

Application No. 23A100  
Case No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Related Appeal on Same Case 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

**APPLICATION FOR A FURTHER EXTENSION OF TIME  
WITHIN WHICH TO FILE A PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
THIRD CIRCUIT CASE No 21-3198**

Dated 8/31/23

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly  
Meghan Kelly, Pro se  
Not acting as an Attorney  
34012 Shawnee Drive  
Dagsboro, DE 19939  
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com  
(302) 493-6693  
US Bar 283696

## **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

I. Whether Meghan Kelly should receive an extension of time to allow her to petition in this matter without vitiating her First Amendment right to petition in this case, and two other cases where she seeks to petition for writ of certiorari, (1) *Kelly v Pennsylvania Office of Disciplinary Counsel* (hereinafter “PA ODC”) scheduled for conference on September 26, 2023, per US Supreme Court Numbers 22A981, 22-7695, and 2) *Kelly v US District Court, Eastern District of PA*, Application Number 23A144), thereby vitiating her 1<sup>st</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment rights and others claims she seeks to assert or defend due to poverty becoming a substantial burden so great as to deny Kelly access to the courts, without any important justification necessary to uphold a compelling interest in denying time somehow more important than the exercise of the First Amendment right to petition to safeguard the exercise of fundamental rights and other interests in this and two other cases.

II. Whether Meghan Kelly should receive an extension of time to allow her to consider how to ask the US Supreme Court to prevent regulation of the US Supreme Court to prevent the elimination of the impartial rule of law by the elimination of the independence federal judges require to uphold the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Equal protections component as applied to Kelly as a party of one with her unique religious beliefs against partiality in the courts and justice as a command by God in *Amos* 5:15, while preserving her claims and appeal to save her liberties given poverty creating a hardship and unique circumstances.

## **LIST OF PARTIES**

The parties are listed on the caption.

## 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.

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

*Kelly v Democrats* 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. US Supreme Court No. 23A144

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**

Jurisdiction.....2  
Statement of case..... 1-27

**TABLE OF APPENDICES OR EXHIBITS**

Appendix (hereinafter “App.”)

**App. A**                    **June 30, 2023** Order and opinion dismissing the case.....1, 2  
**App. B**                    April 20, 2023 Order and opinion dismissing the case.....1  
**App. C**                    June 22, 2023 Order denying the petition for a rehearing.....1  
**App. D**                    June 20, 2023 Order Denying 1. Motion to recuse Judge Scirica, 2. Motion for a caveat to recusal for judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent non-lawyers and non-judges from practicing law or taking the place of people judges without government authority, and 3. Motion for a Second Caveat to 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 lobbyists at the Federalist Society.....1  
**App. E**                    **July 10, 2023** Order Denying En Banc request and Motion for Reconsideration of Order denying recusal of Scirica.....1  
**App. F**                    March 15, 2023 Order denying recusal of Judge Phipps.....1  
**App. G**                    January 6, 2023 Order granting an extension of time and denying of a stay.....1, 2  
**App. H**                    February 9, 2023 Order Denying a stay pending the US Supreme Court’s denial of Judge Phipps Jan 6, 2023 Order denying a stay.....2  
**App I**                    District Court Order and opinion dated November 2021 dismissing my case under Younger.....2  
**App. J**                    District Court Order and opinion dated December 22, 2021 dismissing my case under Younger.....2  
**App. K**                    District Court Order and opinion dated April 26, 2021.....2  
**Exhibit 1**                August 23, 2021 letter sent in interference of my appeal to cause me to forgo appealing Kelly v Trump to the US Supreme Court based on my religious speech contained in my Delaware Religious Freedom Restoration Act and establishment of government religion petitions against former President Donald Trump.....3  
**Exhibit 2**                Paragraph 7 of the Petition to open a case against me showing my religious beliefs in Jesus Christ and my citations to the Bible in Kelly v Trump where m religious beliefs are in

issue is the source for bringing a disciplinary proceeding against me after I filed this civil rights case.....3

**Exhibit 3** Case opening Questions or questions answered in submission of my motion for leave to file in forma pauperis showing my belief of the Delaware Supreme Court’s involvement, collusion or participation in the attacks against me by the Delaware Arms in Kelly v Trump and collusion in the DE Disciplinary proceeding.....4-5

**66<sup>th</sup> Affidavit**, dated 8/15/23, docketed 8/15/23, with exhibits thereto including

**Exhibit 1** Amended Notice of Appeal to a Court of Appeals From an Appealable Order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of PA Docket Number 33 Case No. 22-45 2:22-mc-00045, which I filed attached to the transcript request, along with the Order I seek to appeal dated 8/7/23 wherein Judge Diamond of the Eastern District Court denied *Respondent Meghan M Kelly’s Motion for permission to use electronic filing, and waiver of paper copies before this Honorable Court, and an exemption from PACER costs to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights*. Dated 6/20/23, filed 6/21/23, Copy of the transcript form mailed to District Court 8/7/23 along with the amended notice of appeal

**Exhibit** Amended Notice of Appeal filed with the Eastern District of PA, dated 8/11/23, I signed and dated the documents, but it looks empty as I scanned, the order I seek to appeal dated 8/7/23 wherein Judge Diamond of the Eastern District Court denied Respondent Meghan M Kelly’s Motion for permission to use electronic filing, and waiver of paper copies before this Honorable Court, and an exemption from PACER costs to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights. Dated 6/20/23, filed 6/21/23, Copy of the transcript form mailed to District Court 8/7/23 along with the amended notice of appeal dated 8/6/23 as an exhibit thereto, transcript form, picture of the envelopes I mailed along with emails for both the 8/7/23, and 8/11/23 filings

**Exhibit 2** Docket Text for District Court Matter 22-45 Eastern District Court of PANOTICE OF APPEAL as to [33] Order on Motion for Order by MEGHAN MARIE KELLY. IFP Granted. Copies to Judge, Clerk USCA, Appeals Clerk. (fdc), dated 8/15/23

**Emails** to Eastern District Court of PA staff

**Exhibit 3** Email to Supreme Court Clerk Robert Meek and opposing Counsel attaching Application for more time in the appeal in the Eastern District Court of Appeals Case, along with Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Application to Justice Alito for Leave for an Extension of time to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court for the Third Circuit Case Number 22-3372, and letter filed therewith dated August 14, 2023, with tracking numbers

**Exhibit 6** Confirmation the US Supreme Court received it 8/15/23

**Exhibit 7** Pictures of Delaware’s treasurer, and candidate for US House of Representatives Colleen Carroll now Colleen Davis and I when we played soccer on the boys’ team in Indian River High School as teenagers

**67<sup>th</sup> Affidavit**, dated 8/15/23, and exhibits thereto

**Exhibit 5** Order dated 2/8/23 by Judge Diamond granting Motion to file in forma pauperis in the Eastern District of PA, Case No. 22-45

Docket Text for District Court Matter 22-45 Eastern District Court of PA

NOTICE OF APPEAL as to [33] Order on Motion for Order by MEGHAN MARIE KELLY. **IFP Granted**. Copies to Judge, Clerk USCA, Appeals Clerk. (fdc), dated 8/15/23

Docket Text for District Court Matter 22-45 Eastern District Court of PA

NOTICE OF APPEAL as to [33] Order on Motion for Order by MEGHAN MARIE KELLY. **No fee paid, no IFP filed**. Copies to Judge, Clerk USCA, Appeals Clerk. (fdc) Modified on 8/15/2023 (lisad, ), dated 8/15/23.....8, 10

**73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit**, filed on 8/28/23 including the exhibits to the 73<sup>rd</sup> affidavit, including

Table of Contents to the exhibits

**Internal Exhibits**

**Exhibit A** Notice of Appeal filed with the Third Circuit to appeal the case Kelly v US District Court for the Eastern District of PA, Third Circuit Case Number 22-3372, District Court Case Number 22-45

**Exhibit B** Notice of Appeal filed in the Eastern District Court of PA, with some documents out of the order I mailed them

- Notice of Appeal
- 2 Letters from US Supreme Court regarding Motion to Stay discipline is returned. There is no discipline by the US Supreme Court
- With certified of service and postage along with an email to Case Manager of Eastern District of PA Court indicating the US Supreme Court is not instituting discipline
- [I do not know why this was filed with the notice of appeal]
- Exhibits A, B, C Orders, looks like one was placed on twice. The staff misfiled documents I sought to correct in other Docket Items. I did not catch these.

