

No. 23-7360

Related Application No. 23A144

Related Application No. 23A596

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Esq. Petitioner

V

Eastern District Court of Pennsylvania

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

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

Meghan Kelly, Esquire, pro se

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

US Supreme Court No 283696

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether the US Supreme Court can limit or even consider removing Congressional immunity under the speech and debate clause, mere implied power to investigate, or express power to impeach, executive power and other government immunity within the purview of Constitution limits so as to uphold and not infringe or violate the 1st and 5th Amendment rights to petition fairly without congressional or executive threats against parties, their counsel including attorney generals, and petitioners like me, judges or any of their family members, in light of the recent attacks against Jack Smith, Judge Merchen, Justice Alito, Justice Thomas, and their family, daughter or wives to impermissibly commandeer outcomes in cases like mine related to President Trump based on political affiliation in violation of separation of powers between Art I, II and III and US Amend I, V, XIV, applicable to states via XIV.

II. Whether the US Supreme Court may consider Congress does not have an implied power to adjudicate “monetary fines” for contempt and investigatory proceedings since Congress’s attorney Todd Garvey argues for this power in pages 10-11 of CRS Congress’s Contempt Power and the Enforcement of Congressional Subpoenas: Law, History, Practice and Procedure, dated May 12, 2017, and upon information and belief such unjust implied self-executing power is schemed to be used against attorney generals and this US Supreme Court to restore the one branch government of 1776 from our current more fair government established in 1791 with the passage of the Bill of rights affording the private and public with the right to petition and use the impartial rule of law to resolve disputes and to uphold freedom instead of eliminating freedom by Congressional lawless mobster-like use of money, might and mob societal pressure to force its collective will be done.

III. Whether the new state interference and obstruction to access to this court in terms of chilling and creating obstacles to my access to the law library occurring on October 16, 2024 to the present made by state government to intentionally prevent my capacity to effectively research to submit petitions in this case must be considered in the interest of justice in light of the fact I unfairly face potential suits arising solely on this Court's decision in this case where the state will continue to violate my right to petition fairly in accord with due process by continued obstruction and threats causing additional irreparable injury in term of vitiating 1st Amendment rights including the petition without Due process. US Amend I, V, XIV.

IV. Given Rule 44 does not permit opposing counsel opportunity to respond to the petition for rehearing, I asked her position to request this Court ask her to respond, and she did not object, whether this Court will please allow US Solicitor an opportunity to please respond, given my limited access to research and the required need to protect the US Supreme Court members, other state and federal judges, attorney generals, special prosecutors and their families from government threats that will ultimately aid in the intentionally schemed overthrow by eliminating the rule of law that founded in 1791, which sustains and maintains these United States from schemed dissolution.

V. Whether the US Supreme Court should ask US Solicitor to file a response to this petition for rehearing for another reason: she has standing to defend the government's power through the US Attorney General or special prosecutor, and even judges to petition fairly in accord with due process in light of the threats to eliminate and control them unfairly by congressional commandeering which will continue and worsen as shown by the attached letters Nov. 2024, and the impending plan of 2025 agenda to preserve the impartial rule of law and

Equal Protections of all members not merely government arms who conform with political ideology of Congress's majority or the executive branch.

VI. Whether the failure to recuse Justice Jackson and her participation in the conference on the petition for writ of certiorari violate my right to a fair and impartial forum under 5th Amendment due process given she rendered an advisory decision against me on issues before the court on petition for writ of certiorari on tv on or about September 1, 2024 unfairly preemptively denying my arguments I presented to the US Supreme Court, including the legal issue of whether disciplinary rules and proceedings against US Supreme Court members violate my right to a fair and impartial forum as applied, to a court partial, defensive forum with unfair favoritism towards evading discipline and impeachment instead of impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law to uphold my legal rights and claims or the public's or other private parties' rights in light of the fact actual prejudice occurred in that my petition was denied in toto.

VII. Whether this Court's staff committed a clerical error by failing to distribute *Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly's Motion/Application to Recuse the Honorable Justice Jackson and to postpone the conference date for the writ of Certiorari for Third Circuit pending a supplemental brief for the EDPA appeal No. 7360*, prior to conference depriving me of meaningful access to the courts by vitiating my first Amendment right to petition without due process in accord with the 5th Amendment which must be cured by reopening this case to consider the unaddressed motion to not only recuse Justice Jackson, **but to more importantly** address issues in the **undistributed supplemental brief** explicitly and by reference regarding **not only arguments relating to recusal and disciplinary proceedings or a code for the US Supreme court, but new case law regarding suing a President which is material to my case**

since this reciprocal law suits was brought in retaliation for my religious beliefs contained in my Religious Freedom Restoration law suit to dissolve the establishment of government religion established by President Trump. US Amend I, V.

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

IX. Assuming consideration of the filed but undistributed supplemental brief is granted, is the president above the king above God without Constitutional restraint by his official government authority unbalanced by the people's Constitutional legal checks the petition coupled with due process (US Amend I, V, XIV), the Attorney General's legal check to

prosecute and defend all and protect the entire government, not merely the President, and other branches from a schemed overthrow a President ignorantly, indifferently or intelligently aids in by misguided official conduct in need of judicial and petitioner's guidance to maintain the rule of law, that founded these United States, not the lie of misguided lawless people the consent of the people.

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

XI. Whether the new and additional Congressional attacks against Justice Alito relating to his wife's exercise of 1st Am right to speech, private petition and association relating to flags, where law makers exceed the limits of their constitutional authority to threaten to control the outcome of Trump v US, No 939 by requiring recusal of Justice Alito and foreseeably threatening punishment for failing to recuse which foreseeably prejudices the outcome of my petitions to overturn the orders below for failure to recuse Phipps and Scirica violates my right to a fair and impartial forum and Due Process under US Amend I, V, not partial towards the US

Supreme Court's private interest in protecting its members by ruling in favor of those who defend the court against congressional attacks by granting Trump immunity from criminal prosecution.

XII. Assuming consideration of the filed but undistributed supplemental brief, whether presidential or other government immunity violates the Constitutional legal check of petitioner Meghan Kelly and the US Government to petition fairly in accord with U Amend I. V, without partiality towards a President and bias against petitioners before deprivation of life, liberty or property interest of petitioner Meghan Kelly and the interest of the US Government.

