

No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Application No. 23A100

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

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

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

**Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Opening Brief  
moving the US Supreme Court to vacate the Third Circuit's Orders dismissing the case  
under Younger, denying recusals of Judge Scirica and Phipps and to remand the matter to  
the Delaware District Court for consideration**

October 17, 2023

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. This appeal requires the US Supreme Court to decide the question of whether judges may be disciplined or otherwise corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits of 1. Case or controversy or 2. impeachment by allowing me to amend the complaint to sue the Delaware Supreme Court and its members to void Kelly v Trump, and the disciplinary matter based on violations of my procedural due process rights, and to seek relief for harm and Constitutional deprivations the judges caused or whether judges are above the Constitutional rule of law, or whether I, and parties or attorneys like me, may be retaliated against and disciplined for seeking to petition members of the Court to uphold and not violate the Constitutional and federal law.

II. This case presents a unique important Constitutional question as to whether a disciplinary proceeding brought to punish petitions against the government, in violation of the US Amend I right to petition, and right to speech, on subject matter grounds, and the Equal Protections Clause is subject to voidability. Defendants seek to discipline Colleague Abbott for petitioning against the County and Courts. Are the courts above the law, or will this Court rule judges may be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits 1. Cases and controversies and impeachment, without vindictive retribution for correction.

III. Whether the evidence outlined on the record below concerning both Kelly v Trump and the DE Disciplinary show a high probability of procedural due process violations so great that I should be permitted to argue before the trial Court the Delaware District Court subject matter jurisdiction is void or voidable, especially since the statute of limitations would be tolled for claims relating to Kelly v Trump and for retaliation in response to my exercise of the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment right to petition for exemption for bar dues.

IV. Whether the Court committed reversible error in dismissing my complaint given Defendants indicate my religious beliefs and citations to the Bible contained in my speech in my petitions to alleviate a government substantial burden upon my religious exercise by Trump's establishment of government religion is in issue, as Defendants' reason for interfering with in an attempt to cause me to forgo Kelly v Trump and later after the conclusion of my Religious Freedom Restoration Act lawsuit Kelly v Trump, and after the filing of Kelly v Swartz, in bringing the disability proceeding in violation of my 1st Amendment rights to petition, speech, religious belief and exercise of belief applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment, which claims I may only be bring in the federal court for damages and nominal damages, given the State forum before the Board has no jurisdiction to grant monetary relief or nominal relief for the State's Constitutional, state and federal violations, and since it is highly probable the State DE Supreme Court incited the interference especially since the DE Supreme Court concealed evidence in my favor during Kelly v Trump and fired two material witnesses, two court staff to prevent evidence in my favor during the disability proceeding while denying my right to call them as witnesses.

V. Whether the Court abused its discretion for dismissing my initial complaint under Younger arising from Defendants, the Delaware Supreme Court and the arms of the Court's interference in my RFRA law suit against former President Donald J. Trump made with the intent to intimidate me to cause me to forgo my case based on the Defendants disdain for my religious-political beliefs contained in my speech, in my petitions, or poverty and my petitions to correct and stop Court misconduct in light of the admitted reason for discipline was the Defendants found my religious beliefs in the bible and Jesus incomprehensible, when I sued Trump to alleviate a substantial burden upon my exercise of religious belief from the burden he

caused by the establishment of government religious belief in a course of conduct not limited to executive orders Ex. Or. No. 13198, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021; Ex. Or. No. 13199, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, May 3, 2018; Ex. Or. No. 13279, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No. 13559, November 17, 2010; Ex. Or. No. 13559, Nov. 17, 2010; Ex Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018, and Biden's enactment of Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021 that give churches money to perform government business under the lie of charity and another executive order E.O. 13798 which allows churches to take parishioner' donations to support or give the packing of government candidates or parties to give the blasphemous backing that God backed Trump which incited violence or threats of violence against me based on my apparent rejection of Trump religious belief.

VI. Whether the Court erred in dismissing my claims against Defendants for retaliation to prevent the initiation of an unlawful proceeding brought in bad faith to cover up Court misconduct where Defendants unconstitutional sought to and did place my license to practice law on inactive disabled preventing me from buying and selling as a lawyer in violation of my 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment rights applicable to Defendants pursuant to the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment based on disdain for my private exercise of the fundamental rights to petition, to religious beliefs contained in my protected speech, contained in my petition, essentially conditioning the elimination of fundamental rights for the active license to practice law since they find my religious beliefs repugnant or do not understand them. Basically can a Court place an attorney on inactive disability because they find their religious beliefs illogical or repugnant even if they are genuinely held.

VII. Whether the Court erred in dismissing the case under Younger given the numerous claims the Board whose subject matter jurisdiction under Rule 5 is limited to attorney

discipline could not address, including but not limited to claims for damages, nominal damages and equitable relief for violations of 42 USC §§§ 1983, 1985, 1988, and harm to my reputation, claims for emotional distress, defamation, loss of employment opportunities, or other economic harm and for 1st Amendment rights to private petition, religious belief, speech, association and exercise of religious belief applicable to Defendants via the 14th, compelled violations of my religious belief, retaliation for the exercise of fundamental rights including but not limited to the right to petition, 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination by compelled incrimination required by the disciplinary rules, Constitutional arguments regarding a number of State Disciplinary rules, Constitutional arguments against the disciplinary proceeding, and by extension Constitutional arguments against federal judiciary disciplinary or disability proceedings and rules and the absence of life time appointments during good behavior for District and Appellate Court judges, Constitutional arguments to limit discipline or correction of Judges, including United States Supreme Court members to the purview of Constitutional limits of 1) cases and controversies and 2) impeachment by asking the court to find the US Supreme Court may not violate my 5th Amendment right as a party of one to Equal protection by a partial forum biased towards the regulations or regulators even by self-regulation instead of the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law, and by finding judges are above the law and above cases and controversy by depriving me of a forum for redressability for harm caused by members of the DE Courts who may not be a judge in their own case, denying me access to the record of a case where I am the accused No 341 to cover up additional deprivations of my 14th Amendment right to be heard, sending Court of Common Pleas Judge Clark, DE-Lapp and Defendants to attack me during Kelly v Trump to cause me to forgo my petition, sealing evidence in my favor in Kelly v Trump to fix the outcome in Kelly v Trump and the

future disciplinary case, firing witnesses necessary to my defense, than preventing me the opportunity to call them to cover up the DE Supreme Courts misconduct, Court staff writing on a praecipe and instructing me to cross off local counsel's address to prevent service and misleading me to miss a filing deadline in Kelly v Trump, denial of access to the law library, violations of my 6th Amendment rights applicable to Defendants via the 14th Amendment to self-represent, 6th Amendment right to call and confront witnesses in the Disciplinary Case, ancillary claims of loss of employment opportunities but for the threats incurred during Kelly v Trump which ended talks with my previous employer to start work but for the state's attacks against me during Kelly v Trump and other economic harm, and harm to my reputation, violations of procedural due process, substantive due process and equal protection under the 14th Amendment based on religious-political-poverty animus in both Kelly v Trump and the Disciplinary matter, bad faith harassment in the form Defendant Patricia Swartz lying to me to cause me to expend additional money or the case to be thrown out before the Boad, Defendants intimidating me by sending state agents to attack me or otherwise threaten me to cause me to forgo Kelly v Trump, and lack of notice, denial of opportunity to be heard, opportunity to prepare, perform discovery or call witnesses, and numerous other claims I reserve on the record.

VIII. Whether the Delaware District Court's Orders (DI. ("District-Court"), (DI 16-17, 30-31, 59-60 (collectively, "District-Order")), is now in error as a matter of law and as a matter of fact, in light of with the passage of time the state proceeding has concluded. So, there is no case to abstain from under the Younger abstention doctrine. So they case should be remanded to be heard on the substance of the complaint and motions

IX. Whether the District Court erred in applying Younger to dismiss my complaint and motions by overlooking I asked for damages and relief unavailable in the state forum.

Whether the Court should have granted a stay as opposed to dismissal

X. Whether the District Court erred in applying Younger to dismiss my case, complaint, and motions when I had no adequate opportunity to raise my federal claims or ancillary claims for damages, equitable relief and nominal relief in state court

XI. Whether the District Court erred in applying Younger when bad faith, harassment, or extraordinary circumstances have arisen in my case that make a Younger abstention inappropriate

XII. Whether the Court abused its discretion by denying leave to amend the Complaint, while applying the Younger abstention, when such amendments would certainly overcome a Younger abstention

XIII. Whether new and additional facts and arguments contained in my motions and pleadings must be considered to prevent abuse of discretion, clear error of law, clear error of fact and to prevent manifest injustice against me by denying me the opportunity to be heard to safeguard my exercise of First Amendment rights, creating loss of First Amendment rights and my interest in my ability to work in my profession

XIV. Whether the court deprived me of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to a fair proceeding or violated 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law by failing to recuse Judge Phipps given Defendants attacks against me are based on my petitions against Trump, Trump twice placed Phipp's on a list of nominees for US Supreme Court, and Trump will likely nominate Phipps' as Supreme Court justice should he be reelected and an opening occur considering the facts under objective standards, the probability of actual bias on the part of

the Judge Phipps against me and in favor of Trump and my opponents is too high to be constitutionally tolerable.

XV. Whether the court deprived me of the 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding or violated 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law by failing to recuse Judge Scirica given the conflict of interest Judge Scirica chairs the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability (“Judicial rules”). (DI 149). I made Constitutional arguments against the judicial rules, against regulating the US Supreme Court by a Code of Conduct, self-discipline or disciplinary rules, and made arguments against the State disciplinary rules and proceedings that mirror the rules Judge Scirica is charged to revise and approve.

XVI. Whether the US Supreme Court errs as a matter of law by recognizing the deception of appearance of justice instead of actual justice as an important state objection somehow more important than the Constitutional application of the impartial rule of law by the wicked partial selfish interest of the state’s own appearance, and if so whether this is not a legitimate reason for part of the statute or regulations of the judiciary under 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or otherwise. Since allowing partiality towards the state’s appearance in light of fickle fads and popularity by the mob more than truth and justice creates a biased partial unfair forum in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment procedural due process safeguards and equal protections component.

XVII Whether the Court should extend Brady violations to the Courts who intentionally conceal evidence in favor of the accused to prejudice the accused case.



## LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

### 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**

I Orders and Opinions.....1

II Jurisdiction.....1

III. Constitutional and Statutory Provisions involved.....1

IV. Standard of Review is Strict Scrutiny.....1-4

V. Statement of the Case.....5-187

A. FACTS OF CASE.....5-126

1. 1st Amendment establishment clause and Religious Freedom Restoration Act against former Donald J Trump where I sought to substitute current President Biden for which this case arises Kelly v Trump.....5-10

2. Unbeknownst to me at the time of the Delaware Supreme Court members’ misconduct, Delaware Supreme Court in Collusion with Defendants secretly sealed 4 docket items in Kelly v Trump to conceal evidence in my favor without providing me notice or an opportunity to be heard to hide my petitions regarding the State’s attacks against me to threaten me in order to cause me to forgo the case in violation of 42 Section 1985, my 1st Amendment rights to petition, religious belief, associate, speech, procedural due process, my right to be free from intentional infliction of emotional distress and Equal Protections .....10

3. Kelly asserted Constitutional arguments against attorney disciplinary rules, Board proceedings, Federal Judicial disciplinary and Disability proceedings, and regulations of the US Supreme Court by a Code of Conduct or otherwise that would compromise the members impartiality by partiality towards the rules sustaining their seats and instead of the impartial application of the Constitutional rule of law to uphold the exercise of 1st Amendment individual fundamental rights which do not conform to the courts or the majority’s, including mine. US Amend I, V.....10-14

4. Timing, after Kelly v Trump concluded and the Civil rights proceeding was filed, and the subsequent Attorney Disciplinary proceeding started, and ended, I discovered the DE Supreme Court concealed evidence in my favor, DE Supreme Court Attorney Robinson signed off on terminated Court staff, including a witness I noticed the Defendants I sought to cross examine, and the DE Supreme Court sealed my petitions regarding the Sate’s misconduct in Kelly v Trump to conceal evidence in my favor at the Nov 3, 2022 probable cause hearing, the civil rights case, Kelly v Trump and reciprocal cases.....14-15

5. On 4/26/22, prior to the District Court’s Order dated 4/26/22 denying motion for reargument, Kelly informed the District Court of the State eliminating 2 witnesses, Kelly’s desire to amend the complaint once as a matter of right to conform to the facts, additional legal claim

and additional parties in a rolling motion when remanded back; assertions against Disciplinary Rules 13 and 14, and proof the Delaware Supreme Court caused the interference in a letter by the court to me copying Defendant agent of the Board dated 10/21/2020.....15

6 The State committed attacks against me during 2020-2021 to interfere with and cause me to forgo my case in Kelly v Trump, which included disparate treatment with religious political animus, court staff writing on praecipe dated 10/5/20, and directing me to cross off local counsel’s address on praecipe to prevent service to local counsel, court staff misleading me to miss deadline for an order I did not know existed, sending Court of Common Pleas Judge Kenneth S. Clark to attack me in public at a grocery store demeaning my faith in Jesus not I money as God, and sending three threatening letters by the State to cause me to forgo Kelly v Trump prior to the US Supreme Court’s denial of a writ.....15-20

7 ODC’s letters threaten Kelly with punishment to compel her to violate her previously asserted 1st Amendment religious objection to healthcare, and mental healthcare and threaten actual punishment but for finding her religious beliefs in Jesus and citations to the Bible as a source of her religious beliefs in defense of her private beliefs proof of disability.....20-21

7 On 10/25/21, Kelly Filed this civil rights law suit for monetary damages and equitable relief for emotional distress, violations of procedural due process, Equal Protections claims, First Amendment violations of private rights to petition, religious belief, exercise of belief, speech and association, loss of employment opportunities, or other economic harm, harm to my reputation, witness tampering, procedural due process violations and in violation of 42 USC §§§ 1983, 1985, 1988.....21-23

8. Probable cause hearing occurred where the Defendants accessed the docket according to Lexis’s November 4, 2021 date. It is a delayed date, with evidence in my favor sealed. The petition cites my religious beliefs and citations to the bible in Kelly v Trump to be the reason for the petition.....23

9. District Court Dismissed my Complaint under Younger. I filed a Motion for Reargument and Motion to Amend the Motion for reargument. I showed the DE Members participated in the State’s attacks. Since, I had an appeal in Kelly v Trump to the US Supreme Court, I did not add the DE Supreme Court members initially because the writ of cert may be granted in Kelly v Trump, and the case remanded back to the Court. I alleged additional damages and claims. The State threatened to compel me to violate my asserted 1st and 6th Amendment asserted right to self-represent as a religious-exercise, which caused emotional distress so great a police made a wellness check. During check I told him I couldn’t find the police report where I told the police people talked about shooting me. No report was made, despite the fact I told the police. It may have been a police officer from my former gym outside of his jurisdiction checking on my car because someone threw something at it.....23-36

10. District Court denied my amended motion for a reargument under Younger. I drafted 3 motions under FRCP R. 52(b), and 59 (e) for the Court to alter and amend the judgment of the Court in its December 22, 2021 order to (1) include the availability of new evidence not available previously available, and to later the order (2) to correct a clear error of law, (3) clear

error of fact, (4) and to prevent manifest injustice. I indicating my intent was cemented to add the Delaware Supreme court and the members in the 3rd Motion. I included including additional evidence and violations of my 1st, 6th and 14th Amendment rights including but not limited to lack of notice, vitiating of my opportunity to be heard, denial of an opportunity to perform discovery or call witnesses, emotional distress forming in the shingles, appointing counsel despite my objection, denial of a fair impartial proceeding, which are within the scope of the appeal I reserved in my motions for reargument.....36-52

11. I filed a Motion to Amend my Complaint was as a matter of right, but accidentally did not mail out the signature page. I moved the court to amend my complaint as a matter of right to conform the complaint to the facts of the case in a rolling Motion. DI 58, and continuously moved to add new evidence reserving my right.....52-59

12. DE made a finding of disability causing reciprocal suits. Kelly asserted a physical limitation under the ADA before the DE Supreme Court in the DE Disciplinary case and reserved the potential claim on the record below.....59-66

13. Judge Phipps' created an obstacle so great as to vitiate my access to the US Supreme Court to appeal the original disciplinary decision by denying my asserted right to fair access to other courts by denying my Motion to stay the proceeding pending the US Supreme Court's determination of the original disciplinary proceeding, and by instead expediting the hearing date before briefing was due.....66-72

14. During my proceeding the Appellate Court below, reciprocating courts, and the Defendant Delaware Supreme Court and staff punished me as to chill my First Amendment right to petition to correct the Court staff's docketing mistakes.....73-76

15. Defendants the Board and Disciplinary Counsel violated Rule 9 and Rule h of the disciplinary rules in additional ways by failing to provide documents 10 days in advance of any hearing date to me and preventing me from calling witnesses by allowing me to self-represent with fewer than the 10 days required to not only subpoena witnesses but to provide expected testimony of witnesses to opposing counsel preventing me asserted right to call and cross examine witnesses.....76-79

16. Kelly was denied access to the law library. Defendant Patricia Swartz in bad faith lied to cause needless expenses in an attempt to prevent my petition. Delaware Supreme Court refused to place my appeal on the record in full without fighting by taking additional steps to place them on the docket.....79-80

17. Denial of access to the records where I am a party to discern if I was denied the opportunity to be heard by failing to docket my motions.....80-83

18. Meghan Kelly's Religious beliefs.....83-92

19. Third Circuit denied Meghan Kelly motion to recuse Judge Phipps based on his partial interest in punishing me for suing Trump to secure a potential Supreme Court seat by Trump since he was a nominee for US Supreme Court and will likely be a nominee should

Trump get reelected and based on relationships with Duquesne since I petitioned the law school about rats in 2005.....92-97

20. Third Circuit denied Meghan Kelly motion to recuse Judge Scirica based on my pleadings against attorney disciplinary rules and regulations which mimic the rules he drafts, and regulations of the US Supreme Court and federal Courts by eliminating the rules he is the appointed chair on drafting to prevent US Supreme Court regulation, Constitutional arguments against.....97-105

21. Justice Alito denied 30 day extension required to draft this appeal prejudicing my ability to appeal. Kelly would consider retaining another attorney who got into trouble for doing the right thing so long as I do not go into debt which violates my religious beliefs.....105-108

B. SUMMARY OF APPLICATION OF FACTS ABOVE TO THE LAW PLUS ADDITIONAL REBUTTAL OF THIRD CIRCUIT’S FINDINGS.....108-126

C. ARGUMENT.....126-187

1. The Delaware District Court’s Orders (DI. (“District-Court”), (DI 16-17, 30-31, 59-60 (collectively, “District-Order”)), is now in error as a matter of law and as a matter of fact, in light of with the passage of time the state proceeding has concluded. So, there is no case to abstain from under the Younger abstention doctrine. So they case should be remanded to be heard on the substance of the complaint and motions..... 126-128

2. The Court erred in applying Younger to dismiss my complaint and motions by overlooking I asked for damages and relief unavailable in the state forum. Whether the Court should have granted a stay as opposed to dismissal..... 129-142

3. The Court erred in applying Younger to dismiss my case, complaint, and motions when I had no adequate opportunity to raise my federal claims or ancillary claims for damages, equitable relief and nominal relief in state court.....142-146

4. The Court erred in applying Younger when bad faith, harassment, or extraordinary circumstances have arisen in my case that make a Younger abstention inappropriate.....146-148

5. The Court abused its discretion by denying leave to amend the Complaint, while applying the Younger abstention, when such amendments would certainly overcome a Younger abstention.....148-156

6. New and additional facts and arguments contained in my motions and pleadings must be considered to prevent abuse of discretion, clear error of law, clear error of fact and to prevent manifest injustice against me by denying me the opportunity to be heard to safeguard my exercise of First Amendment rights, creating loss of First Amendment rights and my interest in my ability to work in my profession.....156-173

7. The court deprived me of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to a fair proceeding or violated 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law by failing to recuse

Judge Phipps given Defendants attacks against me are based on my petitions against Trump, Trump twice placed Phipp’s on a list of nominees for US Supreme Court, and Trump will likely nominate Phipps’ as Supreme Court justice should he be reelected and an opening occur considering the facts under objective standards, the probability of actual bias on the part of the Judge Phipps against me and in favor of Trump and my opponents is too high to be constitutionally tolerable.....173-175

8. The court deprived me of the 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding or violated 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law by failing to recuse Judge Scirica given the conflict of interest Judge Scirica chairs the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability (“Judicial rules”). (DI 149). I made Constitutional arguments against the judicial rules, against regulating the US Supreme Court by a Code of Conduct, self-discipline or disciplinary rules, and made arguments against the State disciplinary rules and proceedings that mirror the rules Judge Scirica is charged to revise and approve.....175-184

9. Whether the US Supreme Court errs as a matter of law by recognizing the deception of appearance of justice instead of actual justice as an important state objection somehow more important than the Constitutional application of the impartial rule of law by the wicked partial selfish interest of the state’s own appearance, and if so whether this is not a legitimate reason for part of the statute or regulations of the judiciary under 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or otherwise. Since allowing partiality towards the state’s appearance in light of fickle fads and popularity by the mob more than truth and justice creates a biased partial unfair forum in violation of the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment procedural due process safeguards and equal protections component.....184-187

VI. Conclusion.....187-190

**APPENDIX**

Appendix (hereinafter “App.”)

