

No. _____
Application No. 23A144

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

**On Petition of Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third
Circuit, Case Number 22-3372**

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Pro Se, not represented by
Counsel, Defending my private religious
belief in Jesus as God not money as God
Matthew 6:24
US Bar 283696
(302) 278-2975
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Dated: December 26, 2023

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether the Order below must be vacated due to clear error of fact, of law, creating manifest injustice given: The Eastern District Court abused its discretion based on a misunderstanding. The disbarment was not freely and voluntarily rendered. I was subjected to coercion and duress and I was not fully aware of the implications of submitting a letter regarding retirement. I was confused as to whether I was retired and the Court booby trapped me based on my known confusion, in addition to and in the alternative of

Whether the Order below must be vacated as depriving me of 5th Amendment Due Process before District-Court where I requested clarification of notice as to the subject matter of a hearing order date given:

1. I reserved the right to call witnesses of which I was deprived in the original forum,
2. I had numerous outstanding motions with Judge Diamond, including but not limited to a motion to correct the flawed record where the staff misfiled about 20 years' worth of evidence of State of Delaware and Delaware Courts depriving me of asserted fundamental rights outlined in part in 3DI-56 attached hereto, especially the 1st Amendment right to petition and right to religious belief applicable to the state via the 14th Amendment, was misfiled on the docket, two motions were filed as exhibits and another pro se's medical records
3. the District-Court denied me of clarification as to Notice as to what the substance of the hearing given there was multiple outstanding motions I required orders on to defend and not waive my fundamental rights,
4. The Court knew I believed I was retired before its Court

5. Instead of fixing the fatally flawed record below with 1000s of pages disheveled which deprived me of a full, fair and public record in contravention of my asserted 1st, 5th and 6th Amendment rights as a criminally like accused party, the Court entrapped me knowing I believed I was retired, cared about the two fired court staff I sought to call as witnesses, was under great duress due to poverty, lack of access to legal research, transportation and health causing me to collapse due to severe deadly dehydration relating to our bad healthcare wherein I asserted my right to tend to my health as a religious exercise to live and not die for the convenience, material gain or other vanity of men in place of God, and I was in fear of being deprived of access to other courts, causing irreparable injury in terms of loss of fundamental rights, including but not limited to 1st Amendment rights to petition, religious belief, exercise of belief, association, speech, 6th Amendment rights to call witnesses necessary to my defense, 6th Amendment right to self-represent or to choose the counsel of my choice Richard Abbott should he consider though he is free to say no to the terms per 13th Amendment, 13 Amendment right against involuntary servitude, 5th and 14th Amendment rights to a fair proceeding, notice, fair opportunity to be heard, equal protections, due process and other claims.
6. The Court knew my retirement from the PA bar in 2018 did not cause me to lose my active license to practice law before its own court, wherein I did not know.
7. The Court knew I thought I was retired before its court too by the 2018 act of retiring from PA, and

8. The Court requested I draft a memorandum on why my 2018 retirement in PA would still allow me to be barred before the court to get out of doing work to correct the docket in my case or review the outstanding other motions, to allow me to call witnesses and to deal with the complicated issues in my case, while not clarifying my request as to notice of the hearing by cancelling the hearing and rendering a more draconian order by entrapment I did not freely or voluntarily agree to;
9. Requiring the Order be vacated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

X. Whether eliminating life time appointments of US Supreme Court judges eliminates the impartiality of the judges by tempting them to be partial to who maintains, reappoints or otherwise controls their seats as opposed to the impartial application of the rule of law. And further, whether federal Appellate and District Court judges' term of years tenure should be replaced with life time terms unless retirement, appointment of another position or impeachment so as not to make unfair partial forums partial towards those who maintain their position.

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

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

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

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

XV. Whether the Third Circuit abused its discretion in bad faith, in clear error of law, and clear error of fact as to cause manifest injustice against me by its orders dated June 30, 2023 in dismissing my case while simultaneously denying my motions for a stay, motion for time, motion to vacate an order limiting my motion for an extension of time to three pages given the voluminous reasons time is required and limit on filings under the threat of sanctions given my Motion for reconsideration of Order dated January 17, 2023, with regards denial of waiver of costs, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights and invocation of the 13th Amendment, motion to correct the record given the lower court misfiled 1000s of papers and placed another pro se claimants health records, and other motions, given the two orders deprived me of the Constitutional First Amendment right to petition under a motion for a rehearing under FRAP 40 on these orders and the order denying Kelly's motion to recuse Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps as to deprive me the opportunity to petition and fair opportunity to be heard in violation of procedural due process, denying my Motion to stay this case until the civil rights proceeding is concluded with no possibility to appeal, under the extraordinary circumstances where I face irreparable injury in terms of loss of private Constitutional rights, including but not limited to First Amendment rights to petition, speech, religious belief, exercise

of religious belief, association, other claims and am threatened with potentially 6 needless additional law suits where my exercise of Constitutional rights face further restraint to :

1. Prevent loss of fundamental rights and claims in this case and the civil rights case,
2. Prevent potentially 6 needless lawsuits;
3. prevent duplicity of potentially conflicting decisions in parallel disciplinary cases and in this case and the civil rights.
4. prevent potentially needless unaffordable costs relating to duplicated litigation on the same issues from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, creating an obstacle so great as to deny me access to the courts to defend my license and exercise of fundamental rights, given my poverty and religious objection to debt, and invocation against involuntary servitude, especially given the original disciplinary order prevents me from working in the profession of my free choice
5. prevent a government compelled violation of my religious belief against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in defense of the exercise of fundamental rights and license(s) by increase in needless, duplicative material costs, time and lack of access or limited access to resources including research;
6. prevent government compelled involuntary servitude in violation of my asserted 13th Amendment right in exchange with access to the courts to defend my licenses and liberties from being taken away but for my religious beliefs in Jesus reflected in my speech contained in my private petitions,
7. prevent the risk of loss of my fundamental rights to religious belief, religious exercise of beliefs, political and religious speech, association and the right to privately petition to the courts to address grievances to safeguard my exercise of religious belief

without state persecution but for disagreement with my religious-political speech contained in my petitions, before the Delaware Courts.

8. prevent the chilling of the exercise of First Amendment liberties by the public or other professionals who may fear reprisal in the form of the loss of their license or threat of character assassination b being deemed mentally disabled but for their exercise of individual liberties merely because the State disagrees with their First Amendment beliefs, or their petitions or their attempt to hold the government, including government agents of both state and federal government to the limits of the Constitution.
9. prevent harm to my health and life. My health has diminished. I require time to maintain my health and life, in light of my specific permanent weakness related to a past surgery in my youth, which Defendants and all courts in related litigation have been apprised of, even the Delaware Chancery and Supreme Court. Without time to accommodate my weaknesses my health will diminish further, jeopardizing my life. (Citing, US Amendments I, V, XIII).
10. Given there is a reasonable probability that four Justices will consider the issue sufficiently meritorious to grant certiorari or to note probable jurisdiction; (2) a fair prospect that a majority of the Court will conclude that the decision below was erroneous; and (3) a likelihood that irreparable harm will result from the denial of a stay.
11. The public, the Court and the Defendants are not prejudiced by a stay pending conclusion of the civil rights case.

12. In addition, in my other appeal and on the record below in this case, I indicate my belief the courts are in danger. I believe my appeal for the Third Circuit matter may stifle the plans to eliminate courts, before a far worse scheme is implemented. I must be afforded an opportunity to provide evidence of my belief. It is the mere opportunity to be heard I seek to protect not the guarantee.
13. The public is harmed if a stay is not granted.
14. The balance of the equities require a stay to prevent the loss of my fundamental rights because I had the courage to imperfectly defend them in the Delaware Courts.

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

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

XVIII. Whether the Appellate Court abused its discretion in denying my Motion to recuse Judge Phipps and Motion for a rehearing to recuse Judge Phipps so as to deny me a fair proceeding in violation of the 5th Amendment right to procedural due process, given this reciprocal disciplinary law suit arises based on my Freedom Restoration Act Law suit against President Trump to alleviate a substantial burden upon my exercise of religious belief by dissolving a course of conduct I argued established government religion, when Judge Phipps was twice nominated to the US Supreme Court, I moved to recuse him in the civil rights case, the

state's false allegations testified in his head without an opportunity to cross examine them in this separate suit when the temptation to rule against me with the very real prospect of a reward in terms of appointment to the US Supreme Court in light of the fact there is a high likelihood of a vacancy and Phipps' appointment in light of the threats and pressures to force justices to be impeached or retire tempting an ordinary person should they be placed in Phipps' position to be unduly prejudiced against me and for opponent, especially since President Trump is popular and is likely to be reelected, and given Phipps' ruled against me in the civil rights case and this case.

