

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Meghan Kelly  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.  
Swartz, et.al  
Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Civil Action No. ~~1:21-1490~~ (CFC)

Appo  
LEAD

PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 93rd AFFIDAVIT

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

1. I am still drafting a complaint against Biden per the attached, and intend to file something to make the government fund all branches not merely two. This issue is capable of repetition and yet evading review. I think the Court should rule it unconstitutional under the Equal protection's component of 5th Amendment and the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment right against involuntary servitude without bartered for pay to fully fund the members of the executive branch and Congressional branch while failing to pay members of the judiciary branch for work done.

2. I apprised this court debt is against my religious belief. Money is currently coined to enslave people and the government to debt.

3. The US Supreme Court held the greenbacks President Lincoln coined which were made by Congressional authority were lawful and Constitutional in Knox v Lee, 79 U.S. 457 (1871).

4. Thus the Congressional authority granted to Janet Yellen to coin money without debt and interest to fully fund the courts should be held Constitutional.

5. What is not Constitutional is the violation of the equal protection clause by paying two branches and leaving the courts unpaid to work by compelled involuntary servitude without pay under the risk of losing a position they may not be paid for.

6. I am really freaked out. I have to include more facts than I realized and supply more papers in this appeal to defend my life and liberty against potentially even the US Supreme Court should they seek to sue me to by finding my religious beliefs repugnant.

7. I have to do what is right, not for what is convenient to others which I believe damns people to hell.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Dated

9/30//23

Respectfully submitted,  
Meghan M. Kelly  
Meghan Kelly, Esquire  
34012 Shawnee Drive  
Dagsboro, DE 19939 [meghankellyesq@yahoo.com](mailto:meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)  
(302) 493-6693

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:

9/30/23

Meghan Kelly (printed)

[Signature] (signed)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Meghan Kelly	)	Civil Action No.:
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	
JOSEPH BIDEN,	)	
President of the United States,	)	
in his official capacity,	)	
and,	)	
JANET YELLEN, Secretary of Treasury,	)	
in her official capacity	)	
Defendants.	)	

Plaintiff's Complaint to enjoin Defendants from failing to pay federal government and from suspending the operations of the federal government on the ground Congress has not passed a budget by or before September 30, 2023, and for a writ of mandamus to require Biden and Yellen to coin money under 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) without debt or interest and without regard to the private entity the Federal Reserve

1. Plaintiff Meghan Kelly, Esq., pro se pursuant to FRCP 65 and Act and 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), asks this court to enjoin the President Joseph Biden, in his official capacity as the President of the United States, and Janet Yellen, in her official capacity as Secretary of Treasury, (collectively "Defendants"), from not paying federal workers and from suspending the operations of the federal government on the ground Congress has not passed a budget by or before September 30, 2023 on 1<sup>st</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment grounds and further requests this Court sign a writ of mandamus to require Defendants to coin money without interest or debt under 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) to pay off the national debt in full or in the alternative to pay for federal employees and the operations of the federal government for all sums exceeding the budget shortfall and states as follows:

**Parties**

2. Meghan Kelly is an attorney in the state of Delaware whose license is placed on inactive/disabled but for her exercise of her private 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment right to petition to sue former



President Donald J. Trump in the Delaware Chancery Court to alleviate a substantial burden upon her religious exercise under the RFRA and to dissolve the establishment of government religion. I am currently seeking to appeal judgments, and a dismissal of a civil rights case. I must safeguard my only hope of a savior to preserve my Constitutional freedoms, the courts.

3. Defendant Joseph Biden is the President of the United States (“Biden”). He is a resident of the state of Delaware and may be sued in his official capacity through the local US Attorney General David Weiss, Esq. located at Hercules Building, U.S. Attorney's Office, 1313 N Market Street, PO Box 2046, Wilmington, DE 19801.

4. Defendant Janet Yellen is the Secretary of Treasury (Yellen). Defendant Janet Yellen is the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and, in that position, is responsible for financing the federal government's operations. She may be served through the US Attorney General David Weiss located at Hercules Building, U.S. Attorney's Office, 1313 N Market Street, PO Box 2046, Wilmington, DE 19801.

### **Venue**

5. Venue is appropriate since Plaintiff Kelly is a resident of Delaware under 28 U.S.C § 1391 (e) (c).

### **Jurisdiction**

6. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

### **Background**

7. In 2016 I discovered non-attorney out of state title companies were practicing real estate law without a license messing up the chain of title at the Recorder of Deeds, taking

advantage of attorneys like my esteemed deceased colleague Richard Goll, Esq, and losing income tax for the state of Delaware for business performed out of state, despite my religious objections to taxes.

8. I learned attorney disciplinary rules do not restrain non-attorneys and non-judges such as out of state title companies from practicing law without a license.

9. So, I ran for office in 2018 in hopes to prevent non-attorneys from practicing law without a license to prevent harm to the public.

10. I lost the election, but I learned there is a real agenda to eliminate people judges and people lawyers required to uphold the individual exercise of private Constitutional rights from being eliminated or sacrificed by the marketed or bought, but not actual majority's represented choice, through the vote. See the Exhibits attached hereto and incorporated herein.

11. There is evidence of an agenda to eliminate judges' authority to uphold justice in the courts to be supplanted by injustice through a global agenda to implement a carbon credit debt system through the central banks and other entities who create or control money or debt through digital currency, blockchain or other means to enslave a no longer free people to bend their will to the control of those who control the resources unrestrained by the just rule of law.

12. There is evidence of a schemed slow overthrow of these United States by private and foreign government backed partners taking over the government's authority, to recoup or control resources owed to it by the government through treaties, executive orders, grants or contracts or other exercise of government authority, in order to control the government by controlling the resources to eliminate the government's power to restrain businesses, charities,

banks, not for profits, churches or other entities from enslaving, oppressing, killing, stealing or destroying human life, liberty or health by the just rule of law.

13. There is evidence of a non-violent intentionally schemed rebellion to overthrow the government by eliminating the rule of law and the authority by the judiciary by those the government owes the private and foreign partners, including but not limited to the Federal Reserve, World Bank, IMF in my attempt to require congress coin money without debt and interest to eliminate slavery to safeguard Constitutional freedoms to buy and sell by free not government backed private or foreign choice through currency controlled by those who gain more the worse off we are in.

14. I also seek to dissolve any and all executive orders with the WHO, UN, and any other global entity or agreement this court may deem a threat to national security due to elimination of independence by compromised corrupt collusion with foreign or private entities which eliminate Constitutional liberties by compelled, conditional, compliance. Executive orders creating relationships with global entities eliminate the United States independence that is required to make us free not compromised, corrupt and enslaved to global wicked interests of those who control the resources to rule over people, not adhere to laws protecting their liberty.

15. To maintain our independence that make us free this Court must dissolve the executive orders granting relationships with the UN, WHO and maybe more organizations.

16. To maintain our independence that make us a free people protected by the Constitutional rule of law this court must also dissolve government private relationships and partnerships. No grants or contracts should be given to any private or foreign entity as this creates a forced and unfair market that makes private and foreign partners above the law and the

people for sale slaves in a fixed subpar economy where standards harm and exploit people to serve profit, positions and power under ordered control.