XIII. Assuming consideration of the filed but undistributed supplemental brief, whether the US Supreme Court violated the Constitution which may be cured in this case by eliminating checks to balance Trump's power, namely the law makers authority to draft criminal laws to protect Constitutional rights of people, the congressional check, the US Attorney Generals' power to enforce criminal law upon the President to protect the Constitutional rights of the people and the institution of the government from an attempted coup, while also eliminating my check upon the President through the petition wrongfully due to bias, not the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law, based on affiliation. The US Supreme Court appeared to give into temptation of attacks by ruling partially to be tricked against those who bullied and attacked the court while ruling in favor of those Republicans in office who defended the Court against required recusals, impeachment, discipline and disciplinary rules, by unconstitutionally holding Trump is absolutely immune from prosecution of crimes for official conduct, and presumptively immune from other conduct in violation of Equal Protections and the Constitutional rights of the victims of a President harms only to be entrapped under the 2025 plan.

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

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-viii
Parties.....	ix
Related Cases.....	ix
Table of Contents.....	x
Appendix.....	xi-xxi
Table of Authorities.....	xxii-xxiii
Statement of Case:.....	1
Argument.....	1-15
Conclusion.....	15

APPENDIX

Appendix (hereinafter “App.”)

App 0 93rd affidavit in Kely v Swartz, draft complaint against president Biden to assure the courts, attorney generals and government are fully funded when budget fully funded two branches and left the most important branch unfunded in the plan for an unbalanced budget.....1-15

App 1A Letter from US Supreme Court by New case manager Sara Simmons, dated 11/5/2024 rejecting my petition for rehearing and requesting I amend the required certificate by or before November 20, 2025 within 15 days of the date of the letter.....1-15

App 2B Certificate of service of the returned petition for rehearing mailed Oct 28, 2024 with a court police stamp showing physical delivery by me in person on Oct 29, 2024 with initials CH 1565 with a notation “2 different Police took filings CH 1565 took the biggest load 2 trips CS 563”.....1-15

App 3C Certificate of Service of petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Motion for Leave to file in Forma Pauperis and Petitioners petition for a Rehearing on decision dated Oct 7, 2024 filed in person in the civil rights case 23-7372, dated Oct 29, 2024 with police stamp CS 563 that was accepted for filing and placed for conference November 22, 2024.....1-15

App 4 D Article, Independent, Republicans push for criminal probe into judge in Trump hush money case-and judge’s daughter, dated Nov 10, 2024, by Mike Bedigan.....1-15

App 5 E Letter dated November 8, 2024 by Attorney General of Texas threatening special prosecutor Jack Smith to influence the outcome of his case in collusion with partial biased Judiciary congress members Jim Jordan and Barry Loudermilk exceeding Constitutional limits by violating the first and 5th Amendment rights to petition fairly.....1-15

App 6F Letter dated November 8, 2024 by Jim Jordan and Barry Loudermilk abusing investigatory power to collude with the executive branch with Texas AG to affect and influence the outcome in 2 cases of US v Trump in FL and DC by special counsel Jack Smith by threatening him with prosecution but for the exercise of the First Am right upon the behalf of the Government without Due Process.....1-15

App 7G Email showing Present sense impression of present harm.....1-15

App 8H Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Petition for a rehearing dated October 7, 2024 and all exhibits thereto named the same, dated October 25, 2024.....1-15

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

App G Petitioner Meghan Kelly motion for a caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica, regarding judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent non-lawyers and non-judges from practicing law or taking the place of people judges without government authority, somehow using the rules to uphold the rule of law from nonlawyers lawyering and non-judges judging in place of judges to eliminate the courts as schemed 6/09/2023.....1-15

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Email dated May 13, 2024 regarding the elimination of the rule of law and problems with the manner money is created based on violating *Ezekiel* 18:13, the Babylon way, albeit not as troublesome as the new manner money is schemed to be created and utilized to allow for the overthrow of these US after 2050
- Email, including regarding opposition to mental healthcare manipulation by profiteering cohorting self-proclaimed experts as schemed by the 4th Industrial Revolution plans and religious belief people go to hell for deferring to science, experts, professionals unrestrained by the law to prevent human sacrifice and enslavement
- Fabian Window shows the lawless one’s plan through misguided people
- Picture from phone showing I made Drafts in emails to Lisa Nesbitt I thankfully did not send regarding PA appeal. In a later affidavit I indicate I talked with Lisa and she said not to send the emails to her to correct failure to file or return documents in another matter
- Email to Lisa Nesbitt I noted she kindly corrected Robert Meek’s denial of a petition for writ of cert for matter No 23-7372, where I sought to see if she would help me fix another

deprivation of an opportunity to be heard in the same civil rights appeal, by Robert Meek's rejection of docketing *Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Emergency Application to the Honorable Justice Samuel A. Alito, Junior to stay or pause the time to appeal the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit 21-3198 to discern whether Richard Abbott may represent me as counsel in the civil rights case*

- Meg's rejected unfiled Petition to the Honorable Samuel A. Alito, Junior to stay or pause the time to appeal the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit 21-3198 to discern whether Richard Abbott may represent me as counsel in the civil rights case, US Supreme Court No. 23-7372 for the civil rights appeal Kelly v Swartz, et al, dated February 7, 2024, and the following exhibits thereto including,
- Email to opposing side asking stance on application
- Richard L Abbott's Response in Opposition of Discipline, Case No. 23-524 in the DE District Court dated January 5, 2024
- Meg Kelly's letter to Delaware Supreme Court Justice Henry DuPont Ridgely concerning Judges disparately treating attorneys based on firm size, or place of origin, and examples where judges demeaned people based on place of origin, especially PA, but Maryland too.
- Letter by the US Supreme court denying pages for appeal in Kelly v Swartz, dated January 8, 2024
- Letter by US Supreme Court granting time to cure the defect in exceeding 40 pages in Kelly v Swartz, dated January 12, 2024
- Proof of mailing and certificate of service of the rejected application, and proof of filing
- Email dated February 7, 2024 to Robert Meek forwarding the Emergency Application o the Honorable Justice Samuel A. Alito, Junior to stay or pause the time to appeal the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit 21-3198 to discern whether Richard Abbott may represent me as counsel in the civil rights case, mailed 2/7/2024
- Series of emails including other filings not docketed by this court and messages to check upon status of emergency application
- Letter dated February 12, 2024 from Robert Meek rejecting my emergency application received February 15, 2024
- Email to Robert Meek addressing the reasons for the rejection, the questions Robert asked, and why I believed there was an error in rejecting the application
- Email to DE State AG Ryan Costa, opposing counsel in civil rights case and DE chair to federalist party where I address a constitutional concern of lack of impartial trial court by actual judges in disciplinary proceedings.....1-15