XVIX. Whether the Appellate Court abused its discretion in denying my Motion to recuse Judge Scirica and Motion for a rehearing to recuse Judge Scirica so as to deny me a fair proceeding in violation of the 5th Amendment right to procedural due process, given he too ruled against me in the civil rights case, allowing a different parties testimony which I did not have the means to contest due to the threat of sanctions testifying in this case, and given I opposed Delaware Disciplinary rules and Delaware disciplinary proceedings on the record, which reflect the federal judicial rules Scirica drafts, and I seek to render those rules unconstitutional in both the civil rights case and this case, given the common person would be insulted and rule against me given I oppose Judge Scirica's rules and seek to overturn his hard work.

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

XXI Whether Third Circuit Court of Appeals abused its discretion by failing to file either of the two amended notices I filed in response to the August 7, 2023 order by Judge Diamond in the District for the Eastern District of PA Court filed in bad faith to increase costs needlessly as to cause me to forgo access to the courts as to deny me the First Amendment right

to petition by preserving the record should the case be remanded or reopened essentially vitiating my Constitutional rights and other claims I seek to protect.

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

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

XXIV Whether Kelly's Special appearance as capable of repetition yet evading review under current case law allows other lawyers to specially appear before the US Supreme Court without fear disciplined attorneys' hope of a hero will be their attacker who will attack them more quickly under Rule 8 should they exercise their First Amendment right to petition attorney discipline orders on Constitutional defects or other Constitutional grounds, thus chilling the First Amendment right and other liberties of Citizen lawyers or whether the courts should create a new rule to safeguard Constitutional rights from citizen lawyers who should not be compelled to sell freedom for a license to buy and sell. See the Bible's reference referring this to the mark of the beast.

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

XXVI Whether Federal Disciplinary proceedings violate case and controversy requirements.

XXVII Whether Congress violates separation of power issues by enacting 28 U.S. Code § 144, 28 U.S. Code § 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other regulatory or disciplinary rule or requiring self-regulations by creating the danger of the deception manipulated marketed by third party distortion of appearance to commandeer the court without a case or controversy which pressures the court to be concerned with the lie of appearance instead of actual justice. Whether Procedural Due process and Equal Protections arguments are sufficient to require recusal of judges or overturning of decisions based on unfair partial participants of the court which the appellate court, and the entire forum wherein a party requests recusal not the alleged partial participant must determine of failure to recuse makes the proceeding constitutionally defective.

XXVIII Whether attorney disciplinary rules and statutes violate the constitution and whether judges' powers in an actual case and controversy to correct or even discipline attorneys is sufficient.

XXIX Whether this court may include any other issue on the record or before this court that I addressed on the record below, or in this appeal or that is pressing before this court to preserve the judiciary and the rule of law that binds these United States from schemed dissolution or other harm in the interest of justice to afford any relief this court deems just and fair, especially a grant of time for an opportunity to research and draft additional pleadings should this court require or to allow this to be the only pleading given my poverty and limited resources with leave for the court to consider the important issues with a waiver of my opportunity to be heard in person or in paper further.

LIST OF PARTIES

The parties are listed on the caption.

CASES DIRECTLY RELATING TO THIS CASE

Kelly v Swartz, et al, Delaware District Court No. 21-1490, and Third Circuit Court of Appeals Matter No 21-3198. US Supreme Court filings *Kelly v Swartz et al* 22A747, *Kelly v Swartz et al*. 22-6783, *Kelly v Swartz et al*. 23A100.

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

Kelly v Democrats Delaware Chancery Court No 2020-0157.

The Original disciplinary case in Delaware Supreme Court matter No. 22-58 and IMO Meghan Kelly Number 541 regarding to appointment of counsel where I was denied copies or access to the filed pleadings. US Supreme Court application 22A476 *Kelly v DE Office of Disciplinary Counsel*.

Reciprocal disciplinary case Eastern District of PA matter No 22-45, Third Circuit Court of Appeals No. 22-3372.

Reciprocal Disciplinary case I believe is stayed Delaware District Court No. 22-341.

Reciprocal Case in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals 22-8037. Reciprocal disciplinary case before the US Supreme Court *Kelly v Third Circuit Court of Appeals* No. 22-6584 and application No. 22A478.

PA Supreme Court No 2913 DD3, US Supreme Court filing *Kelly v Pennsylvania Office of Disciplinary Counsel* US Supreme Court Numbers 22A981, 22-7695

DC and the US Supreme Court have refrained from discipline, DC based on jurisdiction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....1

JURISDICTION.....1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2-143

I. Meg Kelly makes a special appearance in order to assert her 1st Amendment right to petition while reserving her claims and defenses of violation of her right to notice, fair process and fair opportunity to be heard in contravention of Due process applicable to Federal Courts via the 5th Amendment.....2-7

II. Original Order disciplining me and infringing on my license to buy and sell as an attorney but for the exercise of fundamental rights based on State’s religious-political animus violates my 1st Amendment private exercise of rights to religious belief, exercise of beliefs, association, speech, petition, and access to the courts and the 5th and 14th Amendment right to Equal protection and must be vacated and not reciprocated as unconstitutional.....7-19

III. DE Court’s violated my 1st Amendment right to access to the Courts applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment to prevent petitioning to require the courts adhere to the law to cover up the courts’ mistakes or misconduct, then sealed my petitions A-4, A-5 in secret without notice or opportunity to be heard and fired two court staff to prevent testimony incriminating the courts.....19-23

IV. Judges should be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits of a 1. A case or controversy or 2. impeachment without waiver, and must uphold and not chill the check placed on the judiciary through parties petitioning to correct Court’s staff misconduct or mistakes by vindictive punishment but for requiring the Court uphold the rule of law as opposed to partial whims.....23-28

V. The Court must find US Supreme Court may only be disciplined or checked within the purview of the Constitutional limits of 1. a case and Controversy under Art. III, and 2. by impeachment, without waiver 1. to preserve my right, as a party of one, and other claimants right under the 5th Amendment Equal protections component and procedural Due Process component to an impartial forum not partial towards an ethics code or towards regulations to maintain justices’ seats but partial towards upholding the Constitutional rule of law as applied to cases, and 2. Courts must not violate the Constitution by impeding and chilling the checks upon its own branch via punishing me in terms of petitioning this Court concerning denial of access to the

courts by appellant, itself, and the original disciplinary forums to uphold the Constitutional law and improve the administration of justice not destroy the courts or individual judges.....28-32

VI. Collateral Estoppel does not apply, US Supreme court staff's delay in docketing an interim stay of civil rights case prevented appeal of original DE Order despite asserted 1st and 5th Amendment rights to fair access to the courts to prevent foreseeable deprivation, This Court's staff deprived me of access to the courts in related cases which affect this case and my ability to petition effectively..... 32-33

A. US Supreme Court staff deprived me of access to the courts to appeal the original disciplinary matter by delays in docketing This Court deprived me of access to the courts in related cases which affect this case and my ability to petition effectively and fairly US Amend I, V.....33-36

B. US Supreme Court staff tampered with and removed exhibits necessary for a full and fair opportunity to be heard with regards to my application for an interim stay and petition for a stay in the civil rights case which deprived me of foreseeable access to other courts since I petitioned for a stay to prevent such an actual deprivation to preserve the underlying fundamental rights not merely my interest in my licenses.....36-39

C. The US Supreme Court staff erred in denying me access to the courts, making judicial decisions and delaying in docketing and for not accepting or rejecting a timely filed Supplemental Brief necessary for consideration of a petition for a rehearing with reasons for rejection and opportunity to cure per case law should the court have rejected it in deprivation of my 1st, 5th and 6th Amendment asserted and not waived rights and deprivation of the opportunity to alert this US Supreme Court of a threat to the judiciary, the rule of law and the country.....39-65