**App 1-A**      CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED....1

**App 1-B**      Petition Letter requesting an exemption for bar dues for all attorneys facing economic hardship dated **January 7, 2021**, which was denied...5, 6, 16, 17, 21, 22, 30, 96, 108, 118, 121, 141, 142, 123, 130, 131, 136, 137, 141, 142, 146, 149, 151, 183

**App 1-C**      Petition in response to denial of January 7, 2021 petition, with a new petition letter dated **February 5, 2021** wherein I requested an exemption for bar dues for all attorneys...5, 6, 16, 108, 136, 137, 183

**App 1-D**      Separate sheet affidavit accompanying Motion for permission to appeal in forma pauperis I supplied when I initially appealed the Delaware District Court decision to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals wherein I indicated Delaware Supreme Court incitement of attacks , against me to cause me to forgo my religious freedom restoration act lawsuit against former President Trump...5, 16, 108, 183

**App 1-E**      CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED continued, additional Delaware Disciplinary rules.....1

**App. A**                **June 30, 2023** Order and opinion dismissing the case...1

**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, 108

**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, 18

**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

**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.....1

**App I**                District Court Order and opinion dated November 2021 dismissing my case under Younger.....1, 24

**App. J** District Court Order and opinion dated December 22, 2021 dismissing my case under Younger.....1

**App. K** District Court Order and opinion dated April 26, 2021.....1, 115

**App L** Memorandum order dated 12/28/23.....1

**App. M** Order granting ECF Access and exemption to PACER fees, dated January 5, 2023.....1,

**Exhibit A** (DI 2) Initial Complaint Kelly v Trump Case No. 2020-0809, filed 9/22/2020...2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 16, 18, 19, 24-26, 60, 108, 115, 121

**A-4** *Kelly’s Motion to the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms from unlawfully pressuring me to forgo or impede my case to protect my free exercise of religion*, and exhibits 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, (3DI 121-11, DI 4)...5, 9, 10, 16, 18-19, 21, 27-30, 108, 131, 136, 171, 182

**A-5** *Kelly’s motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the Honorable Justice Collins J. Seitz*, and related exhibits thereto, proof of payment of bar dues, emails to Mark Vavala confirming he did not incite the investigation, Internal Exhibit Letter from the Court in response to my request for exemption of bar dues for all attorneys facing hardship, dated February 5, 2021; attachment relating my concerns relating to recent US Supreme Court cases I disagreed with. (3DI-121-12, DI 4)...5, 9, 10, 16, 18-19, 21,27-30, 108, 131, 136, 171, 182

**Exhibit B** First Page of letter by Defendants dated 8/23/2021, showing Defendants claim “several pleadings in the “Court of Chancery and the [Delaware] Supreme Court in connection with the lawsuit Kelly v Trump” where my religious beliefs are in issue as the source of the Defendants’ interference in Kelly v Trump...5, 6, 18-19, 23, 60, 78-79, 108, 122, 132-137, 139, 182

**Exhibit C** Page 7 of Defendant’s petition to the Board, dated 11/3/2021, initiating a disciplinary proceeding where they alleged the reason to discipline me is based on my references to the Bible in Kelly v Trump where my religious belief are in issue.....5, 6, 18-19, 23, 60, 78-79, 122, 132-137, 139

**Exhibit D** *Exhibits showing belief of danger based on partnerships between not only church and state but government backed and condoned foreign and private partners inciting private attacks based on perceived religious or political association or beliefs*, including Email to Bo at the Delaware Department of elections, forwarding an email to Jesse Chadderon at the democrat’s office where I was concerned about a neighbor threatening me for my sign because he previously threatened to ram my car if I park it on my parents side lot, and he allegedly threatened to use his gun should someone at the board of the development come onto his property to inspect it without



authorization, pictures of substance thrown at my car, Police report concerning 2 bullets shot into the home of Greg Layton hitting the wall above the dining room table as he and his wife sat there but for his political beliefs incited by Trump-religion, some of my signs I created which caused outrage and attacks, excluding Impeach [Trump] Serve your country not your seat, excluding Impeach [Trump] No one is above the law, No one is below the law.; Exhibit 43 which includes

1. Coastal Point, Guest Column, Representative candidate says health is wealth, By Meghan Kelly, Esq., Candidate Delaware House of Representatives, 38th District,
2. Document, “Your Health is your Wealth You are Priceless. Not a price tag! Kelly seeks Federal Consideration of Health Care Proposal,
3. Meghan Kelly’s teaching certificate, which goes to credibility. I learned psychology and behavior theories like BF Skinner’s. I also am licensed to teach health so I know something about health.
4. Meghan Kelly’s redacted law school transcript to show she took a course Health Care Finance and the course Law and Medicine while attending Duquesne School of Law.
5. Meghan Kelly’s redacted undergraduate college transcript to show she took relevant courses related to
  - a. History of Western Medicine
  - b. Economics
  - c. Medieval Philosophy
  - d. Psychology courses
6. Evidence of surgery that requires I drink water, rest and eat so I do not faint or die due to dehydration when I have my period. I lose five pounds every month. This is still a challenge. I must assert my right to live because many people serve Satan by not wanting to be inconvenienced to care to adapt to safeguard my life, or the lives and health of others.).....5, 6, 8, 21, 23, 34,53, 60, 61, 63, 78-79

**Appendix N** July 12, 2021 letter from Kelly to the Delaware Supreme Court concerning Chancery Court staff Arline Simmons instructing me to cross of the Delaware Civil Process Clerk’s address to prevent service, and the praecipis thereto, attached praecipis with the crossed off civil process clerk’s address, dated October 12, 2020.....16, 122

**App. 0** Chancery Court Staff wrote on praecipe confusing Court dated October 5, 2020, a court stamped Copy of the Oct 12, 2012 praecipe to local counsel with address crossed off.....16, 122

**App P** 11/6/20 letter to Master Patricia Griffin in Kelly v Trump...16, 122

**App Q** Letter to the Court regarding difficulty accessing documents. Delaware Supreme Court indicated Kelly v Trump documents were sealed without notice to me, not destroyed. The correction made by District Court on 10/27/21 were not yet made public. So, I could not see them until I was granted ECF access

**Cont App Q** Court Link docket of Kelly v Trump showing A-4 and A-5 were invisible not accessible and that the docket was last accessed 11/4/22, the date of the probably cause hearing without the sealed documents.

**Cont. App. Q** DE Supreme Court Docket where I point out DI 21 and 16 are missing. I discovered DI 40 and 41 were also missing...10, 14, 15, 122

**App R** Email from file and serve with graph confirming 4 items necessary to my defense in Kelly v Trump, the disciplinary proceeding, reciprocal proceedings and the civil rights case were secretly sealed by the DE Supreme Court without notice or opportunity for me to be heard with dates items were sealed and dates of any changes as of the email's date...10, 14, 15, 122

**App S** File and Serve Graph of sealed documents from file and serve in a readable format on one page...10, 14, 15, 122

**App T** Letter dated 4/26/22 filed before Order by Chief Judge Colms that same day wherein I assert constitutional violations regarding certain rules and regarding the proceeding, indicate my intent to move the court to amend the complaint once as a matter of right in a rolling motion, I also submit videos an additional information on the record that had arisen notably my discovery of two Court staff were fired to prevent their testimony in my favor to hide their whereabouts from me.

**Continued ("Cont.") App T** Table of contents to this April 26, 2022 letter, included are videos with this letter

**Cont. App T** Continued Email to ODC concerning stop interfering with my case Kelly v Trump, and forwarded emails to school staff. Also emails regarding Judge Smalls and Judge Slight showing place of origin animus telling me to go back to PA or calling me a Philadelphia lawyer as if place of origin denotes value or worth when everyone has rights even those born in PA like me. ...11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 57, 115, 118-119, 122, 125, 167, 176-184

**App T-2** 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 8/15/22.....11, 13, 15, 57, 62, 167, 176-184

**App T-3** 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 8/19/22.....11, 15, 57,

**App T-4** 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 6/20/22.....11, 13, 15, 57, 167, 176-184

**App T-5** Plaintiff’s 79<sup>th</sup> Affidavit, DI 194, dated September 7, 2023 regarding my gratitude when US Supreme Court staff talk to me including Danny Bickle, my concern Justice Kavanaugh appeared to encourage regulation of the US Supreme Court

**AppT-5 Continued (“Cont”).** Letter to the US Supreme Court members addressed to Chief Justice Roberts regarding Please refrain from addressing Senator Whitehouse’s publicized disciplinary complaint against Justice Alito as it interferes with my case and controversies as to deprive me of the opportunity to petition this court in two cases regarding the same issue

**Cont. App T-5** Exhibits on an Agenda to Eliminate people in 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, including internal exhibits

- Obituary of Richard Goll, a Delaware attorney who was exploited by an out of state real estate company practicing law without a license
- Newspaper Article I drafted in the Coastal Point on a proposition on how to resolve the fact non attorneys are practicing law without a license
- Article by the Venus project *How can laws be eliminated* regarding a new system to replace governments after 2050
- Excerpts from the Book *Shaping the Fourth Industrial Revolution* By Klaus Schwabb, Founder of the World Economic Forum and Chairman with Nicolas Davis, Copywrite 2018, Published in the United States by Currency, an imprint of the Crown Publishing Group, a division of Penguin Random House LLC
- Excerpts from the Fourth Industrial Revolution by Klaus Schwabb
- Article by World Government Summit Could an AI ever replace a judge in court?, dated 2017
- Article 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
- Excerpts from The Great Narrative for a Better Future, by Klaus Schwabb.....11, 13, 57, 167, 176-184

**App U** Letter dated April 13, 2022, DI 55 discussing new fact I was denied admission into the law library and other facts arising showing additional potential claims or injuries continuously arising. DI 55

**Cont App U**, Exhibit B 35 pages of pages of procedural history, attached. I incorporate the other exhibits by reference....15, 142, 144, 163

**App V** **DI 51**, March 10, 2022 to Court regarding the Clerk confirmed the entire Court reviewed request for bar dues, Denied an opportunity to be heard on Motions dated, 12/18/21,

12/31/21, 1/15/21 and 1/31/22, denied an opportunity to be heard before it was too late and my rights were vitiated by denying notice, discovery, ability to call or cross examine hidden witnesses and a fair opportunity to present my defense , in the Board’s ruling it required loyalty to organization as opposed to the Constitutional rule of law which violates the superseding Constitutional rule of law...

**App V Cont Exhibit A** Board finding that required my loyalty to mere people and organizations preempt the Constitution and the rule of law as opposed the mark of the beast the lusts of those who commit human sacrifice of life and liberty for material gain, convenience, avoidance of cost, position, pride, power or profit.

**App. V Cont. Exhibit B** Order dated 1/11/22 Order denying my emergency appeal dated 1/12/22if the Board’s denial of my objection to notice, asserted rights to call witnesses, perform discovery, adequate opportunity to prepare to meet my accusers as I overcame the shingles, and a fair proceeding

**App V Cont. Exhibit C** Order dated 1/18/22 denying my appeal of the Board’s email order denying an extension of time to allow me to adequately prepare for the proceeding.

**App V Cont. Exhibit D** Email Order dated 1/10/22 I appealed to the DE Supreme Court on 1/12/22 which it rejected 1/18/22 holding

“The Board plans to move forward with the virtual hearing as scheduled...”