17. Under the lie of welfare, security and safety compelled conditional compliance to nongovernment entities within and outside of the US as opposed to the Constitutional provisions of safeguarding people's lives and liberty, the executive orders and private partnerships create the threats and harm to sustain their positions, power and streams of profit. The relationships eliminate freedom by ordered control.

18. Impartiality by the President is required under the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Equal Protections component. When the President corrupts the government by compromising the independence of this country to the collective, conditional, collaborative aims of organizations whose focus is eliminating freedom by economically, or physically compelled conformity ordered control elimination of freedom is the aim.

19. The Fourteenth Amendment section 4 provides in part, "But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void."

20. All of the money owed by the Federal government to private and foreign partners including but not limited to the Federal Reserve, and global banks, including the BIS, IMF, World Bank are debt and obligations incurred in aid of a non-violent insurrection to overthrow the government by indebting to enslave to control a no longer independent government and its people, and may arguably be deemed illegal or void.

21. Yet, the schemed overthrow of the government may be prevented should the government coin without debt and interest to eliminate and discharge by payment debts owed.

22. The Federal Reserve's creation of debt and interest on debt through interest rates for every dollar the Treasury prints out of slavery debt is illegal as in violation of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment by involuntary compelled servitude and my First Amendment right to religious belief and exercise of religious beliefs.

23. The Federal Reserve is a private corporation, containing banks as shareholders. In their private capacity as banks, the worse off the people are, the more money they create out of debt they may sell people and the government to gain not only profit in terms of the debt created owed for lending out what they did not physically have, but profit on interest.<sup>1</sup> There is

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hubbard v. Fed. Rsrv. Bank of Atlanta*, No. CIV.A. 96-2354, 1996 WL 551496, at \*1 (E.D. La. Sept. 26, 1996) ("Federal Reserve Banks are independent corporations owned by commercial banks in their geographic regions"); *Id.* ("While the Federal Reserve Board regulates the Reserve Banks, direct supervision and control of each Bank is exercised by its board of directors. 12 U.S.C. § 301. Each Reserve Bank is statutorily empowered to conduct its activities **without day-to-day direction from the federal government.**"); *Lewis v. United States*, 680 F.2d 1239 (9th Cir. 1982) ("Federal reserve banks are **not federal instrumentalities** for purposes of a Federal Tort Claims Act, but **are independent, privately owned and locally controlled corporations** in light of fact that direct supervision and control of each bank is exercised by board of directors, federal reserve banks, though heavily regulated, are **locally controlled by their member banks, banks are listed neither as "wholly owned" government corporations nor as "mixed ownership" corporations**; federal reserve banks receive no appropriated funds from Congress and the banks are empowered to sue and be sued in their own names." 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 1346(b), 2671 et seq.; *Federal Reserve Act*, §§ 4, 10(a, b), 13, 13a, 13b, 14, 14(a-g), 16, 12 U.S.C.A. §§ 301, 341-360; 12 U.S.C.A. § 361; Government Corporation Control Act, §§ 101, 201, 31 U.S.C.A. §§ 846, 856.)); *Schaffer v. Pub. Emps. Ret. Sys.*, 21 Ohio St. 3d 86, 91, 488 N.E.2d 162, 165 (1986) ("Dissent, In *Lewis v. United States* (C.A. 9, 1982), 680 F.2d 1239, and *Arney v. United States* (Dec. 4, 1979), D.Tenn.No. 77-3503-NA-CV, unreported, the courts held that federal reserve banks were **not federal agents** for purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act, Section 1346(b), Title 28, U.S. Code. Both courts noted that Congress structured the reserve banks as **corporate entities owned by commercial banks** 'under the supervision and control' of their own boards of directors and subject only to general supervision by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. See Sections 301 and 248(j), Title 12, U.S. Code. Both the *Lewis* and *Arney* courts thoroughly analyzed the operation and the legislative history of the Federal Reserve Act and found, among other things, that the federal government had no financial involvement in the banks, the banks were **independent corporations**, the banks primarily serviced **private business** and financial entities, and the federal government did not control the daily operation of the banks. These courts also found that **federal reserve bank employees were not subject to federal governmental control**. The bank had the right to hire and fire its employees. The employees did not participate in the civil service retirement system or the federal workers' compensation programs, they were not subject to federal travel regulations, and they did not receive governmental employees' discounts. The Federal Reserve Act reflects the Congressional intent that federal reserve banks remain non-governmental entities. Although federal reserve bank policy with respect to interest rates and the like remains under the general supervision of the federal reserve board, the banks are private entities separate and distinct from the government. The drafters of the Federal Reserve Act made clear the private function of federal reserve banks: 'The Federal reserve banks \* \* \* would be in effect cooperative institutions, carried on **for the benefit of the community and of the banks themselves by the banks acting as stockholders therein**. \* \* \* The committee, however, recommends that they shall be individually organized and individually controlled, each holding the fluid

aa conflict of interest since central banks like the private federal reserve gain more power, importance in position, and private profit the worse off the Country and the American people are. The shareholding banks of the federal reserve have incentive to make America and the people worse off. Banks gain more profit on debt interest, the worse off, and the more debt America and Americans are in. The wars we wage, are never for freedom, but enslave the people to pay back the debt and debt on interest to the banks, the Federal Reserve gains through military spending, while enriching businesses who make money off of the artificially created need to serve greed under the guise of liberty. There are global plans alluded to by the World Economic Forum members (“WEF”) and participants of the World Government Summit (“WGS”) to create more waste, to create more debt, to gain more profit on debt for banks, and artificial need to serve business greed to private and foreign partners to fund research, contracts, grants, and carbon credits or debts, under the pretty name of science, to maintain debt control over the world.

---

funds of the region in which it is organized and each ordinarily dependent upon no other part of the country for assistance. The only factor of centralization which has been provided in the committee's plan is found in the Federal reserve board, which is to be a strictly Government organization created for the purpose of inspecting existing banking institutions and of regulating relationships between Federal reserve banks and between them and the government itself.’ H.R.Rep. No. 69, 63rd Cong., 1st Sess. (1913), 17–18.”)

<sup>1</sup> *Lewis v. United States*, 680 F.2d 1239 (9th Cir. 1982), (“The Reserve Banks are deemed to be federal instrumentalities for purposes of immunity from state taxation.”)  
*Schaffer v. Pub. Emps. Ret. Sys.*, 21 Ohio St. 3d 86, 488 N.E.2d 162 (1986) (“The Supreme Court held that federal reserve bank is “governmental entity ‘operated by’” United States Government so as to **qualify for credit within Public Employees Retirement System**”); [This does not seem fair that they get federal retirement benefits without oversight or Constitutional limits as a nonfederal instrumentality.] *See also, Farm Credit of Nw. Fla., ACA v. Easom Peanut Co.*, 312 Ga. App. 374, 384–85, 718 S.E.2d 590, 602 (2011) (Holding this bank entity was immune from suit as a government instrumentality, which makes banks above the law); *But See, McGee v. Tucoemas Fed. Credit Union*, 153 Cal. App. 4th 1351, 63 Cal. Rptr. 3d 808 (2007) (This Court holds the banks waive immunity); *Rheams v. Bankston, Wright & Greenhill*, 756 F. Supp. 1004 (W.D. Tex. 1991)(“Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas was not a “federal agency” within meaning of Federal Tort Claims Act and its employees were not employees of government for purposes of removing case to federal court. 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 1346(b), 2671.”).