VII. Reciprocal proceeding is unwarranted. The original DE Proceeding Violated Procedural Due Process, First Amendment, Substantive Due Process Clause and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.....65-69

VIII. This Court must overturn App H Order of the 3rd Circuit Clerk refusing to docket Amended Notice of Appeal to preserve and not vitiate my rights and claims related to a District Court Order dated 8/7/23, argument against vitiation of Constitutional rights including religious belief against debt, involuntary servitude under the 13th Amendment and access to the courts without compelled violation of religious belief, should the case not be vacated with an acquittal.....69-76

IX. District-Court violated procedural due process, depriving me of a fair opportunity to be heard with inaccurate public record in violation of the 1st, 5th and 6th, by placing someone else's case on my record and placing my pleadings out of order, and multiple pleadings in one Docket Item sloppily, carelessly with reckless disregard of vitiation of my liberties not merely my licenses, unfairly and denied me Constitutionally sufficient notice on hearing.....76-78

X The Court exhibited Bad faith misrepresentations to lure me by entrapment into vitiating my rights, with knowledge of my belief I was retired before the District-Court, my 6th

Amendment assertion of the right to call witnesses which I was deprived of in DE, a disability order, poverty and lack of means for research given I documented issues relating to broken computers and lack of means to adequately research and risk of serious harm to health without accommodation in the form of time and a stay given my asserted right to a fair trial and circumstances.....78-86

XI. The Courts must be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits of a case or controversy without retaliation to parties who seek in good faith to correct the court, which includes not retaliating against me by this petition to cure the defects in this case by the entrapment by Justice Diamond.....86-87

XII Court violated my asserted first amendment right to petition and 5th Amendment procedural due process by not recusing Judge Scirica from this case, and must recuse him now should this case be remanded back to the District Court.....88-97

XIII The Court erred as a matter of law, as a matter of fact creating manifest injustice against me in denying the recusal of the Judge Phipps in my case/ So, the Order must be overturned as a deprivation of Procedural Due Process.....97-102

XIV. The system of reciprocity violates Case and Controversy Requirements.....102-106

A. The case and controversy requirements are not met in my case.....103-106

XV The Third Circuit abused its discretion in denying a stay until conclusion of the civil rights case.....107-112

XV The Third Circuit abused its discretion denying a stay effectively vitiating my Constitutional right to petition to defend Constitutional rights that are vitiated by the draconian order with the severest consequences.....112-114

XVI Extraordinary Circumstances warrant a Stay.....115-132

XVII The Court erred as a matter of law as a matter of fact creating manifest injustice against me in denying my motion to exempt costs, fees and taxes before Third Circuit 1. to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, 2. to prevent a government compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights, and 3.to prevent compelled involuntary servitude in exchange with access to the courts to defend my licenses and liberties from being taken away for my religious beliefs in Jesus. (Citing, US Amendments I, V, XIII).....132-142

IX CONCLUSION.....142-143

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1-a Constitutional and statutory provisions involved.....2

Appendix A Order dated July 26, 2023 denying

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

Appendix B Order dated June 30, 2023 denying

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

Appendix C Clerk Order dated June 30, 2023 dismissal for failure to prosecute

Appendix D Order denying recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica

Appendix E Clerk Order threatening sanctions for placing misfiled docket items below and relevant other documents to refer to by reference in my attempt to reduce the appendix, and limiting my motion for an extension of time to 3 pages in bad faith given my religious objections

to debt, poverty creating an obstacle to my access to the courts and invocation of the 13th Amendment.

Appendix F Clerk Order dated **February 1, 2023** denying Motion for reconsideration of Order dated January 17, 2023, with regards denial of waiver of costs, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights, “to be referred to the merits panel once briefing is complete”

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

Appendix H Order refusing to docket the Amended notice of appeal filed with the Eastern District Court, causing the Eastern District Court of PA not to docket the first and second notice I filed with the Eastern District of PA that were not returned.....1, 70

Appendix H-1 22-3372 3DI 62, transcript, Amended Notice of Appeal filed in District Court dated 8/7/23, attached Order dated 8/7/23 denying Motion for permission to use electronic filing, email to Appellee which staff previously indicated was acceptable for filing and previously filed before court changed its mind, with a mailed original copy sent per the attached envelop.....1, 70-85

Appendix H-2 Amended Notice of Appeal to include Notice of Appeal to a Court of Appeals from an appealable Order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District Court for the Eastern District of PA Docket Number 33 Case No. 22-45, stamped DI 34, dated 8/11/23, filed 8/14/23., attached order denying ECF access, transcript, exhibit containing documents found in H-1, with envelop for the 8/11/23 second amended notice of appeal which unlike the first one was docketed.....1, 70-85

Appendix H-3 Electronic Notice **IFP Granted for Notice of Appeal**.....1, 70-85

Appendix H-4 Electronic Notice “**No feed paid, no IFP filed**” Appeals Clerk (fdc) Modified 8/15/2023 (lisad) by District Court.....1, 70-85

Appendix H-5 Order by Eastern District Court, dated 2/8/23 granting In forma pauperis status, DI 29.....1, 70-85

Appendix I Application for retirement in PA granted 5/16/18.....1, 70-85

Appendix J Pleadings filed in District Court showing I believed I was retired before the Eastern District Court of PA.....70-85

Appendix K Letter to Honorable Judge and Panel Leader Paul S. Diamond, dated October 22, 2023, regarding I had no transportation. I requested PA Office of Disciplinary Counsel for a stay. I seek to preserve my life and health. I explained I had surgery as a youth which forever harmed my life and requires time to sustain my life and health as I face severe dangerous dehydration a week each month and longer if I am not afforded time to rehydrate, rest, eat and exercise. I have religious objections to healthcare and believe people will be thrown into the fires of hell for exploiting my weakness for profit as they did when they wrongly took one of my

organs, should they not repent. I indicated to Justice Diamond I collapsed due to severe dehydration as I filed documents by bike in another case. My bike's tire got flat and I live miles from the post office. I asserted my right to live, and incorporated this as evidence of why a stay is necessary in my case.

Exhibit A and B thereto emails and pictures of flat tire sent to opposing counsel in other cases

Exhibit C thereto Letter to PA Office of Disciplinary Counsel Anthony Sodroski, dated September 3, 2022, requesting his stance on a stay given I had 6 other potential law suits, and an appeal to the US Supreme Court, faced poverty creating a substantial burden to my access to the courts, people talked about shooting me, and in fact someone did shoot two bullet holes into the home of a friend due to speech they found repugnant incited by government incited unhealthy backlash for those not supporting Republicans, Trump or candidates with shared views

Exhibit D thereto, Response from PA ODC, Anthony Sodrowski indicating he does not agree to a stay

Exhibit E thereto, Exhibit 43 which includes

1. Newspaper article I drafted published in the Coastal Point, Representative candidate says health is wealth, dated July 20, 2018, Coastal Point, Guest Column, *Representative candidate says health is wealth*, By Meghan Kelly, Esq., Candidate Delaware House of Representatives, 38th District,
2. "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. 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. Health care record.
6. 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

7. Delaware State Police, Camden public alert, two bullets when into the home of my friend Gregory Layton former newspaper reporter at the News Journal because of his political speech incited by Former President trump's incitement of violence against dissidence to the Republican party, platform or Trump

8. Pictures of substance thrown at my car in retaliation for the religious-political speech contained on the stickers I designed on my vehicle.....10, 70 -85

Appendix L Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Petition for a rehearing on the 11/13/23 order denying petition for a rehearing submitted 10/18/23, denied on 11/13/23 to consider intervening causes of substantial or controlling effect concerning my arguments and other claims not previously considered which will vitiate my rights should the court not hear this rehearing in US Supreme Court case No.22-7695, Related Application No. 22A981, Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner V Office of Disciplinary counsel, aka Pennsylvania Disciplinary Counsel On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Western District of PA, Case Number 2913 DD3.....32-33, 34

Exhibits to Appendix L PDF labeled Emergency filing meg Multiple exhibits in electronic format only wherein Meg does not attach all exhibits contained therein

