

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

**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 Court of Appeals for the Third
Circuit Case No 22-3372**

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Pro Se, not represented by
Counsel, Defending my private religious
belief in Jesus as God not money as God
Matthew 6:24
US Bar 283696
(301) 493-6693
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

QUESTION PRESENTED

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 5th 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.

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

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....1-11

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1-a Constitutional and statutory provisions involved.....1

Appendix A (Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI”) 3DI61) Order dated **July 26, 2023** denying

- 1) Motion by Appellant Meghan Kelly for Reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule R. 2, 35, 40 for a en ban rehearing of Motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023;
- 2) Motion filed by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly to Expedite DI 49-50 Motion for Reconsideration of Order Dated 6/20/23 denying the Recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for an en banc rehearing Consider Motions denied by this Court on 6/30
- 3) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly to Reopen Appeal;
- 4) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly for Reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023;
- 5) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly for Reconsideration of Order Dated June 30, 2023 denying Motion for Extension of Time to File Brief on Appeal
- 6) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly for rehearing on papers/reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 regarding 3 motions to vacate Order dated May 19, 2023 with regards denial of waiver of costs by threatening me with 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 compelled violation of my invoked 13th Amendment right against involuntary servitude,
- 7) Indirectly denying Motion for a rehearing on denial of a stay and all outstanding motions not addressed.....

Appendix B (3DI-48) Order dated **June 30, 2023** denying

- 1) Unopposed Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly to Vacate order dated 05/19/2023;
- 2) Unopposed Motion by Appellant to Amend Correct Motion to Vacate to Include Pursuant to Fed. R. App. Proc R 27(b) and Rule 40;
- 3) Motion by Appellant to for Leave to Exceed Word Limit for Corrected Motion to Vacate Order dated May 19, 2023;
- 4) Motion by Appellant to Correct the Record, Specifically District Court Docket Item, DI 12 under Rule 10 (e)(2)(c) and Rule 27;
- 5) . Motion by Appellant for Extension of Time to File Brief and Appendix for 120 Days to appeal the lower court's order placing license on disbarred as retired but for religious beliefs, religious political beliefs, and religious political speech contained in petitions;
- 6) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly to stay of this proceeding including briefing, with the allowance of 30 additional days, when the stay is lifted at the conclusion of case 21-3198.

Appendix C (3DI-48) Clerk Order dated **June 30, 2023** dismissal for failure to prosecute

Appendix D (3DI-46) Order denying recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica

Appendix E (3DI-35) Clerk Order threatening sanctions for placing misfiled docket items below and relevant other documents to refer to by reference in my attempt to reduce the appendix, and limiting my motion for an extension of time to 3 pages in bad faith given my religious objections to debt, poverty creating an obstacle to my access to the courts and invocation of the 13th Amendment.

Appendix F (3DI-18) Clerk Order dated **February 1, 2023** denying 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, “to be referred to the merits panel once briefing is complete”

Appendix G (3DI-16) Clerk Order dated January 17, 2023, denying Motion by Appellant to exempt costs due to utter poverty and due to foreseeable costs creating a substantial burden upon access to the courts and forced violation of religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness

Appendix H (3DI-62) Order refusing to docket the Amended notice of appeal filed with the Eastern District Court, causing the Eastern District Court of PA not to docket the first and second notice I filed with the Eastern District of PA that were not returned

Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Motion for Reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 denying stay under Rules 2, 40, 1st, and 5th Amendment asserted rights to prevent irreparable injury (3DI-56), and exhibits thereto including but not limited to

Exhibit A and B orders denying June 30, 2023 relief and dismissing the case

Exhibit C Motion to Reopen Case to Consider pleadings filed July 4, 2023 and July 5, 2023, Motion to Reopen the case to exercise the 1st Amendment right to petition under FRAP 40 Motions for reargument on denied motions and another potential motion, excluding exhibits, filed on July 10, 2023 Third Circuit Docket Items (hereinafter “3DI”) 3DI 53, 3DI 54, 3DI 55 in 22-3372 incorporated in full, attached in part)