**App. V Cont. Exhibit E** Email where I asserted my right to a formal appealable order and other rights. The Board lied by granting an extension for a reason my motion did not without sufficient days the rule required to call witnesses 8, when more than 10 days is needed with postage assuming 3 and 10 days required to call witnesses. The original date was insufficient time to call witnesses in the sham proceeding against me too. There is no way I could have adhered to the required notice to call witnesses in the sham proceeding against me especially since the DE Supreme Court participated in hiding two witnesses by firing them from the Chancery Court.....15, 18, 53, 55, 79, 163

**App W** Letter to the Court regarding the emergency 2/14/22 TRO, Preliminary injunction and emergency motion and notice of new immediate danger of compelled violations of my religious beliefs, with an outline of the documents filed in the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding, excluding other exhibits dated March 30, 2022 by mistake, filed March 29, 2022. DI 53, with exhibit B thereto, not all of the exhibits showing the table of exhibits in the Disciplinary proceeding, including my ignored filed, but not returned or rejected motions which I do not believe were docketed in a case against me No 58. Clerk refused to provide docket items, or proof of materials on the record.....14, 15, 21

**App X** Plaintiff’s Motion for an urgent Emergency preliminary restraining order to be applied immediately, with a waiver of bond, to prevent immediate and irreparable injury by compelled violations of my religious beliefs, but for the exercise of religious beliefs, filed 2/14/22

**App X Cont. Exhibit A** Jan 18, 2022 request for an order in an appealable form, instead of an order in form evading opportunity for review

**App X Cont. Exhibit B** Jan. 11, 2022 request for a copy of the docket, the record to the person acting as clerk or administrator to the Board. My request was ignored,

**App X Cont. Exhibit C** Jan. 31, 2022, Email to the Board and Patricia Swartz requesting she please send the state's exhibits Patricia and the Board required due Jan. 31, overruling my objection to refer to the record

**App X Cont. Exhibit D** Jan 31, 2022, email requesting Exhibit names, and forwarded E-mail espousing facts and religious beliefs

**App X Cont. Exhibit E** Jan.31, 2022 email asking for exhibits in attachment form with name

**App X Cont. Exhibit F** Jan. 25, 2022, Respondent's Motion for Dismiss for lack of notice in the state forum

**App X Cont. Exhibit G** Jan. 31, 2022, RESPONDENTS MEGHAN KELLYS MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER PREVENTING MENTAL EXAMINATION OF RESPONDENT AS A GOVERNMENT COMPELLED VIOLATIONS OF HER RELIGIOUS BELIEF IN JESUS CHRIST

**App X Cont. Exhibit H** Email dated January 1, 2022 concerning immediately noticed errors in transcript emailed to me on Jan 31, 2022

**App X Cont. Exhibit I** Email dated January 31, 2022 to Board and Patricia regarding serious errors of court reporter, space for faith, I got cancer for I got the answer, and other errors

**Cont. App X Exhibit J** Email to Board and Patricia regarding court reporting errors regarding hegemonic state, Not head demonic state, highly prejudicial inaccurate transcript of hearing

**Cont. App X Exhibit K** my filed corrections of the transcript via Letter and attachment of corrections, with reserve to file additional corrections

**Cont. App X Exhibit L** Resubmitted second petition to the Delaware Supreme Court regarding license filing dues, dated Feb 5, 2021, resubmitted Feb. 1, 2022

**Cont. App X Exhibit M** Feb. 1, 2022, Third request relating to attorney dues, # 14 Exhibit N, order granting third request relating to lawyer dues

**Cont. App X Exhibit N** Feb. 26, 2022 granted request for 2022 for me only.....14, 21, 53-55, 79

**App. Y.** Letter dated May 21, 2023 requesting the Clerk of Court to resubmit my application in Kelly v Swartz for an interim stay, dated 2/11/23 rejected by justice Alito in this case under No. 22-6783 and NO. 22 A 747 incorporated herein by reference.....14,

**App Z (DI 188-9)** Email to Clerk of DE Supreme Court Lisa Dolph dated January 10, 2023, wherein I request all the documents regarding appointed counsel despite my religious objection and objection on the 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment grounds. Lisa's response, she would not give documents to me to see show whether I was deprived of the right to petition to cover up more Supreme Court misconduct January 10, 2023.

**App Z Continued (DI 115)** Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Tenth Affidavit, filed 2/15/23 regarding the Delaware Supreme Court denied me access to or a copy of the records in the case against me No 58 appointing counsel, depriving me of seeing whether my prior objections to appointed Counsel were not docketed as to deprive me of the opportunity to be heard in defense of ny fundamental rights.

**App. Z Cont. Exhibit A** (DI-115-4) Email, dated January 11, 2023 to DE Supreme Court Clerk citing case law requesting the records and asserting the right to the pleadings used against me in No. 58 in appointing counsel.

**App. Z Cont. Exhibit B** (DI 115-5) Order dated December 30, 2021 Motion to self-represent in Case No 541, Board Number 115327-B DE Supreme Court No 58, fewer than two weeks before the hearing date with Court closed January 1, 2023.

**App Z Cont. Exhibit C** (DI 115-6) December 16, 2021 Email to Opposing counsel and US Attorney General David Weiss regarding my religious objections to appointed counsel

**App Z Cont. Exhibit D** (DI 115-7) Obituary for Dick Goll, Esq. pamphlets for when I ran for office in 2018.....115

**App. AA** (DI 209-2,3) Docket sheet for US Supreme Court matter Kelly v PA ODC, No. 7695 showing the US Supreme Court denied my petition on October 2, 2023

(DI 209-3) Meghan M. Kelly’s Petition for a rehearing of this the US Supreme Court’s Denial of Petition for a writ of certiorari to appeal a decision by the Supreme Court of PA, dated October 2, 2023

(DI 209-4) Petitioner Respondent Meghan Kelly’s petition for writ of certiorari to appeal the Pennsylvania Supreme Court dated February 28, 2023, filed May 30, 2023.....14, 68-76

**App. BB** (DI 209-6, 7) US Supreme Court docket sheet for Kelly v US Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, No. 22-6584, denied March 27, 2023

(DI 209-8) On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Case Number Case Number 22-8037, signed 1/12/23.....14, 68-76

**App. CC** (209-10-11) Docket sheet for US Supreme Court Kelly v Trump, No. 21-5522, petition denied 11/1/21

(209-12) Petition for writ of certiorari of the Delaware Supreme Court in Kelly v Trump.....14, 68-76

**App. DD** 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, dated July 10, 2023

**Internal Exhibits to App. DD Exhibit P** Letter by US Supreme Court, dated 2/7/23, rejecting my petition as exceeding the page limit since I filed a motion to exceed the page limit prior to not simultaneously therewith

**App DD** Cont Proof I timely filed a petition of the original disciplinary case 2/3/23, but it was returned, with the new due date conflicting with my civil rights case. I do not have the paper, money or resources to fight it simultaneously.

**App DD** Cont. Cert pool confirmation the conference for my petition before judgment in this case would be too late to grant me relief rendering it moot, April 21, 2023.

**App DD** Cont. Docket Sheet in this Matter NO. 22-6783

**Internal Exhibits to App. DD Exhibit Q** Letter dated 8/24/22 to third circuit to correct a Court staff error that prejudices my case by filing documents from another matter, the reciprocal disciplinary matter onto this case.

**Internal Exhibits to App. DD 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, dated 8/24/22

**Internal Exhibits to App. DD 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, dated August 25, 2022

**Internal Exhibits to App. DD 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, dated August 30, 2022

**Internal Exhibits to App. DD** Docketed proof of postage to show the Clerk threatened me with sanctions based on a false allegation that I sent the document through the emergency email, when the proof of postage was on the record, the case manager and court had prior knowledge I was mailing the documents, and to cover up the mistake or misconduct in placing documents from another matter on this case. (Case: 21-3198 Document: 87-10 Page: 1 and Page 2 Date Filed: 08/30/2022)

**Internal Exhibit to App. DD.** 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, to show I sought to correct the record in the Eastern District Court case, and the Court through Judge Diamonds also too retaliated against me, dated May 27, 2023.

**Internal Exhibit to App DD** another person’s filings in my Eastern District of PA case, showing we need court staff to correct misfilings and we need to be able to assert our rights for an accurate record without retaliation, (Case 2:22-mc-00045-PD Document 12-45 (12-46)(12-47) Filed 10/18/22, with cert of word Court 22-45, DI 55, and also placed on 21-1490.....14, 68-76

**(DI 77-3-DI 77-4)** Respondent’s reply to ODC’s Corrected Response to Respondent’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Board on Professional Responsibility, June 7, 2022.....14, 15, 65, 109-110, 118-119

**(3DI 98)** Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Opening Brief 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, dated October 22, 2022 ...14, 62, 115, 118-121

**(3DI 199-1)** Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Petition for a Panel Rehearing , June 3, 20214,.....14, 15, 62, 109-110, 118-119

(DI 20) Plaintiff's Motion for Reargument, filed 11/8/21, Delaware District Court No. 21-1490, and exhibits thereto...

(DI 20) Cont. Exhibit 1 ODC's Petition to Transfer Plaintiff to disability

(DI 20) Cont Exhibit 2 Email to Defendant Patricia Swartz, regarding, "I have no working phone, and my computer is going into repairs. My car broke down at Delmar last week, and I am going to need maintenance. So, I may not be reachable for a week or so. I have other religious objections to appointed counsel, as going into debt is against my religious beliefs. Please hold off on filing. I would like to talk with you concerning my religious objections to appointment of counsel, and would like to hear your concerns, even if you prefer to communicate via email. Instead, of wasting resources. I prefer we discuss matters directly, and resolve disputes and misunderstandings without litigation, in your proceeding against me, or at least reduce costs by unnecessary mailing...."

(DI 20) Cont. Exhibit 3 Oct 26, 2021 Email regarding calling Justice Seitz as a witness in civil rights law suit.

(DI 20) Cont Exhibit 4 Nov 6, 2021 Email to Defendant regarding it appeared Justice Traynor was seeking jury instruction in federal court for a lawsuit against me

(DI-20) Cont Exhibit 5 Pleading to expedite the case, filed Nov. 6, 2021

(DI 21) Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Plaintiff's Motion for reargument, and exhibits thereto, including Plaintiff's Amended Motion for Reargument filed 11/9/21...8, 12, 15, 21, 24, 29-30-36, 109-110, 115

(DI 21) Cont Exhibit 1 Proof of cert of mailing

(DI 21) Cont Exhibit 2. Email to Counsel concerning my computer needs repairs

(DI 21) Cont Exhibit 3 Email from Computer repair warranty confirming the computer is in repair

(DI 21) Cont Exhibit 4 Confirmation I could not file my attorney registration inactive since a disciplinary proceeding began

(DI 21) Cont Exhibit 5 Police report when my neighbor threatened me due to my signs

(DI 21) Cont Exhibit 6 Pictures of substance thrown on my vehicle.

(DI 21) Cont Exhibit 7 Plaintiff's Amended Complaint

(DI 21) Cont Exhibit 8 Blackline of changes from motion for reargument to Plaintiff's Amended Motion for reargument.....8, 14, 21, 29-30-36, 24, 109-110, 115

(DI 34) 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 and internal exhibits, Table of contents and the following exhibits.....14, 37-42, 115

#### (DI 35) TABLE OF CONTENTS

(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT A First Page of Defendants letter to me dated, August 23, 2021, showing the reason for the law suit against me to retire my license was the Delaware Supreme Court pleadings too.

(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT B Pages of the Complaint relating to claims for damages for infliction of emotional distress



**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT B 2** Letter Dated December 1, 2021, regarding harassment by Defendants, regarding my Answers were sent with confirmation, and resent, and additional facts relating to the case

**(Internal exhibits) Exhibit 1** return receipt confirmation, and receipt.

**Exhibit 2** Electronic signature item was delivered

**Exhibit 3** Email dated November 30, 2021, to Defendant regarding confirmation of Answers, and my religious objection to Ms. Miss and Mrs., Jesus teaches us not to use titles

**Exhibit 4** Email dated November 28, 2021 responding to Defendant about physical delivery, not delivery through email.

**Exhibit 5** Receipt and return receipt of the second set of answers I spent hours printing out, and paid postage, dated November 30, 2021

**Exhibit 6** Email from Defendant indicating November 30, 2021 they received the answers, which is a lie, since I did not mail out the second set until this date, and the confirmation indicates it was delivered November 22, 2021

**Exhibit 7** **November 6, 2020** to Master Patricia Griffin in the Delaware Chancery Court relating to *Kelly v Trump*, regarding the Court's staff booby trapped me and my concern about Trump inciting an insurrection as an excuse to kill his own people to stay in office under a national emergency, a civil war, with attached statutes regarding the President's authority to use force against his own people in an insurrection, and newspaper clips where force was used or allowed by President Trump, when might makes wrong, not right.

**(Attached) (Exhibit A)** 10 USCS Sections 252, 253, 254

**(Exhibit B)** Newspaper article, New York Times, *Armed Agents are allowed to oversee ballot-counting venues*, by Katie Benner, 11/5/2020, Business Insider, *Federal officers sent to Portland by Trump teargassed protesters, despite being told to leave by the mayor and governor*, dated 7/17/2020

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT C** Email and letter from arm of the Delaware Supreme Court DeLapp, threatening me for my petition to the Court for relief on attorney license dues.