- Letter To Donald Baker dated December 4, 2023
- News Article posted in Desert News, *Senate Judiciary Committee issues subpoenas to private citizens connected to Clarence Thomas*, By Eva Terry, dated Thu, November 30, 2023 at 8:28 PM EST
- Exhibit 1 Certificate of Receipt of December 1, 2023 filing of Second Petition for a rehearing, postal tracking, pictures of boxes dropped off, US Police receipt
- *PETITIONER MEGHAN KELLY' SECOND PETITION FOR A REHEARING ON DENIAL OF A WRIT OF CERTIORI LIMITED TO INTERVENING CAUSES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT CONCERNING MY ARGUMENTS AND OTHER CLAIMS NOT PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED WHICH MAY VITIATE MY RIGHTS SHOULD THE COURT NOT HEAR THIS REHEARING*, dated Nov. 30, 2023
- *124th Affidavit*, dated 11/24//23, wherein I discuss denials of other documents which appeared in deprivation of my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts by PA Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court including the attached motion at
- Exhibit B, *Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly's Motion for an exemption from the requirement to serve 10 paper copies of pleadings with this Court pursuant to Rule 12(2), 29(1), and 39(2), by the filing of one paper copy, and in addition to, or in the alternative of, permission to serve the United States Supreme Court electronically without a paper copy for future filings, due to costs relating to printing, mailing and transporting pleadings to the Post Office, creating a substantial burden upon my access to the Court's to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, and forced violation of religious beliefs by the threat of indebtedness*
- Letter denying motion despite case indicating the court has jurisdiction to grant the relief, *Snider v. All State Administrators*, 414 U.S. 685 (1974), albeit it denied it under the facts of that case.
- Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly's Supplemental Brief to provide additional information not previously available on how private partnerships with the UN is schemed to be used to eliminate

judicial authority in open and by stealth, Petitioner’s belief the courts are in danger especially with the debt ceiling approaching November 17, 2023 with no agreement to date, and the convening of Congress October 19, 2023 to attack Justice Thomas and the integrity of the court by subpoenaing witnesses to be used against Justice Thomas and the Court, submitted Nov. 6, 2023.....32-33, 34

3rd Circuit Docket Item 56 (3DI 56) for the case below No. 22-3372 **Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Motion for Reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 denying stay under Rules 2, 40, 1st, and 5th Amendment asserted rights to prevent irreparable injury**, and exhibits thereto including,

3DI 56-3 Ex A and B Order denying Stay and Order Dismissal by Third Circuit in this case (pg 18-22)

3DI 56-4 Ex C, Motion to Reopen July 10, 2023 Third Circuit Docket Items (hereinafter “3DI”) 3DI 53, 3DI 54, 3DI 55 in 22-3372 incorporated in full, attached in part) (pg 23-39)

3DI 56-4 Ex D, (Initial Civil Rights Complaint in DE District Court Kelly v Swartz, et al. 21-1490, though I moved multiple times to amend to include new and additional claims, parties and to shorten it, not included herein) (pg 40-136)

3DI 56-4 Ex E Email to Delaware Supreme Court regarding swearing in violates religious belief, sadness years later when Court disregarded my request to affirm for disobeying Jesus Christ (pg 137-140)

3DI 56-5 Exhibit F Motion before DE Supreme Court in disciplinary matter to be excused from the notary, declaration and swearing in requirements so as not to violate my religious beliefs with two scriptural examples on how two dads violated this command which led to sin, death and their likely damnation in the fires of hell for compromising what is right to please people or for what is profitable at the cost of losing their souls in hell if they did not repent before they died. Repent does not mean saying sorry and making amends. It means be made clean and sin no more, and misguided are those who turn back to their sins without repentance. Forgiveness is revoked and the wrath of God losing eternal life not salvation remains. (pg 141-157)

This contains an exhibit from an England case from 1678 where a man because of his religious beliefs could not swear before the Court. Jesus teaches let your yes be yes and no be no anything else is evil. He says from the evil one, but it makes people evil to be at risk as being too disgusting to live to be destroyed in hell by compromising doing what is right to loyalty to contracting your soul to hell to gain the hope of the word here. Other people’s souls are not for sale. They are free not products to exploit for material gain under the lie of the common good, public welfare, welfare of the state, public welfare or other deceit that misleads humanity to harm and loss of eternal life on judgment day. (pg 157)

3DI 56-6 Exhibit G Letter to DE Supreme Court Justice, The Honorable Henry DuPont Ridgely, dated October 1, 2012, regarding Delaware state judges exhibiting and teaching lawyers to have place of origin animus against DE attorneys associated with other states, with specific

examples of discrimination based on birth in Pennsylvania or association with, and disparate favoritism based on mob marketed reputation not truth and money brought in which creates injustice based on deception and appearance in place of truth. See Jesus's teachings in John 7:24 "Judge correctly not based on appearance (pg 158-160)

3DI 56-7 Exhibit H, I bumper sticker I created based on correcting judicial bias and other prejudice, exploitation of outsiders based on sex, race, religion or origin (pg 161-170)

3DI 56-7 Exhibit I Three newspaper article I drafted and one where I was in based on political ideas to revise laws. (pg 171-180)

3DI 56-8 Exhibit J first petition to Delaware Judge concerning exemption from appointment in family law cases due to religious objections, request for removal on future appointments (pg 181-183)

3DI 56-9 Exhibit K Second request to please remove my name from family court appointments as violative of my religious beliefs in God's teachings in the Bible, especially Malichi and Jesus Christ's teachings (pg 184-186)

DI 56-9 Exhibit L Lawsuit for which the original discipline arises Kelly v Trump Chancery Court Case No. 2020-0809, DE Supreme Court Case No. 119-2021, US Supreme Court Case No. 21-5522 (pg 187-310)

DI 56-10 Ex M Kelly v Democrats and Department of Elections, Complaint, Case No. 2020-0157, Title, PLAINTIFF'S CASE FOR CHRIST, PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT AGAINST DEFENDANTS FOR THEIR VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTIONS CLAUSE, IN THIS CLASS OF ONE, UNDER THE 1ST AMENDMENT APPLICABLE TO THE DEFENDANTS VIA THE 14TH AMENDMENT, FOR DEFENDANTS UNLAWFUL APPLICATION OF 15 DEL.C. § 3103, CONDITIONING PLAINTIFF'S RIGHT TO RUN TO OFFICE, ON THE EMILINATATION OF OTHER FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, AS APPLIED TO PLAINTIFF (pg 311-368)

DI-56-10 Exhibit N, Petition to US Supreme Court for exemption on signature and fee requirements to remove the compelled violations of my religious belief in exchange the exercise of another fundamental right, dated, Exhibit page of O (pg 369-377)

DI 56-10-11 Exhibit O Picture of Republican Rep Steve Smyk and I, He rescued me from attacks from Rep. Ron Gray along with Senator Coon's body guards and Officer Hughes of the Georgetown police now retired (pg 378-379)

DI 56-12 A 4 wrongly sealed Motion to Reign in the courts arms and exhibits thereto filed in Kelly v Trump, *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 (pg.380-417)

DI 56-13 A-5 wrongly sealed motion to recuse Justice Seitz prior to learning the entire incited the state attacks against me during Kelly v Trump, *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. (pg 418-451)

DI 56-14 Ex P, 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, in Kelly v Swartz, et al. Civil rights case No. 21-3198 (pg. 452-506)

DI 56-14 Ex Q Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Petition for a Panel Rehearing on denial of above referenced opening brief in Ex. P, in the civil rights case (pg 507-520)

DI 56-14 Ex R Respondent’s reply to ODC’s Corrected Response to Respondent’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Board on Professional Responsibility, in the original Delaware Disciplinary matter DE Case No. 541, 11537 B Board Matter and Supreme Court No 2022- 58 (pg. 521-552)

DI 56-15 Proof DE Supreme Court Sealed pleadings in my favor sent to appellee, Email from file and serve representative confirming dates the DE Supreme Court sealed my pleadings during Kelly v Trump to conceal evidence in my favor in Kelly v Trump to overturn the case on procedural due process defects, and necessary for the civil rights case, the disciplinary cases and reciprocal cases to prejudice me in favor of the court and the state participants who incited the insidious attacks against me in Kelly v Trump (pg 553-557)

DI 56-16 Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Motion for leave to exceed the word limit in her Motion for Reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 denying stay under Rules 2, 40, 1st, and 5th Amendment asserted rights to prevent irreparable injury (558-566)