24. While the shareholders or members of the Federal Reserve are private persons, they appear to gain the benefits of federal employees, such as retirement, while not being subjected to the liability in the form of federal limits. The Federal Reserve is not the Federal government, though I should like the Courts to find every entity the government delegates grants, contracts or authority to as government agents not protected by the Constitutional limits including the contract's clause, and US Amend XIII, instead limited by them, having reduced freedoms to safeguard the public under the supreme law of the land the Constitution.

25. The Federal Reserve is a private corporation ruling as opposed to governing and guiding due to Congress's delegation of its authority to control currency as a product to maintain its power, position and profit by barter or exchange. This entity exploits the people and the government to control and enslave the people by controlling the value of money under the deception of caring for the people.

26. The Federal government issues paper currency, officially called Federal Reserve notes and commonly called cash. A Federal Reserve note is an IOU from the Fed to the Federal Reserve. As such, it is a liability on the Fed's balance sheet.

27. The government through the treasury issues money, called federal reserve notes in the physical form of dollars or coins and gives them to the Federal Reserve for use by its bank members upon the Fed's request, while increasing debts of the government to enslave a no longer free people to pay back the free lunch for the banks' members' gain.

28. The notes are backed by financial assets that the Federal Reserve Banks pledge as collateral, which are not actually owned by the banks under fractional reserves. The notes are backed by other people's assets, which I believe is the definition of a Ponzi scheme. The notes

are mainly backed by Treasury securities and mortgage agency securities that the banks purchase on the open market by fiat payment using other people's money as their own through fractional reserve banking theories.

29. This jeopardize people's land and homes, should an economic crash occur, to serve the greed of banks and profiteering private and foreign entities, not the welfare of the people or this nation. Securitized property is schemed to be recouped by the banks when increases in taxes make it unaffordable to pay off tax liens. The Banks then recoup resources and property to give it those the banks, including the Federal Reserve owes. The members of the federal reserve do not lose their own personal assets, it is the people's securitized assets and the deposits in the banks that may be lost, despite the limited protection FDIC purports to give.

30. I am concerned this may cause a foreclosure crisis, leaving many homeless, if the court does not consider the welfare of the people more important than debt control, and power money grants to those who have it by unjust gains to buy influence.

31. The Federal reserve should not be charged with controlling the currency. The government must take back its coining power to care for the people while protecting individual liberty, not controlling the people, through money by indebtedness and grants to entities as opposed to individuals in need.

32. The way money is coined is the problem. The new digital currency is a worse problem that exacerbates and substantially burdens Constitutional freedom by slavery debt to the government backed private partners. I should like this Court to require Defendants to coin lawfully at all times, but during this emergency Complaint I humbly request this Court compel Defendants to coin money without debt and interest under 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) to pay off the



national debt in full or in the alternative to pay for federal employees and the operations of the federal government for all sums exceeding the budget given the exigent circumstances.

33. The Federal reserve members and the banks eliminate freedom by substantially burdening the will of the people by creating money out of debt slavery and controlling interest rates. I am a Christian. I believe people Janet Yellen and President Biden not only violate the US Amend XIII by enslaving the government and its people to Central banks and banks through fractional reserve, I also believe they violate God's laws as a Christian.

34. Debt slavery is against my religious belief. I believe Jesus when he teaches "you cannot serve God and money." Matthew 6:24. Those who make money their master and savior in place of God are evil to be damned to hell, because their love for money even through fundraising and charity drives out their love for one another replaced with the mark of the beast that this Court may erase should it require the government to coin lawfully. My God teaches people go to hell for charging debt in interest. Making money out of nothing with no value other than slavery debt plus interest is a far greater sin which the Federal Reserve commits. See, Ezekiel 18: (" He lends at interest and takes a profit. Will such a man live? He will not! Because he has done all these detestable things, he is to be put to death [in hell, the Second death}; his blood will be on his own head.")

35. I do not want people to go to hell. I believe the courts have the power to not only save lives but eternal lives too. I believe that the founders were imperfect fallible and even scheming men. I believe judges reflect the image of God when they care to think things out in order to do what is right by guiding misguiding people and protecting even those they are correcting.

36. Jesus teaches most people will go to hell on judgment day. Matthew 7:13-15. Jesus teaches many people think they follow him, but they are misled which is sad. See Luke 13:23-28. I believe judges in courts can help the blind see, and prevent them from going to hell. Ignorance is not innocence and people go to hell for not caring to know in order to love. I believe people judges can help them know to allow them more opportunity to turn away from living based on desires, sins, to lay down their desires to think things out to do what is right.

37. Presidents Lincoln, Jackson and Kennedy all proposed coining money without slavery debt to uphold the freedoms of the people. President Jackson misbehaved on how treated Indians, but he was correct about the banks.

38. President Lincoln created debt free, interest free money by signing the Act of Feb. 25, 1862, ch. 33 § 1, 12 stat. 345.28. President Kennedy signed FR 5605, Exec. Order No. 11110, which also created money without debt or interest, albeit after he was murdered it was withdrawn.

39. The United States Supreme Court indicated President Lincoln's paper money was constitutional, overturning a prior case. In *Knox v Lee*, 79 U.S. 457 (1871), the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Legal Tender Act, which authorized the printing of paper money, President Lincoln's Greenbacks, not redeemable in gold or silver, nor creating debt or incurring interest, did not violate the U.S. Constitution. In so ruling, the Court reversed its earlier decision in *Hepburn v. Griswold*, 8 Wall. 603, 623, 19 L.Ed. 513. There is a way out to reverse or prevent a planned economic crash.

40. President Kennedy's Order creating money without enslaving people to pay it back like Lincoln.

41. The law authorizing the Treasurer to coin the trillion dollar platinum coin looks similar to the mere executive order President Kennedy signed which he was apparently killed for. Kennedy's Executive Order was withdrawn after his death. Executive Order 11110 was issued by U.S. President John F. Kennedy on June 4, 1963. This executive order amended Executive Order 10289 (dated September 17, 1951) by delegating to the Secretary of the Treasury the president's authority to issue silver certificates under the Thomas Amendment of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended by the Gold Reserve Act. Kennedy allowed money to be coined without debt or interest.

42. Congress passed a law that allows the Secretary of the Treasury to coin money through the platinum bullion without debt and interest by her discretion, not the Federal Reserve. 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) provides: “(k) The Secretary may mint and issue platinum bullion coins and proof platinum coins in accordance with such specifications , designs , varieties , quantities , denominations , and inscriptions as the Secretary, in the Secretary's discretion , may prescribe from time to time”

43. Janet Yellen the Treasurer also indicates she would refuse to coin the platinum coin per the attached articles admissible under the periodical exception and admissions by a party opponent. It is true every note of money we have is an I owe you to slavery debt plus interest to those who lend out what they do not have placing our national security at risk to those who have more power or profit the worse off we are the Federal Banks and the banks. Yet, this Court must direct her coin this without debt or interest owed to the Federal Reserve to preserve these United States by fully funding the federal employees who make up the federal government and the one potentially weakened unfunded branch the Courts. This Court must direct Defendants to coin money without regard to the fact every dollar says Federal Reserve Note, and without regard to

the fact the Federal Reserve private bank may not accept it. This Court must direct Biden and Yellen to coin money without regard to the Federal reserve's desire for slavery debt control and profit. I care about sustaining these United States from a schemed agenda to overthrow it by allowing the private partners to assume Corporate governance and desired hyperinflation to allow private entities the Federal government is wrongly enslaved to owe recoups to control resources to control the government to eliminate the government after 2050.