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

- Newspaper Article from the DE News Journal about the case Richard L Abbott was punished for called *Judge: Rehoboth Bat beach fight one of nastiest*, by Maureen Milford, dated June

26, 2025 where vice Chancellor Glascock noted his disdain about the dispute based on being upset with the animosity between the clients

- Notice mailed to opposing counsel to DE US AG Kathleen Jennings through agent Ryan Costa regarding the civil rights case
- Letter by US Supreme Court of Notice the petition for writ of cert for the civil rights case Kelly v Swartz was filed on May 2, 2024, Waiver form, and envelop Kathleen Jennings, DE AG C/O Ryan Costa to show these items were sent to civil rights opponent, head of DE's federalist association Ryan Costa on behalf of DE AG Kathleen Jennings per instructions of opponents counsel.....1-15

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

- Article Reuters, *Iran's hardliner President Ebrahim Raisi killed in helicopter crash*, by Parisa Hafezi and Yomna Ehab, dated Mon May 20, 2024
- Article Associated Press, AP, *Slovak prime minister's condition remains serious but prognosis positive after assassination bid*, by Lefteris Pitrikis, dated May 19, 2024
- Diocese of Wilimngton Press release, *Bishop Malooly responds to "The Keepers."*
- DE online, News Journal, Ex-Delaware bishop named as Catholic official who covered up clergy sex abuse in Baltimore:Report, by Esteban Parra dated May 5, 2023
- The Keepers Wickepedia, (New neighbor was on this tv show)
- Email dated May 19, 2024, sent opposing counsel request for disciplinary proceeding to be open called and the attached
- *Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for good cause, 1 Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 9, to Unseal the Record, 2. to declare self-regulation of attorneys, other Professions, and judges unconstitutional, making business above the law, by making the dictates of professionals, or bureaucrats within agencies, as opposed to laws enacted by congress people, checked by the vote of the people, the law, and 3. in lieu of and in the alternative, eliminate the secret trial requirements of professionals before Boards, including the Board on Professional Responsibility, requiring the choice of an open or confidential forum left to the accused professional, instead of requiring a secret proceeding, concealing the accused's defense, to the advantage of the accuser state, in violation of equal protections, and due process 1st and 14th Protections.* where I noted the plan to eliminate judges Page ID 47102
- Exhibit A thereto Letter to Colm F Connelly regarding self-regulation is lawlessness with partiality to self not the impartial application of the law to protect all equally, pages 4-5 discussing the importance of judges at the threat of elimination of the same to eliminate the rule of law that founded, sustains and maintains the United States
- Turned in my tags because I could not afford car insurance
- Proof I suspended my insurance

- Proof I am eligible for EBT because the state forces me not to work in my occupation of choice
- Email to Chris regarding agenda to control to eliminate judges
- Proposed Order on my Motion submitted to DE Supreme Court Meghan Kelly's Motion for good cause, 1 Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 9, to Unseal the Record, 2. to declare self-regulation of attorneys, other Professions, and judges unconstitutional, making business above the law, by making the dictates of professionals, or bureaucrats within agencies, as opposed to laws enacted by congress people, checked by the vote of the people, the law, and 3. in lieu of and in the alternative, eliminate the secret trial requirements of professionals before Boards, including the Board on Professional Responsibility, requiring the choice of an open or confidential forum left to the accused professional, instead of requiring a secret proceeding, concealing the accused's defense, to the advantage of the accuser state, in violation of equal protections, and due process 1st and 14th Protections.
- Certificate of service via email and mail to Disciplinary Counsel Kathleen Vavala
- Docket No 22D03109 showing US Supreme Court seals disciplinary matters in secret proceedings
- Article CNN *Netanyahu's son discusses gas deal, prostitutes in strip club* recording By Ian Lee, CNN, January 10, 2018
- Emails to opposing counsel 18 USC sections 201 and 666 and comparing Robert Biden to Prime Minister of Israel's son who also exploited woman as property to buy and sell not people
- Exhibit D, DE Supreme Court Motion in Kelly v Trump previously wrongly sealed Appellant's Unopposed Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to accept her waiver of a speedy decision, where I denote on page 10 I seek the US AG use 18 USC section 201 to eliminate corruption to preserve the impartial rule of law not biased to serving self.
- A-4 Motion sealed wrongfully and sealed as an Exhibit (Page 10 refers to 18 USC section 666 I desired US AG to use to save these United States) Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to Reign in its arms through its agents from unlawfully pressuring appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion by relief it deems just and exhibits thereto including
- A-5 Motion sealed wrongfully and sealed as an Exhibit, Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to Require the Recusal of the Honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz in this matter, please note checks in balance arguments on pages ID 47207-47210 regarding placing checks upon Trump, and exhibits thereto
- Petition for writ of certiorari Kelly v Trump US Supreme Court No. 21-5522 page 8 where I aver Attorney Generals may use 18 USC 201 to save these United States to prevent the overthrow
- Facebook noting my neighbor's kid may have been in danger. This since has been resolved. She is okay now.