**Exhibit B-2** Petitioner Meghan Kelly Affidavit in Support of Recusal of Judge Phipps, and Judge Scirica pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144 from Kelly v US District Court Eastern District of PA 22-3372 and affidavits taken from the Delaware District court Civil rights case, excluding others placed on the other docket under different DI numbers or left off

placed on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit case Kelly v US District Court Eastern District of PA at 3DI 49-50

- Exhibit 1** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 41st AFFIDAVIT UPDATE,
- Exhibit 2** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 43rd AFFIDAVIT UPDATE,
- Exhibit 3** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 44th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE,
- Exhibit 4** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 45th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE,
- Exhibit 5** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 46th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE, dated June 11, 2023
- Exhibit 6** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 46th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE date June 18, 2023 [accidentally named them the same]
- Exhibit 7** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 48th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 8** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 49th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 9** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 50th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 10** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 51st AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 11** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 52nd AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 12** Plaintiff Meghan M Kelly's **Second** Motion to stay the Proceeding until the conclusion of Respondent's originating disciplinary proceeding until a final non-appealable determination is made or the time of appeal has lapsed. Plaintiff further moves the Court, for good cause for permission to file an Amended complaint 30 days after the stay is lifted in this Civil rights case
- Exhibit 13** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S THIRD AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 14** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S FIFTH AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 15** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S TWENTY FIRST AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 16** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 46th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 17** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S TWENTY SECOND AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 18** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 37th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE
- Exhibit 19** PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S FIFTEENTH AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

**Exhibit C** August 24, 2023 Case opening documents for an amended appeal meant to preserve my right to contest an appealable order for remand or on the reopening in Kelly v Eastern District of PA, No. 22-3372, The Third Circuit set me up, which I am not falling for. My amended appeal was made in good faith to preserve the record. Another appeal is frivolous meant to set me up to fall.

**Exhibit D** E-mail from file and serve confirming the DE Supreme court sealed Motions necessary for my appeal in Kelly v Trump, necessary for my defense in the future disciplinary proceeding and all related proceedings to conceal evidence in my favor and to conceal the Constitutional and statutory violations of the law by members of the Delaware Supreme Court including but not limited to witness tampering forwarded to Judge Diamond and Case Manager Gail Olson.

**Exhibit E** Motion DE SUPREME Court wrongly sealed in *Kelly v Trump* called *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*

**Exhibit F** Motion DE SUPREME Court wrongly sealed in *Kelly v Trump* called *APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT TO REQUIRE THE RECUSAL OF THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE COLLINS J. SEITZ, JUNIOR IN THIS MATTER*

**Exhibit G** First Letter to Delaware Supreme Court Chief Justice Seitz dated January 7, 2021 wherein I requested an exemption or waiver of bar due payments for all attorneys facing economic hardship during the pandemic

**Exhibit H** Plaintiff's Motion for Reargument at DI 20 DE District Ct Matter 21-1490 dated Nov 6, 2021, filed November 8, 2021

**Exhibit I** Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Plaintiff's Motion for reargument at District Court DI 21, dated November 8, 2021, filed November 9, 2021 at District Court DI 21, dated November 8, 2021, filed November 9, 2021

**Exhibit J** Amended Motion for reargument at dismissal DI 21-2 pages 13-24 of 38 pages, dated November 8, 2021, received November 9, 2021

**Exhibit K** *PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND FINDINGS OF FACTS AND ALTER THE ORDER, DATED DECEMBER 22, 2021, BASED ON NEW FINDINGS OF FACT, TO PREVENT, CLEAR ERROR OF FACTS, CLEAR ERROR OF LAW, AND TO PREVENT MANIFEST INJUSTICE* at DI 34-35 of *Kelly v Swartz* Delawares District Court dated January 10, 2022, docketed January 11, 2022

**Exhibit L** *TABLE OF CONTENTS OF EXHIBITS TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND FINDINGS OF FACTS AND ALTER THE ORDER, DATED DECEMBER 22, 2021, BASED ON NEW FINDINGS OF FACT, TO PREVENT, CLEAR ERROR OF FACTS, CLEAR ERROR OF LAW, AND TO PREVENT MANIFEST INJUSTICE* at DI 34-35 of *Kelly v Swartz* Delawares District Court dated January 10, 2022, docketed January 11, 2022

**Exhibit M** *PLAINTIFF'S SECOND ADDITIONAL MOTION PURSUANT TO FRCP R. 52(b), 59(e) and 60(b)(1)(2)(6) TO AMEND FINDINGS OF FACTS AND ALTER THE ORDER, DATED DECEMBER 22, 2021, BASED ON NEW FINDINGS OF FACT, TO PREVENT, CLEAR ERROR OF FACTS, CLEAR ERROR OF LAW, AND TO PREVENT MANIFEST INJUSTICE* at DE District Court Docket Number 39, dated January 18, 2022, filed January 19, 2022



**Exhibit N** Table of contents for the exhibits to PLAINTIFF’S SECOND ADDITIONAL MOTION PURSUANT TO FRCP R. 52(b), 59(e) and 60(b)(1)(2)(6) TO AMEND FINDINGS OF FACTS AND ALTER THE ORDER, DATED DECEMBER 22, 2021, BASED ON NEW FINDINGS OF FACT, TO PREVENT, CLEAR ERROR OF FACTS, CLEAR ERROR OF LAW, AND TO PREVENT MANIFEST INJUSTICE at DE District Court Docket Number 39, dated January 18, 2022, filed January 19, 2022

**Exhibit O** *PLAINTIFF MEGHAN M. KELLY’S 3rd EMERGENCY MOTION PURSUANT TO FRCP R. 52(b), 59 (e), 60(b)(1)(2)(6), and 65* at Kelly v Swartz et al. DE District Court DI 36, dated January 19, 2022, filed January 19, 2022, also filed on January 21, 2022

**Exhibit P** April 26, 2022 letter where I indicated witnesses have been removed from the court to conceal evidence in my favor, and I indicated my intent to amend the complaint to inter alias make Constitutional arguments against disciplinary rules or proceedings, Docket item 58 in Kelly v Swartz

**Exhibit Q** Table of contents for August 26, 2022 letter at DI 58

**Exhibit R** 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 1<sup>st</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Protections

**Exhibit S** Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Motion to 1. declare the Reporting Requirements unconstitutional, requiring by written rule I violate my 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right not to testify against myself to the government in order that the government may have evidence to prosecute me, 2. Declare the Case and Controversy requirements are not met in the system of attorney self-regulation

**Exhibit T** Respondent Meghan M Kelly’s Motion for permission to use electronic filing, and waiver of paper copies before this Honorable Court, and an exemption from PACER costs to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights

**Exhibit U** Email from Lisa Dolphe, the Clerk of the Delaware Supreme Court declining me access to the documents and pleadings against me in a case appointing counsel, dated January 10, 2023, meant to conceal the fact my First Amendment right to petition and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment procedural due process fair access to the courts was denied by foreseeably denying my petitions and refusing to docket my pleadings in full defending my 1<sup>st</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to self-represent under religious grounds

**Exhibit V** Email dated August 24, 2023 at 10:24 AM wherein I request opposing counsel's position on an additional extension of time beyond the 30 days.