44. This Court must require Defendants to issue Federal reserve notes to pay off debt and federal workers salaries owed using the trillion dollar coin must without liability for the printed money so coined to the master private Federal Reserve Bank who coins to enslave and control not to safeguard freedom. The government should not owe the Federal Reserve who gives it what it does not have while enslaving the people to pay it back. The 16th Amendment was enacted to tax the people to pay the interest on the debt the federal reserve enslaves the government and the people to.

45. This court must require Biden and Yellen to coin the money without acceptance by the federal reserve, which creates slavery debt and without enslaving the people to interest and debt.

46. Slavery is against my 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment protected religious beliefs and violates the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

47. The failure to pay federal workers, including but not limited to federal judges, judicial staff, US Attorney Generals, FBI, CDC and other federal agencies in a government shut down by compelled force where there is no meeting of the minds is involuntary servitude and compelled slavery.

48. According to the BBC news released 9/26/23,

“The president of the United States has a guaranteed income. Congress is also not affected - its members are exempt and, in any case, its funding bill has already been approved. The US Department of Justice is among those affected - with many lawyers and judges not working during a shutdown. Others are working without pay.” Citing, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-46927916>, BBC News, *What is the likelihood of a US government shutdown?*, By Tom Geoghegan, 9/26/23 (Under periodical exception).

49. The shut down threatens to weaken only one of the three branches of government whereas the President and Congress are fully paid in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment’s Equal Protections component by disparate treatment as to which representatives in the federal government may be paid, which endangers me in particular as a party one. My religious belief requires I uphold the impartial implementation of justice in the courts, which includes safeguarding the judiciary from being weakened and in want of pay for labor performed.<sup>2</sup> See *Romans 4:4*.

---

<sup>2</sup> I am a Christian. I place my faith in God the father, the son Jesus, and the Holy spirit revealed to me, born again people, including people in the Bible. “Justice in the courts” is a command” Citing, the Bible, Amos 5:15 Jesus teaches justice and mercy are greater commands than monetary and material laws . Matthew 23:23; see also, John 7:24 (Jesus commands “Do not judge based on appearance, judge correctly.”) (See the following Bible passages against partiality in the courts, Leviticus 19:15 ""You must not pervert justice; you must not show partiality to the poor or favoritism to the rich; you are to judge your neighbor fairly"); (Exodus 23:6, "You shall not deny justice to the poor in their lawsuits."); (Deuteronomy 1:17, "Show no partiality in judging; hear both small and great alike. Do not be intimidated by anyone, for judgment belongs to God. And bring to me any case too difficult for you, and I will hear it."); (Deuteronomy 16:19, "Do not deny justice or show partiality. Do not accept any bribes, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and twists the words of the righteous."); (See, James 2:1, "do not show favoritism."); (James 2:9, "But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as transgressors."); (Proverbs 18:5, "Showing partiality to the wicked is not good, nor is depriving the innocent of justice."); (Proverbs 24:23, "These also are sayings of the wise: To show partiality in judgment is not good."); (Malachi 2:9, "So I in turn have made you despised and humiliated before all the people, because you have not kept My ways, but have shown partiality in matters of the law."); (Job 34:19, "who shows no partiality to princes and does not favor the rich over the poor, for they are all the work of his hands?"); (Job 13:10, "Surely He would rebuke you if you secretly showed partiality.").

50. I am also in particular danger of justice should the courts not hear my cases to overturn disciplinary determination on my licenses to practice law and vitiations of my fundamental rights due to fewer people reviewing US Supreme Court briefs.

51. In addition, due to my inability to work as an attorney based on a judicial determination of disability, I cannot work at my former law firm. So, I applied for food stamps. I will not receive food benefits should a shut down persists and face particularized danger. I risk losing a property interested protected under the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment should a default arise lasting more than a month, but I care more about my liberty interests more. The shut down decreases the odds the US Supreme Court will grant petitions for writ of certiorari to safeguard my First Amendment rights to petition, religious belief, exercise of religious belief, speech and association without government incited persecution but for finding my religious beliefs repugnant.

52. This issue is capable of repetition yet evading review. Exceptional circumstances of peculiar emergency or public importance require all three federal branches be fully funded.

53. The usurpation of judicial power and a clear abuse of discretion exists by Defendants failure to exercise her discretion to coin money without debt and credit to fully fund one branch of government to preserve these United States from schemed overthrow.

54. The nation is in peril when the federal employees charged with upholding justice in the courts to safeguard individual liberties from being eliminated by majority rule through the vote. The judicial branch is at the mercy of the other two branches without the power to place a check on the other two branches.

55. Defendants thoughtfully, willfully abuse their discretion by not supporting the judicial branch while fully funding the members of the two other branches creating a clear and present danger by not upholding the three branches that make up the government.

56. Federal employees are compelled to work without pay due to two branches childish, dumb, conniving, self-serving antics to follow their lawless lusts untamed by the just rule of law. which may tempt the federal servants to be enslaved to the banks by taking out credit card debt or high interest loans which ultimately profit the members of the federal reserve in their private capacity as commercial bankers, but it endangers the entire nation by weakening once branch.

57. Upholding impartial injustice in the courts is a religious exercise of my belief. I am a Christian. Justice in the Courts is a command by God, a preempting command per Jesus.

56. I believe there will be a slow overthrow of the nation by the unlawful way money is currently coined by slavery debt plus interest and the worse way it is schemed.

57. Defendants unreasonably place national security at risk when the Courts, the Attorney Generals, the FBI, the CDC are left to work with out pay or without a full staff given there is a global war, China's surveillance base is spying on us from Cuba since 2019, there's a global pandemic, there is a global economic crisis, 80 trillion dollars of government pensions and other debt were written off by debt swaps per the BIS in 2022, and we face abnormal incessant contrived crisis. I desire the courts fully fund federal pensions, pay and social security under 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) too to preserve our national security by preserving the people who make up our government.

58. Exceptional circumstances of peculiar emergency or public importance requiring the courts act.

59. Slavery debt must be prevented to preserve the independence of the only impartial branch of the government, that prevents the other two branches from enslaving the country and the people to serve the partial desires of the government backed private and foreign partners under the deception of waiver of Constitutional liberties through the vote.

60. The Courts are the only branch that protects Constitutional liberties from being eliminated and sacrificed by the other two branches under the guise of representative authority in our Democratic Republic.

61. My religious objections to debt are genuine. I am a Christian.

62. Slavery by debt is against my religious beliefs. Federal workers will be required to work without pay, without a meeting of the minds or a choice. It is my religious exercise to seek justice in the courts to uphold the freedoms of government workers who are not below the law's protections, albeit they have more limited freedoms in order not to chill the rights of those they are paid to serve.

