

MEGHAN KELLY, ESQ.

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

[Meghankellyesq@yahoo.com](mailto:Meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

(302) 493-6693

Attn: Cler of Court Scott S. Harris

1 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20543

Clerk of Court of the United States Supreme Court

RE: Kelly v US District Court Eastern District of PA/Supreme Court Rule Exhibit could not fit in box, filed contemporaneously as an exhibit to 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

August 14, 2023

Dear Honorable Clerk of Court:

I could not fit the attached exhibit, *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, and exhibits thereto* in the box of documents in the above referenced matter as an exhibit in the application 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.

Everything else fit perfectly but this exhibit prevented me from closing the box.

This exhibit is important since I am providing evidence on the record that imperfect people like me and all people need people judges and people staff to correct imperfect people's mistakes and misconduct and to safeguard the exercise of individual rights of people like me who do not conform to the standardized doctrines of religious belief.

*Within the exhibits as an attachment thereto is Appellant Meghan Kelly's motion for reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for a new panel to re-consider motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023, (hereinafter "Reargument-Motion") and an affidavit certifying this affidavit is made in good faith to prevent manifest injustice against me by vitiating my Constitutional rights by bias and prejudice so great by Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps in favor of an adverse party or adverse ruling that I respectfully request in support of their recusal in this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144, filed with the Motion for rehearing en banc or by a new panel on the papers on the Court's June 20, 2023 denial of the recusal of Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps, (hereinafter "Affidavit").*

In the Reargument-Motion supported by the Affidavit attached to the Motion to reopen, I made arguments against regulating the federal courts and the US Supreme Court therein.

I argued inter alias:

9. Judge Scirica has a conflict of interest with my case I was not aware of until recently. Judge Scirica chairs the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. (Kelly v Trump, 21-1490, Kelly v Swartz, Civil Rights Docket Item ("CRDI") CVDI 149.)

10. I contest the federal judicial disciplinary rules Judge Scirica drafts on Constitutional grounds. I oppose the elimination of life time limits on US Supreme Court justices and believe district court and Circuit Court judges should have life time appointments to prevent them from the temptation to normalize injustice by partiality to the Disciplinary rules as opposed to the preempting Constitutional application of the law, on religious grounds as a party of one with religious beliefs in God's command against favoritism and for justice in the courts.

11. I declared my belief regulating the Court violates the constitutional rights of citizens the court serves, including me as a party of one, and allows for the schemed overthrow to occur in the DE District Court prior to discovering the conflict between Judge Scirica and I. Regulating the Court through disciplinary rules guarantees the partiality of the Court to the interests of those who discipline them instead of the impartial application of the rule of law. (Examples, (CRDI) 23, concerning my belief only the courts may prevent an economic crash and an overthrow of our government, CRDI-53,-55,56, 78, 95, 102, 104, 114, 127, 129, 131, CRDI 149-162). Favoritism towards those who serve the alleged professions' collective convenience, productivity or

the individual judge's future or current seat or highly esteemed position creates unfair proceedings when conflicts arise. I seek to declare the disciplinary rules Judge Scirica drafts are unlawful by amending my complaint in the civil rights proceeding to make that argument. I included certain arguments against certain DE Attorney Disciplinary rules and the Attorney Disciplinary proceedings I incorporate herein by reference but intent to reserve my right to include more arguments in the Civil rights proceeding, even if on appeal to the US Supreme Court in Kelly v Swartz at 3DI-43-8, 3DI-43-9, 3DI 43-10. Judge Scircia denied me the opportunity to be heard on my arguments, by denying my right to amend to contest certain state rules. Attached hereto please find my Motion for ECF rights in the District Court below, which I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety, wherein I contested an additional, different Delaware Disciplinary rule I wish to include in a complaint Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 7(d). DI 31. Thank you for your time and consideration.

In the affidavit I averred:

“62. I strongly oppose regulating the courts to partiality to business by barter or exchange. This urges the courts to serve greed not humanity or the liberty that allows beautiful disorder and criticism which helps us improve and gain humility needed to escape the certain default for most of humanity loss of eternal life due to pride.

63. I noted on the Delaware record my desire to prevent regulation of the USSC and my hope I could eliminate judicial discipline of federal judges.

64. Judge Scirica is the Chair on the rules of federal judicial discipline I seek to eliminate. He has a personal interest in ruling against me as I seek to overturn his hard work.

65. I also seek to amend my complaint to include Constitutional arguments against the DE disciplinary proceedings and certain Delaware Disciplinary Rules rules I argued on the record in the civil rights case.

66. These rules mirror the rules Judge Scirica works on, and attacks his work.

67. I sought to destroy the work of Jude Scirica first in the Civil rights case and now may seek to attack the rules he works on in this case.

68. In the Civil rights case, at Delaware District Court, Number 21-1490 Kelly v Trump, I alerted the Court of my concerns against Judicial discipline and the elimination of people judges or other hardship and concerns in the attached documents I incorporate herein by reference, and in additional Docket items 23, 53, 55, and 56 which I may not be able to upload in the DE District Court case.

69. I truly believe preventing the regulation of the US Supreme Court and eliminating the corrupt disciplinary rules against federal judges and requiring life term appointments for all federal judges, with the ability to choose different appointments would aid in preventing the schemed overthrow of the rule of law to eliminate it by automation by those who reign over people by the mark of the beast, business greed, with no unconditional love.”

One important reason I require time is to ask the US Supreme Court to prevent regulations that standardizes the courts, with the aim of eliminating people judges and people

staff who are needed to protect individuals like me who exercise individual liberties including religious belief in Jesus outside the standards.

I argued I need time to do this in order to preserve the rule of law as I figure out how to defend my individual licenses, liberties and claims in this case and others. I thought it was important to include these documents in case the Court can think of a way to preserve their own judicial branch, especially since there is no opposing party other than the District Court in name only. I am having a hard time discerning a way to ask this court to please save the rule of law and the world from schemed lawlessness ahead, reign by what I believe is the mark of the beast as a Christian.

August 14, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,  
/s/Meghan Kelly  
Meghan Kelly, Esquire  
34012 Shawnee Drive  
Dagsboro, DE 19939,  
(302) 493-6693  
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com,  
US Supreme Court Number 283696

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

Dated: 8/14/23

Meghan Kelly  
(printed)  
mk Kelly  
(signed)