- Pictures of Cheri's two brothers, Jonathon and Jeremy Watts with me at University of DE when I was younger. Jeremy used to work on top secret cyber contracts1-15

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

App 21 APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT TO REQUIRE THE RECUSAL OF THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE COLLINS J. SEITZ,

JUNIOR IN THIS MATTER in Kelly v Trump, dated May 28, 2021, dated including exhibits
.....1-15

App 22 APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT TO
REIN IN ITS ARMS THROUGH ITS AGENTS FROM UNLAWFULLY PRESSURING
APPELLANT TO FORGO OR IMPEDE HER CASE TO PROTECT HER FREE EXERCISE
OF RELIGION.BY RELIEF IT DEEMS JUST in Jelly v Trump, May 25, 2021 including
exhibits.....1-15

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

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

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

App 26 Present sense impression about people talking about shooting me based on
political religious speech, dated Nov. 18, 2019, prior to filing Kelly v Trump but I care more
about the establishment of gov religion by the gov through Trump misleading people to harm
others, die to be damned to hell since he teaches the way to hell, sin, as Godly
.....1-15

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

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Articles and other references

<i>2025 Play Book, Mandate for Leadership, Project 2025 Presidential Transition Project</i> , foreword by Kevin Roberts, Edited by Paul Stans and Steven Groves, copyright, © 2023 by The Heritage Foundation. I pulled for free at https://static.project2025.org/2025_MandateForLeadership_FULLL.pdf		10, 12
Bible, <i>Amos</i> 5:15.....		14
Bible, <i>Matthew</i> 23:23.....		14
Bill of Rights, dated December 15, 1791.....		14
The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776 creating a one branch government..		14
<i>Federalist</i> letter 78, by Alexander Hamilton.....		14
<i>In Congress’s Contempt power and the enforcement of congressional subpoenas: Law, History, Practice and procedure</i> , in Congressional Research service dated May 12, 2017, Todd Garvey.....		5, 6, 15
Preamble of constitution drafted in 1787 Constitutional Convention held at Independence Hall in Philadelphia.....		14
Kelly v. Trump_ 2021 DE S. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 422 and 423.....		9

CASES

<i>Doe v. Indian River Sch. Dist.</i> , 653 F.3d 256, 259, 2011.....	3
<i>Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada</i> , 501 U.S. 1030, 1054 (1991).....	8
<i>Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks</i> , 436 U.S. 149, 156 (1978).....	13, 15
<i>Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.</i> , 457 U.S. 922, 930 (1982).....	13, 15
<i>McGrain v. Daugherty</i> , 273 U.S. 135 (1927).....	13
<i>Morrison v. Olson</i> , 487 U.S. 654 (1988).....	10
<i>Mullin v. Sussex County</i> , 861 F. Supp. 2d 411 (2012).....	3
<i>National Archives and Records Administration v. Favish</i> , 541 U.S. 157 (2004).....	12
<i>Salazar v. Buono</i> , 559 U.S. 700, 130 S. Ct. 1803, 176 L. Ed. 2d 634 (2010).....	3
<i>St. L. S.F.R.R. v. Spiller</i> , 275 U.S. 156 (1927).....	4
<i>Sinclair v. United States</i> , 279 U.S. 263, 295 (1929).....	6
<i>Trump v US</i> , No 939, <i>Trump v. United States</i> , 603 U.S. ____ (2024).....	4, 13-15
<i>United States v. Guest</i> , 383 U.S. 745, 765 (1966).....	13, 15
<i>Wetmore v. Karrick</i> , 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907).....	4

CONSTITUTION

US Const. Amend I.....	1-15
US Const. Amend V.....	1-15
US Const Amend. XIII.....	1-15
US Amend. XIV.....	1-15
US Art I.....	7, 13
US Art III.....	7, 13

Executive orders

E.O. 13798.....	1-15
Ex. Or. No. 13198, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021.....	1-15
Ex. Or. No. 13199, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, May 3, 2018....	1-15
Ex. Or. No. 13279, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No. 13559, November 17, 2010.....	1-15
Ex. Or. No. 13559 Nov. 17, 2010.....	1-15
Ex Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018.....	1-15
Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021.....	1-15

Statutes:

Freedom of Information Act 5 U.S.C. § 552(b).....	12
The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, Pub. L. No. 103-141, 107 Stat. 1488 (November 16, 1993), codified at 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb through 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-4...	1-15

Supreme Court Rules

Rule 44.....	1, 7
--------------	------

I. STATEMENT OF CASE

I, Meghan Kelly, Esq., pro se pursuant to Rules 44, US Amend (“Am”) I, V rights (“rt(s)”) to meaningful access to the courts, Equal Protections (“EP”) pursuant to the 5th Amendment’s EP component, to petition (“pet”), with fair opportunity to be heard pursuant to US Am I, V, and any other law in the interest of justice move this Court (“ct”) based on intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented. I appeal the Order dated 10/7/24, denying 5th Am recusal of Justice Jackson, denying an extension without DP, and failure to distribute and consider the filed supplemental brief for an extension for an opportunity to petition this Court fairly on attacks against its institution, denying the petition for writ of certiorari and leaving unaddressed or ignored the IFP Motion.

I resubmit herewith my Pet to file in forma pauperis with the required affidavit again with objections to debt on religious grounds US Am I, V, and file it herewith. I incorporate from the record the unaddressed Pet to file in forma pauperis, rejected Pet for rehearing, the undistributed and unconsidered other brief to recuse Jackson and for deferment of conference to allow me to file a supplemental record, and Pet for writ of certiorari and all exhibits thereto into this petition for rehearing. I incorporate all the attached documents hereto into this petition on all pages.

II. ARGUMENT

I appeal the intervening circumstance of the denial of the recusal Justice Jackson as violating my right to a fair proceeding. US Amend V. I also appeal because other new intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or other substantial grounds not previously presented arose I have not been afforded opportunity to petition this Court to consider, including but not limited to, the failure to distribute a supplemental brief to the entire

Court, new state attacks, Trump winning the 11/5/24 election, and new similar government attacks against perceived dissidents of President Trump to affect the outcome of live cases in violation of US Amend I, V, Art I, III, which will continue to eliminate the court's function to allow for the intentional planned dissolution of these United States if the Court does not permit petitioners access to the courts in accord with DP and EP and other arguments that affect the outcome of this case. My case manager was replaced. Per the attached 11/5/24 letter the new case manager rejected the attached Pet for rehearing dated 10/25/24 possibly in error. She requested I alter the Certification and reply by or 11/20/24. I comply with her instructions.