63. The following provision under U.S. Const. art. I, § 8 authorizes Congress to create money, arguably without debt or interest as the US Supreme Court previously upheld in *Knox v Lee*, 79 U.S. 457 (1871).

64. While the Constitution also unlawfully empowers Congress to enslave itself and its people making them less free and for sale slaves to private and foreign partners under a separate provision of U.S. Const. art. I, § 8 authorizing it with the power "to borrow money" to enslave the people to pay back their master creditor as ruler by taxes, which I argue violates the



13<sup>th</sup> Amendment and the premise of the Constitution to safeguard freedom and life as unconstitutional, this court merely must discern whether the delegated provision authorizing Yellen to coin at her discretion, not the discretion or request of the Federal reserve, without debt and interest is an abuse of discretion that jeopardizes the Courts and the federal government from dissolution and schemed overthrow or threat of security and the rule of law.

65. I have sincere religious objections to debt, especially debt created out of slavery by force, not a free meeting of minds under government compelled economic, physical or social government backed private and government backed foreign threats under the 2030 and 2050 plans under the far more heinous private plans to coin.

66. The government must do its own job and not delegate its authority or responsibilities to others. The government must coin to care for the people, not control and enslave the people to private and foreign powers or partners.

67. Elected officials are not above the law. When elected officials in the other two branches violate duties to uphold the life and liberty of those the Constitution requires they serve to instead oppress, and control by subjugated social, economic or physical force, we need the courts to find their conduct in violation of the Constitutional limits to make our people free with the limit the people may not enslave, harm or kill others. We must protect all people's individual freedoms from elimination under the collaborative, conditional, collective control of private and foreign partners and threats.

Wherefore I ask this case to enjoin Defendants from

68. Enjoin Defendants from not paying federal workers and from suspending the operations of the federal government on the ground Congress has not passed a budget by or

before September 30, 2023 on 1st, 5th, 13th and 14th Amendment grounds and further requests this Court sign a writ of mandamus to require Defendants to coin money without interest or debt under 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) to pay off the national debt in full or in the alternative to pay for federal employees and the operations of the federal government for all sums exceeding the budget shortfall and states as follows:

69. Since this issue is capable of repetition, yet evading review, I require an Order to enjoin Defendants from not paying federal workers and from suspending the operations of the federal government on the ground Congress has not passed a budget and further request this Court direct Defendants to coin money without interest or debt under 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) to pay off the national debt in full or in the alternative to pay for federal employees and the operations of the federal government for all sums exceeding a budget shortfall to prevent Congress and the President from fully funding their own salaries while threatening to leave an entire branch the judiciary unfunded.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF  
PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 92nd Affidavit


I, Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire, hereby certify on 9/30/23, I had a true and correct copy of the above referenced document, served to Defendants, through their counsel through email electronically:

Zi-Xiang Shen  
Delaware Department of Justice  
820 North French Street  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801

Dated

9/30/23

Respectfully submitted,


  
Meghan M. Kelly  
Meghan Kelly, Esquire  
34012 Shawnee Drive  
Dagsboro, DE 19939  
[meghankellyesq@yahoo.com](mailto:meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

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:

9/30/23

Meghan Kelly (printed)

 (signed)

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

November 5, 2024

Meghan Kelly  
34012 Shawnee Drive  
Dagsboro, DE 19939

RE: Petition for Rehearing  
No: 23-7360

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The petition for rehearing in the above-entitled case was received October 29, 2024 and is herewith returned for failure to comply with Rule 44 of the Rules of this Court. The petition must briefly and distinctly state its grounds and must be accompanied by a certificate stating the grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

The petition for rehearing in the above-entitled case was sent by commercial carrier and received October 29, 2024 and is herewith returned for failure to comply with Rule 44 of the Rules of this Court. The petition must briefly and distinctly state its grounds and must be accompanied by a certificate stating that the grounds are limited to intervening circumstances of substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

Please correct and resubmit as soon as possible. Unless the petition is submitted to this Office in corrected form within 15 days of the date of this letter, the petition will not be filed. Rule 44.6.

As the original electronic submission has been rejected, kindly electronically file the corrected documents as soon as possible to ensure expeditious docketing.

Sincerely,  
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By: 

Sara Simmons  
(202) 479-3023

Enclosures

No. 23-7360

Related Application No. 23A596  
Related Application No. 23A144

2B

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

of

**Petitioner Meghan Kelly's petition for leave to file in forma pauperis, and Petition for a Rehearing on the decision dated October 7, 2024**

I, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire, hereby certify that on

Oct. 28, 2024, I had a true and correct copy of the above referenced document

sent to all Defendants through their attorneys, served via US Mail, and to

Elizabeth B. Prelogar  
Solicitor General  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dated Oct. 28, 2024

2 different Police  
took filings CH 1565  
took the biggest load  
2 trips CS 563

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

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, Defending my First Amendment

Right to religious belief in Jesus as God, not

money as God. Matthew 6:24

RECEIVED  
SUPREME COURT OF THE  
UNITED STATES  
CLERK'S OFFICE

2024 OCT 29 PM 1:47

CH 1565

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

Dated: Oct. 28, 2024

Meghan Kelly  
(printed)

Meghan Kelly  
(signed)



No. 23-7372

Related Application No. 23A361

Related Application No. 23A100

Related Application No. 22A747

Related No. Petition for Cert before Judgment 22-6783

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

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

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third  
Circuit Case No 21-3198

Certificate of Service of Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion for Leave to file in  
Forma Pauperis and Petitioners' Petition for a Rehearing on the decision dated  
October 7, 2024

I, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire, hereby certify that  
on Oct. 29, 2024, I had a true and correct copy of the above referenced documents,

sent to all Defendants through their attorney,

Kathleen Jennings, Delaware Attorney General  
C/O Ryan Costa or the delegated attorney working with him since former co-  
counsel Zi-Xiang Shen who has left the DOJ  
Delaware Department of Justice  
Carvel State Building 820 N. French St. 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801

Respectfully submitted,

*Meghan Kelly*

Dated Oct. 29, 2024

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

JS Supreme Court Bar No. 283696

RECEIVED  
SUPREME COURT OF THE  
US POLICE OFFICE

2024 OCT 29 PM 1:13

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

Dated: Oct. 29, 2024

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan Kelly (signed)



4D

INDEPENDENT

## Republicans push for criminal probe into judge in Trump hush money case – and the judge's daughter

Mike Bedigan

Sun, November 10, 2024 at 6:34 PM EST  
4 min read

177



Republicans push for criminal probe into judge in Trump hush money case – and the judge's daughter

In the wake of [Donald Trump's](#) sweeping victory, Republicans are turning their attention to [those in the judicial system](#) who went up against the president-elect in the courts.

[Speaking on Fox News on Sunday](#), Florida representatives [Anna Paulina Luna](#) and [Cory Mills](#) floated the idea that criminal charges could be brought against Judge [Juan Merchan](#) – and his daughter [Loren Merchan](#).