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT D** First page of an Order by the Delaware Supreme Court dated July 7, 2021, in *Kelly v Trump* by Justice Vaughn, Traynor, and Montgomery-Reeves

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT E** Letter to the Court, dated November 23, 2021, regarding my intent to object on subject matter grounds, and reasons the Court does not have subject matter.

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT F** Letter to court, dated November 22, 2021, regarding my intent to object to appointment of counsel on religious grounds.

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT G** Letter Motion to the Board, dated **December 18, 2021**, regarding intent to object to appointed counsel, request to postpone hearing, request time for discovery and a determination on counsel

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT H** *Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for Reconsideration of Order dated December 13, 2021, appointing counsel despite my Notice of intent to object, and objection of improper service of the Board's notice of hearing*

**(Internal Exhibits) Exhibit 1**, the Delaware Supreme Court Order relating to Counsel, dated **December 13, 2021**

**Exhibit 2**, Letter from Appointed Counsel and Notice of a hearing dated **December 10, 2021**, received indirectly by email **December 17, 2021**

**Exhibit 4** Email to appointed counsel after I declined forced representation concerning another idea for the court to entertain.

**Attachment to Exhibit 4**, Five Articles of Impeachment I proposed and contacted all 541 federal law makers about

**Exhibit 5**, the In Forma Pauperis which discussed the Delaware Supreme Court's behavior and the burden this petition has upon me from preventing me from rejoining my old law firm where I would be performing real estate settlements and using the company car. So, I could give the car my parents gave me back. My dad needs a car.

**Exhibit 6** Email to Attorney Generals regarding DE Supreme Court concerns, and religious beliefs

**Attachments to Exhibit 6, Exhibit 3**, Email to the Delaware Supreme Court regarding forced violation by swearing in without honoring my request to affirm

**Exhibit 4** Letter to family court regarding performing family law violates my religious beliefs

**Exhibit 5** (Not included) regarding judicial partiality was not included though attached and cited in the Email of Exhibit 6. I included it in another exhibit to the Motion for rearmament, Exhibit 8.

**Exhibit 6** My E-mail directed to Senator Carper regarding using words not weapons to defeat ISIS/ conduct the government performs by funding charities which funds ISIS/evil under the guise of good/charity to reward violence/ using education to prevent leaders from using government established religion for their own vanity.

**Exhibit 8** Proposals sent to law makers to prevent oil drilling. Revelation 11:18 provides, there will be a time to "destroy all who have caused destruction on the earth."

**Exhibit 2** My lawsuit against the democrats to allow me to run for office without violating my religious beliefs by forcing me to collect donations or signatures in violation of Matthew 6:1-4.

**Exhibit 7** E-mail to Attorney Generals regarding Delaware Supreme Court partiality concerns, objection to counsel as compelled forced violations of my religious belief, and other concerns.

**Exhibit 8** Letter to the Delaware Supreme Court, dated October 1, 2012, regarding Judicial partiality and religious beliefs regarding preventing partiality in the courts

**Exhibit 9** Letter dated November 22, 2021 to DE Supreme Court providing notice of intent to object to appointed counsel

**Exhibit 10** Communication to my former employer, as recent as August 6, 2021, before the August 23, 2021 threatening letter.

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT I** Letter to the state court, dated December 21, 2021, concerning I declined representation from counsel, per attached letter to appointed counsel, and requested the court honor my motion. For reconsideration of the order dated December 13, 2021 appointing counsel, despite my objection.

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT J** Letter to the Board of Professional Conduct of the state of Delaware and the Delaware Supreme Court, dated **December 29, 2021, two weeks from the hearing**, concerning the court's and board's determination of postponement of the hearing in the

interest of justice, and status of a determination of my 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to self-representation.

**(DI 35) Cont. Internal Exhibits (Exhibit A)** First Page of the Office of Disciplinary's April 23, 2021 letter indicating the Supreme Court's pleadings as a source of their concern.

**(Exhibit A part 2)** Page 2-3 of Defendants petition showing the reason why they bring the state law suit against me is for my religious beliefs, citing the bible as authority for my beliefs, and their inability to understand my beliefs in Jesus.

**(Exhibit B)** E-mail to Attorney Generals, dated December 16, 2021, showing my distress at appointment of counsel, in the form of tears, admissible present sense impression, putting planning to prevent an economic crash on the back burner.

**(Exhibit C)** November 23, 2021 letter to DE Supreme Court indicating I intend to object on subject matter grounds and why.

**(Exhibit C part 2)** Email to Attorney General, dated December 15, 2021, concerning PACER, and showing emotional distress, and the need to protect free exercise of religion from the forced worship of money by the state, and discussions of the planned, preventable, reversible economic crash.

**(Exhibit D)** Certificate of Service of Respondent's Motion for Reconsideration of Order Dated December 13, 2021, appointing counsel despite notice of my intent to object, and objection of improper service of the board's notice of a hearing, dated **December 21, 2021**, (This shows I gave the board a copy a day after I served opposing counsel and the Court)

**(Exhibit E)** Email to Defendant, dated **November 4, 2021**, objecting to improper service of the August 23, 2021 letter and requiring paper mailed copies, also objecting to the appointment of counsel on religious grounds, and grounds of harassment and intentional infliction of emotional distress, providing notice to the Defendant appointment of counsel uniquely upsets me, and copying loved ones for my safety.

**(Exhibit F)** Email, dated **December 22, 2021**, to Defendant opposing appointed counsel

**(Exhibit G)** E-mail dated **December 21, 2021**, to the Court, Board and Defendant, indicating I did not accept representation from appointed counsel, and requested a docket, and an attachment of the

**December 21, 2021 letter** objecting to counsel, attached letter to Counsel declining representation, **dated December 20, 2021**

**(Exhibit H)** Email dated, **December 22, 2021**, E-mail to court about representation forwarding my email to counsel showing I fired him.

**(Exhibit I)** E-mail dated, **December 27, 2021**, to the court regarding concern not all documents were filed with the court, and attached docket.

**(Exhibit J)** E-mail dated, **December 28, 2021** to the Court, indicating appointed counsel did not have the documents I filed, and the Court did not send him all of the documents I sent, which may be needed in case of an appeal.

**(Exhibit K)** E-mail dated, **December 23, 2021**, to the Court regarding my religious oppositions to expert examinations, and conformation of receipt of filings, with attached filings for the Monday **December 20, 2021** Motion filed with the court and board.

**(DI 35) Cont. EXHIBIT K** Email, dated **Jan. 6, 2022, one week from the hearing**, I sent to the Board of Professional Conduct of the state of Delaware and opposing counsel to check on the status of my motion to postpone the hearing scheduled Jan. 13, 2022.....14, 37-42, 115

(DI 39) 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 and exhibits thereto, including table of contents, and the following exhibits

**(DI 39) Cont.** Table of Contents

**(DI 39) Cont. EXHIBIT 1<sup>ST</sup> A,** Letter of investigation by arm of state court, dated May 24, 2021

**(DI 39) Cont. EXHIBIT A,** E-mail to Defendant regarding my religious beliefs, and world economic forum founder’s plan as outlined in the two books The Fourth Industrial Revolution “to entice people through temptations to make 47 percent of Americans unemployed, to use the unemployed by labeling them mentally disabled, for mad science to teach the lie the mind can be controlled through robotics and medicine.”

**(DI 39) Cont. EXHIBIT B** Letter Motion, Dated December 18, 2021 to Board, DE Supreme Court and Defendant regarding discovery, reconsideration of counsel, and postponement of hearing due 1. to ineffective service, until after a final determination is made on counsel, and 3. Until discovery is complete, and the Receipt and postal confirmation Board and ODC received the December 18, 2022 filing on December 21, 2022

**(DI 39) Cont. EXHIBIT C** Respondent’s Objection to and Motion to enjoin expert observation and analysis of Respondent at hearings and in discovery; notice she will move for a protective order during the discovery stage, and requests to prevent costs as going into Debt is against her religious beliefs, and

Memorandum of Law in Support and Respondent’s Objection to and Motion to enjoin expert observation and analysis of Respondent at hearings and in discovery; notice she will move for a protective order during the discovery stage, and requests to prevent costs as going into Debt is against her religious beliefs

**(DI 39) Cont. EXHIBIT D** Respondent Meghan M. Kelly’s Emergency Objections and Emergency Motion filed with both the Board of Professional Responsibility for the Supreme Court of Delaware, and the Delaware Supreme Court, simultaneously, to postpone the hearing against her to prevent manifest injustice to afford her an opportunity to perform discovery, potentially call witnesses and prepare a defense for the state’s allegedly illegally motivated petition against her for her exercise of fundamental rights, motivated by the state’s disdain for her religious political beliefs, dated January 11, 2022,

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit A** excluded since it is a District Court Doc.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit B** includes internal exhibits, in one saved document

1. Email to Board and Patricia Swartz, dated Thursday, January 6, 2022, following up on motion to postpone the hearing one week from the date, to afford a full

and fair trial, including an opportunity to gather evidence, so as not to violate the substantive and procedural due process clause, and an opportunity to use the evidence to present motions, including a motion to dismiss based on subject matter grounds.

2. Email to the Board and Patricia, dated Monday, January 10, 2022, follow up on status of my request to postpone the hearing.

3. Email to the Board and Patricia, dated Friday, December 24, 2021, regarding following up on my request to postpone the hearing, and the outstanding issues relating to appointed counsel versus permission to represent myself, undecided by the Court. Notice of my intention to file a Motion objecting to an expert's attendance at the hearing as against my religious beliefs, and notice of my intent to file a protective order to protect myself from examinations from mental health and physical health experts on religious grounds.

4. Email notification the Board member is out until December 28, 2021, dated December 24, 2021.

5. Email from the Board dated January 10, 2022, indicating the Board plans to move forward with the virtual hearing as scheduled, despite my appeal based on improper notice, and the need to prepare to defend my case.

6. Email to the DE Supreme Court, Board and Patricia, dated January 6, 2022, regarding the federal government is helping me with the vulture attacks.

7. Accidental duplicate of Dec 24, 2021 email, at No. 3.

8. Email to Court, dated December 22, 2021, forwarded emails to appointed counsel, firing him, and copying to others to protect my safety, dated December 21 and 22, 2021.