This reciprocal attorney discipline case arises based on DE's punishment to chill my rt to pet based on viewpoint of speech and association of the parties where it deemed my religious beliefs in Jesus to be a disability justifying placing my license to practice law on inactive disabled. The DE Sup Ct incited a disciplinary case against me to cover up its own misconduct in inciting attacks against me to cause me to forgo RFRA lawsuit *Kelly v Trump* in violation of my rt to pet fairly and in retaliation against me for my private exercise of petitioning to sue former President Trump under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, and the 1st Am Free exercise and establishment clause provisions to alleviate a substantial burden his establishment of gov religion by a course of conduct and certain executive orders caused upon my free exercise of religious belief. I am punished in this case for suing President Trump based on viewpoint of speech by petitioning to restrain a President's conduct within the purview of the Const and statutory limits, where the President is unfairly deemed above the law by immunity and the people a President harms, including me as a party of one, are rendered below the law's protection. US Am I, V, IV.

The Constitutionality of Presidential immunity by recent case law and by imprudent dismissals such as in my case *Kelly v Trump* conflicts and vitiates other Constitutional checks

such as the government's check upon all the government via the US Attorney Generals. I sought to address the recent events and issues in a supplemental brief by noting concerns and the need for time to do so. However, this court filed but **left undistributed the brief the supplemental brief**. I was deprived of fair opportunity to be heard before violation of my 1st Am right to pet. US Amend I, V. It was not considered by the entire court. These issues must be addressed to prevent a schemed overthrow, and to prevent continued irreparable injury to me in terms of loss of First Amendment rights.

Even if USSC does not grant me time, it must in the interest of justice consider the arguments against immunity contained in the filed but undistributed brief intended for the entire Ct so as not to deprive me of the 1st Am rt to pet without DP.

“Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary all have a duty to support and defend the Constitution.” *Salazar v. Buono*, 559 U.S. 700 “There is no ‘de minimis’ defense to a First Amendment violation.” *Doe v. Indian River Sch. Dist.*, 653 F.3d 256, 259. “The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.” *Mullin v. Sussex County*, 861 F. Supp. 2d 411, 415. I will continue to suffer government threats and obstructions to my 1st Am rights to petition, speech, access to the cts, religious belief, exercise of religious beliefs, affiliation and association by the state if the USSC does not help me by upholding the Constitutional limits from government overreach in this case. I am standing up for my personal freedom to worship Jesus according to the dictates of my conscience, even if no one else shares the same beliefs, without government persecution.

I am deprived of the 1st Am access to the cts and any opportunity to be heard at all in accord with the 5th Am. when the Ct does not distribute or hear colorable pleadings by mistake. I am prejudiced by an unfair deprivation of my fundamental rights outlined in the Supplemental

Brief by denial of access to the courts. Accordingly, I ask the Ct to please cure the defects, and consider my arguments in the filed but undistributed supplemental brief.¹

I petitioned the entire court in the undistributed brief. I desired time to draft a supplemental brief the entire court did not consider. It was not a mere recusal I requested. I made legal material arguments against Presidential immunity. I also asserted a fair opportunity to petition USSC to consider the new impending threats to an impartial proceeding in my case where congress through AOC and Whitehouse threatened Justice Thomas and Alito of disciplinary suits made to compel self-incrimination to be used to impeach USSC members in violation of the 5th to commandeer the court to rule by Congress's whims. Congress threatened Justice Alito to recuse in an active case Trump v US 939, to affect the outcome in Trump's case and on issues in my case which is undue influence that violated my right to petition fairly on issues Congress commandeers the court by threats. Congress's recent threats of impeachment, investigatory power and public ridicule of Ct members to affect the outcome of cases despite the Speech and debate clause violate my rt to pet fairly. US Amend I, V.

The threats were made to commandeer the court to compel it to adopt disciplinary proceedings against its members an issue I oppose in my own cases. USSC succumbed to temptations and adopted a code only to be unshielded by the Const limits by more threats.

I am unfairly deprived of DP by congressional government attacks against court members to commandeer it on issues in my case depriving me of a fair not threatened, defensive retaliatory forum. I preserved for the record my Constitutional objections to disciplinary

¹ USSC held in *St. L. S.F.R.R. v. Spiller*, 275 U.S. 156 (1927) "Errors by court "due to mistake of the clerk may be corrected after expiration of the term at which the judgment was entered." ("emphasis intended"). Ct in *Wetmore v. Karrick*, 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907) "The judgment of dismissal... having been entered improvidently through a mistake or oversight as to an entry of record, the Mass court did not thereby lose jurisdiction, and had the power to vacate the dismissal and restore the case to the docket after the term." USSC in *Wetmore v. Karrick*, 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907), further held, "judgments of dismissal by mistake are excepted" from the bar of statute of limitations on DP grounds.

proceedings against this USSC on DP grounds. I am unfairly compelled to appear before an unfair, defensive retaliatory forum partial towards self-preservation not the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law. I seek to remove those threats, even when I preserve my right to petition to correct errors.

The gov attacks against USSC members and their wives based on recusal issues and disciplinary rules foreseeably deprived me of a fair forum where I seek to overturn the lower Cts order for failure to recuse Phipps and Scirica on more distinguished grounds. Phipps stands to pecuniary benefit by a more likely seat on the USSC should the court deny my requests for relief since Trump twice appointed him on a list of potential USSC Justice nominees, and Scirica benefits by preserving his hard work I seek to dismantle and destroy by ruling against me to prevent against judicial disciplinary rules he chairs. I oppose judicial disciplinary codes especially against the USSC on Constitutional grounds this Ct has thus far refused to consider only to harm itself.