Merchan oversaw Trump's high-profile hush money case where he was ultimately convicted of 34 felonies in New York earlier this year. His daughter subsequently became the target of attacks by the president-elect due to her Democrat-leaning political activities.

ADVERTISEMENT

"Let's look at [Judge Merchan and his daughter](#), who was actually a fundraiser and was actually trying to support Kamala Harris and Joe Biden when it came to raising funds on the back of President Trump being in the New York court system," Mills said.

"I think that what we're seeing right now is that the Department of [Injustice](#) and the lawfare that was going on is now coming to a screeching halt with President-elect Donald Trump coming back into office."

During the hush money trial, Trump ignored an order from Merchan that he should rein in his fiery posts on social media, in which he accused the judge of having a "Trump-hating family" with ties to Kamala Harris.

that the company played any part in Trump's criminal trial or conviction was "completely false and purely politically motivated."

On Sunday, Mills and Luna also discussed possible criminal cases being [pursued](#)

trying to subvert the 2020 presidential election and mishandling classified documents.




Judge Juan Merchan oversaw Trump's high profile hush money case where he was ultimately convicted of 34 felonies in New York earlier this year (AP)

It was reported this week that Smith and the Justice Department are trying to "wind down" the federal criminal cases against Trump before he returns to the White House in January, in order to comply with its long-standing policy not to prosecute sitting presidents.

ADVERTISEMENT

More in Politics



Florida Representatives Anna Paulina Luna (left) and Cory Mills (right) floated the idea that criminal charges could be brought against Judge Juan Merchan, and his daughter (Fox News)

"I have a Trump-hating judge with a Trump-hating wife and family, whose daughter worked for Kamala Harris, and now receives money from the Biden-Harris campaign – and a lot of it," he said.

ADVERTISEMENT

According to Mike Nellis, founder of political consulting firm Authentic Campaigns Inc, which employs Loren Merchan, she did some work for Harris's presidential campaign in 2019 but never "developed an individual personal relationship" with the candidate, and had only "minimal input or contact with any political clients" during the 2024 election cycle.

Nellis said Merchan had received death threats following Trump's comments and had been advised to stay away from the family home.

In August, the House judiciary chairman [Jim Jordan](#), a key ally of Trump, subpoenaed the firm to testify as part of his investigation into what he called the "weaponization" of the federal government. However, Nellis said any suggestion



Lady Gaga's dad reveals their relationship has been 'dicey' since he 'came out as a Republican'

The Independent



Trump still hasn't signed ethics agreement required for presidential transition

CNN



Nikki Haley responds to Trump's announcement that she's not welcome back in his second administration

The Independent

"What I will tell you... is that [Jack Smith](#) violated the Constitution," Luna said.

"And I'm really happy that Jim Jordan and the House Judiciary is telling him to preserve evidence because even after President Trump is elected, we need to ensure that this never happens to any other candidate for president ever again."

She added: "And so we have to follow through, see who exactly ordered that," she continued. "And if it means that we need to bring criminal prosecution, I think that we need to."

**Top Stories**   Dems' working-class exodus   Deathbed discussion   1974 killer found   Paint colors and h



It was recently reported that Jack Smith (pictured) and the Justice Department are trying to 'wind down' the federal criminal cases against Trump before he returns to the White House (AFP via Getty [More](#))

Their comments stopped short of [shocking remarks previously aired on Fox](#), in which hosts Dana Perino and Greg Gutfeld joked that Smith and others who had prosecuted Trump should receive the death penalty.

ADVERTISEMENT

"Dana... a lot of the people that were on this and wanted it so badly, how are they going to survive? Do you think they need therapy," Gutfeld asked Perino.

"Yes, they definitely need therapy," the former White House press secretary responded. "Maybe also the death penalty?"

**View comments (177)**


[Terms and Privacy Policy](#)   [Privacy Dashboard](#)   [About Our Ads](#)

**Up next** \_\_\_\_\_



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 8, 2024



**Via email: [MRUFOIA.Requests@usdoj.gov](mailto:MRUFOIA.Requests@usdoj.gov)**

FOIA/PA Mail Referral Unit  
Department of Justice  
Room 115  
LOC Building  
Washington, DC 20530

**Re:** FOIA request for Department of Justice records regarding Special Prosecutor Jack Smith's probe of President-elect Donald Trump.

Dear FOIA Officer,

This letter serves as an official Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request by the State of Texas, facilitated through Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton's office in relation to Special Counsel Jack Smith's investigation into President-elect Trump.

Texas's requests are set forth below. Should any record or portion of records be claimed as exempt under FOIA, then a sufficient amount of information must be provided in response that allows our office to assess the validity of that claim. *Vaughn v. Rosen*, 484 F.2d 820 (D.C. Cir. 1973). Further, as per 5 U.S.C. § 552(b), all reasonably segregable information must be produced, even if other information is exempt under FOIA.

The State of Texas is requesting a waiver of all fees, and meets the criteria per Justice Department policy. This information request is in the public interest, as it will provide critical information for the public understanding of the Office of Special Counsel's activities. This request does not serve the commercial interest of the Attorney General's office. This request is made in the State of Texas's sovereign capacity. And this FOIA request seeks information that is important for the American people. FOIA serves as "a means for citizens to know what their Government is up to." *Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157, 171 (2004). And it provides "a structural necessity in a real democracy." The Texas Attorney General's Office frequently updates constituents on important, newsworthy information. The Office issues press releases, and posts

news on its website that is frequently reported on by the press. The information from this FOIA request will significantly contribute to the public's understanding of the Special Counsel's investigation, particularly when the subject of that investigation has been elected as the 47<sup>th</sup> President of the United States.

Regrettably, past Offices of Special Counsel appear to have intentionally destroyed documents responsive to similar requests made for their records at the end of their tenure.<sup>1</sup> Our office would consider any destruction of the documents requested herein to be a crime under 18 U.S.C. § 1361, and would refer the matter for prosecution in the event destruction occurs. Furthermore, the following requests constitute only a subset of the Office of Special Counsel's records. Our office may make further requests in the near future. We accordingly demand that, in addition to your existing records retention obligations under federal law, you retain all records in the event that litigation over this request or future ones becomes warranted.

The following definitions apply to each of the following requests:

The term "Communications" means any disclosure, transfer, or exchange of information or opinion, however made, including oral, graphic, written, or electronic transmittal of information.

The term "Document" or "Documents" means any written, photocopied, transcribed, recorded or otherwise produced information however produced or reproduced in the possession of DOJ including, but not limited to, inter-office communications; memoranda; reports; correspondence; manuals; guidelines; meeting agendas; minutes of meetings; calendar appointments; records; instructions; notes; diaries; plans; photographs; photocopies; charts; descriptions; drafts, whether or not they resulted in a final document; agreements; letters; conferences; records or notes of telephone or other conversations or communications; publications; directives; statements; proposals; studies; working papers; indices; recordings or materials similar to any of the foregoing.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.grassley.senate.gov/news/news-releases/doj-foia-release-members-mueller-team-repeatedly-wiped-phones-watchdog-sought>.

