his motives.”). DC Ct is also wrong in Carroll v. Trump, 88 F.4th 418, 422 (2d Cir. 2023) (“ Presidential immunity is a defense that stems from “the President's unique office, rooted in the constitutional tradition of the separation of powers and supported by our history,” and entitles the President to “absolute ... immunity from damages liability for acts within the outer perimeter of his official responsibilities.”) Immunity is unconst removing Const checks on an unbalanced branch.

⁵ But see, Trump v. Vance, 591 U.S. 786, (2020) (“In contrast to a king, who is born to power and can “do no wrong,” the President of the United States is “of the people” and subject to the law.”) Marbury v Madison, 5 US 137 (1803) (“The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws, whenever he receives an injury. One of the first duties of government is to afford that protection. In Great Britain the king himself is sued in the respectful form of a petition, and he never fails to comply with the judgment of his court. In the 3d vol. of his Commentaries, p. 23. Blackstone states two cases in which a remedy is afforded by mere operation of law. In all other cases," he says, "it is a general and indisputable rule, that where there is a legal right, there is also a legal remedy by suit, or action at law, whenever that right is invaded.")

of Const rts and other liberties, not limited to a fair proceeding, the right to vote, to discern who is the President as a matter of law, not as a matter of mob lawless reign or threat of violence. This Ct granted what is not the Ct's to give the removal of Const checks that balance a Pres's authority within the purview of Const limits. Pres is unconst given a sword to execute the law and a shield to defeat Const challenges brought by 1. the lawmakers in criminal statutes enacted to protect the people's rt to pet, vote, and other Const rts, 2. ct's check upon the Pres for violation of criminal laws that appear to violate the citizen's fundamental rts and others safeguards, the AG's check to safeguard victim's of a Pres's criminal violation of Const liberties, the AG's check to prosecute without bias against the citizens and favoritism toward the government, specifically the Pres, and my right to petition to defend my religious exercise of belief in Jesus Christ without persecution incited by a Pres. Trump.

The shield which limits the Pres's authority is meant to safeguard the people not to make one person above the law in violation of EP and clear precedent. This Ct has made Trump not only above a king but above God, by teaching the world he is his own judge on alleged official conduct unrestrained by the law to protect other people's Constitutional legal fundamental rts or authority, including other individuals besides the Pres the AG are charged to protect or defend.⁶

⁶ *In re Murchison*, 349 U.S. 133, (1955) ("No man can be a judge in his own case, and no man is permitted to try cases where he has an interest in the outcome."); See, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nemo_iudex_in_causa_sua "Nemo iudex in causa sua (also written as nemo [est] iudex in sua causa, in propria causa, in re sua or in parte sua) is a Latin legal authority that translates as "no one is judge in their own case". Originating from Roman law, it was crystallized into a phrase by Edward Coke in the 17th century and is now widely regarded as a fundamental tenet of natural justice and constitutionalism. Vermeule 2012, p. 386. (Other Cit omitted Wicpeedia) "It states that no one can judge a case in which they have an interest. In some jurisdictions, the principle is strictly enforced to avoid any appearance of bias, even when there is none: as Lord Chief Justice Hewart laid down in *Rex v. Sussex Justices*, "Justice must not only be done, but must also be seen to be done"" Id. *R v Sussex Justices*, ex parte McCarthy, [1924] 1 KB 256, [1923] All ER 233, Datar, Arvind (18 April 2020). "The origins of "Justice must be seen to be done"" *Bar and Bench - Indian Legal news*. Retrieved 11 September 2023.

See, *Isaiah* 14 to see how the Ct has made a Pres like the devil to be his own Judge and God, reflecting the image of lawlessness leading to hell if unrestrained by the just rule of law by the courts or written in the hearts of men in the form of love *per Jeremiah* 31. See, *Sirach* 8:14 ("Contend not at law with a judge, for he will settle it according to his whim." causing lawless lusts and great injustice). Allowing Pres to be his own judge grants partiality to self not

While I think the law should be equally applied to discern preemption under Art II under certain circumstances, it is not warranted here. An extension of current case law should discern whether Due process is violated by granting Trump authority to be his own judge unrestrained by the courts, unconstitutionally depriving petitioners of the 1st Am rt to pet before vitiation of Constitutional rts or other claims.

It is for the ct to consider whether the Pres violates DP by being his own judge given his personal interest in the outcome of 939, and other criminal cases, including winning elections as a candidate in light of multiple criminal cases where the courts should discern treason, high crimes and misdemeanors and whether a President should be on the ballot, not the one alleged to commit crimes, the Pres or a partial unfair biased horse and pony political forum the congress and where the people, me as applied, are deprived of the rt to pet fairly in accord with DP or other Const rt⁷ I disagree with Trump v. Norma Anderson, where this Ct held it doesn't matter if states found Trump committed treason and high crimes, they must keep him on the ballots and Trump is above the impartial rule of law and the provisions under Section 3 of the 14th Am. This Ct errantly made Trump free to entice congressmen to prevent impeachment for crimes and treasons through encouraging him to rule by temptations, lusts, by helping agendas in a horse and pony forum congress unrestrained by the just rule of law by the lie of this Court that

the impartial application of the constitution to the rule of law to protect the lives and liberty of all, not merely of one person with absolute discretion and a license to commit crime.

⁷ *Williams v. Pennsylvania*, 579 U.S. 1, (2016) ("Due process guarantees an absence of actual bias on the part of a judge." U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 14.); Id at 8–9, (2016) *Citing Murchison*, 349 U.S., at 136–137, ("This objective risk of bias is reflected in the due process maxim that "no man can *9 be a judge in his own case and no man is permitted to try cases where he has an interest **1906 in the outcome." Id., at 136, 75 S.Ct. 623.); *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, (2009) ("In deciding whether probability of actual bias on part of judge is too high to be constitutionally tolerable, court's inquiry is objective one, that asks not whether judge is actually, subjectively biased, but whether average judge in judge's position is likely to be neutral, or whether there is unconstitutional potential for bias.") Id. ("There is serious risk of actual bias, based on objective and reasonable perceptions, when person with personal stake in particular case had significant and disproportionate influence in placing judge on case by raising funds or by directing judge's election campaign when case was pending or imminent.")

immunity is the law, meaning like the devil the President is lawless unrestrained by anyone in his official conduct unlimited by other preempting Constitutional provisions.⁸

While the ct has the power of saying what the rule of law is, I and other petitioners, including my opponent have the Const legal authority under US Am I, V or IX in an Art III case or Controversy to argue and persuade the Ct as to what the Const as rule of law is, especially when the Court is mistaken, and where its decision was based on protecting its personal interest from attacks. These rts should not be infringed upon by the government through the US Supreme Cts' errant decisions or by gov. attacks against petitioners, witnesses, judges or their family to affect the outcome in cases.

When the Ct gets it wrong, it may be corrected through the petition. In order to uphold the fair administration of justice the ct must allow petitions even against the ct to correct errors and mistakes and to preserve the rule of law and equal Protections for all not some, including Trump who is rendered above the law by immunity. Wrongs cannot be righted when petitions are obstructed and fair opportunity to be heard are denied. Injustice is the law when the USSC says immunity or denial of 1st Amendment rights including the petition is now the law. The rule of law is degraded when the rt to pet fairly are denied. US Amend I, V.


CONCLUSION: Wherefore a pray this Ct grants this motion.

⁸ *Federalist 10* "No man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause, because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his integrity. With equal, nay with greater reason, a body of men are unfit to be both judges and parties at the same time; yet what are many of the most important acts of legislation, but so many judicial determinations, not indeed concerning the rights of single persons, but concerning the **rights of large bodies of citizens?** And what are the different classes of legislators but advocates and parties to the causes which they determine? Is a law proposed concerning private debts? It is a question to which the creditors are parties on one side and the debtors on the other. Justice ought to hold the balance between them." When courts balance Constitutional authority and restraints it must uphold the express purpose this Country was founded to protect life and liberty not to sacrifice it for the mark of the beast, lawless lusts leading to hell including avoidance of costs, material gain, convenience, comforts, positions, power and other vain desires if not restrained or repented of. *Federalist 80* "No man ought certainly to be a judge in his own cause, or in any cause in respect to which he has the least interest or bias. This principle has no inconsiderable weight in designating the federal courts as the proper tribunals for the determination of controversies between different States and their citizens.")

Dated

9/19/2024

Respectfully Submitted,



/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

~~302-493-6699~~ MK

US Supreme Ct Number 283696

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

Dated:

9/19/2024

Meghan Kelly

(printed)



(signed)

Exhibit 8 to App B

Exhibits on an Agenda to

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



RICHARD KURT GOLL
AGE: 76 • FENWICK ISLAND

Richard Kurt Goll, age 76, of Fenwick Island died Sunday, June 12, 2016 at Atlantic General Hospital in Berlin. He was born in Havre de Grace, MD and was the son of the late Eugene and Elsa (Ziegler) Goll.

He was a respected attorney for over 50 years in Wilmington Delaware, Sussex County Delaware and Havre de Grace, Maryland.

He is survived by his wife, Nancy M. Goll of Fenwick Island; a son, Richard K. Goll Jr. and his wife Jennifer of Selbyville; a daughter, Cynthia G. Smith of Severna Park, MD; two brothers, Eugene Goll of Easton and Robert Goll of Havre de Grace, MD; a sister, Nancy Gibbons of Westminster, MD; two grandchildren; Carson Smith and Parker Smith.

Services will be held at a later date.

In lieu of flowers, donations in his memory may be sent to the American Diabetes Association (diabetes.org) or to the Sepsis Alliance (sepsis.org).

Condolences may be sent by visiting www.bishophastingsfh.com

leaves 2 sisters-in-law.


Lenox graduated from Howard High School and Lincoln University. He received an honorable discharge from the U.S. Army, serving in WWII.

Lenox retired after working over 40 years with the U.S. Post Office. His friends there often called him Stone-wall Jackson.

Lenox was a member of the Monday Club, Inc., and he was inducted into the Delaware Afro-American Sports Hall of Fame in April 2001.

Lacey loved Photography and listening to Jazz.

He was a well-known figure in the Wilmington Community and will be sorely missed.



DESMOND JONES

AGE: 65 • NEW CASTLE, DE

Mr. Jones departed this life June 02, 2016. Funeral 10AM, Sat., June 18th at Cathedral of Fresh Fire, 2300 Northeast Blvd., Wilm, DE; viewing 8-9:45am only. Burial, Gracelawn Memorial Park.

CONGO FUNERAL HOME
congofuneralhome.com
302.652.8887

Faye Ellen Grant. He continued to live and work in the area until his death.

Clarence is survived by his son, Clarence Jarrett, Jr.; three grandchildren, Isaiah, Ellis and Cameron; sisters Linda (Walter) Nickerson, Brenda (Robert) Young, and Flora Jarret; two brothers, Fred (Valerie) Jarrett and Earnest Daniels, Jr. and a host of nieces, nephew, relatives and friends.

Viewing will be held at The House of Wright Mortuary, 208 E. 5th St., Wilm, DE, Saturday, June 18 from 10:00 am to 11:00 am. Celebration of Life will begin at 11:00 am. Interment will be private.



IN MEMORIAM

The Family Of
**JOHN L.
(JOE LOUIS)
BAISE**

*Would like to thank
everyone for all
The acts of kindness
shown to us
During our bereavement.
You may
Have sent a card, gave
monetary or
Food donation,
volunteered your time
Or talent, it was greatly
appreciated
God bless you all.*

**Loretta Baise and
Family**

BURIAL NOTICES

SMITH, JUDY

Judy Smith, 67, of S. DuPont Blvd., Smyrna, died on 6/11/2016.

Any relatives or friends are requested to immediately contact Joseph Kelly at Chandler Funeral Homes at office (302-478-7100) to claim the remains.

do delawareonline

Dick Goll
→
My friend
who died

His wife
died
a few
years
later.

He has
a son
who was
out of
work.

He helped him.

Letters

Continued from page A15

in criminal prosecution. While there will always be a need for fraud investigation, I will advocate for fraud prevention and actively participate in training that supports good fiscal operations for the various entities that collect and receive state funds.

My goals are to ensure timely completion of audit mandates; to support the elimination of significant noncompliance, fraud and waste based on clearly defined criteria; to perform follow-up of prior unresolved findings and recommendations; and to provide program evaluation and process recommendations that support government transparency and good government.

On a personal note, I live in Dover with my husband, Jerry, who is retired from 20 years of active-duty service in the Air Force. He currently serves as the union president for the American Federation of Government Employees,

Local 1709, at Dover Air Force Base. We have three children and four grandchildren.

In the end, no amount of technology, contracting or delegating that can replace experience, leadership and management specific to the field of state auditing and investigating. As you research the candidates, please consider the need for state auditing qualifications and experience prior to the upcoming elections.

I humbly ask for your vote in the Thursday, Sept. 6, primary.

Kathleen Davies
Candidate for Delaware Auditor of Accounts

Reader offers idea to lessen strife

Editor:

I would like to share with you a "quick fix" to the problem of the political divide engulfing this country, if not the world...

Rewrite the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Coastal Point

with the addition of two words: "prohibits discrimination because of race, color, sex, religion, political view or national origin."

Henry R Hensel
Ocean View

Keeley responds to previous letters

Editor:

I am writing in response to a number of letters in the June 29 Coastal Point.

First, Lloyd Elling's seemingly gross misinterpretations of the Second Amendment; the NRA and President Trump's actions are viewed as preposterous positions by many of us that support our rights as citizens.

Second, Valerie Reeves' denounces President Trump's policy on the enforcement of our laws at the border. Even though he's following the same tough policies as President Obama. The very same tough policies that were overlooked by Obama's fawning media. She also mentions "due process," which I believe requires citizenship. Detention of people entering our country illegally, with or without children, is certainly necessary to protect our borders and, in the long run, our country.

Third, Diane Meyer asks for term limits while noting the immigration quagmire currently strangling our Congress. A solution to the immigration quagmire was one of President Trump's main campaign promises, but he has problems with the professional politi-

cians on both sides of the aisle with this issue.

Unfortunately, the quagmire is not limited to immigration. She has a very good point especially when she mentions our own Sen. Tom Carper, who appears to be the definition of a professional politician. Term limits would certainly be a great step toward getting things done in Washington, especially since our representatives in both parties currently seem to spend most of their efforts at getting reelected!

Fourth and last, Henry R. Hensel states that he believes that our political strife will end. I, however, do not see that happening any time soon! We do have the choice between parties where, simply put, one wants smaller government, versus one that believes bigger government is the answer. Our founding fathers feared this type situation, and it seems they were correct!

I do agree with Mr. Hensel's suggestion that we turn off the 24/7 barrage of so-called news thrown at us by the radio, TV and newspapers. But that is easier said than done, and then where would we be?

Thomas M. Keeley III
Ocean View

Candidate discusses title companies' issues


Editor:

My name is Meghan Kelly. I am an

See LETTERS page A18

Article starts here


The Latest from the
Off The Hook Restaurant Group...



EAT
DRINK
PLAY

Carpets & Renovations by the Ocean

**FLOORING & CARPETING
KITCHENS & BATHROOMS**



**0%
FINANCING
AVAILABLE**



12021 Hammer Rd • Bishopville, MD

410-524-RUGS (7847)
www.ByTheOcean.net

Showroom Hours:
Monday-Friday 9-5
Saturday 10-4
Sunday by appointment only

Letters

Continued from page A16

attorney running for the House of Representatives in the 38th District, which includes Frankford, Selbyville, Ocean View, Bethany Beach and parts of Dagsboro.

One of the reasons why I am running is, two years ago, I found a problem that no one cares to fix. I care.

I found a lot of money not getting taxed by the State of Delaware relating to out-of-state real estate title insurance companies. I contacted various people and entities in an attempt to resolve the issue; however, to date, no one has addressed the problem. So, I am stepping up to confront the issue and to correct the problem.

It appears out-of-state title companies have been practicing Delaware law without a license for more than a decade. I talked with other real estate attorneys and discovered this has been a common practice for many years.

The problem arises, real estate attorneys gain work from those same title companies. So, they fear they will lose profit should they confront this misunderstanding.

The out-of-state title companies do not pay income tax in Delaware. So, the State of Delaware is not receiving income tax for this work. In addition, this has caused errors in the chain of title for deeds. So, good title may not be transferred in real estate transac-

tions if errors are not fixed. So, I sought to correct this by discussing this with the real estate section of the Bar.

Justice Holland gave me a call and offered to draft rules, but he retired.

In addition, [state Sen. Gerald] Hocker suggested we fine the title companies for exceeding the scope of their license. I think Mr. Hocker's idea is an excellent one.

I contacted legislators concerning this, but to date this problem has not been alleviated.

Thus, I strongly urge the Delaware Assembly to draft laws to clearly address this problem by giving notice to those out-of-state title companies with a license to sell title insurance the scope of the activities they may receive payment for in the State of Delaware. Should they exceed the scope, unless authorized permitted by law, fine them a specified amount of money.

The clarification will assist title companies in performing their work in accordance with Delaware Supreme Court case law. In addition, this correction will prevent the legislators from stepping on the Delaware Supreme Court's toes by discussing the unauthorized practice of law.

Thank you for your kind consideration. As a future legislator, I hope to participate in this correction, but I am running not only to win — I am running to make a positive difference in the community I grew up in and love.