I previously argued the USSC may only be disciplined or corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits of case and controversy or impeachment. I now contest impeachment as ineffectual. I drafted 5 proposed articles of impeachment against Trump. They do not uphold justice, and are used to manipulate the court and make a mockery of the Constitution. I also seek to preserve life-time limits so as not to deprive me of an impartial forum, tempting the USSC to become a partial forum to the fickle fads of Congress people who preserve or deny seats based on unfair partial whims. RI judges have life time appointments. RI is the fairest state forum not biased towards evading threats instead of upholding the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law. Impeachments do not work. John Jay admitted so, despite supporting them. England eliminated impeachments because they do not work. Congress through its attorney

Todd Garvey even conceded this USSC may limit its investigatory power to protect the superseding rights 1st and 5th Am right to pet. coupled with DP in cases and controversies so as not to threaten and commandeer the Courts. Art I, Art III in *Law, History, Practice and procedure, in Congressional Research service* dated May 12, 2017 at page 4 by Citing *Sinclair v. United States*, 279 U.S. 263, 295 (1929), holding, “It may be conceded that Congress is without authority to compel disclosure for the purpose of aiding the prosecution of pending suits...” Id

I ask this USSC to make this the limit by law to prevent threats towards judges, their wives, their kids or themselves, attorney generals, me as applied, other petitioners and witnesses by Congress’s improper use of investigatory or impeachment powers to commandeer the court in violation of separation of Article I and Article III powers where congress seeks to act in place of Art III judges to force rulings by threat in violation of my 1st and 5th Am rights as applied.

The intent is the Constitutional issue and I as a petitioner have standing to allege malice. Gov attacks against Alito and his wife were made intentionally to force the Courts finding on issues of discipline with intent to deprive me of a fair forum to foreseeably affect the outcome on issues in my case in violation of US Am I, V and so Congress’s powers must be limited not limitless. USSC gave into temptation to deprive petitioners of rts by enacting a code of conduct that violate my rt to DP as applied. Per the attached 5 articles of impeachment and the fact even John Adams and John Jay noted impeachments do not work, and England got rid of impeachments because commandeering the court by threats violates DP and does not uphold a fair and impartial forum, I ask USSC to consider whether the implied investigatory and statutory impeachment powers must be limited or removed so as not to deprive public and private petitioners of DP. I desire to afford the Solicitor General a way to preserve her power and the US AGs power and my Constitutional legal power to pet coupled with 5th Amt DP fairly to be

heard, EP as a class who sues or prosecutes the president, and 1st Am rt to pet without vitiation based on 1st Am viewpoint of speech in petition against the President as neither above the law nor below the law. Congress and the Cts must also be bound not immune from Const limits too.

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

The Court violated my 5th Am right to due process fairness by failure to recuse Justice Jackson when she gave an advisory opinion against me on issues in my case on 9/1/24 where she indicated she rejected my arguments before conference with the entire court unfairly. She cannot be fair. Moreover, speaking publicly on tv risks great danger of inciting mob unrest or additional congressional and presidential attacks against opponent colleagues on the court.

Rule 44 does not allow opposing counsel to respond. I asked her position if I respectfully requested this Court to request her response. She did not oppose my request. Please request a response by the solicitor general. Last month DE placed an impediment on my access to the law library to intentionally prejudice this case, other cases, and possible future cases relating to the subject of this dispute. She is better equipped with resources to protect this Court in this case.

This Court is in trouble. This case may be the only vehicle to preserve this court and the rule of law that sustains these US from schemed demise.

I ask USSC to please hear evidence I previously was not able to petition to address in this case to alleviate and protect the rule of law by upholding my right to petition fairly without

continuous and impending new and arising gov threats and obstacles to fair proceedings, not limited to obstruction to the law library DE.

This reciprocal case arises from Delaware's punishment of me disparately in contravention of the 1st Am for private speech outlined in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act petition petitions, where my religious belief is material to the issues therein, based on subject matter grounds of disagreeing with my religious belief, and viewpoint in petitions. *Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada*, 501 U.S. 1030, 1054 (1991) ("At the very least, our cases recognize that disciplinary rules governing the legal profession cannot punish activity protected by the 1st Am, and that 1st Am protection survives even when the attorney violates a disciplinary rule he swore to obey when admitted to the practice of law"). Not only did the state punish me for the exercise of 1st Am rts, but on or about 10/16/24, but as predicted in the IFP, the **state agents continue to** violate my 1st Am rt to pet to defend my religious beliefs and other claims.

On 10/16/24 State capital police with DE Supreme Court and law librarians colluded to confiscate my law library card in secret by stealth as I went through the metal detector to create an obstacle to my meaningful access to the cts. The Chancery Court denied me parking for the law library previously permitted to obstruct my ability to petition against its members to affect the outcome of cases and future cases. Although Staff Attorney Robinson of the DE Supreme Ct indicated I could take her spot when the capital police said, "no I could not park there," I did not feel safe but threatened.

Capital police asked me what are you going to do and badgered me as Staff attorney came to my defense. Law librarian Naylor sent me an application for a new card. The next day, 10/17/24 state agent said it would preemptively deny the application. I did not apply. State denied me access to the courts previously allegedly because I did not have the card they appeared

to take. So, they will likely deny me access to the library again should I physically drive to the physical law library. I have not had access to the physical law library. Desperate on **11/13/24** I emailed the law librarian for one case, received it and received an out of office response to obstruct additional requests for legal research.

Summer 2024, DE denied me access to the records in my own cases and refused to make public items it previously in bad faith sealed to cover up state's 1st Am violations applicable to it via the 14th Am in Kelly v Trump and to otherwise continue to cover up evidence necessary to defend myself in this case and all related cases. Neither Westlaw or Lexis had access through the public docket. I provided the docket the concealed evidence with Court stamps to Lexis. Lexis noted there was no order to seal them, and the Clerk's deceptive statements **despite the fact evidence in my favor necessary to my defense in this reciprocal case remain concealed.**

Lexis published them per my request attached hereto at Kelly v. Trump_ 2021 DE S. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 422 and 423. Since continued deprivations of access to this court and material evidence was and remains concealed in bad faith to prejudice and actually prejudice this case and related case by DE, discoverable only after I filed the petition that affect the outcome of this case. This Court must in the interest of justice reconsider the evidence and continued threat of harm towards me in light of potential new law suits against me pending a finding in this case where I will be intentionally deprived of access to the courts by DE to continue their cover up of unlawful conduct by the state and its agents. US Amend I, XIV.