## REQUESTS

1. All Communications from any current or former member of the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith to any New York State governmental office since November 18, 2022. This request includes, but is not limited to, all Communications sent to any of the following email domains:
  - i. @exec.ny.gov
  - ii. @ag.ny.gov
  - iii. @dany.nyc.gov
2. All Communications from any current or former member of the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith to the Fulton County District Attorney's office since November 18, 2022. This request includes, but is not limited to, all Communications sent to any of the following email domains:
  - i. @fultonda.org
3. All Communications from any current or former member of the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith to any Congressional office. This request includes, but is not limited to, all Communications sent to any of the following email domains:
  - i. mail.house.gov
  - ii. .senate.gov
4. All communications from any current or former member of the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith to any governmental or law enforcement officer in the State of Texas. This request includes, but is not limited to, all Communications sent to any of the following email domains:
  - i. @dps.texas.gov
  - ii. @traviscountytexas.gov
  - iii. @house.texas.gov
  - iv. @senate.texas.gov
5. Documents memorializing the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith's final reasoning to request that a trial against President-elect Trump to start in January of 2024. These documents should include all internal messages that contributed to a final decision, communications with actors who are not employed in the Office of the Special Counsel or by the federal government, and any memorandums circulated within the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith regarding this subject.

6. Documents sufficient to show all mobile numbers and corresponding asset tag numbers assigned to the staff of Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ken Paxton". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Ken Paxton  
Texas Attorney General



Congress of the United States  
Washington, DC 20515

November 8, 2024

Mr. Jack Smith  
Special Counsel  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dear Mr. Smith:

The Committee on the Judiciary is continuing its oversight of the Department of Justice and the Office of Special Counsel. According to recent public reports, prosecutors in your office have been “gaming out legal options” in the event that President Donald Trump won the election.<sup>1</sup> With President Trump’s decisive victory this week, we are concerned that the Office of Special Counsel may attempt to purge relevant records, communications, and documents responsive to our numerous requests for information.<sup>2</sup> The Office of Special Counsel is not immune from transparency or above accountability for its actions. We reiterate our requests, which are itemized in the attached appendix and incorporated herein, and ask that you produce the entirety of the requested material as soon as possible but no later than November 22, 2024.

Furthermore, this letter serves as a formal request to preserve all existing and future records and materials related to the Office of Special Counsel’s investigations and prosecutions of President Trump. You should construe this preservation notice as an instruction to take all reasonable steps to prevent the destruction or alteration, whether intentionally or negligently, of all documents, communications, and other information, including electronic information and metadata, that are or may be responsive to this congressional inquiry. This instruction includes all electronic messages sent using official and personal accounts or devices, including records created using text messages, phone-based message applications, or encryption software.

---

<sup>1</sup> Katelyn Polantz, *Special counsel Jack Smith’s office is bracing for retribution if Trump wins*, CNN (Nov. 1, 2024).

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, to Hon. Merrick B. Garland, Atty Gen., U.S. Dep’t of Just. (June 1, 2023); Letter from Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, to Hon. Merrick B. Garland, Atty Gen., U.S. Dep’t of Just. (June 6, 2023); Letter from Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, to Hon. Merrick B. Garland, Atty Gen., U.S. Dep’t of Just. (Aug. 29, 2023); Letter from Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, to Jack Smith, Special Couns., U.S. Dep’t of Just. (Sept. 7, 2023); Letter from Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, and Rep. Andy Biggs, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary’s Subcomm. on Crime and Fed. Gov’t Surveillance, to Jack Smith, Special Couns., U.S. Dep’t of Just. (Dec. 21, 2023); Letter from Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman, H. Comm. on the Judiciary, to Jay I. Bratt, Couns. to the Special Couns., U.S. Dep’t of Just. (June 6, 2024).

Mr. Jack Smith  
November 8, 2024  
Page 2

If you have any questions about this request, please contact Committee staff at (202) 225-6906. Pursuant to the Rules of House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to conduct oversight of the Justice Department.<sup>3</sup>

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Jim Jordan  
Chairman  
Committee on the Judiciary



Barry Loudermilk  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Oversight  
Committee on House Administration

cc: The Honorable Jerrold L. Nadler, Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary  
The Honorable Norma Torres, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Oversight,  
Committee on House Administration

Enclosure

---

<sup>3</sup> Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, R. X, 118th Cong. (2023).



---

**Appendix: Outstanding Oversight Requests**

---

June 1, 2023:

1. Provide information about the use of FBI personnel by Special Counsel Jack Smith, including but not limited to the following:
  - a. The total number of FBI employees assigned to work on the investigation;
  - b. The number of FBI employees from FBI Headquarters working on the investigation; and
  - c. The number of FBI employees from the Washington Field Office working on the investigation;
2. Explain whether any FBI employees who have worked on Special Counsel Smith's investigation previously worked on any other matters concerning President Trump; and
3. Explain whether Special Counsel Smith's investigation relies on any information or material gathered exclusively by the FBI prior the Special Counsel's appointment.

August 29, 2023:

1. All documents and communications referring or relating to any appointment, meeting, or other visit by Jay Bratt to the White House or the Executive Office of the President; and
2. All documents and communications between the Executive Office of the President and the Department of Justice referring or relating to the investigation and/or prosecutions of Special Counsel Jack Smith.

September 7, 2023:

1. All documents and communications referring or relating to any appointment, meeting, or other visit by Stanley Woodward to the Justice Department, including the Office of the Special Counsel, concerning the representation of Walt Nauta;
2. All documents and communications between or among the Office of the Special Counsel, the Office of the Attorney General, or the Office of the Deputy Attorney General referring or relating to Mr. Woodward and his representation of individuals involved in the matters before you; and
3. All documents and communications referring or relating to Mr. Woodward's application to fill a vacancy on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

December 21, 2023:

1. All documents and communications between or among the Office of Special Counsel, the Office of the Attorney General, or the Office of the Deputy Attorney General referring or relating to the investigation and prosecution of President Donald Trump;
2. All documents and communications sufficient to identify the universe of current and former Office of Special Counsel staff members, including but not limited to the following information:
  - a. Salaries for each Office of Special Counsel member of staff;
  - b. Travel costs incurred and trips taken by each Office of Special Counsel member of staff as it relates to the investigation and prosecution of President Trump; and
  - c. The organizational structure of the Office of Special Counsel.
3. All documents and communications referring or relating to the hiring and selection of current and former Office of Special Counsel staff members, including but not limited to the following information:
  - a. Job postings or solicitations;
  - b. Hiring criteria or prospective employees' evaluations; and
  - c. Communications between the Office of Special Counsel and prospective employees.
4. All documents and communications referring or relating to the "Warrant by Telephone or Other Reliable Electronic Means," filed In the Matter of the Search of Information That Is Stored at Premises Controlled by Twitter Inc., Identified in Attachment A, Case No. 23-SC-31 (D.D.C. 2023).

June 6, 2024:

1. All documents and communications referring or relating to meetings between FBI and Justice Department officials sent to or received by you prior to the execution of the search warrant on President Trump's private residence;
2. All documents and communications between or among yourself, employees of the Department of Justice, and employees of the Executive Office of the President from January 2021 to the present, related to the investigation and prosecution of President Trump, including, but not limited to, email communications and notes taken during your meetings with White House officials;
3. All documents and communications sent to or received by you referring or relating to your May 24, 2024, motion to modify President Trump's conditions of release, including,

but not limited to, all drafts of the motion and communications between employees of the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith discussing the motion and timing of its filing; and

4. All documents and communications between or among you and the Office of Professional Responsibility about your course of improper conduct and unethical actions as an employee of the Office of Special Counsel Jack Smith.