Thank you for supporting me in serving you.

Meghan Kelly
Dagsboro

Steele weighs in on previous letters

Editor:

This letter is to answer three letters published June 29.

First, to Mr. Ewing: Your comments about President Trump and the crying little girl on the cover of Time magazine is flat-out wrong. That little girl was crying because she was lost for a few minutes from her family and her father found her just after that photo was taken. She was immediately reunited with her mother and father. Let's face it, when will Time magazine or you care to state the facts correctly?

Secondly, what does the Second Amendment have anything to do with illegal immigration? Maybe you are confused and do not know what the Second Amendment is about, basically, the right to bear arms. And that is what the Americans, who live along our southern border, are doing to protect themselves from armed gang members from Mexico plus the drug and human smugglers crossing the border.

You ask the question, "Whose side will you defend?" My answer: Always the Constitution! How about you?


Second, to Mr. Hansel: Thank you!

See LETTERS page A20

Out of state title companies are practicing real estate law without a license, messing up the chain of title, costing the public \$\$, and taking advantage of lawyers like my esteemed colleague.

Web Site <https://www.thevenusproject.com/faq/how-can-the-use-of-laws-be-eliminated/#:~:text=When%20Earth%E2%80%99s%20resources%20are%20seen%20as%20the%20common,against%20abuse%20could%20be%20designed%20into%20the%20environment.>

[Home](#) » How can the use of Laws be eliminated?



How can the use of Laws be eliminated?

Today we try to control human behavior by enacting laws or signing treaties without changing the physical conditions responsible for aberrant behavior. When Earth's resources are seen as the common heritage of all people, irrelevant laws and social contracts will vanish.

In a resource-based economy, social responsibility would not be a function of artificial laws or force. Safeguards against abuse could be designed into the environment. An example of this is the proposed design of cities where people have free access to resources without debt. This would eliminate theft. Such measures are not a matter of passing and enforcing laws to prevent and punish abuse. Rather, they are a means of designing the flaws out of any social venture, thus eliminating the need for many laws.

We are proposing doing away with the systems that cause corruption and human suffering in the first place. In a city with safe, clean, mass transportation, we do not need police to monitor drivers' speed, behavior at stop signs, or proper papers.

Other examples are the air and the water. Although both are necessary to our well-being and survival, there are no laws regulating how many breaths are taken per hour because we have such abundance at this time. No one monitors a gushing spring to see how much water is taken from it, although fresh water is absolutely necessary for the support of life. If it is abundant, no one monitors it.

I must emphasize that this approach to global governance has nothing in common with the present aims of an elite few to form a world government with themselves at the helm, and with the vast majority subservient to them. This newer vision of globalization empowers every person on the planet to be all they can be, without living in abject subjugation to a corporate governing body.

A society with human concern “designs out” laws and proclamations by making all things available to all people, regardless of race, color, or creed. When governments make laws, we are led to believe that these laws are made to enhance people’s lives. In truth, laws are byproducts of insufficiency.

The question is, “can we grow beyond thinking that “someone” has to make decisions for us?”

A better understanding of natural law involves human’s relationship to the environment, which supports all life. All of nature is subservient to natural law. Natural law cannot be violated without serious consequences to individuals or societies. Natural laws dominate all living systems. For example, without water, sun, or nutrients, plants and animals die.

An environment of scarcity, hunger, and poverty is a threat to everyone.

Foreword by Satya Nadella, CEO of Microsoft

Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution

**Klaus
Schwab**

Founder and Executive Chairman, World Economic Forum
with Nicholas Davis

Shaping the Future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution

A Guide to Building a Better World

Klaus Schwab

With Nicholas Davis



Copyright © 2018 by World Economic Forum All rights reserved.
Published in the United States by Currency, an imprint of the Crown
Publishing Group, a division of Penguin Random House LLC, New
York.

currencybooks.com

Originally published by World Economic Fund, Geneva, Switzerland,
in 2018.

CURRENCY and its colophon are trademarks of Penguin Random
House LLC.


Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available.

ISBN 9781984822611

that not only have commercial value but also serve the public good. We must avoid the tendency of past industrial revolutions to treat the natural world as a sink for the costs of emerging technologies. This will not be easy, yet leaders have no other choice than to manage the externalities of the Fourth Industrial Revolution so unintended consequences are carried collectively rather than concentrated on vulnerable populations or, via environmental damage, on future generations. Given the fragility of the Earth's biosphere after three previous industrial revolutions, the cost of failure is simply too high.

Society and citizens

In addition to their geopolitical and environmental impacts, technological revolutions can affect the social landscape by altering the skills needed to be deemed successful. For example, the third Industrial Revolution improved the lives of knowledge workers, making them better off than the factory workers who had seen their living standards increase during the second Industrial Revolution. The famous elephant graph by economist Branko Milanović (Figure 10) shows how the distribution of global income changed between 1988 and 2008: the benefits bypassed not only the very poorest but also those around the 80th percentile globally, the lower-middle class in advanced economies. There, many industrial workers have joined "the precariat," facing lives of insecurity and stagnating wages. Now, increasing automation has the potential to change who benefits once again.



New forms of automation, including robots and algorithms driven by recent advances in AI, are not just replacing factory workers but increasingly accountants, lawyers and other professional workers. In 2000, Goldman Sachs's New York office employed 600 traders. In 2017, only two equity traders were left, supported by automated

There is also the fact that secure, anonymous, programmable networks could lower the cost of criminal activity. The same protocols that allow for smart contracts to protect the interests of individuals through encryption also allow consortiums to perform illicit activities, such as illegal drug trading, human trafficking, fraud, and more.⁹⁶ Another issue is the accessibility of the technology itself. While bitcoin “wallets” are becoming easier to access and use, few mass or widespread incentives exist for individuals and organizations to accept the switching costs of moving to blockchain-enabled platforms. The lack of abundant platforms and intuitive applications, though they are not far away, poses another barrier.

A Technology for Trust


By Carsten Stöcker, Head, Blockchain Competence Team, innogy SE, Germany, and Burkhard Blechschmidt, Head, CIO Advisory, Cognizant, Germany

Historically, trust was added on to products or transactions as they flowed through the manufacturing supply chain. Physical, or electronic, records trailed every object to prove its origin, destination, quantity and history. Producing, tracking and verifying all this information imposes a massive “trust tax” of time and effort on banks, accountants, lawyers, auditors and quality inspectors. Important information could be lost, inaccessible or even intentionally hidden.

As the Fourth Industrial Revolution unfolds, blurring the line between the physical and digital worlds, blockchain is emerging to allow digital product memories to follow physical objects and guide

BY DESIGN

based on situational context and to generalize without having to train through vast data pools, but this is not yet possible. New technologies, such as quantum computing, may be able to change how AI applications interrogate problems and learn from feedback loops, potentially mimicking human cognitive appreciation of the world. If so, they could bring economic benefits by eroding human error and taking over synthetic tasks that lead to fatigue.



Even without such breakthroughs, progress is quick and hopes are high. Robots are being developed to travel to Mars, to assist nurses and even to build themselves.¹³¹ Swarms of tiny robots, controlled by AI in the cloud, may someday feed data via AI applications to centralized servers capable of coordinating tasks and deploying resources. AI is already advancing into knowledge-based professions, such as journalism, medicine, accountancy and law. Even if it does not altogether replace lawyers or doctors, AI applications that can synthesize and analyze case studies and diagnostic images will change these professions. And while AI is busy improving itself, robotics' industry spending is set to exceed \$135 billion in 2019, nearly double its 2015 figure.¹³² Not only will vehicles lose their drivers, the vehicles themselves are likely to be built by robots, especially since the automotive industry is the number one buyer of automated robots (Figure 17).¹³³

Figure 17: Number of Multipurpose Industrial Robots (All Types) per 10,000 Employees in the Automotive Industry and in All Others, 2014

fully automatable. Instead, as analysis by AlphaBeta has shown, the biggest impact of AI and robotics on the future of work will be the automation of a range of repetitive or technical tasks, freeing up people's time for more interpersonal and creative work.

10. The impact of AI and robotics depends on how we adopt them. The way that AI and robotics systems are applied by organizations to real-life problems is the primary driver of their impact. This means that, as AI and robotic systems become more powerful and capable, the decision-making processes for boards and managers in determining where and when to use them also rise in importance.

Five key ideas

1. AI has improved rapidly in recent years due to machine-learning techniques that take advantage of the increase in available data, sensors and processing power. Machine learning has reached a level where it is capable of mimicking close to (or better than) human-level interaction in constrained scenarios involving areas such as gameplay, customer service queries, medical diagnostics and the navigation of autonomous vehicles.
2. Robotic potential has increased in the last decade as AI has begun to power new physical systems. Humans and machines, working together, will likely begin to take over and reduce the number of roles traditionally needed for educated or skilled persons, such as doctors, lawyers, pilots and truck drivers. This is creating concern about the role of human expertise and to what extent human intelligence and judgment will be needed for many tasks that could be given over to automated systems.





The Fourth Industrial Revolution

Klaus Schwab

global economy would return to its previous high-growth pattern was widespread. But this has not happened. The global economy seems to be stuck at a growth rate lower than the post-war average – about 3-3.5% a year.

Some economists have raised the possibility of a “centennial slump” and talk about “secular stagnation”, a term coined during the Great Depression by Alvin Hansen, and recently brought back in vogue by economists Larry Summers and Paul Krugman. “Secular stagnation” describes a situation of persistent shortfalls of demand, which cannot be overcome even with near-zero interest rates. Although this idea is disputed among academics, it has momentous implications. If true, it suggests that global GDP growth could decline even further. We can imagine an extreme scenario in which annual global GDP growth falls to 2%, which would mean that it would take 36 years for global GDP to double.

There are many explanations for slower global growth today, ranging from capital misallocation to over indebtedness to shifting demographics and so on. I will address two of them, ageing and productivity, as both are particularly interwoven with technological progress.

Ageing

The world’s population is forecast to expand from 7.2 billion today to 8 billion by 2030 and 9 billion by 2050. This should lead to an increase in aggregate demand. But there is another powerful demographic trend: ageing. The conventional wisdom is that ageing primarily affects rich countries in the West. This is not the case, however. Birth rates are falling below replacement levels in many regions of the world – not only in Europe, where the decline began, but also in most of South America and the Caribbean, much of Asia including China and southern India, and even some countries in the Middle East and North Africa such as Lebanon, Morocco and Iran.

Ageing is an economic challenge because unless retirement ages are drastically increased so that older members of society can continue to contribute to the workforce (an economic imperative that has many economic benefits), the working-age population falls at the same time as the percentage of dependent elders increases. As the population ages and there

What evidence supports this and what does it tell us about what lies ahead? The early signs point to a wave of labour-substitutive innovation across multiple industries and job categories which will likely happen in the coming decades.

Labour substitution

Many different categories of work, particularly those that involve mechanically repetitive and precise manual labour, have already been automated. Many others will follow, as computing power continues to grow exponentially. Sooner than most anticipate, the work of professions as different as lawyers, financial analysts, doctors, journalists, accountants, insurance underwriters or librarians may be partly or completely automated.

So far, the evidence is this: The fourth industrial revolution seems to be creating fewer jobs in new industries than previous revolutions. According to an estimate from the Oxford Martin Programme on Technology and Employment, only 0.5% of the US workforce is employed in industries that did not exist at the turn of the century, a far lower percentage than the approximately 8% of new jobs created in new industries during the 1980s and the 4.5% of new jobs created during the 1990s. This is corroborated by a recent US Economic Census, which sheds some interesting light on the relationship between technology and unemployment. It shows that innovations in information and other disruptive technologies tend to raise productivity by replacing existing workers, rather than creating new products needing more labour to produce them.

Two researchers from the Oxford Martin School, economist Carl Benedikt Frey and machine learning expert Michael Osborne, have quantified the potential effect of technological innovation on unemployment by ranking 702 different professions according to their probability of being automated, from the least susceptible to the risk of automation (“0” corresponding to no risk at all) to those that are the most susceptible to the risk (“1” corresponding to a certain risk of the job being replaced by a computer of some sort).²³ In Table 2 below, I highlight certain professions that are most likely to be automated, and those least likely.

This research concludes that about 47% of total employment in the US is at risk, perhaps over the next decade or two, characterized by a much broader

scope of job destruction at a much faster pace than labour market shifts experienced in previous industrial revolutions. In addition, the trend is towards greater polarization in the labour market. Employment will grow in high-income cognitive and creative jobs and low-income manual occupations, but it will greatly diminish for middle-income routine and repetitive jobs.

is a well-worn development pathway, allowing countries to accumulate capital, transfer technology and raise incomes. If this pathway closes, many countries will have to rethink their models and strategies of industrialization. Whether and how developing economies can leverage the opportunities of the fourth industrial revolution is a matter of profound importance to the world; it is essential that further research and thinking be undertaken to understand, develop and adapt the strategies required.

The danger is that the fourth industrial revolution would mean that a winner-takes-all dynamic plays out between countries as well as within them. This would further increase social tensions and conflicts, and create a less cohesive, more volatile world, particularly given that people are today much more aware of and sensitive to social injustices and the discrepancies in living conditions between different countries. Unless public- and private-sector leaders assure citizens that they are executing credible strategies to improve peoples' lives, social unrest, mass migration, and violent extremism could intensify, thus creating risks for countries at all stages of development. It is crucial that people are secure in the belief that they can engage in meaningful work to support themselves and their families, but what happens if there is insufficient demand for labour, or if the skills available no longer match the demand?

3.1.3 The Nature of Work

The emergence of a world where the dominant work paradigm is a series of transactions between a worker and a company more than an enduring relationship was described by Daniel Pink 15 years ago in his book *Free Agent Nation*.²⁶ This trend has been greatly accelerated by technological innovation.

Today, the on-demand economy is fundamentally altering our relationship with work and the social fabric in which it is embedded. More employers are using the “human cloud” to get things done. Professional activities are dissected into precise assignments and discrete projects and then thrown into a virtual cloud of aspiring workers located anywhere in the world. This is the new on-demand economy, where providers of labour are no longer employees in the traditional sense but rather independent workers who perform specific tasks. As Arun Sundararajan, professor at the Stern School

of Business at New York University (NYU), put it in a *New York Times* column by journalist Farhad Manjoo: “We may end up with a future in which a fraction of the workforce will do a portfolio of things to generate an income – you could be an Uber driver, an Instacart shopper, an Airbnb host and a Taskrabbit”.²⁷

The advantages for companies and particularly fast-growing start-ups in the digital economy are clear. As human cloud platforms classify workers as self-employed, they are – for the moment – **free of the requirement to pay minimum wages, employer taxes and social benefits.** As explained by Daniel Callaghan, chief executive of MBA & Company in the UK, in a *Financial Times* article: “You can now get whoever you want, whenever you want, exactly how you want it. And because they’re not employees you don’t have to deal with employment hassles and regulations.”²⁸

For the people who are in the cloud, the main advantages reside in the freedom (to work or not) and the unrivalled mobility that they enjoy by belonging to a global virtual network. Some independent workers see this as offering the ideal combination of a lot of freedom, less stress and greater job satisfaction. Although the human cloud is in its infancy, there is already substantial anecdotal evidence that it entails silent offshoring (silent because human cloud platforms are not listed and do not have to disclose their data).

Is this the beginning of a new and flexible work revolution that will empower any individual who has an internet connection and that will eliminate the shortage of skills? Or will it trigger the onset of an inexorable race to the bottom in a world of unregulated virtual sweatshops? **If the result is the latter – a world of the precariat, a social class of workers who move from task to task to make ends meet while suffering a loss of labour rights, bargaining rights and job security – would this create a potent source of social unrest and political instability? Finally, could the development of the human cloud merely accelerate the automation of human jobs?**

The challenge we face is to come up with new forms of social and employment contracts that suit the changing workforce and the evolving nature of work. We must limit the downside of the human cloud in terms of possible exploitation, while neither curtailing the growth of the labour market nor preventing people from working in the manner they choose. If we

ethics.

New frontiers in global security

As stressed several times in this book, we only have a limited sense of the ultimate potential of new technologies and what lies ahead. This is no less the case in the realm of international and domestic security. For each innovation we can think of, there will be a positive application and a possible dark side. While neurotechnologies such as neuroprosthetics are already employed to solve medical problems, in future they could be applied to military purposes. Computer systems attached to brain tissue could enable a paralysed patient to control a robotic arm or leg. The same technology could be used to direct a bionic pilot or soldier. Brain devices designed to treat the conditions of Alzheimer's disease could be implanted in soldiers to erase memories or create new ones. "It's not a question of if non-state actors will use some form of neuroscientific techniques or technologies, but when, and which ones they'll use," reckons James Giordano, a neuroethicist at Georgetown University Medical Center, "**The brain is the next battlespace.**"⁵¹

The availability and, at times, the unregulated nature of many of these innovations have a further important implication. Current trends suggest a rapid and massive democratization of the capacity to inflict damage on a very large scale, something previously limited to governments and very sophisticated organizations. From 3D-printed weapons to genetic engineering in home laboratories, destructive tools across a range of emerging technologies are becoming more readily available. And with the fusion of technologies, a key theme of this book, unpredictable dynamics inherently surface, challenging existing legal and ethical frameworks.

Towards a more secure world

In the face of these challenges, how do we persuade people to take the security threats from emerging technologies seriously? Even more importantly, can we engender cooperation between the public and private sectors on the global scale to mitigate these threats?