I appeal the intervening circumstance, the deprivation from being heard by the entire Court on the Supplemental Brief attached hereto to consider different constitutional issues relating to recent government ("gov") attacks to force US Supreme Court members recusal or judicial discipline creating a threatened court and depriving me of the 1st Am rt to pet fairly in

accord US Amend V on issues in my case and leaving ignored arguments to preserve the rule of law to restrain the president.

The gov attacks to threaten and commandeer the courts, their kids or wives and threaten parties not limited to Special counsel David Weiss or Jack Smith with congressional or foreseeable executive compliance (under the 2025 playbook or otherwise) materially prejudices my right to fairly petition to overturn the lower courts' decision below and in related cases. I based my arguments in this appeal on arguments Congress petitions or acts as a witness without Art III authority by threat, without 6th Am right to cross examine congressional assertions in this quasi-crim case. I appeal to overturn the Order below based on violation of DP by lower Ct's denial of recusals of Phipps and Scirica and my related Constitutional arguments against Judicial disciplinary rules and proceedings against federal judges and the US Supreme Court members specifically because it causes an unfair, threatened forum partial to those enforcing the rules or threatening it to comply to recusal or be impeached instead of the impartial application of the rule of law to protect my right to petition fairly and Art I, Art III separation of powers to prevent congress or the Pres Art II, from acting as judge and jury by being the judge on issues in their own petitions outside of the Art III purview by threats. ²

It is not fair that Congressmen like Whitehouse can petition against me on issues in my case with threats of impeachment, public disrepute against members of this highest court by abusing speech and debate clause and testifying against me without affording me 6th Am rights. The cure is to limit the other two branches to preserve the 1st Am right to pet fairly to prevent congress or the president from ruling over the courts like mobsters by might, mob rule or money

² *Morrison v. Olson*, 487 U.S. 654 (1988), was a Supreme Court of the United States decision that determined the Independent Counsel Act was constitutional. So, appointment of Jack Smith and David Weiss was done in good faith with statutory authority.

extortion or bribes to control the outcome of the cases unfairly in violation of separation of powers. A ruling limiting the other two branches within the purview of the Constitutional limits to safeguard the right to pet fairly in accord with the 5th Am. would remove the need from making them a party to a case. We do not make law makers or the governors or presidents who sign laws come into court when those laws are unconstitutional per se or as applied. Similarly, this Court may restrict Congress and the President's official actions to preserve the right to petition fairly to preserve the rule of law and the courts which sustains these United States.

The new and continuously arising Congressional or Presidential attacks against parties, Courts and their family members regarding whether Trump is above the law to affect the outcome of live cases is material to this case and all of my related cases. This reciprocal case arises based on DE placing my license to practice law on disability because I sued president Trump, and to cover up the out of court attacks against me, a party in a case Kelly v Trump, by threats in a grocery store by an agent Court of Common Pleas Judge Kenneth Clark and other government threats to violate my 1st and 5th Am rts to pet fairly applicable to the state via the 14th Am. similar to the new government backed threats arising against Jack Smith and NY Judge Merchan by congress and Texas AG Paxton to impermissibly commandeer the outcome of cases occurring after the release of Trump's selection as President elect after 11/5/24.

Per the attached two letters congress colludes with Texas AG to threaten to prosecute or sue Attorney Jack Smith to compel him to self-incriminate against the 5th Am, to violate attorney client product to protect all of the government not the biased, unfair, partial, horse and pony forum of congress to be exploited for selfish political gain by jeopardizing the rule of law that sustains these United States. The threats are made with the intent or with reckless inexcusable disregard that it would violate the government's 1st and 5th Amendment rights to

petition fairly or not in ongoing cases. Congress and their colluding Attorney General are out of line with the limits of the Constitution as law.

Texas AG cites *National Archives and Records Administration v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004). This case allegedly holds FOIA does not apply if the requested data fall within one or more exemptions. Exemption 7(C) excuses from disclosure “records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes” if their production “could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” §552(b)(7)(C). Gov exceeds its investigatory power to chill to diminish the AG's 1st Am right to petition fairly without threats and it is not okay. Similarly, Congress threatens criminal charges against a NY Judge and threatens his daughter per the attached Article dated Nov 10, 2024 to affect the outcome in sentencing or not President elect Trump in violation of separation of Art I, Art II powers including Paxon's misuse of authority and Art III powers. I petitioned the Ct for time to research to file a supplemental brief to protect this court's members and the right to petition fairly because of the recent attacks against Justice Alito and Thomas, but this Ct failed to distribute my filed brief.

11/5/24 Trump was reelected President. 11/10/24 Congress threatened criminal action against NY Judge in NY v Trump case where the jury convicted Trump and sentencing awaits to affect the outcome on the live matter in violation of US Amend I, V. On 11/8/24, Congress and Texas AG threatened to investigate to criminally prosecute Special counsel Jack Smith impermissibly like I was threatened by the government to affect the outcome of a case against the same person President Trump.

The 2025 playbook alleges to eliminate the discretion and independence of AGs by commandeering who and whether they may prosecute based on Art I, Art II whim. Past case law must be distinguished or overturned so as not to chill the government's right to petition to defend

all of its members including the court's integrity and impartiality and Art III powers from Art I and II schemed overreach. The USSC must limit Congressional immunity under the speech and debate clause so as to uphold and not infringe or violate the 1st, and 5th Am rights to petition fairly without congressional or executive threats against parties, their counsel including attorney generals, and petitioners like me, judges or any of their family members, in light of the recent attacks against Jack Smith, Judge Merchen, Justice Alito, Justice Thomas, and their family, daughter or wives.

This Court must distinguish or possibly overrule the case *McGrain v. Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135 where an Attorney General's brother was attacked and punished based on Congressional intent to commandeer attorney generals and act as judges in place of Art III judges to punish the government's exercise of the 1st Am right to prosecute or not to force them to prosecute or not prosecute by government threat of self-incrimination, impeachment, sanctions, criminal charges, or marketed unwarranted disrepute substantially burdening the impartial, fair, unbiased rule of law that founded sustains and maintains these United States to prevent the framework for a schemed overthrow by commandeering.