.....4, 7, 10, 20, 21, 22, 23, 35, 115-132.
133-143

19th Affidavit regarding delay in docketing by the US Supreme Court again, wherein I state “On Monday, March 27, 2023, the Supreme Court received a different emergency application from me. Today is March 31, 2023. The Court has been in physical possession of the paper copies of that emergency application for about 5 entire days, but it is not even noted as docketed or rejected at this time. See the attached for a copy of this email, and the exhibits thereto. Delays in docketing pleadings prejudice me by rendering me without time to know whether I should file a petition. If the Court denies a stay and an interim stay within the next few days, it forecloses my right to Petition in the Delaware case...” and exhibits thereto,

- Exhibit A Emails delay in docketing and the irreparable injury I face at delays
- Exhibit 1 Proof submission 3/21/23, second application to justice Jackson disparately deleted
- Exhibit 2 Different electronic proof of electronic submission rejected from filing but not deleted
- Exhibit B Letter dated July 21, 2021 in *Kelly v Trump* where I expressed concerns to the Delaware Supreme Court concerning the elimination of fiat currency in the letter
- Exhibit C Fed Now Central bank eliminating small banks and the human component down the line
- Press Release by Federal reserve dated March 15, 2023 indicating FedNow would be unleashed April 2023
- BlackRock Delaware entity information
- Artesian and other water sources information
- Wireless entity information stocks
- Exhibit E letter indicating March 28 2023 application to Justice Jackson were removed and returned from the docket for case Numbers 22A747 and 22-6783
- Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Application to the Honorable Justice Alito to place exhibits back on the Docket to prevent the deprivation of her 5th Amendment Equal Protections and procedural due process right to a full and fair opportunity to be heard without selective, arbitrary, disparate, unfavorable treatment towards her as applied, and to preserve her 6th Amendment right, No. 22-6783, No 22A 747
- March 28, 2023 letter returning second letter, with note March 13 letter not docketed until March 28, delays deprived me of access to other courts as I alleged, irreparable injury occurred and worsens.....4, 31, 32, 33-69, 89

26th Affidavit regarding relief by US Supreme Court would be too late to grant me protection and access to its courts in other cases

- Exhibit A, Third Circuit update by letter dated April 18, 2023 per their order requesting updates
- Exhibit B Docket No 22A747 and 22-6783conference was moved but still too late
- Exhibit C April 17, 2023 letter by US Supreme Court
- Application to withdraw petition before judgment and application since relief is too late opportunity to exercise asserted right to access to other courts already vitiated with the 3rd Circuit expedition and pending due dates an impossibility for me
- Exhibit D Feb 7, 2023 Letter, writ of cert postmarked Jan 30, 2023 and received Feb 2, 2023 returned because I filed the petition for more pages first and not with the petition which broke my heart
- Exhibit E PA Retirement dated 5/16/18
- Exhibit F Eastern District Court for the District of PA proof showing I thought I was retired and noted it in its pleadings

- Exhibit G Order setting me up indicating retirement in PA makes me retired in Eastern District Court which is untrue, Court setting me up knowing the law and the fact I did not have easy access to it especially since I turned in my tags as car insurance was unaffordable at te time along with gas
- Exhibit H letter confirming I was not disciplined by its court, email confirming I was not disciplined
- Exhibit I Letter Oct 10, 2022 letter status of motions and advising the court of my needs to sustain my life and health and my assertion of my religious right to live not to harm my health of life for the wicked vanity, convenience and material gain of those who commit human sacrifice for moth and rust, the mark of the beast, noting collapsing at the post office and being rescued by a stranger with water from my bike
- Exhibit A email my transportation bike got a flat
- Exhibit B email to opposing counsel and pictures of the bike
- Exhibit C Sept 3, 2022 Letter to where PA ODC Anthony Sodroski requesting a stay to prevent irreparable injury.
- Exhibit D PA ODC response by Anthony Sodroksi unreasonably opposing my request for a stay
- Exhibit E proof and assertion of my belief people will be thrown into the fires of hell for not respecting my assertions of health and life and my religious objection to healthcare and mental healthcare, and proposal of improving are terrible healthcare, transcripts, bad treatment record that weakened me for life
- Exhibit F Police showing someone tried to shoot and kill my friend and his wife by two bullets entering their home as they sat at the table and they went over their head for their political beliefs, this is not normal
- Picture someone threw substance at my car for my political religious speech contained on the stickers on my car
- Proof submission to Eastern District Court
- Opinion by Third Circuit, delay in docketing made it too late for me to petition DE order. I needed time given my meager resources, and use of those resources for one thing at a time.
- Exhibit K eye injury I was scared I might go blind, in the petition for more time Alito denied it despite injury to my health.
- Exhibit L E-mail
Cert of Service.....31, 32, 33-69

77th Affidavit update, dated 9/6/23, filed in DE District Court 21-1490 Docket Item (hereinafter “DI”), 192 with exhibits thereto including

- Exhibit 1 docket Petitioner’s Motion to Correct an error in Kelly’s petition for writ of certiorari in Kelly v PA ODC No. 22-7695, dated 9/6/23
- Exhibit A thereto, the Federal reserve reduced the limit of reserves to 0 instead of the normal 10 percent setting up banks to crash

- Exhibit B Great Narrative excerpts about eliminating paper money, and eliminating the rule of law’s restraints on central banks control of money and debt
- Exhibit C Senator Whitehouse’s complaint and Attorney Rivken’s Rebuttal
- Exhibit 2 Email to Robert Meek and opposing counsel with copies of the November 6, 2023 filings dated Sept. 6, 2023
- Exhibit 3 Proof of Mailing the Sept. 6, 2023 supplemental brief to opposing counsel sheet for Kelly v PA ODC, 22A478.....31, 32, 33-69

93rd Affidavit, regarding my belief in law that requires payment to judges and their staff in a shut down under the circumstance present with focus on attached draft to sue Yellen and Biden to require court pay be funded.....4.

107th Affidavit, wherein Meg disagrees with Justice Scalia and assertions of political questions and believes the court may use words to prevent the use of weapons and wealth to be used to control a no longer free but for sale slave cattle people. Our only hope of a hero to prevent the overthrow of our government sometime after 2050 are the courts, but they cannot save us if they are eliminated or compromised by regulations.....4-5, 9

108th Affidavit, regarding nonlawyers lawyering in DE, where non-lawyers practice real estate law without a license manipulate and mess up on the dead clouding title. I believe this will be used to recoup real property to entities not bound by the law, UN’s partners and the UN.....28

116th Affidavit update, dated 11/15/23, filed in DE District Court 21-1490 Docket Item (hereinafter “DI”), 252 with exhibits thereto

- Receipt of November 6, 2023 11 boxes of the supplemental brief stating “Received Supreme Court Police Office November 6 P 7:19
- Email to Emergency Supreme Court Clerk Robert Meek, dated November 15, 2023 regarding I submitted and mailed out an Emergency Application to reopen 22-7695 to consider Supplemental Brief filed 11/6/23 in order not to deprive me of 1st Amend right to petition fully & fairly in accordance w/5th Amend before eliminating 1st Amend rights to religious beliefs & license
- Attachment of Emergency Application to reopen 22-7695 to consider Supplemental Brief filed 11/6/23 in order not to deprive me of 1st Amend right to petition fully & fairly in accordance w/5th Amend before eliminating 1st Amend rights to religious beliefs & license
- Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly’s Supplemental Brief to provide additional information not previously available on how private partnerships with the UN is schemed to be used to eliminate judicial authority in open and by stealth, Petitioner’s belief the courts are in danger especially with the debt ceiling approaching November 17, 2023 with no agreement to date, and the convening of Congress October 19, 2023 to attack Justice Thomas and the integrity of the court

by subpoenaing witnesses to be used against Justice Thomas and the Court, submitted November 6, 2023, excluding the exhibits thereto