**Exhibit W** Letter to the PA ODC requesting a stay of proceedings f reciprocal discipline prior to initiating the proceeding noticing I am retired, dated September 3, 2022, and there is no harm to the public or him since I am not licensed to actively practice law in PA.

Exhibits docketed on 22-3372 at 3DI-55 at **Exhibit P** through other exhibits page 1 through 79

Letters from US Supreme Court showing my first attempt to file a petition in the Delaware case was rejected since I filed an application for permission to use more pages prior to and not simultaneously with the petition

US Supreme Court docket showing Judge Phipp's denial of a stay caused an obstacle so great as to deny me the right to petition the original DE Disciplinary order, as I even tried to seek to preserve my right at the US Supreme Court, but the court would not hear me until it was too late to grant relief.

**Exhibit Q** Letter to Clerk of Court for the Third Circuit for this Civil rights case, noticing a misfiled document at Third Circuit Docket Item 76, mailed for the Third Circuit disciplinary matter filed in error in the civil rights case despite my notice to the Court and the case manager by email and phone calls that it was coming by US mail.

**Exhibit R** Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (e), to Strike DI 77 as misfiled to be rescanned in to the Correct Matter No. 22-8037, without lifting my motion for a stay

**Exhibit S** Petitioner Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Corrected Second Motion pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (e), to Strike 3DI 77 as misfiled to be rescanned in to the Correct Matter No. 22-8037, without lifting my motion for a stay

**Exhibit T** Petitioner Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Motion pursuant to Rule 40 for a panel Reargument on Order Dated August 31, 2022, and move for a Judge, not the Clerk of the Court to render an order on this Motion for Reagument, and her Corrected Second

Motion pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (e), to Strike 3DI 77 as misfiled to be rescanned in to the Correct Matter No. 22-8037, without lifting my motion for a stay, and Motion to strike 3DI 77, and exhibits thereto, and related document, **due to the fact I brought up mistakes or potential misconduct by the clerk's office to correct, to preserve impartiality**

Postage receipt at Third Circuit DI 77 page 234 filed on August 22, 2022, showing the Clerk order threatening sanctions in retaliation for my pleadings to correct the Court's misfiling of the documents based on a lie, that I allegedly filed them through the emergency email, when on the docket it shows I filed them via US Mail, and indicated the same to my case manager, by prior notice via email and calls, and actual postage proof, in bad faith meant to cause me to forgo petitioning on appeal, or preserving the record with the Third, since the DE District Court's kind staff indicated the US Supreme Court could not see the district Court's docket unless I placed it on the appellate court's docket. I cannot afford to print out and mail the entire relevant docket and intend to seek to appeal on the record to dispense of the need of an appendix

Appellant Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion to Correct the Record, specifically District Court Docket Item, DI 12 under Rule 10 (e)(2)(c) and Rule 27 in the Eastern District of PA, US District Court to correct 1000s of misfiled pages

Another pro se claimants' documents filed in the District Court, Eastern District of PA case Number 22-45, at Docket Items 12-45, 12-46 and 12-47, including medical records.....5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 17-23, 25

**Exhibit Other Case**

Letter at DI 3 to judges at US District Court Eastern District of PA, providing three reciprocal orders and thanking them for allowing me to file by email, which I did at the trial level.

10/6/22 Order denying a motion for ECF access I never requested.

Email from a representative of the Court, dated 5/16/23 wherein she said "The judge will do an order, and then you have to go on PACER ..."

Email from me to a representative of the Court indicating I applied for efilng 5/15/23, basically so I could try to fix the docket, the Court indicated they no longer were accepting email filing so the need for ECF is dire due to poverty

10/18/22 Letter to correct the docket

Exhibits showing the court reporter in the DE Disciplinary proceeding did not transcribe what I said accurately, but falsified the records. Albeit she said she could not hear me. I

did not read from a script, but desired to point the court to my pleadings it ignored and never addressed

Three Docket items placed on my case from another case in the Eastern District Court for PA matter, including health record

Letter to Judge Diamond requesting the topic of the hearing, dated 11/3/22.....8, 9, 10

**Exhibit Other Case Continued** (22-3372, Third Circuit Docket Item 41-1, filed 5/27/23, Appellant Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Motion to Correct the Record, specifically District Court Docket Item, DI 12 under Rule 10 (e)(2)(c) and Rule 27.....8, 9, 10

**Letter by Meghan Kelly to Clerk of Court, dated 1/3/23**, showing misfiled documents below in the Delaware District Court retrieved through Court connect, a Lexis Product the Upper DE law librarian kindly purchased. When I received ECF access I was able to see the Court corrected this. Without people staff my right to be heard b automation would be vitiated. We need people staff to correct people and automation errors.....6, 25

**Exhibit 43** Healthcare objections on religious grounds, two articles I drafted to improve our harmful healthcare, Under Grad transcript, law school transcript, Health care record of a surgery that made me forever weaker and subjected to death or severe bodily harm should I not be granted time to drink gallons, not cups of water, eat, sleep, and exercise. The surgery seemed to exacerbate allergies by severe dehydration each month, making my throat close up a lot.....13

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

Obituary of Dick Goll, Esq.

Newspaper article I drafted concerning preventing out of state title companies practicing Delaware real estate law without a license, messing up the chain of title, with no attorney on the deed to correct it, and harming the public.

Article by Venus Project where they discuss the scheme to eliminate the rule of law to allow those who control the resources to control the world to sustain power under the guise of sustaining or helping the world.

Shaping the 4<sup>th</sup> Industrial Revolution by WEF references to eliminating attorneys

4<sup>th</sup> Industrial Revolution Excerpts regarding eliminating lawyer jobs

*Robot justice: China’s use of Internet courts* By Tara Vasdani This article was originally published by The Lawyer’s Daily (<https://www.thelawyersdaily.ca/>), part of LexisNexis Canada Inc

Article, by World Government Summit (WGS) published in 2017 *Could an AI ever replace a judge in court?*.....25-26

**72nd Affidavit, filed 8/24/23..... 23-24**  
**74<sup>th</sup> Affidavit.....26**

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Book, Bible

*Matthew 6:24*.....3, 19

### Case Law

*Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963) at 225.....4

*Africa v. Pennsylvania*, 662 F.2d 1025, 1025 (3d Cir.).....3

*Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682.....3

*Doe v. Indian River School Dist*, 653 F.3d 256, 283 n.14 (3d Cir. 2011).....4

*Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 374, 96 S.Ct. 2673, 49 L.Ed.2d 547 (1976).....4

*Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872.....4

*Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada*, 501 U.S. 1030, 1057-58 (1991).....6-7

*Mullin v. Sussex County*, 861 F. Supp. 2d 411, 415, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67571....6

*Salazar v. Buono*, 559 U.S. 700, 130 S. Ct. 1803, 176 L. Ed. 2d 634 (2010).....24

### Procedural Rules

Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 12 (h).....12

Supreme Court Rule 13.5.....1

Supreme Court Rule 30.....1

### Statutes

### US Constitution

U.S. Cons. Amend. 1.....3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 21-21-23, 27

U.S. Const. Amend. V.....5, 6, 7, 12, 15, 21-23, 27

U.S. Const. Amend VI.....12, 27

U.S. Const. Amend. XIII.....3, 10, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27

US Amend XIV.....3, 7

US Const. Article III.....10, 18, 20, 27

**Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Application to Justice Alito for a further extension of time to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit  
Case No 21-3198**

I Meghan Kelly, Esq. pursuant to Pursuant to Rules 13.5 and 30.3 of this Court respectfully requests an additional 30 day extension of time or an amount as this Court deems just to file a writ of Certiorari to review the judgment and orders of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Federal Circuit in this case number 21-3198.