Over the second half of the last century, the fear of nuclear warfare gradually gave way to the relative stability of mutually assured destruction

Shift 17: The Sharing Economy

The tipping point: Globally more trips/journeys via car sharing than in private cars

By 2025: 67% of respondents expected this tipping point to have occurred

The common understanding of this phenomenon is the usually technology-enabled ability for entities (individuals or organizations) to share the use of a physical good/asset, or share/provide a service, at a level that was not nearly as efficient or perhaps even possible before. This sharing of goods or services is commonly possible through online marketplaces, mobile apps/location services or other technology-enabled platforms. These have reduced the transaction costs and friction in the system to a point where it is an economic gain for all involved, divided in much finer increments.

Well-known examples of the sharing economy exist in the transportation sector. Zipcar provides one method for people to share use of a vehicle for shorter periods of time and more reasonably than traditional rental car companies. RelayRides provides a platform to locate and borrow someone's personal vehicle for a period of time. Uber and Lyft provide much more efficient "taxi-like" services from individuals, but aggregated through a service, enabled by location services and accessed through mobile apps. In addition, they are available at a moment's notice.

The sharing economy has any number of ingredients, characteristics or descriptors: technology enabled, preference for access over ownership, peer to peer, sharing of personal assets (versus corporate assets), ease of access, increased social interaction, collaborative consumption and openly shared user feedback (resulting in increased trust). Not all are present in every "sharing economy" transaction.

Positive impacts

- Increased access to tools and other useful physical resources
- Better environmental outcomes (less production and fewer assets required)
- More personal services available
- Increased ability to live off cash flow (with less need for savings to be able to afford use of assets)
- Better asset utilization
- Less opportunity for long-term abuse of trust because of direct and public feedback loops
- Creation of secondary economies (Uber drivers delivering goods or food)

Negative impacts

- Less resilience after a job loss (because of less savings)
- More contract / task-based labour (versus typically more stable long-term employment)
- Decreased ability to measure this potentially grey economy
- More opportunity for short-term abuse of trust
- Less investment capital available in the system

Unknown, or cuts both ways

- Changed property and asset ownership
- More subscription models
- Less savings
- Lack of clarity on what "wealth" and "well off" mean

[Observer](#) / [Articles](#) / [2017](#)

Could an AI ever replace a judge in court?

Will an AI ever replace a judge

Will an AI ever replace a judge

Nov 07, 2017

Briony Harris

Senior Writer at Formative Content

Share the Article



Xiaofa stands in Beijing No 1 Intermediate People's Court, offering legal advice and helping the public get to grips with legal terminology. She knows the answer to more than 40,000 litigation questions and can deal with 30,000 legal issues. Xiaofa is a robot.

China already has more than 100 robots in courts across the country as it actively pursues a transition to smart justice. These can retrieve case histories and past verdicts, reducing the workload of officials. Some of the robots even have specialisms, such as commercial law or labour-related disputes.

Chinese courts also use artificial intelligence to sift through private messages or comments on social media that can be used as evidence in court. And traffic police are reportedly using facial recognition technology to identify and convict offenders.

But these legal uses for AI are just the beginning of what may be possible in the future.

An aide to judges

China has a civil law system that uses case law to determine the outcome of trials. With just 120,000 judges to deal with 19 million cases a year, it is little wonder the legal system is turning to AI, law firm Norton Rose Fulbright says.

The Supreme People's Court has asked local courts to take advantage of big data, cloud computing, neural networks and machine learning. It wants to build technology-friendly judicial systems and explore the use of big data and AI to help judges and litigants resolve cases.

An application named Intelligent Trial 1.0 is already reducing judges' workloads by helping sift through material and producing electronic

"The application of artificial intelligence in the judicial realm can provide judges with splendid resources, but it can't take the place of the judges' expertise," said Zhou Qiang, the head of the Supreme People's Court, who advocates smart systems.

Eliminating bias?

But recent advances in AI mean the technology can do far more than sifting through vast quantities of data. It is developing cognitive skills and learning from past events and cases.

This inevitably leads to questions as to whether AI will one day make better decisions than humans.

All human decisions are susceptible to prejudice and all judicial systems suffer from unconscious bias, despite the best of intentions.

Algorithms that can ignore factors that do not legally bear on individual cases, such as gender and race, could remove some of those failings.

One of the most important considerations for judges is whether to grant bail and how long prison sentences should be. These decisions are usually dictated by the likelihood of reoffending.

Algorithms are now able to make such decisions by giving an evidence-based analysis of the risks, rather than relying on the subjective decision-making of individual judges.

Despite these obvious advantages, it is far from clear who would provide oversight of the AI and check their decisions are not flawed. And more cautious observers warn that AIs may learn and mimic bias from their human inventors or the data they have been trained with.

Making connections

But AI could also help solve crimes long before a judge is involved. VALCRI, for example, carries out the labour-intensive aspects of a crime analyst's job by wading through texts, lab reports and police documents to highlight areas that warrant further investigation and possible connections that humans might miss.

AIs could also help to detect crimes before they happen. Meng Jianzhu, former head of legal and political affairs at the Chinese Communist Party, said the Chinese government would start to use machine learning and data modelling to predict where crime and disorder may occur.

"Artificial intelligence can complete tasks with a precision and speed unmatched by humans, and will drastically improve the predictability, accuracy and efficiency of social management," Mr Meng said.

Setting a precedent

It is as yet uncertain which of these technologies may become widespread and how different governments and judiciaries will choose to monitor their use.

The day when technology will become the judge of good and bad human behaviour and assign appropriate punishments still lies some way in the future.

However, legal systems often provide ideal examples of services that could be improved, while trials are likely to benefit from better data analysis.

The law often requires a trial to set a precedent – so watch out for the test case of AI as judge.



[About](#)

[Events & Initiatives](#)

[Community](#)

[العربية](#)

[Awards](#)

[News Room](#)



[Download on the App Store](#)

[Download on Google Play](#)

Enter your email address

Send

Follow Us



[Terms & Conditions](#)

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Copyrights](#)

[Sitemap](#)

Copyright © 2023 World Government Summit.

Robot justice: China's use of Internet courts

By Tara Vasdani

This article was originally published by The Lawyer's Daily (<https://www.thelawyersdaily.ca/>), part of LexisNexis Canada Inc.

Would it scare you if I said that China has been doing this since 2017?

In December 2019, China has announced that millions of legal cases are now being decided by “Internet courts” that do not require citizens to appear in court. The “smart court” includes non-human judges, powered by artificial intelligence (AI) and allows participants to register their cases online and resolve their matters via a digital court hearing.

The Chinese Internet courts handle a variety of disputes, which include intellectual property, e-commerce, financial disputes related to online conduct, loans acquired or performed online, domain name issues, property and civil rights cases involving the Internet, product liability arising from online purchases and certain administrative disputes. In Beijing, the average duration of a case is 40 days; the average dispositive hearing lasts 37 minutes; almost 80 per cent of the litigants before the Chinese Internet courts are individuals, and 20 per cent corporate entities; and 98 per cent of the rulings have been accepted without appeal.

It is 2020. Your Canadian commercial dispute is paperless. A document management platform sifts through all parties' documents to flag relevant vs. non-relevant documents. A subsequent platform reviews the relevant documents, and tells you that your case has the stronger evidentiary background.

A legal research tool in the meantime is determining whether a shareholder may attract wages for services performed, or simply be paid dividends. It's time to move to summary judgment. An Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) tool reviews your motion materials, your Affidavit (e-signed) and the Responding Record. An AI judge flags a case from 1970 that still applies today and — you win your dispute. The decision can be appealed to a human judge.

Cost savings? Astronomical. A preliminary decision? Within one month. The AI judge's eye for 1970 case law? Well, he's not hungry or tired like your articling student.

China's first Internet court was established in the eastern city of Hangzhou in 2017 and in 2019, it was reported that users completed more than 3.1 million legal activities using the court system from March

through to October. More than one million citizens were registered with the system, along with approximately 73,000 lawyers.

Judicial officials recently invited reporters to the Hangzhou Internet court to see how it operates. In a demonstration, citizens were seen using video messaging to communicate with the AI judges, and the following was observed:

"Does the defendant have any objection to the nature of the judicial blockchain evidence submitted by the plaintiff?" a virtual judge asked during a pretrial meeting. The non-human judge was represented in the system by an image of a man wearing a black robe.

"No objection," the human plaintiff answered.

The judges "appeared" by hologram and are artificial creations — there is no real judge present. The holographic judge looks like a real person but is a synthesized, 3D image of different judges, and sets schedules, asks litigants questions, takes evidence and issues dispositive rulings.

A Hangzhou court official told China's state-run CGTN television network that the Internet court system operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

In today's marketplace where almost everything is purchased or transacted online, the potential for this type of court system is significant.

In a previous article (<https://www.thelawyersdaily.ca/articles/11582/estonia-set-to-introduce-ai-judge-in-small-claims-court-to-clear-court-backlog->), I commented on Estonia's adoption of an AI judge to settle small claims disputes. Prior to that, I commented on the Ontario Superior Court of Justice's pilot project launched on Feb. 11, 2019, the Digital Hearing Workspace (<https://www.thelawyersdaily.ca/articles/10192/digital-hearing-workspace-pilot-project-one-step-closer-to-court-modernization->) (DHW). The program is currently used to deliver, store, organize and retrieve all documents relevant to a file, electronically. It applies to all Commercial List proceedings, and failure to upload documents to the platform is addressed by a presiding court official.

Combined with an ODR system or AI-powered judges, and considering the backlog of civil and commercial disputes experienced by litigants in Canada, the idea of an AI judge seems to resolve many current issues. And it is not too far from our midst.

The U.S. recently forecasted a time when AI-driven legal assistants might be presenting judges with case law, precedents and the background needed to make a decision. Hear that? Legal assistants.

In 2019, I reviewed a very helpful, and very vanguard legal research AI tool championed by the Toronto-based company, Alexsei.

Tools such as Alexsei use machine learning to identify relevant and up-to-date case law across the web and

scan the Internet to discern lawyers' opinions on cases as identified in their legal blogs. The software then generates a legal memorandum within 24 hours of being asked a legal research question.

China, or Estonia as I reported in 2019, are not the first to mix AI and the law. In the United States, algorithms assist in recommending criminal sentences. The widely popular U.K.-based app DoNotPay, an AI-driven chatbot, overturned 160,000 parking tickets in London and New York a few years ago.

The international deployment of Internet courts is just another step in the saga of the eventual automation of certain legal tasks and processes.

Taken in harmony, the last year in Canada alone saw the adoption of directives within the federal government regarding AI's replacement of mundane administrative tasks; judges' reprisal for the failure to use legal research AI tools to assist in conducting research and saving client legal fees; the DHW, requiring counsel and parties to upload their documents to an electronic filing system; and my personal favourite, Google's Duplex which I hope will arrive into our industry soon.

All in all, I repeat, adopt and reiterate that the legal industry's resistance to the above changes will create great hurdles to lawyers and their staff alike. Modern judiciaries have already begun to expect the employ of legal tech tools by counsel, students and the courts. Should lawyers choose not to live up to the challenge, they could end up with a very disappointed client, potentially large and assessment-worthy client cost consequences and since 2017, an algorithm's reprisal.

Tara Vasdani is the principal lawyer and founder of Remote Law Canada (<https://www.remotelawcanada.com/>). Her practice centres on employment law, civil litigation and remote work. She has been featured in Forbes. She was the first Canadian lawyer to serve a statement of claim via Instagram, and you can reach her directly at tara@remotelawcanada.com (<mailto:tara@remotelawcanada.com>).

Interested in writing for us? To learn more about how you can add your voice to The Lawyer's Daily (<http://www.thelawyersdaily.ca/>), contact Analysis Editor Peter Carter at peter.carter@lexisnexis.ca (<mailto:peter.carter@lexisnexis.ca>) or call 647-776-6740.

< Back to In-House Counsel Resource Page

(<https://www.lexisnexis.ca/en-ca/products/in-house-counsel.page#HOME>)

The Lawyer's Daily

This article was originally published by *The Lawyer's Daily* – providing Canadian legal news, analysis and current awareness for lawyers and legal professionals who need a real-time view on the shifting legal landscape.

TAKE A 14-DAY FREE TRIAL ([HTTPS://WWW.THELAWYERSDAILY.CA/SUBSCRIBE/GET_INSTANT_ACCESS](https://www.thelawyersdaily.ca/subscribe/get_instant_access))

CONTACT US

LexisNexis Canada

111 Gordon Baker Road

Suite 900

Toronto, ON, M2H 3R1

1-800-255-5174 (tel:1-800-255-5174)

Support (</en-ca/about-us/contact-us/contact-us.page#support>)

Training (</en-ca/training/training-overview.page>)

Sales (</en-ca/about-us/contact-us/contact-us.page#sales>)

ABOUT US

Careers (</en-ca/about-us/careers.page>)

Leadership (</en-ca/about-us/leadership/local-leadership.page>)

Rule of Law (</en-ca/about-us/rule-of-law.page>)

Responsibility (</en-ca/about-us/corporate-responsibility.page>)

Customer Charter (</en-ca/support/customer-charter.page>)

Privacy Policy (<https://www.lexisnexis.com/global/privacy/en/privacy-policy-ca.page>)

Privacy Center (<https://www.lexisnexis.com/global/privacy/en/privacy-center-ca.page>)

Terms & Conditions (</en-ca/terms.page>)

Email Permissions (<https://go.lexisnexis.ca/preferences>)

CONNECT WITH US



LinkedIn (<https://www.linkedin.com/company/lexisnexis-canada/>)



Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com/lexisnexiscanada>)



Twitter (<https://twitter.com/lexisnexiscan/>)



YouTube (<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCSZZnJmXOAyqjTPn1BYCe5g/>)

UPCOMING EVENTS

PARTNERS



(<https://www.cba.org/Home>)




(<https://www.ccca-accje.org>

/Membership/CBA-Preferred-Suppliers)

Copyright © 2022 LexisNexis. All rights reserved. (<https://www.lexisnexis.com/terms/copyright.aspx>)

THE GREAT NARRATIVE

For a Better Future



KLAUS SCHWAB
THIERRY MALLERET

FORUM PUBLISHING

THE GREAT NARRATIVE

Klaus Schwab
Thierry Malleret

FORUM PUBLISHING

Edition 1.0

© 2022 World Economic Forum

All rights reserved

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying or recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system.

World Economic Forum
91-93 route de la Capite
CH-1223 Cologny/Geneva
Switzerland
Tel.: +41 (0)22 869 1212
Fax: +41 (0)22 786 2744
mail: contact@weforum.org
www.weforum.org

Print ISBN: 978-2-940631-30-8

ePub ISBN: 978-2-940631-31-5

- (4) The strong and rapid emergence of cryptocurrencies, and more broadly fintech, entangles economics with technological innovation in such a complex way that it makes it hard to identify how the causality runs and what some of the potential applications and policy implications might be. Analysts and media reports give the impression that national currencies already compete with cryptocurrencies since individuals and institutions can hold digital wallets with whichever crypto asset they chose. As Parag Khanna states:

We are about to enter an age of global monetary competition, where national currencies must earn their place in someone's wallet portfolio every hour of every day, even among citizens of their own countries. The digital version of the Japanese yen will be plunged into head-to-head global competition with the Swiss franc, the Brazilian real, and any other asset with an open capital account, including Bitcoin. Everyone becomes a foreign-exchange trader, all the time, and only the best national currencies – or cryptocurrencies – are ever held by anyone.³⁴

Elimination of fiat \$ to trackable money coins of the pleasure of banks.

It might be that government-supported cryptocurrencies compete with each other, as hinted at by Khanna. If they do so, they'd blur the line with fiat money and would change the financial system in terms of financial stability and traditional monetary policy in a way that nobody can yet predict.

Currently, both monetary authorities and private institutions issue cryptocurrencies as viable, mainstream payment vehicles. Central banks and governments experiment with "govcoins", or Central Bank Digital Currencies, while private "sponsors" develop "stablecoins" – cryptocurrencies whose value is pegged to the value of an underlying asset. The trajectory and endgame for govcoins and stablecoins remain unknown, but their respective fates may ultimately be decided by adoption and above all regulation (the power of the state). The only certainty: their economic, societal and possibly geopolitical impacts will be considerable. Will physical cash still be accepted? Will cryptocurrencies pervade our privacy? How will they redefine the role of technology in our daily lives? What will their impact be on the effectiveness of monetary policy? Could they foster greater financial inclusion? Could cryptocurrencies advance environmental objectives and the policies that support them? Could they be used to accelerate the demise of the US dollar? Will

They predict it, they plan it in their agenda.

The elimination of the dollar is discussed in other WEF documents (??)

future. Their original ideas translate into narratives that produce models which in turn influence behaviour and help construct the future. Ultimately, they become instruments of policy and project market power. By way of demonstration, four innovative projects, or sets of projects, are described, all different from each other but all pertaining to the environmental sector (this macro category was chosen arbitrarily because it is where the stakes are the highest). Just a few years ago, all these ventures were unknown or in their infancy. Now, they are a collective testimony to the power of imagination of those who conceived them.