This Court errantly deemed president Trump above the law with absolute discretion for official acts, leaving the Constitution as a lie not the law. No 939. USSC held the Const applies to the government not private people unless exceptions apply.³ USSC held the Const does not apply to the government because lawlessness immunity is the law. No 939. USSC allows for its own destruction and the overthrow of these United States for removing the Supreme rule of law by making the Const the exception, not the law should it not consider petitions to reverse its clear error. USSC not only failed to consider my petition but violated DP by not distributing it creating

³ E.g., *Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 156 (1978); *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 930 (1982); *United States v. Guest*, 383 U.S. 745, 765 (1966). See FN 5 at page 15 herein.

structural error that must be cured to prevent manifest injustice not only in terms of vitiating fundamental rights but for allowing the overthrow and elimination of the rule of law that founded, sustains and maintains the US. Federalist letter 78 is wrong.

In 2018 I ran for office per the attached news article at App B, Ex 8 because non-lawyers were lawyering. I learned there was a plan to eliminate judges to eliminate the rule of law that founded, sustains and maintains these United States with the passage of the bill of rights in Dec 15, 1791 which gave the people the right to petition coupled with due process fairness before impartial forums to **enforce the rule of law more fairly forming a democratic republic.**

The nation was not formed in 1776 with a group of guys forming the confederation of the United States by self-proclaimed power as law makers in a **one branch government** under the lie of consent when there was no meeting of minds or consent.⁴ On page 10-11 in CRS, *Congress's Contempt power and enforcement of congressional subpoenas: Law, History, Practice and Procedure*, by Congress's attorney Todd Garvey legislative Attorney May 12,

⁴ The Founders booby trapped us by certain texts of the Constitution with knowledge of the scientific experiment to allow for a new world order, which I do not have room to elaborate on at this time, but are important to petition to prevent the schemed overthrow of government. One lie that left a crack to make the foundation of this nation fall was Hamilton's Federalist 78 letter where he asserted in other words the president rules by the sword by mobster like might. Congress rules by the purse like a mobster by bribes or extortion and the Court is the weakest branch. All 3 falsities are not true. The government governs by the rule of law not like a mobster through temptations and economic, social and physical scientific conditioning to control a no longer free but slave people to be slaughtered as sheep and sacrificed to wolves who eat the fate of their labor by lawless unjust gains under the lie lawlessness is the law. The professed purpose of the nation is to protect life and liberty not to sacrifice it and enslave the people under the legal fiction, the lie of consent or for vain desire for happiness. Franklin added happiness, when my God teaches enslaved to lawlessness are those who live based on desires, including gratifications, to be controlled not free by those who entice them in a slave system of deception. My God and the just rule of law teaches me to lay down our desires and the desires of men to do what is right by restraining ourselves from sacrificing or enslaving the lives and liberties of others by making mammon God, the mark of the beast, aka lawlessness leading to certain damnation in hell should we not be corrected or restrained by love written in the hearts or the just rule of law. Assume my religious beliefs are stemmed in truth, that makes this imperfect Court's function and the private and public petition coupled with due process necessary indispensable to preserve life and liberty to save not only lives but eternal lives from the fires of hell. My God teaches "justice in the courts" as a command. Amos 5:15. Jesus teaches "justice, mercy and faithfulness" are greater commands. *Matthew* 23:23. My God teaches unclean hearts, hands and minds may be made clean by petitioner's and courts' correction, transforming what was once dead in sin alive. That makes you, even when I disagree with you, and my opponents, even when I disagree with them important to protect and to petition to correct when you are led astray to harm yourselves or others.

2017, Congress acknowledges no authority for fines or monetary damages has been found, but it argues for it, and desires to create it by partial whim as an implied power to threaten to eliminate this court to create a one branch government to lay a foundation for a one world order by eliminating the rule of law which restrains public, even Presidents, and private people from human sacrifice and enslavement for partial, biased whimsical desires cloaked in official conduct. I seek to preserve our Democratic Republic from dissolution by pet to uphold the Const. USSC held the Const applies to the government not private people unless exceptions apply.⁵ USSC held the Const does not apply to the government because lawlessness immunity is the law. No 939. This Court allows for its own destruction and the overthrow of these United States for removing the Supreme rule of law by making the Constitution the exception, not the law should it not reverse course to save these United States.

III. Conclusion:

Wherefore I pray this Court grants just relief.


I especially pray this Court grants the Honorable Solicitor General an opportunity to respond since Rule 44 deprives her of that opportunity unless this Court grants it.

⁵ E.g., *Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 156 (1978) ("most rights secured by the Constitution are protected only against infringement by governments"); "[T]he Due Process Clause protects individuals only from governmental and not from private action." *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 930 (1982); "[T]he [non-gov] party charged . . . must be a person who may fairly be said to be a state actor. This may be because he is a state official, because he has acted together with or has obtained significant aid from state officials, or because his conduct is otherwise chargeable to the State," despite not being a member of the government as a private person per se. *Id.* at 937. The Supreme Court has recognized only two exceptions to the general rule that constitutional claimants must satisfy the government-action requirement. First, the 13th Am. "applies to private conduct as well as government action." 13th amendment provides, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude ...shall exist within the United States" Thus, a claimant who alleges that he/she has been subjected to slavery, or involuntary servitude need not prove that government action was involved. Second, the Court has stated that the privilege of United States citizens to use public roads is protected against private as well as governmental infringement. *United States v. Guest*, 383 U.S. 745, 765 (1966). This rule may extend to other, similar privileges of United States citizens as well. **These exceptions must be used to prevent the schemed overthrow after 2050 in petitions.**

Dated

Nov. 15, 2024

Respectfully submitted,




/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
US Bar Number 283696

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

Dated:

Nov. 15, 2024
Meghan Kelly
(printed)



(signed)

CERTIFICATION OF COUNSEL (RULE 44)

I certify that the Petition for Rehearing from Denial of Certiorari is presented in good faith and not for delay and is restricted to the grounds specified in Supreme Court Rule 44.2 limited to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

Dated: Nov. 15, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
US Supreme Court Number 283696

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

Dated: Nov. 15, 2024

Meghan Kelly
(printed)

Meghan Kelly
(signed)