1. The opinion and order of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals to review the merits appears at Appendix (“App.”) A, entered 6/30/23. There is a previous Order by the Third Circuit with an opinion on 4/20/23 at App. B. I seek review of an order denying my Motion for reargument on dismissal of my case on 6/22/23 at App C. I seek a review of the Order dated 6/20/23 denying recusal of Judge Scirica and two motions for caveats thereto, 1) caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica to move him for judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent non-lawyers and non-judges from practicing law or taking the place of people judges without government authority, 2) 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 at App. D, and Order entered most recently July 10, 2023 denying my motions for reargument to recuse Scirica and my motion for reargument en banc at App E. I seek review of the order dated 3/15/23 denying Motion to recuse Judge Phipps at App F. I seek review of the Order dated 1/6/23 denying a stay to afford me the opportunity to appeal a Third Circuit reciprocal Order and the DE Disciplinary Order for which the reciprocal orders arose before the US Supreme Court and granting additional time at App G. I seek review of the Order denying Motion for a stay pending Supreme Court Review of This Court’s 1/6/23 Order and to File Reply

Brief 30 Days After, dated 2/9/23 at App. H. Also attached, please find the District Court Orders the Third Circuit affirmed Order with a Memorandum opinion dated 11/2/21 at App. I, an Order with a Memorandum opinion dated 12/22/21 at App. J, and an opinion and a Memorandum Order dated 4/26/22 at App. K. The DE District Court also rendered an Order dated January 5, 2023 granting me ECF filing rights which is not the subject of this appeal at D.I. 111.

2. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254 or in the alternative under 28 U.S.C. § 1253. The date on which the Appellate court decided my case is 4/20/23. A copy of that decision appears at App. B. The date on which the Appellate Court denied my motion for rehearing was on 6/22/23. The due date would have been 9/20/23.

3. I previously requested 60 additional days, and believed I actually had more time than the time calculated in error. This Court granted a 30 day extension extending the due date from 9/20/23 20, to 10/20/23.

4. I respectfully request for good cause this Court extend the deadline for an additional 30 days. The new due date would be Monday 11/20/23, since 60 days falls on a Sunday, per Rule 30.1.

5. I am uncertain whether this Court may extend the date even further. Additional issues have arisen since this Court's grant. In the alternative to my 30 day request above, and only if permissible by law, I respectfully request for good cause an extension in the amount of 60 additional days to appeal this case or an amount of time this court deems just from the extended date, October 20, 2023. The new due date would be on my birth date 1/19/23.

6. I require more time for good cause to preserve my claims and fundamental rights from vitiation in the only forum which may grant me relief, especially in light of the fact the



statute of limitations would run on certain claims should that occur regarding retaliation by the state for bar due petitions before the Delaware Supreme Court.

7. Per the attached exhibits 1 and 2 which contains part of Defendants' 8/23/21 letter and Petition, dated 11/3/23 initiating the probable cause hearing on 11/3/21 at paragraph 7, the Defendants interfered with *Kelly v Trump* to cause me to forgo my appeal to this United States Supreme Court for procedural due process violations at No. 21-5522 based on deeming my religious beliefs in Jesus and the holy spirit inspiring people in the Bible as a disability. It appears the Defendants made a treble violation of my First Amendment rights, attacking me based on disdain for my First Amendment religious beliefs contained in my protected under the First Amendment speech contained in the pleadings submitted in exercise of my First Amendment right to petition, where my religious beliefs are in issue. US Amend V, XIV. I am quite distressed that the State finds my religious belief in Jesus Christ "illogical". The US Supreme Court held, in *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 682. "Courts have no business addressing whether sincerely held religious beliefs asserted in a RFRA case are reasonable." My claims against Presidents Trump and Biden, and the Defendants' wrongful action against me relate to my pleadings in RFRA action *Kelly v Trump*. Accordingly, the ODC and the Board have no business addressing whether my beliefs in the RFRA *Kelly v Trump* are reasonable. *Also see, Africa v. Pennsylvania*, 662 F.2d 1025, 1025 (3d Cir.)("Judges are not oracles of theological verity, and the founders did not intend for them to be declarants of religious orthodoxy."); *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872, 887, ("Repeatedly and in many different contexts, we have warned that courts must not presume to determine the place of a particular belief in a religion or the plausibility of a religious claim.").

8. Loss of my right to the First Amendment religious belief in Jesus as God, not money or business as God *even for a limited time constitutes irreparable injury*. See, Bible, *Matthew* 6:24, *Doe v. Indian River School Dist*, 653 F.3d 256, 283 n.14 (3d Cir. 2011) (“*Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 374, 96 S.Ct. 2673, 49 L.Ed.2d 547 (1976) (“The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.”); see also *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963) at 225, (“[I]t is no defense to urge that the religious practices here may be relatively minor encroachments on the First Amendment.”)”)

9. The State Courts have deprived me of fundamental rights of religious belief and other rights for about 20 years per the last application. I fear I will not be free from state persecution or violations of my religious belief in Jesus, refraining me and others from the ability to buy and sell should this court not grant me sufficient time to appeal. I am scared I will run out of stamps, paper and means to appeal this and other matters. I have two other potential appeals before this Court too. Due to poverty constituting a substantial burden to my access to the courts, I require time to figure out the means I may be able to afford to research, paper, ink, and postage or transportation costs.

10. Per the attached Exhibit 3, please find the issues I outlined for the Third Circuit to review submitted in part with my Motion for Leave to file in forma pauperis below or my initial documents.

9. Please note at the inception of the appeal to the Third Circuit I noted the member of the Delaware Supreme Court’s involvement in the interference of *Kelly v Trump*, in the initiation of the Supreme Court’s arms and agents and in the subsequent Disciplinary proceeding initiated after the Civil rights case began. (Exhibit 3). Later I discovered my suspicions were

correct, and moved in my motions for reargument to add claims against the DE Supreme Court. The Court fired two court staff to inhibit their testimony despite my request for time to call one as a witness. I also discovered the Court concealed two of my pleadings in *Kelly v Trump* as Exhibits and Motions to conceal the fact I requested the Court stop the Court's interference instigated by a Supreme Court member to safeguard my access to the courts, my First Amendment right to petition, procedural due process right to a fair as opposed to a fixed proceeding and other rights. I also moved to amend my complaint once as a matter of right on 1/24/22, withdrew the motion, and filed various rolling motions to amend my complaint as a matter of right when the case was remanded back to the District Court as new and additional information, claims, causing manifest injustice continued to arise since the DE District Court's last Order denying my motion for reargument. There are other claims and Constitutional violations I allege. Since, these are not filed in writeable format since I did not have ECF access and filed by mail or hand delivery by the 4 hour round trip, I attach the motions for reargument in writeable format in the attached 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit, attached hereto and incorporated herein with the table of exhibits contained in the attached exhibits. (Exhibits G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q to 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit attached hereto and incorporated herein)

10. Opposing Counsel did not oppose this extension.

11. Besides the irreparable loss should poverty create a substantial burden so great without time to somehow seek the means to appeal this case, I also face irreparable injury and require time to figure out how to gather the means by research and stamps to defend my Constitutional rights from vitiation by exercising the First Amendment right to petition in other cases. I have a petition before this Court due in *Kelly v US District Court Eastern District Court of Pennsylvania* per US Supreme Court Application Number 23A144, and another petition in

*Kelly v PA ODC* scheduled for conference on September 26, 2023, per US Supreme Court Numbers 22A981, 22-7695.