(1) Network for Greening the Financial System and beyond: Imagining new policies

The Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) is a group of 91 central banks and supervisors committed to mobilizing mainstream finance to support the transition towards a sustainable economy. It is investigating many bold financial innovations¹¹⁷ that could (and most likely will) one day revolutionize the way in which climate-related risks are accounted for in central banking and banking supervision. In short, alongside governments (which have a much broader and more effective range of tools and policies available to prevent and mitigate climate-related risks), central banks will adapt their monetary policy operational frameworks to reflect climate-related risks. This will involve the mitigation of balance sheet risks that stem from climate change and environmental degradation, but also the active support of the transition to a non-carbon, green economy. Imagining what form this might take and devising policy tools and instruments to get there is the task of the NGFS, and largely depends on how climate risks will affect the economy and financial system through a range of different transmission channels.¹¹⁸ The menu of options available is extensive and encompasses changes in all three most important policy fields of a central bank: credit operations, collateral policies and asset purchases. It is not the purpose of this book to delve into the technicalities of what this involves¹¹⁹ but, suffice to say, some of the options represent a radical departure from standard central bank operational policies. They are, in short, the product of central bankers' imagination.

Some ideas go into uncharted territory, well beyond the scope of what the NGFS is devising in terms of possible policies. Creating "carbon quantitative easing" policies is one of them. It's a novel, untested and somewhat outlier

The rule of law is the "product of the bankers' imagination" when bankers gain more & the worse off we are. This is terribly horrific.

APPC

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,	§	APPEALS COURT
Respondent.	§	CASE NUMBER: 22:37372
	§	DISTRICT COURT
	§	Misc. No. 22-45
v.	§	DISTRICT COURT
United States District Court,	§	JUDGE: The Honorable Paul D.
Eastern District of Pennsylvania	§	Paul S. Diamond, Judge

Petitioner Meghan Kelly moves this Court to recuse Four Judges, Judge Hardiman, Judge Phipps, Judge Honorable Montgomery-Reeves, and Judge Scirica

I Meghan Kelly, Esq., pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 27, my 5th Amendment right to a fair trial to defend the exercise of my 1st Amendment rights of petitioning, speech, religious belief, exercise, and association, 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law move for the recusal of Judge Hardiman, Judge Phipps, Judge Honorable Montgomery-Reeves, and Judge Scirica and to prevent the participation of four judges on the Third Circuit in this matter and related matters.

1. This law suit arises based on my law suit against former President Donald J. Trump to dissolve the establishment of government religion that created and continues to create a substantial burden upon my religious exercise. I incorporate herein by reference the pleadings I filed in *Kelly v. Trump* at Third Circuit Docket Item ("3DI") 3DI21-4. I am a Christian, who associates as a Catholic who places her faith in God, not the church or priest as God. See, 1 *Corinthians* 2:5, *Matthew* 23:8, *John* 14:1. I believe Jesus is God.

2. I sought to substitute President Biden under Chancery Court Rule 25 since he misbehaves too. He passed an executive order allowing the President to give money to churches in other countries to perform government business. Ex. Or. 14015, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021: Jesus teaches. Do not to give money seen. Give alms in secret, not knowing your left

hand from the right, meaning not giving to get, which is business. Jesus teaches if we give to be seen, or for reward, such as connections, marketing, tax breaks, under the deception of charity, we will have no reward from God, meaning we will go to hell on judgment day. I sit up straight when Jesus says not to do something. I believe Jesus because I believe Jesus is God. *Matthew* 6:1-4. Jesus also teaches people who worship God by buying and selling are not welcome in his father's house in heaven, should they not unhardened their heads and hearts and be made clean of adultery with money, making money and mammon God. *John* 2:16.

3. I believe in God the Father, Jesus the son, and the holy spirit as master, God and guide in my life, not money and material gain through business or alleged charity as master, God and guide in my life. *Matthew* 6:24. I believe people go to hell for making money and material things, including the alleged necessities of life master, savior and God in their life to be enslaved not free by those who entice their desires. *Matthew* 6:1-4 (Jesus teaches people will go to hell for organized charity, fundraising, volunteering) Cf: *Matthew* 25:30-45 (Jesus teaches about true charity required in order not to be damned to hell, done in secret at a material loss for a Godly gain); *Proverbs* 25:21 ("If your enemy is hungry, give him food to eat; if he is thirsty, give him water to drink."); *Matthew* 5:44 ("But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you"); *Exodus* 23:5 ("If you see the donkey of one who hates you fallen under its load, do not leave it there; you must help him with it.")

4. The State of Delaware admitted it placed my license to practice law on inactive disabled but for my private-exercise of my private First Amendment right to petition in *Kelly v Trump*, my private First Amendment right to exercise of religious belief, my private First Amendment right of protected speech to outline my genuinely held religious beliefs in *Kelly v Trump*. See, DE Disciplinary petition at 7 at 3DI21-6, August 23, 2021 letter 3DI21-7. Though

evidence shows they also colluded based on my private exercise of the right to petition concerning bar dues, and private right to petition both the Chancery Court and Delaware Supreme Court concerning procedural due process defects by its own members and agents. *Id.* See, A-4, *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, and exhibits thereto*, Exhibit 55 of the brief below, the December 1, 2020 letter regarding due process concerns to the Master, and the October 19, 2020 letter to the Master regarding the fact I am *pro se*, not represented by counsel, and, A-5. *Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this matter, exhibits thereto*, proof of payment of bar dues, emails to Mark Vavala confirming he did not incite the investigation, Letter from the Court in response to my request for exemption of bar dues for all attorneys facing hardship, Feb. 5, 2021 request for relief from bar dues, my concerns relating to recent US Supreme Court cases. Citing, (State-Docket 89-90 also separately, State-Docket 54 and Docket 36 and 3DI 21-4.)

5. The DE-State also brought the petition to conceal the DE Supreme Court's misconduct in sealing petitions where I allege the DE Court committed violations of my right to petition in violation of procedural due process without providing me, the party notice or an opportunity to be heard to prejudice my case, and schemed state disciplinary case. 3DI 21-5 for proof the DE Supreme Court sealed the documents in Kelly v Trump to prejudice the appeal to the US Supreme Court, and the planned contrived case the Court colluded in bringing to protect then illusion of the appearance of justice while the Delaware Supreme Court committed great injustice against me and to our country.

6. I believe both President Trump and Biden use God's name for their political vanity by teaching the mark of the beast is good or charity. I believe court correction may prevent them from misleading others to harm and their own damnation in hell. I do not want them to go to hell. I believe courts may save lives and eternal lives. *Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23*. Justice in the courts is a command by God to correct people to prevent their damnation in hell when their love for money and material things drives out their love for other people. I do not want people to harm one another, die or be doomed to hell.

7. Former President Trump nominated Judge Phipps and Judge Hardiman to be US Supreme Court justices. President Trump is running for President in 2024. He will likely win. Trump will likely nominate Judge Hardiman or Judge Phipps again should President Trump be elected and another justice retires.

8. My religious belief President Trump served lawlessness, also known as sin, under the color of religious and secular law presents a conflict of interest with Judge Hardiman and Judge Phipps. I attach and incorporate my Motions to recuse and letters reflecting conflicts hereto and incorporate them herein.

9. Judge Phipps and Judge Hardiman may be offended by my religious beliefs contained in my petitions, or at least create the appearance of bias by the temptation to be partial towards the one who benefits them. This creates the appearance of impropriety and possible actual impropriety I seek to prevent.

10. I respect these two judges, Judge Hardiman and Judge Phipps be recused from this matter. My complaints about President Trump's misconduct in profaning my God's Word

for his own vanity should not be attributed to either of these two well respected judges.

Nevertheless, the appearance of conflict is too great to allow them to judge me in this case.

11. I respectfully request Justice Montgomery Reeves be recused since she is a judge in my case Kelly v Trump and the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding for which this reciprocal proceeding arose. I also sought to amend the complaint as a matter of right to include her as a Defendant.

12. Judge Montgomery Reeves and another Supreme Court Judge, Judge Vaughn appeared to evade review by retiring from the Delaware Supreme Court, possibly with the help of President Biden since I sought to sue him in Kelly v Trump.

13. President Biden also exercised religious-political conduct establishing government religion which offends the holy spirit. For instance he spoke of the soul of the nation, which is a pagan religious belief in that land, and Earth are deities to worship and commit human sacrifice to for material gain. I believe people serve Satan when they teach people to sacrifice their lives for their country by laying down their lives. Jesus laid down his life. Jesus is God. Those who teach men are God reflect the image of the devil. See *Isaiah* 14. Jesus said we are his friend when we do what he commands. Jesus commands us to love, not kill our enemy. God teaches the devil has power over death. *Hebrews* 2:14. God comes to offer life and eternal life. I stand with God, not the devil for money or material gain, not even to gain the entire world to sacrifice my soul to hell. I do not believe either President Biden or President Trump will escape the fires of hell should the court not guide their misguided thinking and doing. I am sad for them. I believe the Courts may save lives and eternal lives in their secular function if they chose to do what is right, not what is convenient, beneficial, productive at the cost of sacrificing

life or liberty for material gain which is lawless lusts, the mark of the beast. *Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23*.

14. In my civil rights case and disciplinary cases I argue the DE Disciplinary rules and proceedings are unconstitutional. I attach docket Item 58 of *Kelly v Swartz* which discuss a couple of Delaware Disciplinary Rules Rule 13-14, and two motions with other Constitutional arguments towards the Disciplinary proceeding and incorporate them herein by reference in their entirety,

(1) 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, and

(2) 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.

15. I have Constitutional challenges to the Delaware Disciplinary Rules and Proceedings.

16. Per the attached motion to recuse the Honorable Judge Scirica, Judge Scirica has a conflict of interest since he invests his time in carefully crafting the federal rules of disciplining the federal judiciary which mimic the rules I seek to overturn.

17. I also seek to prevent the regulation of the US Supreme Court to prevent injustice which would be used to create a partial biased court, under the guise of upholding justice.

18. Sameness is not equality under the equal protections clause which allows the freedom of the judges to uphold the exercise of Constitutional liberties which do not conform towards the norms.

19. I believe the regulations of the US Supreme Court will be used to impeach and overthrow the justices to be replaced by automation that serves lawless lusts of those who control technology without any government or just law to restrain them to prevent oppressing, killing, stealing and destroying of life, liberty and country if left unstopped.

20. I believe the courts are in danger. So, we are all in danger since the courts are the only branch that safeguards our freedoms from being sacrificed under the guise of the common good for the interest of the other two branches.

21. Judge Scirica is the chair of a commit on rules I seek to eliminate in order to protect the integrity of the federal courts.

22. I write in haste in order to assert my rights. So, they are not waived. I assert my right to a fair proceeding under the 5th Amendment's Equal Protection and procedural Due process component.

21. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Wherefore I pray this Court grants this motion.

Dated June 8, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
Inactive license
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(2,199 words)

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

Meghan Kelly) Appellate Court
Appellant, Plaintiff,) No.: 21-3198
v.) No. 22-2079
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.)
Swartz, et al.) District Court
Appellees, Defendants.) No.: 1:21-cv-01490-CFC

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

I Meghan Kelly, pursuant to my 5th Amendment right to a fair trial to defend the exercise of my 1st Amendment rights of petitioning, speech, religious belief, exercise, and association, 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law move for the recusal and to prevent the participation of the Honorable Peter J. Phipps in this case.

1. Defendants admit in their letter sent to me on August 23, 2021, that my religious restoration act pleadings against former President Trump in the Delaware Chancery and Delaware Supreme Court are the source of the State's interference, witness intimidation, and disciplinary case against me. Exhibit A

2. This letter was intended to intimidate me to cause me to forgo my right to petition by appeal the Delaware Supreme Court's decision in Kelly v Trump. It did in fact intimidate me causing me to expedite as opposed to forgo my

appeal in Kelly v Trump by mailing it out to the US Supreme Court later that same day, August 23, 2021.

3. Defendants admit that my religious beliefs contained in my petitions are the source of their disciplinary case in their disciplinary complaint against me at 7. Exhibit B.

4. My religious beliefs contained in my petitions to safeguard my religious belief includes my belief that Former President Trump reflects the image of the devil by conducting his life by lawless lusts and enticing the populace to give into temptations of their desires instead of using their free will, their brain, to do what is right.

5. I believe former President Trump misleads people to harm and hell under the guise of Godliness by enticing people to give into temptations to be controlled and enslaved by those who tempt their desires in violation of US Amend I, XIII.

6. I believe people serve lawlessness leading to damnation in hell when their eyes are focused on productivity, pleasure, position, profit, praise and power blinding their eyes from upholding justice by caring for the people while respecting their Constitutional liberties with the limit to refrain them from enslaving others to their will.

7. I believe people sin and serve lawlessness in violation of US Amend I and XIII when they look at people for what they may contribute materially or as products to buy and sell to use for material gain instead of people to respect, unearned required.

8. I believe the mark of children of the devil not yet adopted by God is business greed. I believe that every government official whose eyes are on jobs, the economy and money enslave the people in violation of US Amend XIII. Jesus teaches people who do business or their job as worship are not welcome into heaven. *Citing John 2:16*. Worshipping employees, employers, businesses and job creation leads to damnation in hell in a fixed subpar economy with poor products and services and defamation laws which stifle innovation created by honest criticism which helps us improve. Worshipping the beast, business greed eliminates freedom by teaching people to look at everyone and everything to buy or barter or sell instead of as a free people. US Amend XIII.

9. I believe the lawless way Congress gave away its Article 1 Section 8 coining power to the private bank the federal reserve unnaturally enslaves the government who in turns enslaves the people to debt and debt on interest.

10. This Babylon way of coining the Federal Reserve adopted from the Bank of England eliminates freedom of many in a selective master slave state in contravention of the 5th Amendment's Equal protections component by disparately

treating people in a fixed, not free economy based on material bartering not minds which improves products and services.

11. The Court appears to be enslaved to serve lawlessness under the color of the law when its focus is on business productivity, money and saving of costs as opposed to equal access to truth under the impartial rule of law not bent towards material gain, but towards equal access towards the law with limits on government official conduct to protect freedom of citizens.

12. If money was coined lawfully without US Amend XIII, the court would not be tempted towards partiality towards funding its seats or the government. Government funding would not be in an issue if the government took back the coining power from the federal reserve and the banks.

13. Banks used to be able to lend out or invest up to 90 percent of people's deposits. That has changed to 100 percent which places people's money in the bank in a precarious situation.

13. I believe the elimination of the fiat dollar will be used to eliminate the courts as money is schemed to be coined in a far more oppressive manner, so as to dispense of the need of judges by making the central banks above the law and the judge of all things in the years to come if schemes are not unraveled by the courts before the courts are unraveled.

14. I do believe the courts are in danger. I am seeking to save not destroy them.

15. It is my religious belief former President Trump reflects this lawlessness based on partial lusts, misleading people to attack me and others giving the rise of government sponsored private persecution based on perceived religious-political beliefs, speech, petitions or association.

16. The Honorable Peter J. Phipps was twice appointed a nominee to the US Supreme Court by former President Trump.

17. I forgot that the Honorable Peter J. Phipps was twice a nominee by President Trump to be placed on the United States Supreme Court.

18. I actually wrote the Honorable Master Patricia Griffin of the Delaware Chancery Court that I was concerned about being heard by Justice Phipps and other Trump appointees in *Kelly v Trump* in the attached letter dated October 19, 2020, I incorporated herein as Exhibit C.

19. The temptation to be partial towards the President who may give Justice Phipps a seat at the US Supreme Court creates partiality or the appearance of partiality.

20. I seek to overturn *Kelly v Trump* based on voidable or void subject matter jurisdiction for procedural due process violations, some of which I was not aware of until after both *Kelly v Trump* and the Disciplinary hearing, including but

not limited to the sealing of my petitions regarding other procedural Due Process violations, without being afforded notice or an opportunity to be heard, and the firing of material witnesses Court staff, by the Delaware Supreme Court's agent which appeared to have happened before the conclusion of Kelly v Trump.

21. Former President Trump seeks to run for President of the United States.

22. Former President Trump may get nominated.

23. Justice Phipps may unknowingly be partial towards the man who twice chose him to be on a list of nominees to the US Supreme Court since Former President Trump may be reelected and would then likely nominate Justice Phipps again should another vacancy at the US Supreme Court occur.

24. In addition, I would sue President Trump again to keep my God's name holy not used for the vanity of politicians by establishing government religion with every blasphemous word or dollar in the bought and bartered for union of church and state, not based on freedom but making speech and power for sale, while the many are for sales slaves in contravention of US Amend XIII and my religious beliefs in Jesus and against debt so as not to go to hell.

25. Justice Phipps appears a respectable judge. My genuine religious beliefs that former President Trump reflects evil not good is not upon Judge Phipps.

26. Nevertheless, I move this Court to recuse the Honorable Justice Phips to preserve impartiality needed to protect my 5th Amendment procedural Due Process rights, my property interests in my licenses to practice law, my exercise of fundamental rights, and my right to petition to seek redressability for their violations before the courts.