- PDF of US Police Office's receipt dated Nov. 6, 2023
- PETITION FOR A REHEARING ON DENIAL OF A WRIT OF CERTIORI LIMITED TO INTERVENING CAUSES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT CONCERNING MY ARGUMENTS WHICH MAY VITIATE MY RIGHTS SHOULD THE COURT NOT HEAR THIS REHEARING, dated 10/10/23, filed 10/18/23 with US Supreme Court
- Petitioner Respondent Meghan Kelly's petition for writ of certiorari to appeal the Pennsylvania Supreme Court dated February 28, 2023, submitted May 30, 2023
- Email to Lisa Dolph DE Supreme Court Clerk regarding an update on public status
- 114th Affidavit exhibits thereto,
- Exhibit 1 thereto US Supreme Court docket Sheet dated 11/13/23 showing the Nov 6, 2023 Supplemental Brief was not docketed to be considered,
- Exhibit 2 News Article US Supreme Court passed a code of ethics,
- Attached code of ethics, dated November 13, 2023
- Exhibit 3 Newspaper articles regarding Congress's censorship of Congress person Rashida Tlaib's representative viewpoint in deprivation of a segment of her constituents' representation,
- Exhibit 4 and 5 concerning the creation of the Federal Reserve, 16th Amendment and Income Tax in 1913, the creation of the IRS in 1953 regarding beliefs contained in affidavit
- E-mail to Robert Meek Nov 6, 2023 email request that Robert Meek present the emailed version to the justices and my request they be submitted in an expedited fashion so as not to deprive me of the opportunity to be heard
- 92nd Affidavit regarding meg's concerning about preserving the checks and balances by preserving the pay of the court in a shut down and thoughts on a lawsuit against Biden and Yellen to preserve their pay with belief of an overthrow
- Certificate of Service of Application with postage receipt.....31, 32, 33-69

124th Affidavit, regarding unaccountable Nov 6th Supplemental Brief, and other documents the US Supreme Court did not file, and PA Supreme Court filings not docketed

- Exhibit A filings in red not accessible to me on the electronic filing system
- Exhibit B , Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly's Motion for an exemption from the requirement to serve 10 paper copies of pleadings with this Court pursuant to Rule 12(2), 29(1), and 39(2), by the filing of one paper copy, and in addition to, or in the alternative of, permission to serve the United States Supreme Court electronically without a paper copy for future filings, due to costs

relating to printing, mailing and transporting pleadings to the Post Office, creating a substantial burden upon my access to the Court's to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, and forced violation of religious beliefs by the threat of indebtedness submitted to the US Supreme Court but not docketed and letter of return

- Exhibit C Petitioner Meghan M Kelly's Motion for permission to use electronic filing before this Honorable Court, even if my active license to practice law is suspended, in representing myself, in appeals of State Disability Proceedings and in a potential Disability proceeding before this Court, and in all proceedings I act pro se in, including civil rights proceedings and for a waiver of the paper original requirement, 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 was similarly rejected for filing per the attached letter.
- Exhibit D undocketed Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion for Leave to file Different in Forma Pauperis Motion to waive costs due to utter poverty, and due to foreseeable costs creating a substantial burden upon Petitioner's access to the courts and forced violation of her religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness
- Exhibit E undocketed Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion to exempt costs and waive Court fees under Supreme Court Rules 38 and 43 eliminate people lawyers and people judges by creating a foundation of immunity from debt or responsibility
- Letter to the US Supreme Court invoking the 5th Amendment wherein the US Supreme Court indicated they did not want any more boxes and to stop sending them reciprocal discipline or disciplinary documents. The Court indicated my invocation of the 5th was sufficient.
- Law review article where the US Supreme Court accepted multiple petitions for rehearing and sua sponte accepted previously denied petitions by reopening cases
- Email to opposing counsel.....31, 32, 33-69

127th Affidavit regarding Supplemental brief properly filed in accordance with Rule 25.6.us Supreme Court on 11/6/23. As of 11/20/23 case manager I have not received acceptance or a letter outlining the deficiency and opportunity to cure in accordance with case law. Discovered another petitioner appeared to be denied access to the courts by the US Supreme Court in contravention to the 1st Amendment based on viewpoint of speech contained in petitions, I attached as exhibit to 127th Affidavit hereto.....31, 32, 33-69

133rd Affidavit regarding the Petition for a rehearing on the Supplemental brief for the PA matter, and exhibits thereto relating to removal of items I filed on the docket and deprivation of access to the courts fully and fairly by changing the pleadings or not docketing them

Exhibit 1 email to US Sup Ct staff and opposing counsel missing 127th Affidavit and 127th importance

Exhibit 2 Docket showing 127th affidavit is missing

Exhibit 3 electronic filing view my side of Dec 7 filings for a rehearing on the Nov 13, 2023 Order.

Application to place exhibits back on the docket US Supreme Court Case No. 22-6783, Application No. 22A747, Kelly v Swartz et al, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Application to the Honorable Justice Alito to place removed exhibits back on the Docket to prevent the deprivation of her 5th Amendment Equal Protections and procedural due process right to a full and fair opportunity to be heard without selective, arbitrary, disparate, unfavorable treatment towards her as applied

Part 2 Second different motion for an interim stay in US Supreme Court Case No. 22-6783, Application No. 22A747, Kelly v Swartz et al

Exhibit 5 Email Dec 9 and attachments thereto showing removed items in my pleading an emergency application to Justice Alito to expedite consideration of an application in Kelly v Swartz, et. al, Case Number 22-6783. in the record, the first exhibit 1 shows the pleadings as I filed them in papers and electronically, the second docket page at Exhibit 2 shows 6 items removed. The third docket page at Exhibit 3 shows Clerk Meek appeared to make partial not complete adjustments in response to my request. Also attached an email by Attorney Yin Toa Zoa providing evidence documents were changed, removed or not docket in violation of the 1st Amendment access to the courts based on viewpoint of speech contained in her petitions, to correct court staff which relates to Kelly v Trump and my assertions before this US Supreme Court that it is bound by the Constitution and must uphold the Constitution by curing defects by its own agents to uphold the law and the courts not to destroy the courts or its staff (emphasis intended)

Exhibit 6 1 copy of Dec 2023 filing returned by letter dated Dec 5, 2023

Exhibit 7 Allstate alleviated warranty concern

Exhibit Appellant’s Motion to withdraw her Petition before Judgment and Application to Justice Jackson, since relief if granted will be too late in US Supreme Court No. 22-6783, Application No. 22A747 Kelly v Swartz, since my right to access to the US Supreme Court was already vitiated for the original disciplinary proceeding due to delays in docketing (Emphasis intended).....31, 32, 33-69

Exhibits on 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, and exhibits therein including

- 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 and
- and 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.).....4, 33-69, 93-94, 95

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 and signs I created4, 28

Letter dated April 26, 2023 and some exhibits not all exhibits thereto including:

Letter to Chief Justice Colm F. Connelly from Meghan Kelly regarding Running motion to allow complaint to be amended to reflect the facts, witnesses eliminated by state, concealed the fact they retired during proceeding, did not allow me to gather discovery from them to hide this fact. (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit Table of Contents of Exhibits and electronic data, # 2 Exhibit A doctored up praecipe Oct 5 2020 I did not know she wrote on it, # 3 Exhibit B ltr to DE Supreme Court, July 12, 2021 regarding staff told me to cross off, # 4 Exhibit C Praecipe with address crossed off, # 5 Exhibit D Praecipe with switched address sheets, # 6 Exhibit E Letter to Master Patricia Griffin regarding I am not an attorney advocate in the case, # 7 Exhibit F Letter to Assigned Vice Chancellor., # 8 Exhibit G Ltr October 30, 2020, regarding removal, immunity remove, # 9 Exhibit H Letters to Courts requesting waiver of notary requirements, President Trump has covid 19, # 10 Exhibit I Letter from the Court notary requirements, # 11 Exhibit J Letter to Master regarding disparate treatment by court based on religion, political association and poverty, # 12 Exhibit K Letter to Master regarding Chancery Court staff misled me to almost miss the appeal deadline., # 13 Exhibit L Email to David Weiss and opposing counsel regarding Dr. Bunting, Judge Smalls regarding out of state animus and other concerns.....19-20. 90

Meghan Kelly’s waiver of a speedy trial not filed, but drafted during the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding wherein I outline how lawyers infringe and do not preserve right while violating superseding Constitutional laws to enforce laws that violate the same or otherwise harm the public for profit, essentially human sacrifice for material gain which I believe is anti-Christ lawless lust not the impartial rule of law to preserve and protect life, liberty and health as opposed to harm it to create need to serve greed.....30-31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Book, Bible or other document