12. The two reciprocal cases I also intend to appeal arise based on a reciprocal proceeding in the state of Delaware brought to discipline me for the exercise of my private First Amendment rights to religious-political belief, exercise of religious belief speech, association, petition and to cover up years of Court misconduct I petitioned to correct. I risk irreparable injury in terms of loss to my First Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus forever without government incited persecution should I not successfully petition this Court to appeal on the dismissal in the civil rights case. I also may face a needless law suit in PA should I not overturn the PA appeal scheduled for conference in September where PA Supreme Court's rules do not grant it jurisdiction.

13. A lawyer's right, my right to pursue my profession constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and of which I cannot be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the state's disagreement with my religious-political beliefs contained in speech in religious-political petitions.

14. In *Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada*, 501 U.S. 1030, 1057-58 (1991) this Court held"

"At the very least, our cases recognize that disciplinary rules governing the legal profession cannot punish activity protected by the First Amendment, and that First Amendment protection survives even when the attorney violates a disciplinary rule he swore to obey when admitted to the practice of law. See, e. g., *In re Primus*, [436 U.S. 412](#) (1978); *Bates v. State Bar of Arizona*, *supra*. We have not in recent years accepted our colleagues' apparent theory that the practice of law brings with it comprehensive restrictions, or that we will defer to professional bodies when those restrictions impinge upon First Amendment freedoms."

15. Although the Court indicated in *Gentile* the First Amendment of speech may be limited by attorneys, that limit is not limitless. There is certain speech that must be protected

including my religious beliefs contained in my petitions, wherein I seek to protect my genuinely held religious beliefs from a substantial burden caused by former President Trump's establishment of government religion. *Id.* Merely because the Defendants values money and material gain more than the eternal souls of those it is charged to serve not control and exploit does not mean I should not have freedom to my own religious belief I tightly cling too no matter the attacks. I argued more about my concern for eternal lives and less about people threatening me based on Trump's incitement of attacks based on perceived religious-political affiliation because I value eternal life more than gaining the world here to lose my soul, or the souls of others in the second death on judgment day, the last day God speaks of in the Bible.

16. Time is required to give me a fighting chance in this civil rights case relating to the 3 cases I hope to appeal to prevent vitiation of my 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment rights and other claims. 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

17. I require time to afford me the First Amendment right to petition and the 5th Amendment fair opportunity to be heard in the civil rights case and in the appeal relating to the Eastern District of PA on appeal to this court in hopes to prevent 6 new law suits too.

18. To make matter worse, causing great anxiety and duress the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in collusion with the Eastern District Court appeared to booby trap me. Attached hereto and incorporate herein please find 66th, 67th and 73rd affidavits I filed with opposing counsel and the DE District Court showing the Eastern District Court of PA evaded filing my amended Notice of appeal of an order dated 8/7/23 as to vitiate the relief I sought to avoid by its 8/7/23 Order to a Motion the Court requested I draft per the attached.

19. The Eastern District Court filed the second amended notice but indicated the In forma pauperis motion it previously granted was denied per the attached docket notice.

20. To make matters worse, I drafted the attached letter, dated 8/27/22 thanking the justices of the Eastern District Court of PA for allowing me to file by email, which I did. (66<sup>th</sup> and 67<sup>th</sup> affidavits, and Exhibit-Other Case, all attached hereto and incorporated herein). I did not file a motion for ECF access at that time. Nevertheless, Judge Diamond denied a motion for ECF access I did not request by Court Order dated 10/6/22, attached hereto. I sent the Court a letter with 3 reciprocal orders at DI 3, attached hereto in other exhibits. I thanked the Court for allowing me to file by email. The Court indicated they no longer were allowing me to file by email, and I was required to file a motion for ECF that it would grant.

21. The Court requested I file a motion for ECF access so I could fix 2,000 or more misfiled documents including another pro se claimant's health record on the Eastern District Court's docket with it. Then the Court denied the Motion the Court requested I draft on 8/7/23, knowing I do not have funds or the means, even research capacities to respond to their booby trap, placed on another docket to deny me the relief indirectly while setting me up to fall. I desired to preserve my right to appeal should the case go back on remand or be reopened, not reopen another case which would be frivolous as relief is undirectedly denied and harm towards me would be caused as to deny me access to other courts by requiring payment of funds I sought to avoid for an issue not yet ripe. Yet if Judge Diamond may place an order, I should have the power to file an amended appeal to preserve the record to preserve and not waive my rights, should the case be remanded or reopened. I am so upset. In response to my request to correct the docket Judge Diamond scheduled a hearing in bad faith to get out of work and denying me a full and fair opportunity to be heard under the 5th. I drafted a request on what the topic of the

hearing was as there were a number of outstanding motions. In response the Court requested I draft a motion on why I should be barred in its courts since I have been retired from PA since 2018. I thought I was retired. The Court knew I was retired. Per Exhibit W, to the 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit attached hereto and incorporated herein, I filed a letter with PA ODC asking him to stay the proceeding, noting I was retired and there was no harm to anyone since it is impermissible to practice law while retired, dated September 3, 2022. I filed the letter with the Eastern District Court of PA, on 10/12/21 at DI 31. The Court disbarred me based on retirement per its order.

22. I require time in order that my right to buy and sell as an attorney is not exterminated but for my exercise of the First Amendment rights to petition, to speech, to religious belief contained in my petitions even if the courts should find my religious beliefs repugnant.

23. The First Amended notice was not formally rejected or mailed back by the Eastern District Court. It is normal protocol for a US District Court to send back or note rejection of documents. No one noted a rejection or sent back the amended notice dated 8/7/23. The title of this notice was the same as the original notice of appeal labeled Third Circuit Court of appeals on top, but the staff suggested I file one labeled US District Court Eastern District of Appeal. I complied on 8/11/23 noting my desire to amend the Notice of appeal and attaching the August 7 Notice I previously submitted for filing. This Notice was docketed on 8/14/23

24. On 8/24/23, the Third Circuit filed case opening documents in bad faith in a separate matter so as to tempt me to file a frivolous appeal which would vitiate the relief I sought to avoid, while setting me up for a booby trap by retaining opposing counsel needlessly in order to create an obstacle so great as to deny me access to this Court in 3 appeals due to poverty,

religious beliefs against debt, invocation of the 13th Amendment, lack of stamps, access to resources and means to appeal this matter, *Kelly v PA ODC*, and *Kelly v US District Court, Eastern District of PA*, Application Number 23A144. (See 66<sup>th</sup>, 67<sup>th</sup> and 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavits, specifically see exhibit C to the 73<sup>rd</sup> affidavit)

25. I seek to appeal Orders in *Kelly v US District Court, Eastern District of PA* (hereinafter “other case”) with this US Supreme Court per the application attached to the 67<sup>th</sup> affidavit and incorporated herein . This US Supreme Court kindly granted an extension to appeal that case on or before December 26, 2023.

26. I filed documents in the other case and even more documents in this case wherein I argued it is unconstitutional to regulate federal judges, and specifically the US Supreme Court. See the affidavits attached to Exhibit B of the 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit, Exhibits 1-11, 13-19 therein.

27. It has come to my attention that this Court allows regulation of federal judges below which will likely be used to threaten this court above based on the fact the same arguments I make against regulating the Supreme Court I make against regulating federal judges. So, it is foreseeable law makers and marketing lobbyists will note this hypocrisy as a reason to allow the same or similar regulations of the US Supreme Court the US Supreme Court approves of to regulate the appellate and district courts.

