

# Appendix P

November 6, 2020

Court of Chancery Courthouse  
34 The Circle  
Georgetown, DE 19947

**RE: Meghan Kelly v. the President of the United States,  
Defendant, Donald Trump, a.k.a. Donald J. Trump, a.k.a.  
President Trump, a.k.a. President Donald Trump, his official  
capacity as President of the United States Case No. 2020-0809-  
PWG  
Second Amended Complaint, Exceptions**

Dear Honorable Master Griffin:

On November 4, I talked with the court's staff. They indicated I hold off on subpoenas until I receive some routine paperwork from you. I asked if I was in trouble. They indicated I was not. It appears I am.

I googled Meghan v Trump and discovered you recommended a dismissal of my case. I immediately contacted the Chancery Court, and asked permission to pick up a copy, which was not received until the pick up late on November 6, 2020.

“Ct. Ch. R. 144 requires a party to file a notice of exception to a draft report within seven days of the date of that draft report. Rule 144 does not require the exceptions themselves to be filed within seven days.” See, *Hitchens v. Hastings*, 2010 Del. Ch. LEXIS 7, \*1, 2010 WL 322992

The Court filed the recommendation on Monday, November 2, 2020.

Accordingly, I must file a Notice of Exceptions, on Monday, November 9, 2020, the next business day, to prevent dismissal, which does not afford me sufficient time to complete the exceptions themselves.

I respectfully submit the Notice of Exceptions herewith, on Monday, November 9, 2020, in accordance to the rule.

I respectfully request adequate time to draft the exceptions.

On October 12, 2020, I hand delivered a Second Amended Complaint to this Honorable Court that added a prayer for declaratory relief to limit federal employees' freedoms under the first amendment, such as President Trump, in order not to chill the freedoms of those a federal employee, Defendant, serves, and to add the United States as a Defendant, in accordance to the requirements under FRCP, Rule 12.

On October 12, 2020, I also hand delivered three praecipes, one of which included a praecipe for an in-state Defendant, the civil process clerk for the US Attorney's Office for the District of Delaware, US Attorney's Office.

The Honorable Court's staff requested I seek permission from this Honorable Court to serve the civil process clerk by certified mail, in a manner that is not allowed under local rules.

I hand delivered letters and orders in accordance with the Court's staff's request for alternative service pursuant to the Chancery Court Rule 4 (d)(7).

Yet, no subpoenas have been issued at this time for the Second Amended Complaint, nor has a subpoena been issued for the civil process clerk for the Amended Complaint.

The US Attorney for the District of DE has not been served anything. Once served, pursuant to 28 USCS § 1446, he is afforded 30 days from service to apply for removal of the entire case to the District Court, despite the other two defendants being time barred this week.

The Federal rules conflict with the state rules of service for the civil process clerk. The Federal rules require in state service via registered or certified mail if I use the civil process clerk, which is not expressly permitted under the local rules.

I think it more prudent to amend the unserved complaint to serve the US Attorney for the District of Delaware, David C. Weiss, Esquire pursuant to FRCP Rule 12 (1)(A), which permits service via the sheriff under local rules and federal rules, in place of the civil process clerk.

Since, none of the Defendants have been served, assuming my case is not dismissed, may I please amend the Second Amended complaint to

address this Honorable Court's concerns, after exceptions are filed, to replace the civil process clerk with the US Attorney for the District of Delaware, and to clean up errors such as correct the misspelling in the title of the Complaint Amended(ed).

My heart is falling to the floor since I desired this Honorable Court to also prevent violence, under the guise of Godliness. Yet, I do not believe your honor will.

The President has been stirring up the pot of unrest by talking of the left, "taking away guns," I fear only to devour his own supporters by increasing the temptation they exercise the second amendment, when courts would likely deem it suspended.

Constitutional freedoms are suspended during national emergencies to preserve life. Defendant encourages lawlessness, under the guise of law, to foreseeably use the insurrection act to harm and kill people he is charged to serve. The President tempts folks to exercise the second amendment, when the courts allow the president to remove freedoms (which will predictably include the 2nd amendment) during times of emergencies, creating a trap, tempting folks to lawlessly behave only to gain authority to harm and kill his own citizens under the Insurrection Act. (See Exhibits A, Provisions of the

Insurrection Act, and B, articles relating to the Defendant's use of the threat of violence).

I was also hoping this Court may hold the Insurrection Act unconstitutional, should Defendant use it, for his own gain, at the expense of those he serves. While, yes the Supreme Court has allowed the executive branch to remove freedoms to safeguard lives during national emergencies such as war, it is not a license for the President to take lives, or to violate the constitution.

The purpose of the second amendment, protection from reign by government violence or threat of violence is eliminated, during times of national emergencies, during the time it was intended to be used against reign by violence. The common man may not be aware lawlessness is not the law. I will set this issue aside.

This Court may yet balance the executive branch to prevent tyrannical, limitless, reign by one unchecked, unbalanced limb.

Thank you for the opportunity to address your concerns.

Very truly,



Meghan Kelly

Pro Se

34012 Shawnee Drive  
Dagsboro, DE 19939