9. Email to Court asking for the Board's number, December 22, 2021. I was only able to leave messages.

**(DI 39) Cont. EXHIBIT E** Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's **motion appealing** the Order of the Board on Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware dated, January 11, 2022, granting postponement of the hearing for 8 days due to illness, not a reason identified in my motion to grant postponement to afford me opportunity to prepare a defense, perform discovery, research, file motions, be heard on outstanding motion(s) unaddressed by the Board, to defend my exercise of fundamental rights and to preserve my license to practice law, on the grounds the amount of time is not enough and a hearing date must be postponed until after a fair opportunity to build a defense is granted, and moves the court to suspend a hearing date until the parties and the Board determine a fair opportunity to perform discovery has been allowed so as not to violate the norms of a fair proceeding, displaying disparate treatment towards respondent based on her unique religious political beliefs, in violation of the Equal Protections clause applicable to her as a party of one, **dated January 12, 2022.**

(DI 39) Cont. **(Internal Exhibits) Exhibit A** Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's Emergency Objections and Emergency Motion filed with both the Board of Professional Responsibility for the Supreme Court of Delaware, and the Delaware Supreme Court, simultaneously, to postpone the hearing against her to prevent manifest injustice to afford her an opportunity to perform discovery, potentially call witnesses and prepare a defense

for the state's allegedly illegally motivated petition against her for her exercise of fundamental rights, motivated by the state's disdain for her religious political beliefs, dated January 11, 2022

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit B** The Delaware Supreme Court Order Denying my emergency objections and motion to postpone the hearing.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit C** The Board Order granting a postponement of the hearing to the date January 21, 2021, "due to illness," a reason I did not request.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit D** Email to Patricia Swartz, dated January 3, 2022, regarding I am not feeling well, took a covid tests, and negative, but believe I am developing the shingles.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit E** Email to Board, Lisa at the Supreme Court and Patricia Swartz regarding still sick, problems with phone, and vulture issue at home, which may interfere with scheduling, also attached pictures of the vultures that chase me and peck at the glass windows, and do not go away when I yell at them.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit F** Email from the Board dated January 10, 2022, responding to my most recent request on my motion to postpone the hearing indicating "The Board plans to move forward with the hearing as scheduled"

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit G** Email To the Board and Patricia, dated December 24, 2021, regarding

1. I received docket ending before December 21, 2021,
2. Told the Board I would send them my November 19, 2021 answers to the petition via email for ease,
3. Indicated the Board is aware of my request to postpone a hearing date so I may properly defend my exercise of Constitutionally protected activity from state retaliation, but for the exercise of fundamental rights, requiring the government to bear the burden of strict scrutiny.
4. I told the Defendants I intend to file a motion objecting to an expert's attendance at a hearing, as it is against my religious beliefs. I am a child of God, not a scientific object for observation and examination by health or mental health examiners who play God by seeking to mold people like me to scientifically conditioned and conformed dictates instead of protecting the individual's dictates of conscience. Experts deem those whose will does not bend with temptations to adhere to the communally accepted trendy molds as unfit. My God teaches me those who are conformed to the world do not have eternal life and will be unfit for heaven, should they not repent.
5. I also told the Defendants I will likely file a protective order to protect myself from examination from mental health or physical health experts on religious grounds, should petitioner seek an examination. My exercise of fundamental rights, including exercise of my religious beliefs, requires the state meet strict scrutiny, which it is not likely to meet.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit H** Emails dated January 11, 2022, email from Patricia Swartz to Board and me, objecting to postponing the hearing, and my responses, including my right to believe differently than the majority, and my religious objections to healthcare.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit I** Email January 11, 2022, my email responding to opposing counsel, providing religious objections to healthcare and my religious beliefs, my disagreement with many democrats on healthcare when I ran for office in 2018, and a sign healthcare that cares not healthcareless, your health is your wealth, as I was still under the weather.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit J** January 4, 2022 email to Court, Board and Defendant regarding I wasn't feeling well. The covid test was negative, but looks like I developed shingles.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit K** Email, dated January 5, 2022, relating to a broken phone through the federal government

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit L** Email dated December 31, 2022, to the Board of motion, *Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's objection to and motion to enjoin expert observation and analysis of respondent at hearings and discovery; notice she will move for a protective order during the discovery stage; and requests to prevent costs as going into debt is against her religious beliefs; Memorandum of law in support of this motion, certificate of service, postal receipt, table of contents of the exhibits, and exhibits thereto contained, dated December 31, 2021*

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit M** Emails January 12, 2022, regarding I was not making a new motion merely because I communicated with the Board and Defendant I desired time to afford a fair opportunity to prepare a defense.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit F** Answer to petition, excluding exhibits.

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit G** *Respondent's more particularized motion to suspend the hearing, scheduled for January 21, 2022 to allow me opportunity to research and prepare a defense, requesting opportunity to draft requests for admission, interrogatories and subpoena opposing counsel, Patricia Swartz, as a necessary witness in her defense, and subpoena other necessary witnesses, including but not limited to, Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Judge Kenneth S. Clark, Jr., due to his admission he interrogated me based on my exercise of fundamental rights incited by the ODC, and Arline Simmons, to show unconstitutional motive for this petition, to allow, the accused, respondent an opportunity to defend herself on the defense illegality of proceeding, as applied to her, motivated by disdain by the state for her religious associated beliefs and exercise of fundamental rights, and lack of jurisdiction based on the Delaware Supreme Court's apparent participation in inciting this petition against respondent.*

**(DI 39) Cont. (Internal Exhibits) Exhibit A** Post Office Receipt, and certified mail receipt and confirmation the December 18, 2021 letter motion requesting opportunity to perform discovery and file motions to dismiss was received by the Board and ODC on December 21, 2021

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit B** Postal Receipt for December 29, 2021 letter to Court, Board and ODC, dated December 29, 2021

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit C** Emails to and from Patricia regarding moot motion

**(DI 39) Cont. Exhibit D** January 12, 2022 email correction to Motion filed January 12, 2022, the federal government is helping me with the vultures, forwarded email from the Federal government representative.

(DI 39) Cont. **Exhibit E** Email to and from federal government official relating to the fact there is no charge for federal assistance with elimination of vulture problem, so as not to violate my religious beliefs.

(DI 39) Cont. **Exhibit F** Email filing dated Thursday, January 13, 2022, motion to expedite motion to appeal with the Delaware Supreme Court.

**(DI 39) Cont. App Q** Health docs averring I require time in order not to harm my health or die, including medical exhibit...14, 42-48, 115

(DI 36) PLAINTIFF MEGHAN M. KELLY'S 3rd EMERGENCY MOTION  
PURSUANT TO FRCP R. 52(b), 59 (e), 60(b)(1)(2)(6), and 65

(DI 36) Cont Exhibit A Postal Receipt

(DI 36) Cont Exhibit B Confirmation of receipt

(DI 36) Cont Exhibit B email confirming seek to cross examine Justice Seitz

(DI 36) Cont C Exhibit C Motions for time to perform discovery, call witnesses, prepare given less than 2 weeks was granted right to self-represent deemed frivolous request by State court in bad faith, showing the Court made a determination on my case without affording me an opportunity to be heard

(DI 36) Cont D Exhibit D Order denying appeal for time to perform discovery, call witnesses, prepare

(DI 36) Cont E Rehearing rescheduled for a reason I did not request with fewer days than the rules permit to call witnesses

(DI 36) Cont F Communication by Defendant Aug 23, 2023.....14, 48-52, 115-122



## TABLE OF CITATIONS

### BIBLE

<i>1 Corinthians</i> 1:18, 2:14-16.....	19, 135
<i>1 Corinthians</i> 3-17.....	60
<i>1 John</i> 5:19.....	34, 88
<i>2 Thes.</i> 9- 12.....	83
<i>2 Corinthians</i> 4:4.....	101
<i>Amos</i> 5:15.....	12, 31, 52, 63, 85
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 1:16-17.....	105
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 1:17.....	12
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 16:19.....	12
<i>Ephesians</i> 5:11.....	34
<i>Exodus</i> 23:6.....	12
<i>Ezekial</i> Chapter 9.....	34
<i>Ezekiel</i> 34:2-5.....	90
<i>Genesis</i> 3.....	20, 107
<i>Hebrews</i> 12:14.....	34, 38
<i>Hosea</i> 4:6.....	34, 83
<i>Isaiah</i> 9:16.....	7
<i>Isaiah</i> 10:1-2.....	52, 88
<i>Isaiah</i> 10:22.....	89
<i>Isaiah</i> 14.....	88, 139
<i>James</i> 2:1.....	12
<i>James</i> 2:9.....	12
<i>Jeremiah</i> 31.....	20
<i>Job</i> 13:10.....	12
<i>Job</i> 34:19.....	12
<i>John</i> 2:16.....	7, 20, 34, 35
<i>John</i> 7:24.....	85, 185
<i>John</i> 12:40.....	37, 49
<i>John</i> 14:26.....	33, 35
<i>John</i> 19:4-6.....	185
<i>John</i> 19:11.....	185
<i>Leviticus</i> 19:15.....	12
<i>Luke</i> 11:34.....	37, 49
<i>Luke</i> 13:23-28.....	89
<i>Luke</i> 16:15.....	84
<i>Malachi</i> 2:9.....	12
<i>Mark</i> 7:8.....	34
<i>Mark</i> 8:36-38.....	20
<i>Mark</i> 13:11.....	33, 35
<i>Matthew</i> 5:4.....	34
<i>Matthew</i> 6:1-4.....	7, 35, 87, 88, 101, 138,
<i>Matthew</i> 6:24.....	7, 20, 31, 33, 87, 101, 106, 124

<i>Matthew</i> 7:13-15.....	88
<i>Matthew</i> 12:34-38.....	85
<i>Matthew</i> 13.....	101
<i>Matthew</i> 16:24-26.....	84
<i>Matthew</i> 16:26.....	31
<i>Matthew</i> 23:23.....	12, 31, 52, 63, 85
Nu. 23:9.....	38
Proverbs 15:27.....	90
Proverbs 18:5.....	12
Proverbs 24:23.....	12
<i>Psalms</i> 51:5.....	84
Rev. 13:17.....	38
Romans 1:25.....	19, 20, 60, 83, 106
<i>Romans</i> 4:4.....	20, 101
Romans 12:2.....	34, 38

**Book**

1 *Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Mary Kay Kane, Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2862.....154

Article 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.....See App. T-5

Article by the Venus project *How can laws be eliminated*.....See App. T-5

Article by World Government Summit Could an AI ever replace a judge in court?, dated 2017.....See. App. T-5

*The Great Narrative for a Better Future*, by Klaus Schwabb.....See App. T-5

*Covid-19:The Great Reset*, by Claus Schwab and Thierry Malleret, Portfolio Penguin Publishing, published 2020, by Forum Publishing, which may be found at [https://carterheavyindustries.files.wordpress.com/2020/12/covid-19\\_-the-great-reset-klaus-schwab.pdf](https://carterheavyindustries.files.wordpress.com/2020/12/covid-19_-the-great-reset-klaus-schwab.pdf), (Excerpts of this Book in Exhibit D)..... See App T-5

The Great Narrative for a Better Future, by Klaus Schwabb.....See App. T-5

*The Fourth Industrial Revolution*, by Klaus Schwab, 2016 version, excluding additional pages of the 2017 updated version published by Portfolio Penguin, which may be found at [https://www.academia.edu/38203483/The\\_Fourth\\_Industrial\\_Revolution\\_pdf?fbclid=IwAR1koMak7N-40mbSf9wSGt8XzdhAJgafnbmobfn70FB4nbqcafl\\_hsN-RnQ.....](https://www.academia.edu/38203483/The_Fourth_Industrial_Revolution_pdf?fbclid=IwAR1koMak7N-40mbSf9wSGt8XzdhAJgafnbmobfn70FB4nbqcafl_hsN-RnQ.....)38, See App T-5

*Shaping the Fourth Industrial Revolution* By Klaus Schwabb, Founder of the World Economic Forum and Chairman with Nicolas Davis, Copywrite 2018, Published in the United States by Currency, an imprint of the Crown Publishing Group, a division of Penguin Random House LLC... See App. T-5