28. I oppose regulating any federal judge based on the affidavits I filed with DE District Court. However, despite the fact I attached some of these on the Third Circuit Court’s docket in this case, the issue on this case is whether my civil rights case should be heard. I have not even served the complaint. If the case should be remanded it would give this court an opportunity to consider other arguments and additional attacks against the court as they arise or



allow the lower courts to hone in the issues, after all the rules regulating federal judges apply to them.

29. The Judicial branch is schemed not only to be eliminated by automation, but also replaced by non-judges judging in place of judges, banks, central banks, world banks, IMF, BIS (the global money changer), businesses, not for profits, churches and charities through block chain technology this court may consider limiting with the just rule of law.

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

31. The proceedings also involves the important question as to whether anyone with a license to practice law has any First Amendment private freedoms to 1) petition, 2) religious belief, 3) association as a Christian, Catholic, Democrat without removal of the association as a lawyer but for the exercise of the right to petition to safeguard religious beliefs contained in private speech the government finds repugnant, or speech to petition to correct government misconduct or mistakes without retaliation but for the exercise of the 1st Amendment right to petition or 1st Amendment right of speech petitioning the courts for grievances of caused by government misconduct and mistakes based on subject matter making the government above the

law and lawyers below the law 4) Private speech outlining my religious beliefs in Jesus as God not money or mammon or professional collective gain as God which is the mark of lawlessness leading to damnation in hell, 5) and other private claims and rights from government infringements and violations of including, but not limited to, Equal Protections under the 5th and 14th, 6th Amendment right to self-represent, claims for a fair trial, claims for a right to pleadings in a case against me Case Number 541, claims relating to a conspiracy under 1985 to cause me to forgo *Kelly v Trump* by Delaware supreme Court incited witnesses intimidation, threats, concealing evidence by sealing evidence in my favor to cover up procedural due process and misconduct by the state court, preventing my ability to call witnesses by ignoring my motions where I assert the right to self-represent, to perform discovery, scheduling the hearing within fewer days required to subpoena witnesses 8 days as opposed to 10 required by the state disciplinary rules and other harm such as firing two court staff to conceal evidence necessary to my defense, the reciprocal proceedings and this case, and other claims. (Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 12 (h))

32. This Court does not have any important justification necessary to uphold a compelling interest in denying time somehow more important than my exercise of the First Amendment right to petition to safeguard the exercise of fundamental rights and other interests in this and two other cases. I respectfully time be granted in order that I may attempt to effectively appeal the civil rights case and in this case. I am quite concerned about inability to pay for postage to mail out documents, poverty creating an actual impediment to my right to exercise the First Amendment right to petition. I hope to beg my parents for stamps. So, I need time to persuade them to assist me too please. I am using up most of my stamps in filing this application.

33. I also need time to consider how to ask this US Supreme Court to please be our hero by preventing the schemed regulation of this US Supreme Court that will be used to eliminate this court to eliminate the rule of law that protects the Constitutional freedoms we all hold dear from elimination by entities who enslave, oppress, kill, steal and destroy without restraints in the form of love written on their hearts or the just rule of law should this Court not stop it.

34. I do not know how I will be able to afford to appeal everything. I previously attempted to file a variety of motions with this Court my case manager rejected including permission to file electronically without paper copies. It is possible she rejected them since I filed them prior to not simultaneously with my petition. I also considered asking this Court to waive an in person hearing and grant this court authority to render an order on the papers, given my poverty creates a substantial burden upon my access to the courts. Additionally, the compelled poverty based on Delaware preventing me from returning to the profession of my choice has caused a strain on my ability to care for my health, work out and drink water given my special needs due to a surgery which forever weakened me in my youth. I cannot afford a membership to the gym where I could more easily drink a gallon of water. I have religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare. Attached please find Exhibit 43 which contains some beliefs about healthcare, and other documents including a record concerning bad care.

35. 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.

36. Two of my cases that may be rejected or accepted before this Court *Kelly v US District Court, Eastern District of PA* 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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. Art III.

37. 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.

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

39. 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. The arguments I make on the record 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.

40. 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. (Please see Exhibits D, E and F to 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit, attached hereto)

41. 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. See 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit Exhibits P, Q, R, S, T., See Art. III.

42. On the record below in this case and the other case I moved to recuse Judge Phipps and Scirica per the attached motions and amended Motion and caveats I attach hereto and incorporate herein.

43. In pleadings on the dockets 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

other case to show I have continuously objected to regulating the US supreme Court or ending life time appointments during good behavior.

44. 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.

45. 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. I have religious beliefs requiring impartiality by the courts that may provide unique standing. Preventing regulations of judges prevents the appearance of partiality or the actual partiality of judges towards the regulators as opposed to the impartial application of the rule of law to protect my liberty, as applied and the claims of others whose exercise of Constitutionally protected liberties do not conform to the standards or regulations US Supreme Court justices may be compelled to obey, should this Court not limit the check upon its own branch to the purview of the Constitution by 1. Cases and Controversies, or 2 impeachment, without waiver of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right against self-incrimination and compelling citizens like me to waive their 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to an impartial court to a court that becomes partial towards the regulators business goals as opposed to justice.

46. My cases may allow the courts to prevent the danger. 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 or the other case gives you the authority within the law not mere ever changing fickle public opinion or perception to preserve these United States.

47. 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 and the other 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.

48. In the attached 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit I am trying to narrow the questions to appeal in the other case, but they are getting rather voluminous including but not limited to:

### **“QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

I. Whether Meghan Kelly (“Kelly”) has standing to ask the US Supreme Court to prevent regulations or disciplinary rules binding the US Supreme Court and its members 1) to prevent the elimination of the impartial rule of law by the elimination of the independence federal judges require 2), to uphold the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Equal protections component as applied to Kelly as a party of one with her unique religious beliefs or exercise of religious beliefs against partiality in the courts and justice as a command by God in *Amos* 5:15, 3), to prevent compelled violations of her religious beliefs and 4) given the unique facts of this case, including but not limited to evidence Kelly provided plans to use standardization and regulations to eliminate people judges and people staff (as outlined in her Motion for additional time and record below in this case and her civil rights case) to eliminate the rule of law that restrains businesses from enslaving, oppressing, killing, stealing or destroying human life, liberty or health unrestrained by love written in the hearts of men or the just rule of law.

II. Should the Court deny Kelly First-party standing, whether Kelly has Third Party standing based on her special or close relationship with the right holder(s) the US Supreme court members and Federal courts to prevent regulations or elimination of life

time appointments during good behavior given she is an active member of the US Supreme Court whose religious exercise of beliefs includes upholding the impartiality of the courts, she made arguments against regulating the US Supreme Court in this case and the right holder the members of the US Supreme Court or federal courts face obstacles to suing on their own behalf because they may not be the judge in their own case, but may consider the Constitutional rights violated by Congressional or self-regulation of its members or the federal judiciary not limited to such regulations creating courts that violate the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment Equal Protections clause against partiality towards Kelly and other claimants by such regulations making the courts partial to the rules that control their judicial positions as opposed to the Constitutional application of the rule of law which protects Kelly's and other claimants Constitutional rights and claims.

III. Whether Congress or third parties may commandeer the court to draft disciplinary rules or obey rules in violation of their 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right against self-incrimination by required incrimination through regulations that impede the federal judiciary's impartial application of the rule of law violating the separations of power, making the federal judiciary branch incapable of placing checks on the other two branches without the fear of reprisal or removal.