Exhibit D (Initial Complaint in the Civil rights case though I moved multiple times to amend to include new and additional claims, parties and t shorten it, not included herein 21-1490 District Court Case 21-1490)

Exhibit E (Email to Supreme Court regarding swearing in violates religious belief, sadness years later when Court disregarded my request to affirm for disobeying Jesus Christ) dated , February 21, 2012 to Jeanie Balke

Exhibit F Motion to the Delaware Supreme Court to be excused from notary and affirming requirements on religious grounds dated June 6, 2022, and internal exhibits A-D thereto

Exhibit G October 1, 2012 letter to Delaware Supreme Court Justice regarding the partiality of judicial presenters based on firm size or place of origin at a CLE

Exhibit H Bumper stickers I made when I ran for Delaware House of Representatives in 2018

Exhibit I Newspaper articles I drafted or was in

Exhibit J December 10, 2009 letter to family Court Judge requesting I be removed from the list of rotating lawyers appointed for family law proceedings based on religious belief

Exhibit K 2012 letter to family Court Judge requesting I be removed from the list of rotating lawyers appointed for family law proceedings based on religious belief

Exhibit L RFRA Complaint Kelly v President Trump filed in 2020

Exhibit M Complaint Kelly v Democrats seeking to enjoin democrats and the department of election from conditioning my right to run for office on the elimination of other fundamental rights, including requiring I violate my religious belief as applied to me as a party of one

Exhibit N Letter to the US Supreme Court per the US Supreme Court staff's request dated April 3, 2019

Exhibit O Picture of Representative Steve Smyk who heled me when Representative Ronald Gray attacked me on bury the Hacket Day in lower Delaware, despite being a republican displaying leadership and compassion for all even me, a democrat who sometimes disagrees with him. He placed people above profiting party interests as a leader servant

A-4 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 attachments thereto, filed on May 27, 2021, with attachments thereto

A-5 Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this matter, and exhibits thereto, filed June 2, 2021, with attachments

Exhibit P Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Opening Brief in the Civil rights case moving the Third Circuit Court of Appeals to vacate the Delaware District Orders (DI. DI 16-17, 30-31, 59-60), and to remand the matter to the Delaware District Court for consideration

Appellant Meghan Kelly's Petition for a Panel Rehearing dated June 3, 2023 in the Civil rights case

Email showing the DE Supreme Court sealed the two motions showing the Court's violation of my procedural due process rights in Kelly v Trump, 1) 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, Internal Exhibit thereto, including December 1, 2020 letter to Master Patricia Griffin of the Chancery Court regarding my belief I received disparate treatment by the court's staff based on religious belief, political association or poverty; emails, Internal Exhibit, Oct 19, 2020 letter to Patricia Griffin regarding I am acting as a party not as an attorney, DE-Lapp threatening email, Internal Exhibit, letter dated May 21, 2020, and 2) Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this matter, and exhibits thereto, filed June 2, 2021, with attachments

Appellant Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Motion for leave to exceed the word limit in her Motion for Reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 denying stay under Rules 2, 40, 1st, and 5th Amendment asserted rights to prevent irreparable injury.....end of 3DI 56

Petitioner Meghan Kelly moves this Court to recuse Four Judges, Judge Hardiman, Judge Phipps, Judge Honorable Montgomery-Reeves, and Judge Scirica, dated June 8, 2023 and exhibits thereto not limited to

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Motion to recuse the Honorable Thomas Hardiman and the Honorable Tamika Montgomery-Reeves from participating in this Case to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5th, dated January 3, 2023

Exhibit A showing my religious objection of celebrating birth dates or being defined by age by telling the newspaper “I am ageless” when I ran for office.

Exhibit B Picture of nominee for US Supreme Court Third Circuit Appellate Judge the Honorable Thomas Hardiman and I when I did an unpaid externship with him during law school. I have the highest regards for him and care about him as a person beyond a judge.