## CASES

<i>Abbott v. Mette</i> , No. CV 20-131-RGA, 2021 WL 327375, at *3 (D. Del. Jan. 31, 2021), report and recommendation adopted, No. 20-CV-131-RGA, 2, 1021 WL 1168958 (D. Del. Mar. 26, 2021), aff'd, No. 21-1804, 2021 WL 5906146 (3d Cir. Dec. 14, 2021).....	2, 141
<i>Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie</i> , 239 F.3d 307, 317 (3d Cir. 2001).....	168
<i>Abington School District v. Schempp</i> , 374 U.S. 203 (1963).....	135
<i>Adams v. Quattlebaum</i> , 219 F.R.D. 195 (D.D.C. 2004) .....	3, 150-151.
<i>Africa v. Pennsylvania</i> , 662 F.2d 1025, 1025, 1981 U.S. App. LEXIS 16448, *1, (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 456 U.S. 908, 72 L. Ed. 2d 165, 102 S. Ct. 1756.....	27, 138
<i>Agosto v. Aponte Roque</i> , 631 F. Supp. 1082, 1986 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27992 (D.P.R. 1986), remanded, 889 F.2d 1209, 4 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 1827, 1989 U.S. App. LEXIS 18910 (1st Cir. 1989).....	132
<i>Alexander v. Ieyoub</i> , 62 F.3d 709, 713 (5th Cir. 1993).....	2, 140
<i>Allgeyer v. Louisiana</i> , 165 U.S. 578, 589-590.....	127
<i>Anderson v. Creighton</i> , 483 U.S. 635, 640, 107 S.Ct. 3034, 97 L.Ed.2d 523 (1987).....	136
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). .....	136, 150
<i>Bank of Am. Nat'l Tr. &amp; Sav. Ass'n v. Hotel Rittenhouse Assocs.</i> , 800 F.2d 339, 343 (3d Cir. 1986).....	83, 161
<i>Board of Trustees v. Holso</i> , 584 P.2d 1009, 1978 Wyo. LEXIS 228 (Wyo.), reh'g denied, 587 P.2d 203, 1978 Wyo. LEXIS 245 (Wyo. 1978).....	132
<i>Bolden v. SEPTA</i> , 21 F.3d 29, 9 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 676, 146 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2065, 127 Lab. Cas. (CCH) ¶ 57650, 1994 U.S. App. LEXIS 6575 (3d Cir. 1994).....	132
<i>Ben-Levi v. Brown</i> , 136 S. Ct. 930, 934, 194 L. Ed. 2d 231, 235-236, 2016 U.S. LEXIS 991, *10-12.....	26, 138
<i>Boyd v. Farrin</i> , 575 Fed. Appx. 517 (5th Cir. 2014).....	140, 161
<i>Brady v. Maryland</i> , 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963).....	57-163
<i>Brindley v. McCullen</i> , 61 F.3d 507 (6th Cir. 1995).....	140, 145, 190
<i>Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 682.....	19, 27, 138, 159
<i>Bush v. Rauch</i> , 38 F.3d 842, 847 (6th Cir. 1994).....	154
<i>Cantwell v. State of Connecticut</i> , 310 U.S. 296, 60 S. Ct. 900, 84 L. Ed. 1213 (1940)....	27, 138
<i>Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.</i> , 556 U.S. 868, 872 (2009).....	183-184
<i>Carroll v. City of Mount Clemons</i> , 139 F.3d 107(6th Cir. 1998).....	2, 141
<i>Carter v. Kubler</i> , 320 U.S. 243.....	127
<i>Centifanti v. Nix</i> , 865 F.2d 1422, 1430 (3d Cir. 1989).....	119
<i>Constr. Drilling, Inc. V. Chusid</i> , No. 03-3786, 2005 WL 1111760, at *3 (3d Cir. May 11, 2005) .....	143, 154, 169
<i>Crane v. Fauver</i> , 762 F.2d 325 (3d Cir. 1985).....	2, 140

<i>Cunard Line Ltd. v. Abney</i> , S.D.N.Y.1982, 540 F.Supp. 657.....	151
<i>Datastorm Technologies, Inc. v. Excalibur Communications, Inc.</i> , N.D.Cal.1995, 888 F.Supp. 112.....	151
<i>Davis v. Jones</i> , 506 F.3d 1325, 1330 (11th Cir. 2007).....	39
<i>Deakins v. Monaghan</i> , 484 U.S. 193, 108 S. Ct. 523, 98 L. Ed. 2d 529 (1988).....	2, 140
<i>De La Cruz-Saddul v. Wayne State University</i> , E.D.Mich.1980, 482 F.Supp. 1388.....	3, 150
<i>Dent v. West Virginia</i> , 129 U.S. 114.....	126-127
<i>Doe v. Indian River School Dist</i> , 653 F.3d 256, 283 n.14 (3d Cir. 2011).....	18, 47, 135
<i>Elrod v. Burns</i> , <a href="#">427 U.S. 347, 374</a> , <a href="#">96 S.Ct. 2673</a> , <a href="#">49 L.Ed.2d 547</a> (1976).....	15, 47
<i>Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith</i> , 494 U. S. 872, 887, 110 S. Ct. 1595, 108 L. Ed. 2d 876 (1990).....	27, 138, 160
<i>State ex rel. Tate v. Cabbage</i> , 210 A.2d 555, 557, 1965 Del. Super. LEXIS 67, *1, 58 Del. 430, 433.....	27, 138
<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.</i> , 544 U.S. 280, 292–293, 125 S.Ct. 1517, 161 L.Ed.2d 454 (2005).....	119-120
<i>Faretta v. California</i> , 422 U.S. 806, 95 S. Ct. 2525, 45 L. Ed. 2d 562 (1975).....	115, 117
<i>Fisher v. City of Cincinnati</i> , 753 F. Supp. 681, 687 (S.D. Ohio 1990).....	133
<i>Fletcher-Harlee Corp. v. Pote Concrete Contractors, Inc.</i> , 482 F.3d 247, 253 (3d Cir. 2007)..	
<i>Flores v. Pierce</i> , 617 F.2d 1386, 1980 U.S. App. LEXIS 17814 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 875, 101 S. Ct. 218, 66 L. Ed. 2d 96, 1980 U.S. LEXIS 3269 (1980).....	132
<i>Foman v. Davis</i> , 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962).....	120
<i>Freedom from Religion Found. Inc. v. New Kensington Arnold Sch. Dist.</i> , 832 F.3d 469, 490, 2016 U.S. App. LEXIS 14594, *49-5.....	43
<i>Gianetti v. Cross</i> , No. 091416, at *16-17 (May 18, 2010).....	3
<i>Greene v. McElroy</i> , 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959).....	117, 126,
<i>Hammond v. Baldwin</i> , 866 F.2d 172, 177 (6th Cir. 1989).....	144
<i>Harmon v. Department of Finance</i> , 3rd Cir.(Del.), April 27, 2020.....	144
<i>Harsco Corp. v Zlotnicki</i> , 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985).....	37
<i>Harris v. Raymond</i> , No. 3:20-CV-01119, 2020 WL 5267920, at *4 (M.D. Pa. Aug. 17, 2020), report and recommendation adopted, No. 3:20-CV-1119, 2020 WL 5260769 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 3, 2020).....	154
<i>Hill v. City of Scranton</i> , 411 F.3d 118, 122 (3d Cir. 2005).....	160
<i>Holt v. Hobbs</i> , 574 U.S. 352, 352, 135 S. Ct. 853, 856, 190 L. Ed. 2d 747, 747, 2015 U.S. LEXIS 626, *1, 83 U.S.L.W. 4065, 93 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 777, 25.....	27, 138
<i>Inc. v. Lopez</i> , CIV. No. 14-1223 (PG) (D.P.R. Oct. 27, 2015).....	144
<i>In re a Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court, of the State Enna</i> , 971 A.2d 110, 125 (Del. 2009).....	112
<i>In re Cincinnati Radiation Litigation</i> , 874 F. Supp. 796, 823 (S.D. Ohio 1995).....	133
<i>In re Oliver</i> , 333 U.S. 257, 273.....	127
<i>Ins. Corp. of Ir. v. Compagnie Des Bauxites De Guinee</i> , 456 U.S. 694 702-03 (1982)...	112
<i>In re Kelly</i> , No. 58, at *3 (Del. Sep. 7, 2022).....	128.
<i>International Shoe Co. v. Washington</i> , 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945)....	112-113
<i>In Re Murchinson</i> , 349 US 133, 136 (1955).....	39, 144, 180
<i>Isom v. Arkansas</i> , 205 L. Ed. 2d 373, 140 S. Ct. 342, 343–44 (2019).....	180
<i>Johnson v. Carroll</i> , 369 F.3d 253, 259 (3d Cir. 2004).....	39
<i>Joint Anti-Fascist Committee v. McGrath</i> , 341 U.S. 168-169.....	127

<i>Jones v. Prescott</i> , 702 Fed. Appx. 205, 209 (5th Cir. 2017).....	2, 140
<i>Kalman v. Cortes</i> , 723 F. Supp. 2d 766, 769, (2010).....	7
<i>Kalniz v. Ohio State Dental Bd.</i> , 699 F. Supp. 2d 966, 975 (S.D. Ohio 2010).....	2, 141
<i>Kennedy v. Bremerton Sch. Dist.</i> , 142 S. Ct. 2407 (2022).....	154
<i>Kirby v. United States</i> , 174 U.S. 47.....	127
<i>Lavoie v. Aetna Life &amp; Casualty Co.</i> , 374 So. 2d 310, 312 (1979).....	181
<i>Laird v. Tatum</i> , 409 U.S. 824, 93 S. Ct. 7, 34 L. Ed. 2d 50 (1972).....	181
<i>Lewis v. Beddingfield</i> , 20 F.3d 123, 124 (5th Cir. 1994).....	2, 140
<i>Lewis v. Casey</i> , 518 U.S. 343, 370 (1996).....	168
<i>Licata v. U.S. Postal Serv.</i> , 33 F.3d 259, 260 (3d Cir. 1994).....	24
<i>Liljeberg v. Health Servs. Acquisition Corp.</i> , 486 U.S. 847, 108 S. Ct. 2194, 100 L. Ed. 2d 855 (1988).....	180
<i>Liteky v. United States</i> , 510 U.S. 540, 114 S. Ct. 1147, 127 L. Ed. 2d 474 (1994)....	180
<i>Lucero v. Ramirez</i> , No. 20-CV-2411-CAB-JLB, 2021 WL 1529932, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 16, 2021).....	155
<i>N. Jersey Media Grp. Inc. v. United States</i> , 836 F.3d 421, 434 (3d Cir. 2016).....	117
<i>Night Clubs, Inc. v. City of Fort Smith</i> , 163 F.3d 475 (8th Cir. 1998).....	2, 141
<i>Magera v. Lincoln National Life Insurance Company</i> , CIVIL ACTION No. 3:08-CV-0565, at *4 (M.D. Pa. May 14, 2009) .....	4
<i>Malhan v. Sec'y U.S. Dep't of State</i> , 938 F.3d 453, 462 (3d Cir. 2019).....	129
<i>Maraan v. Off. of Ohio Disciplinary Couns. for Supreme Ct. of Ohio</i> , No. 1:18CV645, 2021 WL 3173311, at *3 (S.D. Ohio July 27, 2021).....	2, 141-142
<i>Mayle v. Felix</i> , 545 U.S. 644, 663 (2005).....	120
<i>May v. Anderson</i> , 345 U.S. 528, 537 (1953).....	143
<i>Mattox v. United States</i> , 156 U.S. 237, 242-244.....	127
<i>Max's Seafood Cafe ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros</i> , 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999).....	37
<i>Mayberry v. Pennsylvania</i> , 400 U.S. 455 (1971).....	155
<i>McCool v. Gehret</i> , 657 A.2d 269, 277 and 280 (Del. 1995).....	144
<i>McDonough, Petitioner</i> , 457 Mass. 512, 519 n.16 (Mass. 2010).....	64
<i>Meyers v. Franklin Cty. Court of Common Pleas</i> , 23 F. App'x 201, 206 (6th Cir. 2001)...	2, 241-142
<i>Middlesex Cnty. Ethics Comm. v. Garden State Bar Ass'n</i> , 457 U.S. 423, (1982).....	4, 129
<i>Mir v. Bureau of Pro. &amp; Occupational Affs.</i> , No. 2557 C.D. 2015, 2016 WL 6407477, at *3 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Oct. 31, 2016).....	63
<i>Molina v. Pa. Soc. Serv. Union</i> , 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 120040, *27, 2019 WL 3240170...	43
<i>Moore v. Illinois</i> , 408 U.S. 786 (1972).....	163
<i>Moran v. Burbine</i> , 475 U.S. 412, 466 (1986).....	163
<i>Morgan v. United States</i> , 304 U.S. 1, 19.....	127
<i>Motes v. United States</i> , 178 U.S. 458, 474.....	127
<i>Mullin v. Sussex Cnty., Delaware</i> , 861 F. Supp. 2d 411, 427 (D. Del. 2012).....	47, 135
<i>Murray v. Giarratano</i> , 492 U.S. 1, 18 (1989).....	168
<i>Night Clubs, Inc. v. City of Fort Smith</i> , 163 F.3d 475 (8th Cir. 1998).....	2, 141
<i>Nimer v. Lichfield Twp. Bd. of Trustees</i> , 707 F.3d 699 (6th Cir. 2013).....	2, 141
<i>N. Jersey Media Grp. Inc. v. United States</i> , 836 F.3d 421, 434 (3d Cir. 2016).....	83, 117, 161
<i>Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 435 U.S. 589, 98 S.Ct. 1306, 55 L.Ed.2d 570 (1978)....	83
<i>Obergfell v. Hodges</i> , 576 U.S. 644.....	159