IV. Whether Congressional commandeering of the US Supreme Court to consent to incriminating rules by forced waiver of the 5<sup>th</sup> amendment right against self-incrimination violates the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment against involuntary bondage to regulators by commandeering the court to the dictates of the regulators or forcing them to draft rules that will be used to incriminate judges in compelled violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right against self-incrimination by government compelled forced not free choice.

V. Whether regulations and disciplinary rules standardizing the Federal courts or the practice of law impede and infringe upon Kelly's First Amendment exercise of religious belief, exercise of religious belief, association, speech, and petition in defense of Constitutional rights and other claimants whose exercise of fundamental rights do not conform to the standards.

VI. Whether we need people judges to uphold Kelly's exercise of First Amendment rights including but not limited to religious beliefs which do not conform to the majority or the standardized exercise of fundamental rights or whether automation or allowing nonjudges such as out of state title companies, banks, charities, churches, not for profits or businesses to be the judge of her and the people suffices.

VII. Can the Courts prevent nonlawyers from practicing law and non-judges from judging without government authority given no State or Federal Courts attorney disciplinary rules allow the US Attorney General, the State Attorney General or the Office of Disciplinary Counsel to prevent non lawyers and nonjudges from allowing entities or automation to replace licensed attorneys or sworn in judges, given Kelly ran for office because title Companies practiced law without a license, messed up on the chain of title, and took advantage of her deceased colleague Dick Goll, and it appears to continue and will get worse as Kelly believes real estate chain of title will assist in an agenda to allow private entities to recoup resources to control the people and the government to eliminate the government if left unstopped by the courts.



VIII Whether we need unregulated people judges to uphold Kelly's Constitutional exercise of First Amendment rights contained in the speech in her petitions which do not conform to standardized religious belief, exercise of belief or religious-political association, since her religious beliefs are so unique they cannot be automated or boxed into standards.

IX. Whether eliminating life time appointments of US Supreme Court judges eliminates the impartiality of the judges by tempting them to be partial to who maintains, reappoints or otherwise controls their seats as opposed to the impartial application of the rule of law.

X. Whether Congress may commandeer the Supreme Court to draft rules requiring they waive the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right against self-incrimination, and possibly setting them up for **ex post facto** character evidence, despite good behavior, given disciplinary rules allow ex post facto evidence as to character and conduct in attorney and judicial disciplinary cases. So, there is a similar risk federal judges may be threatened and extorted to bend their will to the dictates of those who behave like mobsters by threats instead of using their minds in cases or controversies or impeachment.

XI Whether regulating federal judges, including district court and appellate judges, by disciplinary rules and requiring term limits makes federal judges partial to the regulations and those who wield the power to regulate as opposed to the impartial application to the Constitutional rule of law violating my religious beliefs as a party of one against partiality.

XII. Whether Courts must allow lawyers to correct judges and courts within the purview of the Constitution 1. in cases and controversies or 2. Impeachment without retaliation in order that the courts may uphold the constitutional rule of law and guide otherwise misguided parties "as to what the law is" to improve and uphold the administration of justice.

XIII. Where federal judges may only be corrected within the purview of the Constitution's limits of 1. Cases and controversies, and 2. Impeachment to preserve the Constitutional checks by the only branch that safeguards our Constitutional liberties from being sacrifice to serve fickle mob lusts through the vote by the other two branches.

XIV. Whether the Third Circuit abused its discretion in bad faith, in clear error of law, and clear error of fact as to cause manifest injustice against me by its orders dated June 30, 2023 in dismissing my case while simultaneously denying my motions for a stay, motion for time, motion to vacate an order limiting my motion for an extension of time to three pages given the voluminous reasons time is required and limit on filings under the threat of sanctions given my Motion for reconsideration of Order dated January 17, 2023, with regards denial of waiver of costs, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights and invocation of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, motion to correct the record given the lower court misfiled 1000s of papers and placed another pro se claimants health records, and other motions, given the two orders deprived me of the Constitutional First Amendment right to petition under a motion for a rehearing under FRAP 40 on these orders and the order denying Kelly's

motion to recuse Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps as to deprive me the opportunity to petition and fair opportunity to be heard in violation of procedural due process, denying my Motion to stay this case until the civil rights proceeding is concluded with no possibility to appeal, under the extraordinary circumstances where I face irreparable injury in terms of loss of private Constitutional rights, including but not limited to First Amendment rights to petition, speech, religious belief, exercise of religious belief, association, other claims and am threatened with potentially 6 needless additional law suits where my exercise of Constitutional rights face further restraint to :

- i. Prevent loss of fundamental rights and claims in this case and the civil rights case,
- ii. Prevent potentially 6 needless lawsuits;
- iii. prevent duplicity of potentially conflicting decisions in parallel disciplinary cases and in this case and the civil rights.
- iv. prevent potentially needless unaffordable costs relating to duplicated litigation on the same issues from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, creating an obstacle so great as to deny me access to the courts to defend my license and exercise of fundamental rights, given my poverty and religious objection to debt, and invocation against involuntary servitude, especially given the original disciplinary order prevents me from working in the profession of my free choice
- v. prevent a government compelled violation of my religious belief against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in defense of the exercise of fundamental rights and license(s) by increase in needless, duplicative material costs, time and lack of access or limited access to resources including research;
- vi. prevent government compelled involuntary servitude in violation of my asserted 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment right in exchange with access to the courts to defend my licenses and liberties from being taken away but for my religious beliefs in Jesus reflected in my speech contained in my private petitions,
- vii. prevent the risk of loss of my fundamental rights to religious belief, religious exercise of beliefs, political and religious speech, association and the right to privately petition to the courts to address grievances to safeguard my exercise of religious belief without state persecution but for disagreement with my religious-political speech contained in my petitions, before the Delaware Courts.
- viii. prevent the chilling of the exercise of First Amendment liberties by the public or other professionals who may fear reprisal in the form of the loss of their license or threat of character assassination b being deemed mentally disabled but for their exercise of individual liberties merely because the State disagrees with their First Amendment beliefs, or their petitions or their attempt to hold the government, including government agents of both state and federal government to the limits of the Constitution.
- ix. prevent harm to my health and life. My health has diminished. I require time to maintain my health and life, in light of my specific permanent weakness related to a past surgery in my youth, which Defendants and all courts in related litigation have been apprised of, even the Delaware Chancery and

Supreme Court. Without time to accommodate my weaknesses my health will diminish further, jeopardizing my life. (Citing, US Amendments I, V, XIII).

- x. Given there is a reasonable probability that four Justices will consider the issue sufficiently meritorious to grant certiorari or to note probable jurisdiction; (2) a fair prospect that a majority of the Court will conclude that the decision below was erroneous; and (3) a likelihood that irreparable harm will result from the denial of a stay.
- xi. The public, the Court and the Defendants are not prejudiced by a stay pending conclusion of the civil rights case.
- xii. In addition, in my other appeal and on the record below in this case, I indicate my belief the courts are in danger. I believe my appeal for the Third Circuit matter may stifle the plans to eliminate courts, before a far worse scheme is implemented. I must be afforded an opportunity to provide evidence of my belief. It is the mere opportunity to be heard I seek to protect not the guarantee.
- xiii. The public is harmed if a stay is not granted.
- xiv. The balance of the equities require a stay to prevent the loss of my fundamental rights because I had the courage to imperfectly defend them in the Delaware Courts.

XV. Whether considering the factors outlined in XIV above the US Supreme Court must grant a stay in this case, and whether this Court may reverse the decision to safeguard my First Amendment right to petition to prevent the irreparable loss in term so loss of Constitutional rights forever in the state of Delaware and other irreparable harm.