Exhibit C email requesting position on recusal to opposing counsel, noting with concern two DE Supreme Judges I sought to add as defendants in the civil rights case on January 24, 2023 retired from the State Court, Judge Tameka Montgomery Reeves was inducted as an appellate judge of the third circuit by appointment by President Biden. I sought to substitute Biden for Trump in Kelly v Trump

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Motion to recuse the Honorable Peter J. Phipps twice a nominee to US Supreme Court by President Trump to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5th, dated February 14, 2023

Exhibit A thereto August 23, 2021 threatening letter by DE ODC during Kelly v Trump in violation of 42 USC 1985 and my First Amendment right to petition in a live case top cause me to forgo my First Amendment right to petition the US Supreme Court by threats

Exhibit B ODC petition showing my religious belief in the Bible to be the reason for discipline and disability

Exhibit C October 2020 Letter to Master Patricia Griffin of the DE Chancery Court

Federal Reserve Press release that banks reserve requirements remain at zero not 10 percent setting up banks to fail in bank runs by intentional design

February 15, 2023 letter to the court, including additional reasons to recuse Judge Phipps
Exhibit C shows Judge Phipps taught at Duquesne, the school I petitioned when I had rats in my apartment and was on tv.

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Renewed Motion to screen and recuse the Honorable Justice Tamika Montgomery-Reeves from participating in this Case to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5th, dated February 16, 2023

Order granting Honorable Thomas Hardiman's recusal and denying Justice Montgomery Reeves Recusal as not ripe, dated January 6, 2023

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Motion to recuse the Honorable Judge Anthony J. Sirica to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5th in civil rights case, dated June 8, 2023,

Exhibit A email showing present sense impression upon discovery Judge Scirica chairs rules on judicial discipline and disability to opposing counsel in civil rights case

Exhibit B 41st Affidavit filed in civil rights case and exhibits thereto regarding judicial discipline

39th Affidavit update in civil rights case

April 26, 2022 letter to Chief Delaware District Court Judge Colm F. Connelly regarding newly discovered information, and desire to contest the Constitutionality of two more Delaware Disciplinary Rules, including a letter where the DE Supreme Court copied the arms to attack me, and exhibits thereto

Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion to 1. declare the Reporting Requirements unconstitutional, requiring by written rule I violate my 5th 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, dated August 19, 2022

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, dated August 15, 2022

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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Book, Bible

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| <i>Amos</i> , 5:15..... | 5 |
| <i>Matthew</i> 6:24..... | 5 |
| <i>Matthew</i> , 23:23 | 5 |

Case Law

Procedural Rules

| | |
|--|---|
| Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure Rue 2..... | 1 |
| Supreme Court Rule 30..... | 1 |

Publications Statutes

US Constitution

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------|
| U.S. Cons. Amend. 1..... | 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 |
| U.S. Const. Amend. V..... | 2 |
| U.S. Const. Amend. XIII..... | 2, 4, |
| US Amend XIV..... | 7 |
| US Const. Article III..... | 5 |

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

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 Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit Case No 22-3372

I Meghan Kelly, Esq., pursuant to United States Supreme Court Rule 30, and Fed. R. App. P. 2, for good cause in the interest of justice move this Honorable United States Supreme for an extension of time to file a writ of Certiorari to appeal the Third Circuit decision denying a plethora of motions, and denying me the First Amendment right to a fair opportunity to petition on rehearing under FRAP Rule 40 on motions by dismissing the case for failure to prosecute simultaneously with denying my motions for a stay and for time effectively denying me the 5th Amendment fair opportunity to be heard to prevent the vitiation of my private First Amendment rights of religious-belief, religious exercise of belief, speech, association, property interests in my license to practice law and other claims.