<i>Ohio Bell Telephone Co. v. Public Utilities Commission</i> , 301 U.S. 292.....	127
<i>Parkview Assoc. Partnership v. City of Lebanon</i> , 225 F.3d 321, 327-28 (3d Cir. 2000)...	119
<i>Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg</i> , 23 F.3d 772, 780-81 (3d Cir. 1994).....	83, 161
<i>PDX N., Inc. v. Comm'r N.J. Dep't of Labor &amp; Workforce Dev.</i> , 978 F.3d 871, 882 n.11 (3d Cir. 2020).....	128
<i>Pease v. Rathbun-Jones Eng. Co.</i> , 243 U.S. 273, 276 (1917).....	143
<i>Peters v. Hobby</i> , 349 U.S. 331, 352.....	127
<i>Peters v. Kiff</i> , 407 U.S. 493, 502 (1972), <i>Overruled in Gregg v. Georgia</i> , 428 U.S. 153, 169 (1976).....	155
<i>Powell v. Pennsylvania</i> , 127 U.S. 678, 684.....	127
<i>Presbyterian Church in U. S. v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church</i> , 393 U. S. 440, 450, 89 S. Ct. 601, 21 L. Ed. 2d 658 (1969).....	27, 138
<i>Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co.</i> , 517 U.S. 706, 719 (1996).....	2, 140
<i>Reed v. Goertz</i> , No. 21-442, at *5 (Apr. 19, 2023).....	119
<i>Reilly v. Pinkus</i> , 338 U.S. 269.....	127
<i>Richards v. Jefferson County</i> , 517 U.S. 793, 798 n.4 (1996).....	136
<i>Rocker-Feldman doctrine</i> , derived from 2 cases, 1) <i>Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.</i> , 263 U.S. 413 (1923) and 2) <i>District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman</i> , 460 U.S. 462 (1983)..	119, 120
<i>Salazar v. Buono</i> , 559 U.S. 700, 717 (2010).....	18, 29, 47, 135
<i>Saucie v. Katz</i> , 533 U.S. 194 (2001) .....	133
<i>Schweiker v. McClure</i> , 456 U.S. 188 (1982) reversed on other grounds; <i>Gibson v. Berryhill</i> , 411 U.S. 564, 570 (1973).....	144
<i>Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners</i> , 353 U.S. 232.....	127
<i>Sharp v. Johnson</i> , 669 F.3d 144, 159 (3d Cir.2012).....	136
<i>Skinner v. Switzer</i> , 562 U.S. 521, 532 (2011).....	119
<i>Slochower v. Board of Education</i> , 350 U.S. 551; <i>Truax v. Raich</i> , 239 U.S. 33, 41 ....	127
<i>Reed v. Illinois</i> , No. 19-1164, at *4 (7th Cir. Jan. 9, 2020).....	64
<i>Rippo v. Baker</i> , 580 U.S. 285, 137 S. Ct. 905, 197 L. Ed. 2d 167 (2017).....	179, 183
<i>Sprint Communications, Inc. v. Jacobs</i> , 571 U.S. 69,(2013).....	2, 3, 4, 129, 140
<i>Tanzin v. Tanvir</i> , 141 S. Ct. 486, 208 L. Ed. 2d 295 (2020).....	19
<i>Tennessee v. Lane</i> , 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004).....	64, 168
<i>Tumey v State of Ohio</i> , 273 US 510 (1927).....	144
<i>Ungar v. Sarafite</i> , 376 U.S. 575, 584 , <i>Citing, Tumey v. Ohio</i> , 273 U.S. 510.....	144
<i>United Church of the Medical Center v. Medical Center Comm'n</i> , 689 F.2d 693, 701 (7th Cir. 1982).....	144
<i>United States v. Bagley</i> , 473 U.S. 667 (1985).....	163
<i>United States v. Fiorelli</i> , 337 F.3d 282, 288 (3d Cir. 2003).....	37
<i>United States v. Nixon</i> , 418 U.S. 683, 703, 94 S.Ct. 3090, 41 L.Ed.2d 1039 (1974).....	135
<i>University of Delaware</i> , 434 F. Supp. 1273, 1977 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15317 (D. Del. 1977).....	132
<i>U.S. v. Wecht</i> , 484 F.3d 194, 221, 226 (3d Cir. 2007).....	161
<i>Utica Packing Co. v. Block</i> , 781 F.2d 71, 77 (6th Cir. 1986).....	144
<i>Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski</i> , 141 S. Ct. 792, 794, (2021).....	24
<i>Velasquez v. Litz</i> , No. CV 3:21-1659, 2021 WL 5298912, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Nov. 15, 2021)...	154
<i>Ward v Village of Monroeville</i> , 409 US 57 61-62 (1972).....	144

<i>Watkins v. Ohio Dep't of Educ.</i> , No. 2:21-CV-04482, 2022 WL 672565, at *8 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 7, 2022).....	2, 141, 142
<i>Werkheiser v. Pocono Twp.</i> , 780 F.3d 172, 176 (3d Cir. 2015).....	19, 26, 135, 136
<i>Williams v. Hepting</i> , 844 F.2d 138, 145 (3d Cir. 1988).....	2, 141
<i>Williams v. Pennsylvania</i> , 579 U.S. 1 (2016).....	3, 180, 181, 183, 185
<i>Williams-Yulee v. Fla. Bar</i> , 575 U.S. 433, (2015).....	184
<i>Withrow v. Larkin</i> , 421 U.S. 35, 46 (1975).....	144, 180, 183
<i>Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Stroud</i> , 179 F.3d 598 (8th Cir. 1999).....	2, 141
<i>Younger v. Harris</i> , 401 U.S. 37 (1971)....	4, 23, 24, 25, 109-110, 119, 123-124, 128-129, 141-142
<i>Zilich v. Longo</i> , 34 F.3d 359 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994).....	133

**CONSTITUTION**

US Const. Amend I...4, 5, 6, 9-10, 11, 12, 13, 18-24, 27-100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 123-124, 125, 126, 133-135-137-167, 171, 174, 177, 178, 181-184, 187-188, 189
US Const. Amend V...4, 5, 11, 13, 63, 65, 66, 67, 73, 85, 86, 90, 99, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 107, 111, 117, 119, 124, 179, 181-184, 187-188, 189
US Const Amend. IV.....101, 174-175, 188
US Const. Amend. VI...4, 5, 18-24, 27-36, 107, 111, 116, 117, 126, 127, 163, 188
US Const Amend XIII....36-37, 90, 93, 100, 101, 105, 106, 107, 111
US Amend. XIV...4, 5, 6, 9-10, 27-100, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 123, 125, 126, 133-167, 171, 177, 178, 187, 188, 189
US Art III...11, 13, 126

**Executive orders**

E.O. 13798.....	6, 7, 9, 33, 35, 38, 155
Ex. Or. No. 13198, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021...6, 7, 9, 33, 35, 38, 155	
Ex. Or. No. 13199, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, May 3, 2018...6, 7,9, 33, 35, 38, 155	
Ex. Or. No. 13279, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No. 13559, November 17, 2010.....	6, 7, 9, 33, 35, 38, 155
Ex. Or. No. 13559 Nov. 17, 2010.....	6, 7, 9, 33, 35, 38, 155
Ex Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018...6, 7, 9, 33, 35, 38, 155	
Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021...6, 7, 9, 33, 35, 38, 155	

**FEDERAL STATUTES**

CFR § 2200.68.....	98, 173-187
18 USC 227.....	174

28 U.S. Code § 144 .....	98, 173-187
28 U.S.C.A. § 453.....	185, 190
28 U.S. Code § 455.....	3, 39, 40, 41, 98, 173-187
28 U.S.C. § 1253.....	1
28 U.S.C. § 1254.....	1
28 U. S. C. § 1343.....	
28 U. S. C. § 2101(e).....	68, 71-72
28 U.S.C. § 2106.....	1
28 U.S.C. § 2071-2077.....	101
42 USC §1983.....	21, 22, 27, 31, 38, 39, 108, 110, 125, 132, 188
42 USC §1985...10, 21, 27, 31, 38, 39, 108, 110, 125, 188	
42 USC §1988.....	21, 22, 27, 31, 38, 39,108, 110, 125, 188
42 U. S. C. § 2000bb-1 through 4 Religious Freedom Restoration Act...5, 6, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 38, 39, 108, 109, 110, 125	
42 U.S.C. §§ 12181- 12189.....	63, 64

**Local District Court rule**

<i>D. Del. 7.1.5 (a)</i> .....	24
--------------------------------	----

**FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE**

Fed. R. App. P. 27.....	103, 104
-------------------------	----------

**FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 Rule (a)...3, 31-36, 59, 120	
Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 52.....	36, 37, 42, 48, 51
Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 59.....	24, 36, 37, 42, 48, 51
Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 60.....	184, 42, 48, 51
Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 605.....	40

**SUPREME COURT RULES**

Supreme Court Rule 23.....	71-72
----------------------------	-------

**STATE REGULATIONS**

Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule (also “DLRDP Rule”) 1 (a)..111-112, 176-184	
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 5.....111-112, 176-184	
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 7(d).....11, 13, 14, 176-184	
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 8.....111, 176-184	
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 9 (d) (2).....176-184	
DLRDP Rule 9(d)(3).....76, 163, 176-184	
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 10.....111, 176-184	
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 12 (h).....78, 68-76, 79, 167, 176-184	
Delaware Rules of Disciplinary Procedure, Rule 13.....11, 13, 14, 14, 176-184	



Delaware Rules of Disciplinary procedure Rule 14.....11, 13, 176-184  
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 18.....176-184  
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 19 (a).....11, 13, 176-184  
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 19 (c).....11, 13, 176-184  
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 19 (d).....11, 13, 176-184  
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 19 (e).....11, 13, 176-184