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants this motion

February 14, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan 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: 2/14/2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan Kelly (signed)

Exhibit A

Office of Disciplinary Counsel
SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

The Renaissance Centre
405 N. King Street, Suite 420
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 651-3931
(302) 651-3939 (FAX)
<https://courts.delaware.gov/odc>

DAVID A. WHITE
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

PATRICIA BARTLEY SCHWARTZ
Disciplinary Counsel

KATHLEEN M. VAVALA
Disciplinary Counsel

August 23, 2021

CONFIDENTIAL
VIA EMAIL & U.S. MAIL

Meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

RE: ODC File No. 115327-B (Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire)

Dear Ms. Kelly:

This Office has reviewed several pleadings you have filed in the Court of Chancery and the Supreme Court in connection with the lawsuit *Meghan Kelly v. Donald Trump*. The content of these documents raise serious concerns as to your mental capacity and fitness to practice law.

Under Rule 9(a) of the Delaware Lawyers' Rules of Disciplinary Procedure, the ODC "shall screen and evaluate all information coming to its attention by complaint or otherwise concerning possible misconduct by or incapacity of a lawyer." Procedural Rule 19 (c) provides "Information relating to a lawyer's physical or mental condition which adversely affects the lawyer's ability to practice law shall be investigated by the ODC. If there are reasonable grounds to believe the interests of respondent's clients or the public are endangered, such information shall be the subject of formal proceedings to determine whether the respondent shall be transferred to disability inactive status. The procedures and hearings shall be conducted in the same manner as disciplinary proceedings. The Board may take or direct whatever action it deems necessary or proper to determine whether the respondent is so incapacitated, including the examination of the respondent by qualified medical experts at the respondent's expense. If, after reviewing the recommendation of the Board and upon due consideration of the matter, the Court concludes that the respondent is incapacitated from continuing to practice law, it shall enter an order transferring the respondent to disability inactive status for an indefinite period and until further order of the Court."

Are Christians unfit to
practice law
I am a follower
of Jesus
Christ

Exhibit B

6. In September 2020, Respondent filed a lawsuit in the Court of Chancery of Delaware against former-President Donald Trump: *Meghan Kelly v. Donald Trump*, Case No. 2020-0809 (September 21, 2020). The Court of Chancery dismissed Respondent's complaint. Respondent appealed to the Supreme Court of Delaware, which affirmed the Court of Chancery. On August 23, 2021, Respondent filed a writ of certiorari with the Supreme Court of the United States.

7. The factual averments, argument, and other content in Respondent's filings in the Delaware courts, raise serious concerns regarding her mental capacity to practice law. Respondent's statements and arguments: lack focus and clarity; are objectively illogical; and rely on non-legal sources, including the Bible, instead of appropriate legal authority. The following excerpts demonstrate, by way of example only, Respondent's apparent inability to make cogent, rational legal arguments:

13. The President's words and conduct supporting religion, as discussed below, were accepted as truth by many, thereby, instilling the belief, supporting the President's perceived thinking or conduct or his candidacy, despite all of his sinful misbehavior and in a way supporting his sins, as excusable without confession or without repentance, is supporting God, when I believe sinfully doing your own will leads to damnation. (Mark 8:34, "Whoever desires to come after Me, let him deny himself (meaning not doing their own will, their own selfish, sinful desires, but exercise self-discipline, using their mind, their brain, which is their free will to do God's will, love), and take up his cross, and follow Me (by love in truth, not lusts in deception)."); Also see, (Matthew 16:24, Luke 9:23 regarding the same message of personal sacrifice to follow Jesus).

My religious beliefs are the source of the reason why this will be done

Exhibit C

EFiled: Oct 19 2020 02:46PM EDT
Transaction ID 66033468
Case No. 2020-0809-PWG



October 19, 2020

Court of Chancery Courthouse
34 The Circle
Georgetown, DE 19947

RE: Meghan Kelly v. United States, President of the United States,
Defendant, Donald Trump, a.k.a. Donald J. Trump, a.k.a. President
Trump, a.k.a. President Donald Trump, his official capacity as
President of the United States, No. 2020-0809- Master PWG
Plaintiff Not officer of the Court/Economic Crash/Forum

REGISTER IN CHANCERY
GEORGETOWN, DE 19947
2020 OCT 19 P 2:09

Dear Honorable Master Griffin:

Thank you for taking the case.

I am not an attorney advocate in this case. I am without the insulation and protection of counsel. I am a pro se litigant. I am the party, not the party's counsel. If I was a mere attorney, an officer of the Court, as opposed to the party, it would be different. Lawyers are permitted to talk to judges, but not on matters relating to matters, ex parte. I am not allowed to talk to you ex parte period.

The court's staff adds a buffer, and are not the Judge on the case.

It is strange for the staff, and for me. For instance, I could not share the rules that required 60 day notice instead of 20 days notice to the staff ex parte to give to you, even though I had them in my hand, and the staff kindly said she could take them.

Instead, I must communicate with the defense counsel simultaneously, electronically, or by mail while speaking directly to this honorable Court.

I do not know whether this case will remain in this Court or be removed to federal Court. This area heavily supports President Trump. One of Defendant's biggest campaign contributors allegedly lives in Sussex, and Delaware's liason for President Trump, Rob Arlett, lives in Sussex.

Although I am cognizant of the pro Trump atmosphere in this county, I have faith in the fair impartial rule of law by this Honorable Court.

The federal courts are more of a concern for me. The President's sister presided as a judge in the Third Circuit until recently. In addition, the President placed two Third Circuit judges on his list of potential nominees for Supreme Court, creating a concern that the federal judges may be biased toward their colleagues' potential nominations at the death of the next Supreme Court justice, Justice Hardiman and Justice Phipps.

I believe this Honorable Court, from the smallest state, has more power to save the country than the Supreme Court.

This is the corporate capital of the globe.

The biggest government expense globally is healthcare. (See the web site cited in Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"), Count 234). The US spends more money on social security and healthcare than any other sector.

I named
the Honorable
Justice Phipps

That fact is often hidden by discretionary charts, instead of mandatory spending charts. The US now must pay out more.

The country and the globe have the biggest bill in the history of the world that has fallen due, healthcare and retirement for the baby boomers. Those who value money more than humanity are seeking to get out of paying this earned and owed debt, by bad business. Bad business, made to fail, made to bail out or bankrupt as directors continue to collect hefty salaries and potential bonuses, should not be rewarded by the government for the profit of the few at the expense of the many. (See, SAC, Counts 229-286)

Directors have the power to artificially inflate stocks through stock buy backs. Entities may resell worthless debt in bankruptcy remote entities into infinity while creating the illusion the economy is above water. I used to draft these bankruptcy remote entities at RLF, Delaware's largest home-grown corporate law firm.

With regard to business bailouts and business incentives, creating artificial debt and charging interest to give to businesses to enslave the people to desperate conditions to require the people pay debt back is the sin of inequity and oppression, arguably violating the 13th Amendment by creating wage slaves, or forced volunteering.

Creating jobs is not helping the people. (See, Romans 4:4. "Now to the one who works, wages are not credited as a gift but as an obligation.")

Creating jobs is not a gift.

It is exploiting the people to serve those who already profited at their expense with bail outs and incentives, under the deception of doing people a favor by employment.

Soon we will see entities exploit people in a different way only to gain praise by those they oppress, by the elimination of welfare such as social security and medicare, and replacing it with charity violating Matthew 6 misleading people to hell.

This Honorable Court is the only Court in the world that can prevent a global economic crash, while saving government pensions, retirement, social security, lives' savings and Medicare by cutting through the corporate veil of entities to hold those people, directors or otherwise, responsible for made to fail, made to profit from, bad business.

Misleaders and deceivers exacerbate desperate conditions to exploit those they are charged to serve for self-gain. Leaders look after those they serve by alleviating desperate conditions.

This Court is the king of corporate law. Now we need this Court to be a servant leader by slicing the ill gained fat of a few to save the many.

Years ago, I negotiated for a really cool lawyer tool either from Westlaw or Lexis that gave me people and entity's information, including people's social security numbers, except the last two, which is scary because you could go upstairs in the Superior Court and get the last two numbers for Defendants.

The source provided relationships with other people and entities, including entity information in other countries relating to entities here.

Lawyers now have the means to cut through entity shells. The Court is powerless to save the world if lawyers do not have the courage to ask.

I am grateful for the opportunity to be heard.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Meghan Kelly".

Meghan Kelly
Pro Se
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(Words 983)

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

Meghan Kelly)	
Plaintiff,)	Appellate Court
v.)	No.: 21-3198
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.)	No. 22-2079
Swartz, et al.)	
)	District Court
Defendants.)	No.: 1:21-cv-01490-CFC

**Certificate of Service of
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**

I, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire, hereby certify that
on February 14, 2023, I had a true and correct copy of the above referenced
document sent to all Defendants through their attorneys, served via E-filing,
and to

Zi-Xiang Shen and Caneel Radinson-Blasucci
Delaware Department of Justice
Carvel State Building 820 N. French St. 6th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801,


Dated February 14, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(302) 493-6693
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
US Supreme Court Bar No. 283696
Not acting as an attorney on behalf of
another

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

Dated: February 14, 2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)

 (signed)

Press Release

November 29, 2022

Federal Reserve Board announces annual indexing of reserve requirement exemption amount and low reserve tranche for 2023

For release at 3:00 p.m. EST

[Share](#)

The Federal Reserve Board on Tuesday announced technical details related to reserve requirements for depository institutions. The annual indexation and publication of these amounts are required by law and does not indicate a change in depository institutions' reserve requirements, which will remain zero.

If reserve requirement ratios were not zero, these amounts would be used to determine the different ranges of reserve requirement ratios that could apply, depending on the amount of transaction account balances at a depository institution. The reserve requirement exemption amount will be set at \$36.1 million, up from \$32.4 million in 2022, and the low reserve tranche will be set at \$691.7 million, up from \$640.6 million in 2022. The adjustments to both of these amounts are derived using formulas specified in the Federal Reserve Act.

The adjustments will apply beginning January 1, 2023.

For media inquiries, please email media@frb.gov or call 202-452-2955.

Federal Register notice: Reserve Requirements of Depository Institutions

Last Update: December 09, 2022

A p p e
THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,) Case No. 21-3198
) Case No. 22-2079
v.)
PATRICIA B. SWARTZ, et. al.)

**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**

Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Motion pursuant to 1st Amendment right to petition against government grievances, 5th Amendment procedural Due Process requirement of a fair proceeding, Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure Rules 2, 27, 35 and Rule 40 for an en banc reconsideration of this Court’s Order dated June 20, 2023 at Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI”) 3DI-203, attached hereto as Exhibit A, denying 1) *Motion to recuse the Honorable Judge Anthony J. Scirica to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5th*, 2) *Motion for a caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica to move him for 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*, and 3. *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*. I further move this Court pursuant to US Amendments I, V, and Federal Appellate Rule 2, and its equitable powers for good cause for a new panel to consider my Motion for a Rehearing on Denial of the original Appellate Brief, since a grant of a recusal is an admission the proceeding was biased in violation of my 5th Amendment right to a fair impartial proceeding. I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety 3DI-

199, 3DI-200, 3DI-201, 3DI-202, and my appellate Brief at 3DI-98 and all documents referred therein as if incorporated herein in full, and aver as follows.

1. The proceeding involves questions of exceptional importance which to my knowledge have not previously been addressed by any Court. The answers the Court provides may promote the impartiality of the federal courts and preserve the United States from an unnaturally schemed overthrow. The answers may also preserve not only my Constitutional liberties but the Constitutional liberties of the people from the government backed foreign and private partners elimination of all Constitutional protections under the threat of removing the ability of people to buy and sell but for their exercise of religious belief in Jesus's teachings which do not conform to the secular or religious belief of the government, or the government backed foreign of private partners.

2. The proceeding also involves the important question as to whether anyone with a license to practice law has any First Amendment private freedoms to 1) petition, 2) religious belief, 3) association as a Christian, Catholic, Democrat without removal of the association as a lawyer but for the exercise of the right to petition to safeguard religious beliefs contained in private speech the government finds repugnant, or speech to petition to correct government misconduct or mistakes without retaliation but for the exercise of the 1st Amendment right to petition or 1st Amendment right of speech petitioning the courts for grievances of caused by government misconduct and mistakes based on subject matter making the government above the law and lawyers below the law 4) Private speech outlining my religious beliefs in Jesus as God not money or mammon or professional collective gain as God which is the mark of lawlessness leading to damnation in hell, 5) and other private claims and rights from government infringements

and violations of including, but not limited to, Equal Protections under the 5th and 14th, 6th Amendment right to self-represent, claims for a fair trial, claims for a right to pleadings in a case against me Case Number 541, claims relating to a conspiracy under 1985 to cause me to forgo *Kelly v Trump* by Delaware supreme Court incited witnesses intimidation, threats, concealing evidence by sealing evidence in my favor to cover up procedural due process and misconduct by the state court, preventing my ability to call witnesses by ignoring my motions where I assert the right to self-represent, to perform discovery, scheduling the hearing within fewer days required to subpoena witnesses 8 days as opposed to 10 required by the state disciplinary rules and other harm such as firing two court staff to conceal evidence necessary to my defense, the reciprocal proceedings and this case, and other claims. DI 98.

3. Exhibit B attached hereto and incorporated herein shows my petitions in *Kelly v Trump* were sealed by the Court to prejudice my appeal to the USSC, and to conceal evidence in my favor in the disciplinary proceedings and this civil rights case in violation of my right to a fair trial, notice and an opportunity to be heard and my First Amendment right to petition against the Delaware Courts' conspiracy to threaten me by inciting attacks against me to cause me to forgo my case against Former President Trump and current President Biden to alleviate a substantial burden upon my religious exercise caused by their establishment of government religion based on barter or exchange not freedom, making our rights for sale to be exercised by only those who may legally barter the government through its private or foreign partners to exercise. US Amend I, XIV.

4. My Reply to the ODC's response to my objections to the Board's determination incorporated herein as Exhibit C, my appellate brief, incorporated herein

as Exhibit D, Objections , attached as Exhibit E, and Answers incorporated herein without signature page as Exhibit F, my apologies the format including but not limited to indentation of paragraphs were removed in the answers and I incorporate all the items referred therein and all exhibits. These exhibits show Constitutional violations and aver facts if taken in the light most favorable to me show evidence the DE Supreme Court incited the violations of my first Amendment right to petition, violations against witness tampering, reckless or intentional infliction of emotional distress and bodily harm, procedural due process violations in Kelly v Trump and procedural due process violations in the Disciplinary proceeding making the DE Supreme Court the judge and jury, and other claims.

5. At DI 58 I incorporate herein by reference, along with two DE Disciplinary Motions where I aver Constitutional violations of the rules as Exhibit G, the Supreme Court showed it colluded in bringing the disciplinary petition by copying the Disciplinary Board on a letter providing me with the waiver of notary requirements in the pandemic. The Delaware Supreme Court incited the collusion to violate my right to petition in Kelly v Trump and to punish me for my belief in Jesus by sending its arms to attack me. The information the arms used in their attacks were only in the possession of the DE Supreme Court, including but not limited to my private petition for an exemption of bar fees I ended up paying. The Delaware Supreme Court referred to a case in its disciplinary opinion of the requirement of bar fees in its order unnecessarily showing its disdain for my petition. The State Court cared more serving partial business and money not individuals and individual Constitutional liberties in violation of US Amend I, XIV, XIII. As a Christian I believe this is the type of lawless lusts serving material gain at the

cost of human sacrifice of life or liberty will damn each justice to hell under the color of law should they not repent with the help of court correction. The lawless partiality to cover up its own misconduct to serve the mere appearance of justice while committing lawlessness will fester and spread should judges remain above the law within the purview of the constitutional limits of 1. Cases and controversies such as mine and 2.

Impeachment.

6. I have religious beliefs against partiality by the government. (Exhibits H-J)

7. The Board's function as a group of professionals serving the professionals' interests by making justice a business as opposed to a matter of truth as a matter of law regardless as to whether citizens are poor and have nothing to barter with violates my religious belief, as applied, Equal protections and Due process, as applied and per se.

8. I believe government partiality towards business and interest groups is sin. (See *Isaiah* 10:1-3) That is why I sued the democrats and asked for a waiver from filing requirements.

9. Just like I do not want to go to hell for favoritism, I do not want judges to go to hell based on partiality to those who serve their seats, or who may take them away by judicial discipline, nor do I desire the courts to be placed in a position of temptation to violate the rights of those they serve.

10. Judge Scirica has a conflict of interest with my case I was not aware of until after I filed my motion for a rehearing on June 3, 2023. 3DI-199

11. I moved to recuse him pursuant to my 5th Amendment right to a fair trial to defend the exercise of my private 1st Amendment rights of petitioning, speech, religious belief, exercise, and association, 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68. 3DI-200.

12. Judge Scirica chairs the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. (DI 149).

13. I contest the federal judicial disciplinary rules Judge Scirica drafts on Constitutional grounds. I oppose the elimination of life time limits and believe district court and Circuit Court judges should have life time appointments to prevent them from the temptation to normalize injustice by partiality to the Disciplinary rules as opposed to the preempting Constitutional application of the law. I declared my belief regulating the Court violates the constitutional rights of citizens the court serves and allows for the schemed overthrow to occur in the District Court prior to discovering the conflict. (See, some examples Docket Item (DI) 23, concerning my belief only the courts may prevent an economic crash and an overthrow of our government, DI-53, DI-55, DI-56, DI-78, DI-95, DI-102, DI-104, DI-114, DI-127, DI-129, DI-131). Favoritism towards those who serve the alleged professions' collective convenience, productivity or the individual judge's future or current seat or highly esteemed position creates unfair proceedings when conflicts arise. I seek to declare the disciplinary rules Judge Scirica Drafts are unlawful.