1 <i>Corinthians</i> 1:18, 2:14-16.....	21
1 <i>Timothy</i> 6:10.....	72
<i>2052: A Global Forecast for the Next Forty Years</i> by Jørgen Randers, Published by Chelsea Green Publishing, 2012, affiliated with the Club of Rome.....	5
<i>Amos</i> , 5:15.....	28, 72, 138
<i>Brief of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, the Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission, the International Mission Board, and Dr. R. Albert Mohler, Jr. as amici curiae in Support of Petitions before the US Supreme Court by the Little Sisters of the Poor Home for the aged, Denver Colorado, et.al, Petitioners v. Sylvia Matthews Burwell, Secretary of Health and Human Serviced, et. al, No.15-105, 2015 WL 5013734 (US).....</i>	19
Chicago Kent Law review, <i>Rehearing SUA Sponte in the U.S. Supreme Court: A Procedure for Judicial Policymaking</i> , by Rosemary Krimbel, dated October 1989.....	62
<i>Comment, Another Look at Unconstitutional Conditions</i> , 117 U. Pa. L. Rev. 144 (1968)....	121
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 1:17.....	25
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 8:3.....	9
<i>Deuteronomy</i> , 15:1.....	73
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 15:2.....	74
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 16:19.....	25
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 23:19.....	74
<i>Deuteronomy</i> 30:19.....	48
<i>Ephesians</i> 2:2.....	48
<i>Ephesians</i> 2:3.....	49
<i>Exodus</i> 3:14.....	9
<i>Exodus</i> 22:24-26.....	74
<i>Exodus</i> 22:25.....	74
<i>Exodus</i> 23:6.....	25
<i>Ezekiel</i> 18:13.....	74
<i>Hosea</i> 4:6	72

<i>Isaiah 9:16</i>	10
<i>Isaiah 10:1-2</i>	91, 137
<i>Isaiah 10:1-3</i>	54
<i>Isaiah 14</i>	46
<i>Isaiah 28:13</i>	54
<i>James 2:1</i>	26
<i>James 2:9</i>	26
<i>Jeremiah 31</i>	9
<i>Job 13:10</i>	26
<i>Job 34:19</i>	26
<i>John 2:16</i>	9
<i>John 3</i>	9
<i>John 13:34-35</i>	
<i>J. Story, Conflict of Laws 2d ed. § 607 (1841)</i>	5
<i>Leviticus 19:15</i>	25
<i>Leviticus 25:36-37</i>	74
<i>Luke 12:11</i>	66
<i>Malachi 2:9</i>	26
<i>Mark 8:36</i>	135
<i>Matthew 4:4</i>	9
<i>Matthew 6:1-4</i>	9, 10, 55, 71, 72, 75
<i>Matthew 6:14-15</i>	73
<i>Matthew 16:26</i>	73
<i>Matthew 6:24</i>	9, 10, 57, 62
<i>Matthew 6:24-34</i>	
<i>Matthew 7:21–23</i>	9
<i>Matthew 10:8</i>	73
<i>Matthew 16:26</i>	16, 73

<i>Matthew</i> , 18:21-35.....	73
<i>Matthew</i> 23:23.....	28, 73, 138
<i>Matthew</i> 28:19.....	9
<i>Matthew</i> 6:30-33.....	73
<i>Proverbs</i> 18:5.....	25
<i>Proverbs</i> 24:23.....	25
<i>Proverbs</i> 28:8.....	74
<i>Psalms</i> 51:5.....	48
<i>Romans</i> 1:25.....	5
<i>Romans</i> 13:8.....	72, 133
<i>Revelation</i> 13:17.....	6
<i>The Report from Iron Mountain on the Possibility & Desirability of Peace</i> by Leonard C. Lewin, published in 1967 (during the Johnson Administration) by Dial Press.....	5
<i>The New World Order</i> , by H.G. Wells, published by Secker & Warburg in January 1940..	5
<i>Van Alstyne, The Demise of the Right-Privilege Distinction in Constitutional Law</i> , 81 Harv. L. Rev. 1439, 1445-1454 (1968).....	121

Case Law

<i>Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie</i> , 239 F.3d 307, 317 (3d Cir. 2001).....	140
<i>Abington School Dist. v. Schempp</i> , 374 U.S. 203 (1963).....	37
<i>Africa v. Pennsylvania</i> , 662 F.2d 1025, 1025 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 456 U.S. 908 (1982)..	120
<i>BANK OF KENTUCKY v. WISTAR ET AL</i> 28 U.S. 431 (1830).....	43
<i>Bartone v. United States</i> , 375 U.S. 52, 54 (1963).....	44
<i>Becker v. Montgomery</i> , 532 U.S. 757 (2001).....	40
<i>Ben-Levi v. Brown</i> , 136 S. Ct. 930, 934.....	120
<i>Board of Education v. Barnette</i> , 319 U.S. 624 (1943).....	55
<i>Borough of Duryea v. Guarnieri</i> , 564 U.S. 379 (2011).....	40, 44, 45, 63
<i>Buck v. Colbath</i> , 70 U.S. 334 (1865).....	112
<i>Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 682.....	13, 120
<i>Brooks v. Jones</i> , 875 F.2d 30, 31 (2d Cir. 1989).....	44

<i>Cahill v. New York, N. H. H.R. Co.</i> , 351 U.S. 183 (1956).....	60
<i>Cafeteria Workers v. McElroy</i> , 367 U.S. 886, 894.....	121
<i>Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.</i> , 129 S. Ct. 2252 (2009).....	4, 95, 96
<i>Cantwell v. State of Connecticut</i> , 310 U.S. 296, 60 S. Ct. 900, 84 L. Ed. 1213 (1940)...	120
<i>Centifanti v. Nix</i> , 865 F.2d 1422 (3d Cir. 1989).....	129
<i>Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. Hialeah</i> , 508 U.S. 520 (1993).....	13, 14, 111-112
<i>Committee on Legal Ethics v. Douglas</i> , 179 W. Va. 490 (1988).....	18
<i>Covell v. Heyman</i> , 111 U.S. 176 (1884).....	112
<i>Doe v. Indian River Sch. Dist.</i> , 653 F.3d 256, 259, (3d Cir. 2011).....	37
<i>Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith</i> , 494 U. S. 872....	120
<i>Elrod v. Burns</i> , 427 U.S. 347, 374, (1976).....	37
<i>Flynn v. U.S.</i> , N.Y.1955, 75 S.Ct. 285.....	61
<i>Frazier v. Heebe</i> , 482 U.S. 641, 648 n.7 (1987).....	82
<i>Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n</i> , 271 U.S. 583.....	121
<i>Garrity v. New Jersey</i> , 385 U.S. 493.....	121
<i>Gondeck v. Pan American Airways</i> 382 U.S. 25 (1965).....	60
<i>United States v. Finnell</i> , 185 U.S. 236, 249 (1902).....	42, 47
<i>United States v. Finnell</i> , 185 U.S. 236 (1902).....	
<i>Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada</i> , 501 U.S. 1030(1991).....	17
<i>Greene v. McElroy</i> , 360 U.S. 474 (1959).....	18, 67
<i>Gumbel v. Pitkin</i> , 124 U.S. 131 (1888).....	112
<i>Harris v. Champion</i> , 15 F.3d 1538, 1557 (10th Cir. 1994).....	42
<i>Harris v. McRae</i> , 448 U.S. 297, 323, (1980).....	140
<i>Harkness v. Hyde</i> , 98 U.S. 476 (1878).....	3-4
<i>Herring v. New York</i> , 422 U.S. 853.....	83
<i>Hilton v. Guyot</i> , 159 U.S. 113 (1895)).....	5
<i>Holt v. Hobbs</i> , 574 U.S. 352.....	120
<i>Homer v. Richmond</i> , 292 F.2d 719.....	121
<i>Illinois Elections Bd. v. Socialist Workers Party</i> , 440 U.S. 173 (1979).....	16