1. The orders of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals to review the merits of appear at multiple dates: including a denial of a motion to reopen the case to consider my motions for rehearing under FRAP Rule 40, with denial of motions for reargument on a plethora of other motions for reargument, including but not limited to the June 30, 2023 Orders at Appendix (“App”) A, **dated 7/26/23**, including denial of rearguments of stay, time, vacating order dated 5/19/23, recusal of Scirica and Phipps, and denial of reargument to vacate order dated 6/30/23; **6/30/23 Order** denying 1. motion to vacate order dated 5/19.23 limiting motion for time to 3 pages, 2. Motion to correct record, 3. Motion for time, 4. Motion for stay and 5. Other two motions at App B; **6/30/23 Order** dismissing the case for failure to prosecute at App C; 6/20/23

Order denying recusal of Judges Phipps and Scirica at App D; 5/19/23 Order limiting Motion for an extension of time to 3 pages and threat of sanctions for violating page limit and order at App E; 2/1/23 Clerk Order postponing consideration of my motions to exempt costs and taxes based on religious belief against debt, poverty creating a substantial burden to access to the courts in the exercise of my First Amendment right to petition to safeguard not merely my property interests in licenses to practice law but my Constitutional liberties, life and eternal life, invocation against the 13th and other arguments at App F; 1/17/23 Clerk Order denying motion to be exempt from costs at App G; **8/8/23** Clerk Order staying action on amended notice of appeal of District Court's 8/7/23 order denying Motion for ECF action. There is no opinion to publish.

2. There is no opposing party. I asked the Appellee in name the US District Court for the Eastern District of PA for its position through Justice Diamond. He did not oppose or respond.

3. The case and motions were denied and dismissed on June 30, 2023.

4. The Court denied my motions for reargument to overturn the dismissal and orders on July 26, 2023.

5. The date the petition is due is on October 24, 2023.

6. I respectfully request 60 additional days for good cause. The new date would be December 23, 2023.

7. I have a petition before this Court due in Kelly v Swartz by October 20, 2023 per US Supreme Court Application Number 23A100, and another petition in Kelly v PA ODC scheduled for conference on September 26, 2023, per US Supreme Court Numbers 22A981, 22-7695.

8. This case arises 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 to try me as not ripe should I not overturn the case.

9. I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety the Motion for reargument on denial of a stay at Third Circuit Docket Item (hereinafter "3DI") 3DI 56 below in its entirety and attach it hereto as an exhibit herein. In the exhibits I outline about 20 years of the Delaware judges and Courts violations of my First Amendment rights.

10. I sought to include the Delaware Supreme Court and members as Defendants in the civil rights case that must be appealed by October 20, 2023. Citing 3DI-57, not attached. I placed records of the civil rights case on the appellate case below as they are relevant to motions in Appellate Court.

11. Time is required to give me a fighting chance in the civil rights case relating to *Kelly v Swartz* to prevent vitiation of my 1st 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

12. 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 this case on appeal to this court in hopes to prevent 6 new law suits too.

13. 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 another case. I respectfully time be granted in order that I may attempt to effectively appeal the civil rights case and in this case.

14. 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.

15. 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. 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 will have the same

phone number, but I do not think I can afford to keep my phone on this month as of August 15, 2023. When my brother was in an accident during my first year of law school, I similarly had no phone. Debt is against my religious beliefs. I refuse to buy things I cannot afford for the convenience and profit of others as against my religious belief in Jesus as God not money as God. Matthew 6:24. I believe people go to hell for seeking money as savior and master, and I am not going to exchange my soul to gain the world only to lose it in hell. Duquesne Law School's representative said I could go to the hospital and take my civil proceeding exam later. The School changed its mind. I found out the day before the exam. I found a note in the law school box. I got the worst grade in that exam civil procedure. That day, I learned how unjust and cold people were to serve convenience and costs at the exchange of other people's lives, health and liberty creating injustice to serve what I believe to be the mark of the beast discussed in the Bible business greed. I believe judges can save lives and eternal lives by restraining businesses and entities from oppressing, enslaving, killing, stealing and destroying human life, liberty or health for the bottom line. Jesus teaches justice is a greater command. (*Matthew 23:23*) In *Amos 5:15* "justice in the courts is a command." I wanted to erase that mark of the beast and uphold justice by safeguarding people and their free will as the treasures not to be sacrificed for moth and rust. In order to do so I must safeguard people judges and people staff in the courts. Without you there is no individual liberty just automated standardized compelled conduct. The equality under this new economic system is not equal protection, but after 2050 it will be compelled conformity and sameness by those who control the resources needed to sustain life.

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.

August 13, 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