14. The fact I argued on the record below, my desire to eliminate or prevent disciplinary rules of federal judges and the United States Supreme Court creates a

conflict of interest. The appearance of a conflict requires a recusal and a new panel who is not swayed by Judge Brilliant mind and perceived expertise in a subject I disagree

15. I sought to amend my complaint below to include Constitutional arguments against the disciplinary rules and proceedings against attorneys. I incorporate some not all of my proposed arguments against rules I proposed to the Delaware District Court at DI 58, and two state motions. Exhibit G.

16. I oppose attorney self-regulation and third party professional regulation through professional boards on Constitutional grounds, on religious grounds and on grounds the rules violate the Constitution. Standardized compelled practice eliminates free will needed to protect Constitutional freedoms of clients and professionals who do not conform to the standards. Standards makes professional practices above the law by deference of the courts to the standards even when such standards harm, oppress, kill, steal and destroy human life and health for the bottom line. The standards create partiality to profit, productivity not justice.

17 The state proceeding and state disciplinary rules reflect the rules Judge Scirica works on in his capacity as Chair of the federal disciplinary rules. I should be afforded the right to assert my right to amend my complaint to include reasons why the rules violate the Constitution before an impartial forum, as opposed to a Judge who supports disciplinary rules by actively drafting rules for disciplinary proceedings.

18. Judge Scirica privately opposes my view due to his stakeholder interest he has in upholding rules that mirror his work. This conflict of interest violates my procedural due process rights and Equal Protections rights as applied, as a party of one with unique religious-political beliefs in unbiased justice as a religious command by God.

19. I believe there is an attack on judges to eliminate the judiciary to eliminate the rule of law, as I mentioned previously.

20. I believe the courts must limit the purview of correcting federal judges to the purview of the Constitutional limits without waiver, 1. Cases and controversies such as mine, 2. or impeachment, to preserve these United States from schemed overthrow. Allow attorneys to fulfill their duty by requiring in cases that judges do not vitiate Constitutional rights for business. Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary all have a duty to support and defend the Constitution,” not *Salazar v. Buono*, 559 U.S. 700, 717 (2010).

21. Judges’ loyalty to Boards and regulators must not supersede the Constitution to create actual not mere apparent injustice.

22. I believe regulations will be used to assist the other two branches to exceed the Constitutional limits to impeach and control a no longer free, independent and impartial judiciary. I believe this will be used to eliminate the courts down the line if left unstopped.

23. Upon information and belief there is not only a schemed overthrow of our economic system but there is also an unnatural, man-made designed overthrow and elimination of governments to allow entities who control the resources through technology to enslave the population to live based on their whim with no restraint in the form of law to prevent their oppressing, killing, sealing and destroying liberty and human life.

24. I informed the District Court of lobbyists who scheme to eliminate people judges and people lawyers to eliminate the rule of law at both the World Government

Summit (“WGS”) and the World Economic Forum (“WEF”). Speaker Sebastian Thrun at the WGS mentioned lawyers and judges would be replaced by automation at Day 2 of WGS in 2018 you may see on youtube by clicking:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NsdmPiBc9TI>

25. Also see the attached exhibits where it appears villains who receive unjust gains through banking, grants, charities and government contracts seek to cover up the fact there is no money to pay out for the boomers for their eared retirement, healthcare and social security. The manner money is coined enslaves the people to debt in violation of my religious belief against debt which I believe damns people to hell. DI 2. I proposed a way to coin correctly without violating my religious belief as applied or the 13th Amendment as applied to all by enslaving the masses to pay the Central and other banks back for the money the government grants and contracts money with interest.

26. In DI 123,I provided an article where a lobbyists boldly stated

“How can the use of Laws be eliminated? Today we try to control human behavior by enacting laws or signing treaties without changing the physical conditions responsible for aberrant behavior. When Earth’s resources are seen as the common heritage of all people, irrelevant laws and social contracts will vanish. In a resource-based economy, social responsibility would not be a function of artificial laws or force.”

27. I understand the plan is to control the resources people require to live to control a no longer free people’s behavior to bend to the dictates of those who control the technology and resources required for life. The scheme is to control the government by controlling the resources for it to function before eliminating the need of government to govern and guide.

28. Professional control through standardized discipline of professionals allows for the schemed government overthrow to take place by allowing professional practices and business to supersede Constitutional laws, making business above the law, unchecked by the courts or government via the governments backing of it.

29. I believe the courts are in trouble. Allowing cases like mine to show judges are not above the law but may be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits will prevent the overthrow should I persuade the courts regulating the judiciary creates injustice and should be deemed unconstitutional.

30. Judges must not waive the 5th Amendment against self-incrimination by allowing self-regulation or Board regulations because they eliminate the 5th Amendment right to Equal protections of claimants they serve by the temptation of judges to be partial towards disciplinary rules which may conflict with the Constitutional application of the rule of law

31. Judicial disciplinary rules also will likely allow ex post facto activity to create cases against Judges to allow congress to more easily impeach judges or create a horse and pony show and mockery of justice by hanging judges they disagree with based on fickle fads. My God teaches impartiality is a command. I must protect the court, even when I disagree with them.

32. June 30, 2023, I received 2 orders dismissing my 2 cases by this court as I write this in haste. I apologize for typos. I write with tears in my eyes and provide you evidence of harm. Please see the attached article showing there are automated peopleless courts in China. Please see some excerpts from the WEF books, including the note of

eliminating the job of attorneys by 2027 or so. This is real life. I read information by those I disagree with to understand their plans.

33. The issue of whether the practice of law should be regulated within the purview of the Constitution so as not to prejudice the public by creating injustice by partiality to serve ourselves may very well save the courts from a very real planned overthrow. The attacks against the US Supreme Court are not normal. They are hypocritical since the Congress and the President commit the same acts unashamed. I have religious beliefs against partiality. Regulating professionals and the courts through disciplinary proceedings guarantees injustice by chilling attorneys' duty to require judges adhere to the rule of law without vindictive retaliation based on court correction needed to preserve the judiciary and the government.

34. Under objective standards in my case, "the probability of actual bias on the part of the judge or decisionmaker is too high to be constitutionally tolerable." (*Rippo v. Baker*, 137 S. Ct. 905, 907 (2017), Citing *Withrow v. Larkin*, [421 U.S. 35, 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456, 43 L.Ed.2d 712](#) (1975); *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 872 (2009)). "The Tumey Court concluded that the Due Process Clause incorporated the common-law rule that a judge must recuse himself when he has "a direct, personal, substantial, pecuniary interest" in a case. Ibi" *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 876 (2009). In this matter, Judge Scirica;s personal interest in opposition to my claims is too prejudicial to my case to afford me a fair proceeding. US Amend I, V.

35. "A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process." *Murchison, supra*, at 136, [75 S.Ct. 623](#)" *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S.

868, 876 (2009). The Court cannot grant a fair proceeding with Judge Scirica's participation.

36. "The Court asks not whether a judge harbors an actual, subjective bias, but instead whether, as an objective matter, the average judge in his position is likely to be neutral, or whether there is an unconstitutional potential for bias" *Williams v. Pennsylvania*, 579 U.S. —, —, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 1905, 195 L.Ed.2d 132 (2016) ("(internal quotation marks omitted))."); See, *Rippo v. Baker*, 137 S. Ct. 905, 907 (2017) ("we did not hold that a litigant must show as a matter of course that a judge was "actually biased in [the litigant's] case")

37. Should this Court find Justice Scirica's participation violated due process. I seek relief from this court to prevent needless waste of judicial resources.

38. The "Federal Rules of Civil Procedure treat orders that are entered without due process as void, permitting reopening of the case. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 5; *Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule* 60(b)(4). The panel's inclusion of Judge Scarica violates Due process. US Amend I, V.

39. Reopening the case would be needless should this court grant this motion on recusal.

40. To prevent the need to reopen the case, I move this Honorable Court pursuant to US Amendments I, V, and Federal Appellate Rule 2, for good cause for a new panel to consider my Motion for a Rehearing on Denial of the original Appellate Brief find out Third Circuit Docket Item ("3DI" 3DI-199).

41. Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 2 provides, “On... a party's motion, a court of appeals may for good cause-suspend any provision of these rules in a particular case and order proceedings as it directs.” Fed. R. App. P. 2

42. Since granting my motion for a rehearing on the denial of the recusal of Judge Sirica would show a procedural Due Process violation of my right to a fair trial occurred by requiring a recusal, I would be left without a remedy before this Court unless the Court suspends the rules of Rules “for good cause” to uphold my right to a fair and impartial forum to safeguard my exercise of fundamental rights without punishment and elimination of my liberties and property interests in my licenses to buy and sell as an attorney but for my religious belief in Jesus Christ as God, not mammon, money and material gain as God. Citing Bible, Matthew 6:24. Appealing the Matter before the US Supreme Court would be a waste of resources for all should this Honorable Court require the recusal of Judge Scirica. Thus, this Court must suspend the rules to prevent waste of resources and likely elimination of my Constitutional rights

43. I have shown good cause to suspend the Rules to allow a different panel to consider my Motion for reagument on the denial, should this Court grant my motion for reargument of Judge Scirica. Id. Safeguarding my Constitutional rights also shows good cause.

44. I move for a panel on the papers only since poverty creates a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and the cost for a transcript and to travel are so great under my circumstances as to deny me the First Amendment right to petition to defend my exercise of my Constitutional rights.

45. I also do not feel well. I had surgery as a teenager I apprised this Court and every court of and assert my religious exercise of belief to the right to live.

46. I move this panel for reconsideration on the papers only in order to sustain my health. I am required to take time to drink inordinate amounts of water and rest that the average person does not require to stay alive. I require time to sustain my health. A hearing would take away time.

Wherefore I pray the Court grants my motion.

Dated June 30, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
INACTIVE, not acting as an
attorney on behalf of another
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(302) 493-6693

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

(3,877 words)

APPF

MEGHAN KELLY, ESQ.

34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

Third Circuit Court of Appeals
James A. Byrne United States Courthouse
601 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

RE: /Kelly v Swartz, et al. No. 22-3198 /Joint petition on electronic record/
more of the record

February 15, 2023

Dear Honorable Clerk of Court:

I called my case manager to confirm I required to file documents on this Court's record in order to comply with the US Supreme Court's Rule 26 (8) to eliminate costs and dispense of the need for a record. She directed me to contact the US Supreme Court, not this Court with US Supreme Court procedural questions.

The US Supreme Court has not addressed this question I asked them, and indicates file things. If I get it wrong, they will let me know after I file them.

I believe the US Supreme Court incorrectly rejected a filing in 22-6582 while refraining from referring to Supreme Court Rule 43, while noting the reason Rule 28 motions for exemptions should be included in the motion to file in forma pauperis.

I have electronic records of all filings rejected and accepted, accept this one became missing when it was rejected. This was strange. See, Exhibit A attached hereto.

I am scared. People have talked about shooting me, made threats against me, thrown things at my vehicle based on my perceived religious political beliefs, speech or affiliation. This violence against me stems in the government's establishment of government religion in the mark of the beast, business greed, as Godly and good. Worship of the beast eliminates freedom by making everything and everyone a product to buy, barter or sell, instead of serve and care for as opposed to control. I am a Christian. I associate as a Catholic and a Democrat, but I place my faith in God, not man. I independently critically think and make no man my master and God, but God. My love for humanity and God unearned is not what this misguided world teaches. Yet, the First Amendment should protect my unpopular beliefs in Jesus's teachings.

Every day I face irreparable injury, loss of my license to buy and sell but for my belief in Jesus Christ.

I sought to petition the US Supreme Court for help in this matter on February 6, 2023. The US Supreme Court received my pleadings on February 8, 2023. It is more than a week since it was physically received. Yet, I see no

notation of acceptance or rejection on the United States Supreme Court's electronic filing system.

The post office lost track of my Emergency Motion. Per the attached tracking my Emergency motion was received Monday February 13, 2022. (Exhibit B)

I am scared. Justice Phipps taught as an adjunct professor at Duquesne, the School. (Exhibit C) On the record below, I pled Duquesne increased my rent in retaliation for complaining about rat babies at my school apartment. I incorporate my complaints from DI 2, and in the exhibits thereto at DI 3 and 4, and in the video contained on the jump stick of me on TV at Duquesne.

Duquesne is a Catholic School. It is weird that my Constitutional law School Professor used the same secretary as Third Circuit Court of Appeals Judge Thomas Hardiman, and it appears he may have assisted my schoolmate Bill Stickman to receive a federal judicial position. He may have helped Justice Phipps get appointed too. After all, schools help their students and faculty gain employment. I incorporate herein by reference Exhibit C.

I do not believe it is right and just to gain money, power and position based on who you know as opposed to how you serve, even if that is what is taught to kids in schools. In the pictures President Gormley helped Judge Phipps, and Bill Stickman. President Gormely also helped Judge Hardiman. He helped me too. It

doesn't make it right or make me more worthy of a position based on the connections I have. I wish the Courts would judge people correctly independent of association to respect individual liberties. *Citing Jesus, John 7:24.*

President Gormley vouched for my US Supreme Court admissions too. So, my hands may be unclean in this statement, and yet I am required to have the testimony of one or two in order to gain admissions to the bar. There was no testimony of outside witnesses to place my licenses on inactive disabled. This is not fair.

I am concerned about Catholic institutions, including my law school Duquesne School of law, receiving government aid or collaborating with the government creating government belief through bartered for partnerships.

I am from Lower Delaware. Some folks down here think Catholics go to hell and the Pope is the Anti-Christ. Do I believe this, no, but I respect people's freedom to believe. I do not respect their threats of violence towards me or others based on such belief. That is where the law must protect not collude in such violence. This dangerous union of church and state may get innocent people like me killed, as a Catholic, democrat independent critically thinking human.

I am scared. I filed Kelly v Trump because my faith in Jesus is the most important thing I have, and hold in my heart even if lose everything, even my life. I should not get into trouble for asking the government to respect the law instead of

violating the law for money and material gain. People I love may disagree with my desire to create a wall between church and state. I seek a wall to safeguard both the church and the state, the union of which is based on a foundation of sand of money not liberty which will make this house fall down in times of turmoil. Citing, Jesus, Matthew 7:26-30.

I called the Delaware District Court and confirmed I must place the Delaware District court exhibits and other Complaint exhibits on this Court's docket in order to plead on the Record per Supreme Court Rule 26 (8) to eliminate costs.

Thank you. I hope I am not denied the opportunity to be heard at the US Supreme Court. I hope at least they docket my pleadings.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 15, 2023

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
302-493-6693
Bar No 4968 DEACTIVE
Not acting as an attorney

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:

2/15/23

Meghan Kelly

(printed)

Meghan Kelly

(signed)

[Athletics](#)[Giving](#)[News & Stories](#)[Information](#)
Events For[ACADEMICS](#)[ADMISSIONS & AID](#)[LIFE AT DUQUESNE](#)[RESEARCH](#)[SOCIAL IMPACT](#)[ABOUT](#)

Image Alt

[Faculty And Staff](#)

Peter Phipps

Adjunct Professor School of
Law Law

[Staff](#)

Privacy policy statement. Our
privacy policy has recently been
updated.


[DISMISS](#)[PRIVACY POLICY](#)

20 of 554





Supreme Court of the United States of America



Meghan Marie Kelly
of Dagsboro, Delaware

was on motion first made to the Court in this behalf by

Kenneth P. Gormley

duly admitted and qualified as an Attorney and Counsellor of the Supreme Court of the United States on the twenty-ninth day of May, in the year of our Lord two thousand twelve and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and thirty-sixth.



In testimony whereof as Clerk of said Court, I hereunto set my hand and affix the seal of the Court in Washington, D.C.
this twenty-ninth day of May, 2012.

William K. Suter
Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States

Professor Gormley, a good man.

AppG

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,
Respondent.

v.

United States District Court,
Eastern District of Pennsylvania

§ APPEALS COURT
§ CASE NUMBER: 22:3372
§ DISTRICT COURT
§ Misc. No. 22-45
§ DISTRICT COURT
§ JUDGE: The Honorable Paul D.
§ Paul S. Diamond, Judge

Petitioner Meghan Kelly motion for a caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica

I Meghan Kelly, Esq., pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 27, move to include a caveat to
Petitioner's motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica and move him for 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.

1. I ran for State local office in 2018 because no one would do anything about the
rampant problem we have here in Delaware. Non-attorneys-out of state title companies are
practicing real estate law without a license to practice law.

2. I lost, but I care because this is bigger than Delaware. I have uncovered a plan
that intends to allow those who control entities through technology to practice law, judge and
govern without authority by the people or the law.

3. DE Office of Disciplinary Counsel did not help lawyers, or help me when I
complained about the problem of non-lawyers practicing law without a license back in 2016. I
did not know why until they sued me. I was compelled to read their rules of limited jurisdiction
before the Board, which does not allow my federal claims, nor does it give office of disciplinary
counsel in Delaware or Pennsylvania subject matter jurisdiction to discipline, correct or protect
nonlawyers and nonjudges from acting as judges and attorneys without a license.

4. The plan in the schemed overthrow is to allow entities to behave above the law, above correction from the government, to take over government to eliminate it down the line.