<i>In re Hey</i> , 192 W. Va. 221 (W. Va. 1994).....	18
<i>In re Eternal Word Television Network, Inc.</i> , 818 F.3d 1122, 1140 (11th Cir. 2016)...	120
<i>In re Ruffalo</i> , 390 U.S. 544 (1968).....	82, 83
<i>In re Surrick</i> , 338 F.3d 224 (3d Cir. 2003).....	82
<i>Isaacs v. Caldwell</i> , 530 S.W.3d 449, 455 (Ky. 2017).....	20, 42
<i>Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath</i> , 341 U.S. 123.....	84
<i>Jones v. Board of Education</i> , 397 U.S. 31 (1970).....	14, 121
<i>Kalman v. Cortes</i> , 723 F. Supp. 2d 766, 769 (2010).....	9
<i>Kennedy v. Bremerton School Dist.</i> , No. 21-418 (June 27, 2022).....	15, 121
<i>Kreshik v. St. Nicholas Cathedral</i> , 363 U.S. 190 (1960).....	12
<i>Krippendorf v. Hyde</i> , 110 U.S. 276, 283 (1884).....	112
<i>Kusper v. Pontikes</i> , 414 U.S. 51 (1973).....	16
<i>Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding</i> , 344 U.S. 590.....	121
<i>Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.</i> , 486 U.S. 750 (1988).....	12
<i>Lanzetta v. State of New Jersey</i> , 306 U.S. 451 (1939).....	84
<i>Lewis v. Casey</i> , 518 U.S. 343, 370 (1996).....	140-141
<i>Lubin v. Panish</i> , 415 U.S. 709 (1974).....	16
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i> , 5 U.S. 137, 147 (1803).....	45
<i>McDaniel v. Paty</i> , 435 U.S. 618 (1978).....	13
<i>Minn. Ass'n, Health Care v. Minn. Dept., P.W.</i> , 742 F.2d 442, 446 (8th Cir. 1984)	
<i>Mullin v. Sussex Cnty., Delaware</i> 861 F. Supp. 2d 411 (D. Del. 2012).....	37
<i>Murchison</i> , 75 S.Ct. 623,	96
<i>Murray v. Giarratano</i> , 492 U.S. 1, 18 (1989).....	140
<i>Phillips v. Negley</i> , 117 U.S. 665, 674 (1886).....	43
<i>Presbyterian Church in U. S. v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church</i> , 393 U. S. 440, 450, (1969).....	120
<i>Pushinsky v. Board of Law Examiners</i> , 164 W. Va. 736 (1980).....	18
<i>Rendell v. Rumsfeld</i> , 484 F.3d 236 (3d Cir. 2007).....	102-103

<i>Remmers v. Brewer</i> , 361 F. Supp. 537, 540 (S.D.Iowa 1973).....	120
<i>Rippo v. Baker</i> , 137 S. Ct. 905 (2017).....	95
<i>Salazar v. Buono</i> , 559 U.S. 700 (2010).....	24, 37, 93
<i>Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners</i> , 353 U.S. 232 (1957).....	3
<i>Selling v. Radford</i> , 243 U.S. 46, 49 (1917).....	82
<i>Sibbald v. The United States</i> , 12 Pet. 488.....	43
<i>Sherbert v. Verner</i> , 374 U.S. 398.....	120, 121
<i>Snider v. All State Administrators</i> , 414 U.S. 685 (1974).....	45, 50
<i>Speiser v. Randall</i> , 357 U.S. 513.....	121
<i>Stokes v. Delo</i> , 495 U.S. 320, 323 (1990).....	38, 42, 44, 45
<i>St. L. S.F.R.R. v. Spiller</i> , 275 U.S. 156 (1927).....	42
State ex rel. Citizens National Bank v. Superior Court, 236 Ind. 135, 139-40 (Ind. 1956)...	65
<i>States v. Finnell</i> , 185 U.S. 236, 249 (1902).....	42, 46
<i>Surrick v. Killion</i> , 449 F.3d 520, 530 (3d Cir. 2006)...	82
<i>Tennessee v. Lane</i> , 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004).....	123, 140
<i>Thomas v. Review Board</i> , 450 U.S. 707 (1981).....	12, 120
<i>Theard v. United States</i> , 354 U.S. 278 (1957).....	2, 82,
<i>Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer</i> , 137 S. Ct. 2012 (2017)..	13, 111, 113
<i>U.S. v. Levin</i> , 973 F.2d 463, 466 (6th Cir. 1992).....	84
<i>United States v. Ohio Power Co.</i> , 353 U.S. 98 (1957).....	58, 59, 61
<i>United States ex Rel. Hankins v. Wicker</i> , 582 F. Supp. 180, 182 (W.D. Pa. 1984)...	44
<i>U.S. v. Mohawk</i> , 20 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1994)	44
<i>Way v. Crouse</i> 421 F.2d 145 (10th Cir. 1970).....	44
<i>Werkheiser v. Pocono Twp.</i> , 780 F.3d 172 (3d Cir. 2015).....	20, 21, 37
<i>Western Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of Equalization</i> , 451 U.S. 648 (1981).....	13, 120
<i>Wetmore v. Karrick</i> , 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907).....	42

<i>Williams v. Pennsylvania</i> , 579 U.S. —, —, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 1905, 195 L.Ed.2d 132 (2016).....	96
<i>Williams v. Rhodes</i> , 393 U.S. 23 (1968).....	16
<i>Wisconsin Dept. of Industry v. Gould Inc.</i> , 475 U.S. 282 (1986).....	101
<i>Withrow v. Larkin</i> , 421 U.S. 35 (1975).....	95
<i>Zilich v. Longo</i> , 34 F.3d 359 (6th Cir. 1994).....	20

Delaware Disciplinary Rules

<i>Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 9 (d)(3)</i>	67
<i>Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 12 (h)</i>	6, 66, 67

Procedural Rules

FRAP 2.....	100, 132
FRAP R 4.....	75
FRAP 40.....	117
Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 60(b)(4).....	100
Supreme Court Rule 23.....	114
Supreme Court Rule 44	59, 60, 61
Supreme Court Rule 25.6	40-41, 49, 50-51, 53

Statutes

8 U.S.C. § 201.....	9
28 U.S. Code § 144.....	91, 100
28 U.S. Code § 455.....	91, 100
29 CFR § 2200.68.....	91, 100
28 U.S.C. § 1651.....	2, 3
28 U.S.C. § 2101.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 1253.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 1254.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 2106.....	2

31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k).....	4
42 USC §1985.....	12
42 USCS § 2000bb 1-4 Religious Freedom Restoration Act (“RFRA”)....	3, 7, 17
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1989, Public Law 336, U.S. Statutes at Large 104 (1990): 327-378 (“ADA”).....	46-47

US Constitution

Article 1 Section 9 and Article 1 Section 10.....	31
Art III.....	26, 30, 31, 32
U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 3, § 2, cl. 1.	102-143
U.S. Cons. Amend. 1.....	2, 3, 6, 7, 10-12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 26, 30, 31-34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41-46, 47, 51, 52-76, 77-78, 79-132-143
U.S. Const. Amend. V.....	2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31-34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41-46, 51-65, 68-76. 77-78. 79-132-143
US. Const. Amend. VI.....	6, 16, 18, 32, 33, 34, 36, 65-68, 77-78, 79-132-143
U.S. Const. Amend. XIII.....	1, 5, 25, 26, 27, 28, 46, 54, 68-76-143
U.S. Const. amend. XIV.....	4, 6, 7, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, 30, 31-34, 36, 38-46, 47, 52-65-68-74

US President’s Executive Orders

Executive Orders by President Bush, Junior

Ex. Or. No. 13198, 66 Fed. Reg. 8497, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 1401, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021.....	8
Ex. Or. No. 13199, 66 FR 8497, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, 83 FR 20715, May 3, 2018.....	8
Ex. Or. No. 13279, 67 FR 77141, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No.13559, 75 FR 71319, November 17, 2010.....	8

Executive Orders by President Obama

Ex. Or. No. 13559, 75 Fed. Reg. 71319, Nov. 17, 2010.....	8
---	---

Executive Orders by President Trump

Ex. Or. No. 13798, 82 Fed. Reg. 21675, May 4, 2017.....	8, 9, 10
---	----------

Ex Or. No. 13831, 83 Fed. Reg. 20715, May 3, 2018.....8

Executive Orders by President Biden

Ex. Or. 14015, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021.....8