AG hope of preserving law by restraining gov within purview of const limits too Protect Jack Smith please



From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; sco\_jls\_supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; info@attorneygeneral.gov; usapam.contact@usdoj.gov; usapae.usattorney@usdoj.gov; usapaw.webmaster@usdoj.gov; iadams@sidley.com; tmastro@gmail.com; supremecourtbriefs@usdoj.gov; ryan.costa@delaware.gov

Date: Wednesday, November 13, 2024 at 09:53 AM EST

Good morning,

I saw Jack Smith is stepping down due to government incited pressures abuse by Trump and Congress's threats to sue him for information to harm him in his private capacity.

Regardless of where your potential loyalties to people lies, you must set that aside and preserve your authority to independently without threat prosecute or not by your independent judgment, not by government command with threat of reprisal by congress or the president for not prosecuting or prosecuting.

Please work together without regard to party or who is in congress or the oval office. The loyalty is impartial application of the Constitutional limits to preserve life and liberty by truth and justice, not eliminate it by threats of social, economic or physical force Think of a criminal case to restraint.

The way the overthrow works is they praise professions like dogs before they eliminate them, pleading the lie "that's what the voters wanted". Your positions are not the only ones in jeopardy.

Other professions they target include but are not limited to teachers to automated learning incessantly to control the thoughts to eliminate free will to be saved from hell, nurses and doctors/hospitals to home care and drones, police praised than eliminated by automation... and more

The lobbyists discussed eliminating grocery stores down the line to, to control the food and water under the lie of Lucifer the devil to help us and sustain the world only to sacrifice us by eliminating the necessities needed to live if we do not conform.

They are misguided.

DE is not only the King of corporate law, but it is the prince of patent law. That means the district court can cut through the fluff to unravel schemes too, especially under the 30 30 plan.

No one can unravel any schemes if access to the courts is denied, or if cases are dismissed because the government is rendered immune.

It is not merely an economic model change around the globe. That is a mere transition. There is an overthrow of government and the rule of law that restrains entities from human sacrifice of other people's lives and liberty, lawlessness marketed as freedom.

Please help Jack Smith and protect him. Protecting him prevents you from being next.

Thank you,  
Meg

8H

No. 23-7360

Related Application No. 23A144

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Esq. Petitioner

V

Eastern District Court of Pennsylvania

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

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

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

## QUESTION PRESENTED

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

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

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

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

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

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

V. Whether this reciprocal lawsuit initiated per original state's, Delaware's retaliation against Meghan Kelly for her private religious-political beliefs contained in her private religious freedom restoration act lawsuit against former President Trump and current President Biden where she averred her belief the Attorney generals may bring lawsuits under 18 Sections 201 or 666 to prevent the overthrow of these United States by preventing the Government's private and foreign partners from controlling the government to eliminate the government to eliminate the rule of law which founded, maintain and sustains these United States from a very real scheme to eliminate the rule of law by eliminating the Constitutionally vested power of the petitioners under the 1<sup>st</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Equal Protections component.

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



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

VII. Whether the new and additional Congressional attacks against Justice Alito relating to his wife's exercise of 1<sup>st</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to a fair and impartial not threatened and biased court towards avoiding punishment by Congress who acts as a witness without a case or controversy on issues I am petitioning in case and made with the express intent of Congressmen to affect a lawsuit Trump v US, No 939.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

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

## **CASES DIRECTLY RELATING TO THIS CASE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

## APPENDIX

Appendix (hereinafter “App.”)

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

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

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

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

**App D**           Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Motion to recuse the Honorable Peter J. Phipps twice a nominee to US Supreme Court by President Trump to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5<sup>th</sup> dated February 14, 2023 .....1-15

**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, 2023 .....1-15

**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 5<sup>th</sup>, 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 208<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 2 120<sup>th</sup> 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 3 210<sup>th</sup> Affidavit and exhibits thereto** relating to documents in Kelly v Trump concerning how the Attorney Generals may use the criminal statutes 18 USC sections 201 and 666 to dissolve the corruption partnerships and monetary backing in a forced slave economy neither free nor fair that allows for the overthrow may be dissolved to prevent the overthrow, including:

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

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

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

**App 4 215<sup>th</sup> 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 5 212<sup>th</sup> 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 6 216<sup>th</sup> Affidavit**Justice Alito’s letter responses to Congress’s improper attacks made with the intent to affect outcome in live cases, the County and State’s corrupt laws in DE under the lie of helping the farmers they are forcing them into foreclosures. A neighbor committed suicide in my development as he lost his farm .....1-15

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

**App 8 211<sup>th</sup> 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 9 223<sup>rd</sup> 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 10 228<sup>th</sup> 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**        229<sup>th</sup> 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**        **231<sup>st</sup> 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**        235<sup>th</sup> 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, 235<sup>th</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment in accord with due process under the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment applicable to the federal gov and the 14<sup>th</sup> 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, 236<sup>th</sup> 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, 237<sup>th</sup> 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, 239<sup>th</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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** *In Congress's Contempt power and the enforcement of congressional subpoenas: Law, History, Practice and procedure*, in Congressional Research service dated May 12, 2017, Todd Garvey.....14-15

Kelly v. Trump\_ 2021 DE S. CT. BRIEFS LEXIS 422 and 423.....4

### CASES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

## CONSTITUTION

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

## Executive orders

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

## DE Disciplinary Rules

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

## Supreme Court Rules

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

## **I. STATEMENT OF CASE**

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

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

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

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

## **II. ARGUMENT**

This appeal also relates to Delaware's punishment of me disparately in contravention of the 1<sup>st</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> Am, and that 1<sup>st</sup>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I argue it does violate DP as applied to me.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Conclusion:** Wherefore I pray this Court grants just relief.



Dated

Oct. 25, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,

Meghan Kelly

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire *pro se*

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

302-493-6693

US Supreme Ct Number 283696

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

Dated:

Oct. 25, 2024

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan Kelly (signed)

CERTIFICATION BY PRO SE PARTY (RULE 44)

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

Dated: Oct. 25, 2024

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

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

Dated: Oct. 25, 2024

Meghan Kelly  
(printed)  
Meghan Kelly  
(signed)

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. In 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 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment right to petition fairly in accordance with the 5<sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup>Congress 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> This reciprocal case arises based on DE Sup Ct's malicious intent to

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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.

<sup>3</sup> *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.<sup>4</sup> This Ct ruled other conduct is presumed immune.<sup>5</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> Am rt to petition and fair oppty to be heard before vitiation

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> 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.”<sup>41</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *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\\_judex\\_in\\_causa\\_sua](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nemo_judex_in_causa_sua) "Nemo judex in causa sua (also written as nemo [est] judex 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 Wicpepedia) "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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 rt<sup>7</sup> 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 14<sup>th</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> *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. <sup>8</sup>

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 1<sup>st</sup> 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.


---

<sup>8</sup> *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)