5. Per the attached two email I sent opposing counsel, Walmart and businesses are already governing without election or government authority restricting my right to buy and sell.

6. Since the overthrow and unnatural fall of the US is based on nonlawyers and nonjudges lawyering and judging without government authority I thought it imperative to seek Judge Scirica's consideration of drafting laws to prevent nonjudges from taking the place of judges, even by controlling automation. Non-people courts already exist in China.

7. I attach an affidavit I filed in Delaware District court for this Court's consideration.

8. I was alarmed lobbyists wrote Judge Scirica to lobby control over the rules controlling the Judiciary, the only impartial branch. (Exhibit E to the Affidavit.)

9. In Exhibit E to the attached affidavit, you will find their letter. What makes this even more alarming is they lobbied to allow non-attorneys to practice law without a license.

10. Should this not be stopped, the rule of law will be eliminated, our government may fall as schemed.

11. I should like the Honorable Judge Scirica's consideration of this narrow issue. I respectfully request he consider whether he may draft laws to prevent non attorneys from practicing law or judging in the place of people judges without government authority.

12. I pray Judge Scirica considers drafting federal rules granting state Office of disciplinary counsel through federal law authority to discipline and correct non-lawyers from acting as lawyers on behalf of another, as opposed to pro se.

13. I pray Judge Scirica drafts federal disciplinary rules to prevent nonjudges from taking the place of judges by giving the U Attorney General or/and state Office of Disciplinary Counsel authority to prevent the schemed elimination of people judges by automation.

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants this Motion.

Dated June 9, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
Inactive license
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(554 words)

Civil Action No.: 1:25-cv-00490 (CFC)

1 On an aside, I cite articles since they are admissible as evidence under the periodical exception to hearsay of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 803, (18). Similarly present sense impression, state of mind, and excited utterances are also admissible. Should anything happen to me, opposing counsel or US AG may be able to use these affidavits to prevent an economic crash and the planned unnatural fall of the US to preserve this government. I cited

possibly murder employees for money if alleged care really could sustain their life. The case eliminates freedom by government backing of buying and compelling beliefs upon employees to serve greed, not any personal individual good of employees. They save costs by potentially buying rights and selling the souls of the workers leading to potential death. It is government backed human sacrifice.

6. I believe people sin leading to the fires of hell for believing money is protected free speech or freedom should they not unharden their heads and hearts and repent. It is bought speech. Free speech is not for sale by barter or exchange which eliminates the freedom liberty component.

7. The focus on money as savior to care for their own family or others through business or organized charity drives out love from the hearts of men for God and others replaced with the love of money. The Bible teaches the love of money is the root of every evil. I believe God is not kidding.

8. Those who entice people to give into temptation by reward or threat of harm to bend their substantially burdened will serve lawless lusts, not Constitutional freedom, but control. I believe little kids are taught to go the way to hell by fundraisers, boosters and by selling girl scout cookies under the guide of good for evil greed, leading to their damnation in hell should they not be born again I believe judges commit lawlessness before the eyes of God for confusing lawless lusts with the impartial rule of law, by partiality towards profit, money and material gain as savior, as freedom and God. I believe it is enslavement to sin and death in the fires of hell, not freedom.

newspapers in Kelly v Trump since I knew they were admissible as evidence under this exception not to be demeaned like this Court appeared to do in one of its orders. It is acceptable under the rules.

9. My religious beliefs are genuine. Those within the government whose eyes are evil by speaking of job creation enslave people to work for their private partners who receive unjust, disparate favoritism arguably violates the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component applicable to the federal government, and the 14th amendment equal protections based on First Amendment belief and exercise of beliefs applicable to the states. Plus, I believe it damns those who give or accept government contracts and grants to hell for unjust gains should they not repent. The Bible speaks of unjust gains. The impartial rule of law should be used to restrain businesses from creating subpar, polluting products. Just decrees not money is the solution to save lives and eternal lives. Money is not God. Matthew 6:24.

10. I believe people go to hell for teaching money is the solution through charities, business or fundraising making money God. Matthew 6:24.

11. That said, in recent news, per the attached newspaper article, labeled as Exhibit B, a state, Oklahoma, is allegedly allowing a religious school to receive 100 percent pay and backing through taxes. I believe this establishment of religion based on business, buying the backing of the church will damn many people to hell by teaching religion is a business that may be bought and owned by the government as opposed to a matter of Constitutionally protected free choice. See, *Flast v. Cohen*, 392 U.S. 83 (1968)(tax payer had standing to contest pay of tax money which conflicts with religious belief. Though I believe taxes under US Amend XVI violates God's teachings. The way money is coined is based on slavery, eliminating freedom by debt is in contravention of my faith in Jesus. I leave this issue aside).

12. I am quite upset. I do not want people to go to hell.

13. Part of the global plan is to demean religion as a mere business to eliminate diverse religions, making the mark of the beast, the twice dead, those without eternal life, lawless

lusts, business greed by barter or exchange under the guise of saving the world the only acceptable belief. This plan to make religion a business is to eliminate freedom of religion and religious belief in Jesus the Christ. (Please see attached Exhibit C where evidence of UN schemes are prevented. Please note I do not condone the preachers preaching, just citations. This preacher teaches people like me are naughty since I associate as a Catholic.)

14. Jesus teaches people who perform business as worship are not welcome in heaven. Citing John 2:16.

15. Most of the world in existence may be damned to hell by the temptation to worship the beast, business greed, (money and material gain as savior to care for their own as God through business or charity in place of God) if the courts do not dissolve the establishment of Government religion.

16. I am scared. I filed a motion to recuse Judge Scirica in both Third Circuit matters, this appeal and Kelly v Eastern District Court since I seek to attack attorney and judicial disciplinary rules on Constitutional grounds. See, Exhibit D

17. Judge Scirica is a big deal. Per the attached, he has the power to control and persuade the Supreme Court, making him possibly more powerful than the US Supreme Court.

18. That power is compromised when lobbyists seek to control a no longer intendent judiciary like mobsters by threats of discipline. Per the attached petition to members of the federal rules to discipline judges, lobbyists sought to gain control over the rules and judges by allowing non-attorneys to practice law without a license. (Exhibit E)

19. Recall, the reason I ran for office in 2018 is that out of state entities were practicing law without a license, messing up the chain of title on deeds, losing revenue for the state, and taking advantage of my deceased esteemed colleague Dick Goll, Esquire. No one

21. Defendant and PA ODC should protect the rule of law, the courts, the justice system and country by correcting and regulating these non-attorneys who destroy the fabric of the rule of law that holds the government together.

23. Maybe I should have addressed the need to draft rules to prevent the overthrow of the courts and the government by adding rules relating to non-attorneys practicing law without a license on behalf of another to prevent the schemed unnatural overthrow of our government. Those who teach of the fall of America like the fall of Rome teach lies to mislead and deceive the public based on their ignorance or wicked vanities.

25. I am concerned because my law school professor allegedly used a secretary in private practice, to give the Honorable Hardiman the same secretary. I am concerned because he

interviewed Justice Thomas too. I believe the rule of law should be governed by those who serve the people, not those with internal connections.

26. I am concerned since this same professor interviewed Justice Thomas, with whom I often disagree.

27. I disagree with Justice Thomas in the attached excerpt of his dissent of a recent voting rights case where the Supreme Court protected black voters from intentional contrived discrimination. (Exhibit F)

28. I am grateful the US Supreme Court allowed law suits under 1983 to prevent old people from being drugged up like vegetables easier to tend to be doomed to hell because I believe we must use our brains to go to heaven. The US Supreme Court saved lives, liberty and eternal lives in the attached excerpt of case. (Exhibit G).

29. My case manager said I would be granted time in response to my motion for more time to file an appeal in the appeal of the PA Eastern District Court case. My parents departed and are on their way here from Florida now. They are coming late due to this week's news on the air pollution in Delaware and North East allegedly to be caused by the Canadian fires.

30. I am relying on her comforting words so I may prepare for their arrival and spend time with loved ones.

31. Many of my cousins are lawyers. I think my Uncle Luke's daughter, Hannah is coming to Delaware for the reunion. Hannah Kelly is going to law school next year. Her big brother already completed law school at Duquesne and is in private practice. Her other brother Luke went to Duquesne on a soccer scholarship. He may still be attending school.

32. I am grateful Hannah is showing the world women are people to respect, not things or property or products to market items.

34. Per the attached article, Exhibit G, Saudi Arabia is artificially decreasing supply to increase the demand and prices. Everything will get more expensive in the fall. If the post office decreased prices, including stamps to a quarter, the price of shipping goods would be reduced, reducing the alleged manufactured cause of inflation. I told the post office about this over a decade ago, but no one listens to my ideas or does anything about it. Again, that is why I ran for office myself in 2018, to improve the world by doing something about problems, not using problems to serve my own agenda to serve my seat.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/9/23

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

Dated: June 9, 2023
Meghan Kelly (printed)
Meghan Kelly (signed)

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

ANTHONY J. SCIRICA
CHAIR

PETER G. MCCABE
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

SAMUEL A. ALITO, JR.
APPELLATE RULES

A. THOMAS SMALL
BANKRUPTCY RULES

DAVID F. LEVI
CIVIL RULES

EDWARD E. CARNES
CRIMINAL RULES

JERRY E. SMITH
EVIDENCE RULES

Judge Scirica is a big deal. Wow!

DATE: December 6, 2002
TO: Judge Anthony J. Scirica, Chair
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure
FROM: Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr., Chair
Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules
RE: Report of Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Appellate Rules met on November 18, 2002, in San Francisco, California. At its meeting, the Advisory Committee approved several proposed amendments and removed a number of items from its study agenda. Detailed information about the Advisory Committee's activities can be found in the minutes of the November 18 meeting and in the Advisory Committee's study agenda, both of which are attached to this report.

II. Action Items

The Advisory Committee will not be seeking Standing Committee action on any items in January.

III. Information Items

A. Amendments Approved for Later Submission to the Standing Committee

The Advisory Committee is continuing to consider and approve proposed amendments to the Appellate Rules, although, pursuant to the directive of the Standing Committee, the Advisory Committee will not forward these amendments in piecemeal fashion, but will instead present a



P.O. Box 10841
Eugene, Oregon 97440
p/f: 541.257.8878
info@t1df.org
www.t1df.org

October 30, 2018

The Honorable Anthony J. Scirica, Chair
Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability and
The Honorable Ralph R. Erickson, Chair
Committee on Codes of Conduct
Judicial Conference of the United States
Administrative Office of the United States Courts
One Columbus Circle, NE
Washington, D.C. 20544


*Lobbyist Control
Rule making of Judges
Not merely the executive
or legislative branch
despite noble
aim, under
guise of profit
for entity.*

RE: Proposal to Change the Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges (Code) and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings (JC&D Rules)
Oral Comment regarding Proposed Changes to JC&D Rules §3(c)(1)
from Charles Fournier, on behalf of the Type 1 Diabetes Defense Foundation

Judge Erickson, Judge Scirica, Members of the Committees,

My name is Charles Fournier, and I comment today on behalf of the Type 1 Diabetes Defense Foundation, an Oregon-based advocacy nonprofit. My comments narrowly concern procedural standing requirements and, more specifically, the definition of person in Rule 3(c)(1) of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. I'll refer to these rules as the Conduct Rules or JCD Rules. I am specifically requesting that the Committees clarify the definition of person as employed in the draft of the proposed rule.

This year the Type 1 Diabetes Defense Foundation became an accidental unrepresented consolidated plaintiff in three putative class actions pending in the District Court of New Jersey. These unusual circumstances have placed us in an adversarial relationship in regard to plaintiffs' counsel long familiar to that District Court, as well as in the unexpected status of unrepresented



corporate plaintiff litigating for its right to appear *pro se*. Should we believe that an emerging pattern of judicial harassment could merit the filing of a formal complaint under the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 351-64, we would thus confront not only the existing bias of the Bench against *pro se* complainants (many of whom are unsophisticated defendants in criminal proceedings as well as serial complainants), but also some residual ambiguity in the proposed Rule language, interpreted through the prism of local rules and legal precedents, regarding whether an unrepresented corporate plaintiff would be allowed to file such a complaint personally.

Bias against Pro Se violates equal protection component of the

From our unusual, and possibly unique, perspective as an unrepresented nonprofit corporation currently awaiting a decision on a pending request to appear *pro se*, we would like to comment narrowly regarding those portions of the proposed Rule that refer to "persons." We believe that the Judicial Conference's reluctance to define "person" expressly and to address flawed procedural standing requirements in these rules and, more broadly, local rules of circuit courts, enables and perpetuates ongoing prudential discrimination against unrepresented (and underfunded) nonprofit rights advocacies that represent disfavored causes and oppressed minorities.

Entities are not people. Judges violate the Const I disagree w/ Citizens United

In light of U.S. Courts' ongoing refusal, despite evolving jurisprudence regarding corporations over the past 20 years, to apply the letter of the law governing procedural standing, it seems necessary that the Committees overseeing the current rulemaking process take all possible steps to adopt unified definitions of "person" (and related standing requirements) and to expressly recognize, in the Commentary section of the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings, the right of an artificial entity to appear personally in the complaint process currently under review but also in all judicial proceedings that could have given rise to a complaint.

We need the courts help please.

To eliminate
to screw people

Oh NO YIPES
are entities scheming
lawyers in real estate
YIPES!!





TYPE 1 DIABETES
DEFENSE FOUNDATION

Judicial consideration of the extent and nature of the constitutional rights enjoyed by corporations has been sporadic and at times confusing. It is, however, well established that the United States Supreme Court has extended certain rights to corporations, including the right of access to the federal courts, in 1809, in the seminal case all law students study during their first semester of law school — *Bank of the United States v. Deveaux*. The Court also extended the protection of the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to corporations in a series of railway cases between 1886 (*Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad Co.*—equal protection) and 1893 (*Noble v. Union River Logging Railroad Co.*—due process protections). “That a corporation is a person, within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment, [was] no longer open to discussion” in 1910 (*S. Ry. Co. v. Greene*, 216 U.S. 400, 412 (1910)); the personhood of corporations became a statutory right with the enactment of the Dictionary Act of 1947. The Fourteenth Amendment rights of corporations have been reaffirmed in a series of opinions since, such that the Court in 1985 called the principle that corporations have Equal Protection Clause rights “well established” in *Metro. Life Ins. Co. v. Ward*, 470 U.S. 869, 881 n.9 (1985). But when you are an underfunded and unrepresented impact advocacy nonprofit, these rights only exist on paper—as you do not have access to judicial proceedings under prudential standing requirements set forth in all local rules of U.S. district courts.

Professor Adam Steinman and Professor Fred Smith, formerly a clerk with Justice Sotomayor, have reminded us that:

Access to courts is crucial for making substantive rights that exist on paper real and enforceable in the real world. And access to federal courts requires having “standing” to assert those rights. For all practical purposes, standing is the key to the courthouse door.

In September 2018, 209 years after *Bank of the United States v. Deveaux*, the Judicial

Conference committees on Codes of Conduct and Judicial Conduct and Disability released for

They sacrifice people
under the lie of the common
good. Their will be
done like

Satan
eliminating
substantially
bordering

Free
will



Nobody
smokes
Yipes!

NO N HOLY SMOKE S

YIPES!

= access for humans, not entities who

will

be

represented by artificial intelligence
controlled by people in secret.





public comment proposed changes to the Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges and the Rules for Judicial-Conduct and Judicial-Disability Proceedings. These proposed changes reportedly respond to recommendations provided in the June 1, 2018 Report of the Federal Judiciary Workplace Conduct Working Group. The Working Group acknowledged in passim that they looked beyond sexual harassment and considered inclusivity and "power disparities," but in practice they limited these concepts to the workplace context, not the procedural standing requirements that underpin the Conduct Rules. "Due process" is mentioned only once, in an attachment that addresses whistleblower protections. The term "Person" is mentioned in 30 of the 45 pages of this report, but primarily to refer to 'in-person' interviews rather than to address procedural standing requirements.

The Report notes on page 28 that the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364) states, "**Any person** alleging that a judge has engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts, or alleging that such judge is unable to discharge all the duties of office by reason of mental or physical disability, may file with the clerk of the court of appeals for the circuit a written complaint containing a brief statement of the facts constituting such conduct."

Any person?

The standing requirements of the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 were codified as JCD Rule 3(c)(1). The Act stated "any person" and only "any person" without qualification. But standing and thus appearance under the current version of Conduct Rule 3(c)(1) is much more restrictive than the Act: it is limited to a natural person acting *pro se* and a small subset of corporations represented by a natural person.

The first clarifying amendments to the Conduct Rules recommended by the Working Group concerned this rule. But the Working Group there was exclusively concerned about a possible



misunderstanding regarding substantive standing, not about the definition of ‘person’ and related procedural standing requirements. The Working Group only required that a clarification be added to explain that “traditional standing requirements” do not apply to judicial conduct and disability proceedings. The Working Group’s purpose was solely to help complainants understand that they need not themselves be the subject of the alleged misconduct.

By “traditional standing requirements,” the Working Group seems exclusively to mean “substantive standing requirements,” i.e. the complainant’s injury being of a certain character relative to the alleged wrong, forum, process and remedy. A complaint process addressing any form of harassment can only be deemed to be effective if, at a bare minimum, all potentially injured parties have standing. Logically, the Working Group should thus have turned its focus to the prudential standing requirements artificially embedded in the Conduct Rule but not the Act. They did not.