XVI. Whether this Court should resolve the split in the Third Circuit and Fourth Circuit concerning whether a claimant may appeal an order denying recusal of a judge prior to a final determination on the merits, in light of the dissent brilliantly distinguishing Supreme Court case Order on this issue at *Martin v Knox*, 112 S.Ct. 620.

XVII. Whether the Appellate Court abused its discretion in denying my Motion to recuse Judge Phipps and Motion for a rehearing to recuse Judge Phipps so as to deny me a fair proceeding in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to procedural due process, given this reciprocal disciplinary law suit arises based on my Freedom Restoration Act Law suit against President Trump to alleviate a substantial burden upon my exercise of religious belief by dissolving a course of conduct I argued established government religion, when Judge Phipps was twice nominated to the US Supreme Court, I moved to recuse him in the civil rights case, the state's false allegations testified in his head without an opportunity to cross examine them in this separate suit when the temptation to rule against me with the very real prospect of a reward in terms of appointment to the US Supreme Court in light of the fact there is a high likelihood of a vacancy and Phipps' appointment in light of the threats and pressures to force justices to be impeached or retire tempting an ordinary person should they be placed in Phipps' position to be unduly prejudiced against me and for opponent, especially since President Trump is popular and is likely to be reelected, and given Phipps' ruled against me in the civil rights case and this case.

XVIII. Whether the Appellate Court abused its discretion in denying my Motion to recuse Judge Scirica and Motion for a rehearing to recuse Judge Scirica so as to deny

me a fair proceeding in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to procedural due process, given he too ruled against me in the civil rights case, allowing a different parties testimony which I did not have the means to contest due to the threat of sanctions testifying in this case, and given I opposed Delaware Disciplinary rules and Delaware disciplinary proceedings on the record, which reflect the federal judicial rules Scirica drafts, and I seek to render those rules unconstitutional in both the civil rights case and this case, given the common person would be insulted and rule against me given I oppose Judge Scirica's rules and seek to overturn his hard work.

XIX Whether Justice Scirica or Phipp's participation violated due process rendering the orders they rendered void or voidable requiring the orders below be vacated. US Amend I, V.

XX Whether Third Circuit Court of Appeals abused its discretion by failing to file either of the two amended notices I filed in response to the August 7, 2023 order by Judge Diamond in the District for the Eastern District of PA Court filed in bad faith to increase costs needlessly as to cause me to forgo access to the courts as to deny me the First Amendment right to petition by preserving the record should the case be remanded or reopened essentially vitiating my Constitutional rights and other claims I seek to protect.

XXI. Given I filed an amended notice by mailing the same and emailing the same on August 7, 2023 to the District Court, which it did not file, but gave to the Third Circuit, wherein I never received official filed notice or a letter of rejection, when it is customary for Courts to send back rejected documents, just a verbal request from District Court staff to change the heading to Eastern District Court and they would file it despite filing my initial notice with the heading Third Circuit Court of appeals, when neither the Eastern District Court, nor the Third Circuit Court filed the first notice, and the Third Circuit indicated it docketed the notice by allowing me to file it, while setting up a booby trap by creating a new case Number where Solicitor appears to be opposing counsel to create the burden to my access to the courts my Amended Notice was meant to prevent vitiating the rights I sought to preserve should the case be remanded or reopened.

XXII. Whether the Third Circuit's denial of my motion to exempt costs, taxes and any other fee must be overturned in order not to violate my First Amendment rights to petition, religious beliefs against debt misleading people to certain damnation in hell by making mammon God in violation of Jesus Christ's teachings in Matthew 6:24, my invocation of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, and my poverty making fees and costs obstacles to my access to the Courts below, and other courts as to deprive my of the First Amendment right to petition to defend Constitutional rights thereby vitiating my Constitutional rights and claims forever, especially my protected right to religious belief in Jesus Christ as God not money or material gain as God without government persecution.

XXIII Whether Kelly's Special appearance as capable of repetition yet evading review under current case law allows other lawyers to specially appear before the US Supreme Court without fear disciplined attorneys' hope of a hero will be their attacker who will attack them more quickly under Rule 8 should they exercise their First Amendment right to petition attorney discipline orders on Constitutional defects or other Constitutional grounds, thus chilling the First Amendment right and other liberties of

Citizen lawyers or whether the courts should create a new rule to safeguard Constitutional rights from citizen lawyers who should not be compelled to sell freedom for a license to buy and sell. See the Bible's reference referring this to the mark of the beast.

XXIV If this court seeks to discipline Kelly in response to her request for help whether they should place her license on inactive disabled in the Eastern District of PA Court to prevent its own court from initiating a law suit against Kelly, and prevent the initiation of 6 more needless lawsuits based on the bad faith of Appellant to render an order to get out of correcting over 2,000 pages of misfiled documents showing relevant information of Delaware or other reciprocating Court's mistreatment or condoning mistreatment of Kelly based on the her religious beliefs, place of origin, or exercise of Constitutional protected rights, including another pro se claimants medical exhibits, to prevent her from not having enough stamps, paper to continue this appeal, the appeal and hopefully remand in the civil rights case, and the appeal in Kelly v PA ODC so as to deprive her of 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment fair access to the courts to exercise her First Amendment right to petition to prevent the vitiation of her constitutional rights and other claims forever."

49. On an aside, the issue relating to special appearance is rather critical since I do not want to be sued by this Court by petitioning the Court for help. (Please see the 72<sup>nd</sup> Affidavit incorporated herein noting my concerns that the court may sue me or other attorneys for asking for help so as to chill the First Amendment right to petition based on Constitutional defects and Constitutional arguments that I believe should be appealed first as opposed to placing the appellant accused guilty until proven innocent. It is rather unfair for all accused attorneys in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Applicable to Federal Courts and the 14<sup>th</sup> related to state courts).

50. 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.

51. "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)

52. 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.

53. 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.

54. 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.

55. 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.

56. Per the exhibits attached to the 73<sup>rd</sup> Affidavit which were placed in this case and on the other case 22-3372 at 3DI-55 at Exhibit P through other exhibits page 1 through 79, and the attached letter dated 1/3/23, filed with the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit below, 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.

57. 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.

58. 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, the exhibits I attach hereto labeled *Exhibits on an Agenda to Eliminate people in the law to eliminate the law to eliminate the government that restrains entities from getting as much as they can for as little unrestrained from the just rule of law from oppressing, killing, stealing or destroying human life, liberty or health for the bottom line.*

59. 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.

60. Attached, please find the 74<sup>th</sup> Affidavit I filed with the district Court outlining 4 stealthy attacks against the court to eliminate the courts down the line 1. Allowing Central banks and banks to judge in place of judges by debits and credits under the carbon credit plan. 2. Allowing businesses, charities and churches to judge in place of judges while being unreachable by the courts by determining who may buy or sell or be granted resources (in my case Walmart will not allow me to buy less expensive printing supplies online since I do not have a bank account as debt is against my religious belief, and I tried to use a gift card), 3. Verbal repetitive insults like we read about in the papers to drill it into people's brains in hopes they believe a lie and do not think things out 4. Through automation. Note, Case Text's AI legal drafting system was bought by Westlaw's affiliate Thompson Rueter. A representative explained to me the lawyer who got into trouble for using ChatGPT was because ChatGPT scans the entire internet, not merely case law and statutes on Westlaw, like their AI system Thompson Rueter bought from Case text. This is a problem since we need judges to safeguard the liberties of those who do not conform with the exercise of liberties exercised in past case law. Only people judges may protect individuals and individual exercise of rights of people like me whose religious belief does not conform to the standards of others.

61. 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.



August 31, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

DE Bar Number 4968

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

(302) 493-6693

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

US Supreme Court Bar No. 283696