The Working Group did not even gloss over the prudential impairment of standing included in Conduct Rule 3(c)(1) when compared to the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act of 1980 (28 U.S.C. §§ 351-364). The Report of the Working Group merely quoted from existing JCD Rule 3(c)(1) verbatim, without requesting that it be changed or amended in any manner. The Working Group’s apparent imperviousness to the discriminatory intent of the procedural standing requirement of Rule 3(c)(1) as currently drafted is indicative of a deep-seated prejudice, so engrained in the fabric of our judicial and legal establishment as to blind a distinguished group of legal scholars and learned professionals.

The Act does not define person. It only defines “judge” and “complainant.” In the absence of an intra-statute definition or other unambiguous contextual information, the term “Person” has the general meaning stipulated by the Dictionary Act of 1947, codified at 1 U.S.C. § 1 in 2012.

The added prudential restraint on standing embedded in the current JCD Rule 3(c)(1) is thus a

lobbiest fantasy to control
the federal judges like mobsters by
rackets



typical case of “procedural rights” injury—one in which a federal statute creates a right to have the government follow a particular procedure, but fails to follow that procedure.

The Working Group missed this critical prudential standing issue. The Committees, however, did not. Sometime prior to issuing the proposed change, the Committees apparently amended the proposed change to JCD Rule 3(c)(1) to address this procedural injury.

Unfortunately, the Committees have done so without any written explanation, commentary or even explicit acknowledgment of the rule change.

This silence is not inconsequential.

Throughout the Circuits, local rules of U.S. District Courts have institutionalized prudential discrimination against a specific type of person — a weak unrepresented impact advocacy nonprofit that defends the rights of disfavored causes and minorities. When you are a nonprofit corporation, standing is subject to pay-to-play demands that could in other contexts be deemed, when stripped of the disguise of legalese, either unsavory or outright unlawful. This injustice may be best illustrated by the dystopian situation that the Type 1 Diabetes Defense Foundation currently faces in the District Court of New Jersey.

After losing counsel midway through a complex action (when the counsel through whom we initiated our action chose to pursue a competing fact pattern), T1DF de facto ceased to exist in the eyes of the Court, chambers and counsel. We were not allowed ECF registration. We received no service by mail. Patently flawed allegations by counsel that we had withdrawn as a plaintiff were accepted by the Court at face value. When we reached out to the Court to seek clarification, our papers were intercepted by the Court Clerk rather than filed and entered in the case docket. Based on allegations of Rule 26 inadvertent discovery disclosure—advanced by our former counsel when discovery had not begun—our communications with chambers were embargoed and the docket sealed. Our attempts to complain to the Court regarding an obviously

Putpurported savors may be the villain. Allow 3rd party standing be by people

Not entitled

The injustice would be to allow lobbyist like you to control

and no longer impartial Court

Good entities are not people. I know the plan to eliminate the gov through entities under the lie of equality. Samehess



unlawful seal of the docket itself were then met with allegations against T1DF officers, by their former counsel, of Unauthorized Practice of Law (UPL)—a criminal statute in NJ. For a period of several months, T1DF’s officers faced allegations of UPL for the very act of attempting to communicate with Chambers, while unrepresented by counsel, regarding our inability to find replacement counsel.

In the absence of explicit clarification from the Committees regarding whether a corporate person unrepresented by legal counsel can act as a complainant, the officers of T1DF have reason to fear that any attempt to file, similarly unrepresented, a complaint regarding “conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts” would similarly face prudential discrimination. The procedural injury caused by the prudential discrimination currently embedded in Conduct Rule 3(c)(1) and local rules of the U.S. District Courts is thus not inconsequential. If these Committees are to address this injury, they must do so expressly and must communicate, to the U.S. Courts, the basis for their amendment of the Conduct Rule in no uncertain terms. Procedural and sexual harassment have one point in common: the first and most important line of defense is normative.

Until the U.S. Courts convey in an unambiguous manner that procedural harassment and prudential discrimination will not be tolerated, the Courts will de facto be condoning the resulting injury caused to impact advocacy nonprofits that don’t have the funds for pay-to-play. The Judicial Conference must therefore use this opportunity to remind the Councils that Courts are “obligated to be open and accessible to anyone who . . . is drawn into federal litigation, including litigants, lawyers, jurors, and witnesses” and unrepresented rights advocacy nonprofits.

In conclusion,

*People judges may be wrong
they were wrong back then*

Over two centuries ago, the United States Supreme Court recognized that, under the protection of the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment, “persons” for the purpose of

*Continuing wrongs is not smart, and does
not improve or uphold justice. It guarantees
injustice. (sad face)*



the rules of procedures includes artificial entities such as nonprofit corporations. The proposed revision to the definition of "complaints," and thus "persons," in JCD Rule 3(c)(1) finally brings the Conduct Rules into compliance with current jurisprudence; the proposed amendment does not, however, go far enough.

The suggested correction of JCD Rule 3(c)(1) is a step in the right direction. The prior wording reflected the long-held belief that Courts had the prudential authority to discriminate between corporations. The proposed revision does not, however, expressly correct the definition of person; it does so implicitly. Without explicit definition and further clarification in the Commentary section of the Conduct Rules, the proposed language would allow long-held discriminatory biases to persist unaddressed. The Judicial Conference should instead expressly state that discrimination between artificial entities for the purpose of standing and other procedural matters addressed in the courts' Local Rules is now barred as the result of rulings in *Janus* and *Hobby Lobby*.

More specifically:

1. The Conduct Rules should expressly clarify that, for the purpose of the rules, the words "person" (and thus "complainant") have the meaning given them by the Dictionary Act 1 U.S.C. § 1, i.e. that they include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as natural persons.
2. The Commentary on that section should also explain the reason for the revision and summarize the Court's evolving jurisprudence on the rights of artificial entities that led to that revision; and
3. Finally, the Judicial Conference should appoint a Working Group for the purpose of coordinating the Judicial Councils' rulemaking (and harmonizing local rules) on the



definition of “person” and related procedural matters, e.g. *pro se* appearance, ECF registration, unbundled legal representation, legal assistance (without representation). The general rules of practice and procedure issued pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2072(a) and the courts’ rules issued pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2071(a) should also be brought up to date with current jurisprudence. Adding a definition of “person” and, in the Commentary on JCD Rule 3(c)(1), adding a detailed explanation of the reasons and basis for the proposed change would encourage the Judicial Councils to act.

Thank you.

A P P H
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS THIRD CIRCUIT

Meghan Kelly)	Appellate Court
Appellant, Plaintiff,)	No.: 21-3198
v.)	No. 22-2079
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.)	
Swartz, et al.)	District Court
)	No.: 1:21-cv-01490-CFC
Appellees, Defendants.)	

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

I Meghan Kelly, Esq., pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 27, and US Const Amendments I, and V move to include a Second caveat to Petitioner's motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica and 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.

1. The Honorable Judge Anthony J. Scirica is the Chair for the federal rules to discipline federal judges.
2. It has come to my attention a number of federal judges create the appearance of bias or the actual partiality towards political beliefs of the political think tank with whom not all citizens agree, the Federalist Society. (Exhibits A, B, C)

3. Judges should remain impartial. I was uncomfortable when the Honorable Justice Ruth Ginsberg spoke out on political beliefs. (Exhibit D) Justice Ginsberg likely chilled the political beliefs of those who think differently than she. I am similarly uncomfortable when Federal Judges speak at partial political forums.

4. Individual exercise of Constitutional freedom is chilled when the only impartial government branch, the judiciary engages in partial, biased, politicking, association, support and speaking engagements.

5. The First Amendment of the US Constitution protects citizens' freedom to associate without disparate unequal favoritism by the courts towards certain associations and disparate treatments towards individuals whose ideology do not conform towards the courts favored lobbyists associations including the Federalist Society. (US Amend V, Equal Protections Component, and procedural Due Process protections of a fair not politically biased proceeding)

6. While I oppose regulating federal judges through federal rules, it appears the alleged potentially unconstitutional acts of the judiciary are left unchecked by the purview of the limits on judicial conduct by cases or controversies or impeachment.

7. Federal Judges should have more limited rights under the First Amendment in order to uphold and not chill the Constitutional freedoms of those they are charged to serve.

8. I respectfully move Judge Scirica for judicial consideration of drafting rules to prevent judges from speaking engagements on behalf of political think tanks such as the lobbyists at the Federalist Society and other political organizations or entities to protect the impartiality of the courts.

9. I believe attorneys, even attorneys labeled disabled have a duty to require the impartiality of the courts, not the mere appearance, but actual impartiality of the courts within the purview of the Constitutional limits to prevent favoritism towards the partial political interests of lobbyists like the Federalist Society. Judicial opinions and dissents should speak for themselves without encouraging favoritism towards certain view points in lawsuits through judicial lobbying by speaking engagements or lobbyist groups.

10. My religious beliefs require I uphold the impartiality of the courts as a religious exercise as a party of one. (See. Deuteronomy 1:16-17, "...Hear the disputes between your brothers, and **judge fairly** between a man and his brother or a foreign resident. Show **no partiality** in judging; hear both small and great alike...."

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants this Motion.

Dated June 15, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
Inactive license
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(619 of words)

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

Dated: June 15, 2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan Kelly (signed)

Exhibit A



Hon. Anthony J. Scirica

U.S. Court of Appeals, Third Circuit



Anthony J. Scirica, Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, is currently the chair of the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Chief Judge Scirica is the former chair of the Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States and was a member of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules. He was also chair of the Judicial Conference Working Group on Mass Torts. He is a former member of the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation.

Chief Judge Scirica practiced law in Pennsylvania, where he also served as an

ssistant district attorney and a judge of the Court of Common Pleas. He was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature and also served as chair of the Pennsylvania Sentencing Commission. In 1984 he was appointed to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and in 1987, to the Court of Appeals. He is a member of the American Law Institute.

- University of Michigan, J.D., 1965
- Wesleyan University, B.A., 1962
- Fulbright Scholar, Central University Caracas, Venezuela

A person listed as a contributor has spoken or otherwise participated in Federalist Society events, publications, or multimedia presentations. A person's appearance on this list does not imply any other endorsement or relationship between the person and the Federalist Society. In most cases, the biographical information on a person's "contributor" page is provided directly by the person, and the Federalist Society does not edit or otherwise endorse that information. The Federalist Society takes no position on particular legal or public policy issues. All expressions of opinion by a contributor are those of the contributor.

PAST EVENTS

COMMENTARY



Feb
22
2012

Wednesday
12:00 p.m.
EDT

Is the Affordable Care Act Constitutional?

Pennsylvania Student Chapter

University of Pennsylvania Law School
3501 Sansom St
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Speakers:


Richard A. Epstein • Daniel Pollack • Theodore Ruger • Anthony J. Scirica

[more](#)

Topics:

Constitution • Federalism • Healthcare • Supreme Court • Federalism & Separation of Powers

Exhibit B



Hon. Colm F. Connolly

Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Delaware



Colm F. Connolly has served as a United States District Judge since August 3, 2018. He was a partner at Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP from 2009 until he took the bench in 2018. He served as the United States Attorney for the District of Delaware from 2001 to 2009 and was an Assistant United States Attorney from 1993 to 1999. He was a partner with the firm of Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell from 1999 to 2001.

Judge Connolly was a law clerk for the Honorable Walter K. Stapleton of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit from 1991 to 1992. He holds degrees from the Duke University School of Law, the London School of

Economics, and the University of Notre Dame.

Judge Connolly is a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers and a member of the American Law Institute.

A person listed as a contributor has spoken or otherwise participated in Federalist Society events, publications, or multimedia presentations. A person's appearance on this list does not imply any other endorsement or relationship between the person and the Federalist Society. In most cases, the biographical information on a person's "contributor" page is provided directly by the person, and the Federalist Society does not edit or otherwise endorse that information. The Federalist Society takes no position on particular legal or public policy issues. All expressions of opinion by a contributor are those of the contributor.

PAST EVENTS



This event has concluded.

Apr

28
2023

Friday
10:30 a.m.
EST

Panel I: The Gatekeepers: Judicial Decision Making at the Federal District Courts

2023 Third Circuit Chapters Conference

The Pyramid Club
1735 Market St 52nd Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Speakers:

Renee Bumb • Colm F. Connolly • Kent A. Jordan • William S. Stickman • Joshua D. Wolson

more

 In-Person Event

Exhibit C

“Political groups may favor a particular appointment,” he wrote, “but once appointed a judge naturally decides a case in the way that he or she believes the law demands. It is a judge’s sworn duty to be impartial, and all of us take that oath seriously.”

Eric J. Segall, the Ashe Professor of Law at Georgia State University College of Law, said that there’s always been a “close relationship between the executive branch and justices,” and that it is unrealistic to claim that justices have historically been nonpolitical entities. What has changed recently, however, “is the Federalist Society-American Constitution Society divide has become much more pronounced as our country’s become more polarized.”

“We’re so polarized that when Gorsuch and Thomas and [Justice Samuel] Alito rant at Federalist Society events, and when [Justice Ruth Bader] Ginsburg and [Justice Sonia] Sotomayor and Breyer ranted at ACS events, it just feels like they’re taking sides in a way that in my 30 years of being a law professor I’d never felt ... before,” Segall added. “I think they should reconsider what they’re doing.”

The optics of both Barrett’s statements at the McConnell Center and Gorsuch’s appearance at an event featuring Pence, Segall said, “are really bad.”

“Supreme Court justices have to turn down like 90 percent of the events they get invited to,” Segall said. “Why don’t you pick one that’s not where *Roe* is being discussed, and Pence is not going?”

Carrie Severino, the president of the conservative Judicial Crisis Network and a former law clerk for Thomas, dismissed criticisms of Gorsuch’s participation as “laughable,” given that Ginsburg, Breyer and Sotomayor regularly appeared at American Constitution Society events over the past two decades.

“The attacks on Gorsuch for speaking at this event are just part and parcel of the Left’s broader effort to discredit and intimidate the Court,” Severino said in a statement to The Washington Post.

Gorsuch’s ties to the Federalist Society are deep. He was on its list of potential Supreme Court picks that Trump shared in the campaign in 2016. Leonard Leo, co-chairman and former executive vice president of the society, assisted with Gorsuch’s and Justice Brett M. Kavanaugh’s Supreme Court selection and confirmation process.

“The public doesn’t know if Justice Gorsuch is going to disclose anything that would give some sort of indication about how he’s going to rule on a case,” said Renee Knake Jefferson, the Doherty Chair in Legal Ethics at the University of Houston Law Center. “And so whether or not he does that, you have a public perception problem.”

Bannon said Gorsuch’s appearance at the Federal Society is the perfect example of why the court needs to adopt an ethics code that would dictate rules for public appearances, given that the perception of partisanship is “something that the justices need to be attuned to.”

In the first year of his presidency, President Biden formed a Supreme Court reform commission that, in December, published a report with recommendations. Among them, the report suggested that the court create a written code of ethics that “would bring the court into line with the lower federal courts and demonstrate its dedication to an ethical

Unlike other federal judges, the Supreme Court justices are not bound by a formal code of conduct, a decision Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. has defended by saying the justices self-police and consult the code for lower-court judges in assessing their own ethical obligations. The commission’s report found that this voluntary system may not be the best approach to conflicts of interest that may affect the public’s perception of the court.

“It is not obvious why the court is best served by an exemption from what so many consider best practice,” the report said.

Jefferson said she’d like to see an ethics code that would require all justices to disclose any time they are giving a speech, especially if they’re being paid for it.

“If an organization is paying a large speaker’s fee, that’s something that the public would want to know, because it goes to impartiality and the perception of impartiality of the court,” Jefferson said. “It’s also something litigants would want to be able to look up, to make sure that their opponent hadn’t just, a year ago, invited a justice to speak and given them \$50,000 or \$250,000, to speak to them.”

Segall clarified that most judicial ethics experts agree that justices should not be prohibited from participating in these types of events, or engaging with groups deemed partisan. The consensus, however, calls for more transparency around these activities.

“I don’t want Supreme Court justices hiding in their marble castle, never coming out,” Segall said. “I think the world would be a slightly better place if the American Constitution Society would host events with a conservative justice, and the Federalist Society hosted events with a liberal justice.”

Davis said Gorsuch would agree to participate in an event hosted by the ACS, which he described as the “liberal version” of the Federalist Society.

“The members have informative, good-natured debates on their different judicial philosophies,” Davis said. “Like late, great Justices Ginsburg and Scalia, Justice Gorsuch enjoys speaking with groups with differing views.”

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

Meghan Kelly)	
Plaintiff,)	Appellate Court
v.)	No.: 21-3198
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.)	No. 22-2079
Swartz, et al.)	
)	District Court
Defendants.)	No.: 1:21-cv-01490-CFC

Certificate of Service of 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

I, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire, hereby certify that on June 15, 2023, I had a true and correct copy of the above referenced document sent to all Defendants through their attorneys, served via E-filing, and to

Zi-Xiang Shen and Caneel Radinson-Blasucci
Delaware Department of Justice
Carvel State Building 820 N. French St. 6th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801,

Dated June 15, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(302) 493-6693
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
US Supreme Court Bar No. 283696

Not acting as an attorney on behalf of
another

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

Dated: June 15, 2023

Megha Kelly
(printed)

Murkin
(signed)