

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to vacate the Orders below and Grant relief this court deems just pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2106 and avers as follows:

OPINIONS BELOW

The orders of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals to review the merits of appear at multiple dates: including a denial of a motion to reopen the case to consider my motions for rehearing under FRAP Rule 40, with denial of motions for reargument on a plethora of other motions for reargument, including but not limited to the June 30, 2023 Orders at Appendix (“App”) A, dated 7/26/23, including denial of rearguments of stay, time, vacating order dated 5/19/23, recusal of Scirica and Phipps, and denial of reargument to vacate order dated 6/30/23; 6/30/23 Order denying 1. motion to vacate order dated 5/19.23 limiting motion for time to 3 pages, 2. Motion to correct record, 3. Motion for time, 4. Motion for stay and 5. Other two motions at App B; 6/30/23 Order dismissing the case for failure to prosecute at App C; 6/20/23 Order denying recusal of Judges Phipps and Scirica at App D; 5/19/23 Order limiting Motion for an extension of time to 3 pages and threat of sanctions for violating page limit and order at App E; 2/1/23 Clerk Order postponing consideration of my motions to exempt costs and taxes based on religious belief against debt, poverty creating a substantial burden to access to the courts in the exercise of my First Amendment right to petition to safeguard not merely my property interests in licenses to practice law but my Constitutional liberties, life and eternal life, invocation against the 13th and other arguments at App F; 1/17/23 Clerk Order denying motion to be exempt from costs at App G; 8/8/23 Clerk Order staying action on amended notice of appeal of District of Court’s 8/7/23 order denying Motion for ECF action, which caused the

Court not to file the amended notice of appeal docketed by District Court for the Eastern District Court of PA. (App. H, H1-H-5) There is no opinion to publish.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1253, 28 U.S.C. § 1254, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, 28 U. S. C. § 2101 and 28 U. S. C. § 2106.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Pertinent statutory provisions are reprinted in the appendix to this brief, App 1-A.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

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

I file this by making a special appearance so this Supreme Court may not reciprocate in an order passed without **notice** under the circumstances, given the Eastern District Court (“District-Court”) had notice of multiple jurisdictions placing my license to practice law on disabled. While I contest any allegation of mental disability, the Third Circuit who has declared me disabled separately by order may not deem me disabled while ignoring the Constitutional law’s protections this Court has created to safeguard lawyers from disbarment for an adjudication of disability under *Theard v. United States*, 354 U.S. 278 (1957).

Despite the fact the Appellee (“District-Court”) indicated disbarment was not punishment, the District-Court knew I thought I was retired. Due to poverty, and other limitations, I did not have access to the law or even access to a vehicle to drive to the law library for a time the Court entrapped me into disbarment through the District-Court’s Order dated 11/17/22 requiring a memorandum why the 2018 retirement of my PA state license would not cause me to be retired or lose my bar before the District-Court. The District Court knew or

should have known I did not understand and had no notice the District-Court would enter an Order disbaring me in response for its request as to why my retirement from PA in 2018 would cause me to no longer be an active member before its own Bar. The Court knew I was under great duress because I cared about the two Chancery Court staff the Delaware Supreme fired by forced retirement to conceal their testimony in any proceeding in defense of my Constitutional rights, licenses and other claims. Former court staff member Katrina Kruger was a fitness instructor at my former gym. I used to see her every day and the Delaware Supreme Court participated in firing her under forced retirement to conceal her testimony in contravention of US Amend VI applicable to the state via US Amend XIV. I care about former DE Court staff member Arline Simmons too. When I petitioned the court it was to safeguard my rights not destroy those who violated them. I did not want her to lose her job to cover up lawless conduct of the court that snowballed into worse constitutional and legal deprivations of my rights under state and federal law. I reserve my right to plead lack of notice by specially appearing and denial of a fair proceeding. US Amend I, V.

“A State cannot exclude a person from the practice of law or from any other occupation in a manner or for reasons that contravene the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment” or the 5th Amendment applicable to the federal government. *Citing, Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners*, 353 U.S. 232 (1957). My Due process rights were violated in this case and in the original Delaware Disciplinary case.

I provided copies of orders adjudicating me disabled to the District-Court. The DE order and reciprocating orders of disability were rendered but for my religious beliefs contained in my speech in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act and establishment of government religion complaint in *Kelly v Trump* where my religious beliefs and the government substantial burden

upon my exercise of religious beliefs but for the establishment of government religion by the president's course of conduct outlined in US Supreme Court Appeal No 22-5522 are in issue.

This US Supreme Court held *Harkness v. Hyde*, 98 U.S. 476, 479 (1878), "Illegality in a proceeding by which jurisdiction is to be obtained, (in my case notice of discipline, order, or the subject of the cancelled hearing and fairness) is in no case waived by the appearance of the defendant for the purpose of calling the attention of the court to such irregularity; nor is the objection waived when being urged it is overruled, and the defendant is thereby compelled to answer."

Judge Diamond tried to get out of correcting the voluminous thousands of pages his staff misfiled when the case manager was out, including another pro se party's health records, attaching two of my motions on the bottom of a separate pleading, and filing things out of order with missing documents evidencing almost 20 years of disparate treatment by the State of Delaware and Delaware Courts in retaliation for my exercise of the First Amendment rights to petition, religious belief, exercise of belief, speech, and association in contravention of the Equal Protections component by political-religious or poverty animus against me and partiality to the selfish interest of those within the government for their individual convenience, productivity, avoidance of costs, profit, position, marketing business or caseload speed at the cost of liberty, life, and health which lawless people claim is for the common good, public good or welfare. (App. 3DI 56) I believe this argument used to eliminate the Constitutional law's restraint upon government and government backed private and foreign partners, government agents, based on human sacrifice of life or liberty under the deception of the welfare of the people will be used

after 2050 when a schemed overthrow is planned to eliminate the rule of law should the courts not stop it.¹

Justice Story explained, “It is easy to understand that the defendant may be at liberty to impeach the original justice of the judgment by showing . . . that it was procured by fraud [or judicial partial whims and temptations for avoidance of work and convenience at the cost of human sacrifice, sacrificing my liberty, health or life.]” *J. Story, Conflict of Laws 2d ed. § 607* (1841) (quoted with approval in *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113, 190 (1895)).

Wherefore, I pray this Court does not punish me for asking for help in this special appearance. I am scared. People have talked about shooting me but for my religious-political beliefs or presumed beliefs. I also have health limitations where I require time in order not to harm my health or die I have asserted in all of my cases. I assert my right to live as a religious exercise, and my religious belief that people go to hell for trusting in or telling others to trust in or participate in healthcare examinations, treatments or professionals. It makes men and their professional work above the law when they harm, kill, steal or destroy human life or health like a

¹ See, App. 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 App. 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) See, *Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.*, 129 S. Ct. 2252, 2259 (2009) regarding the requirement of impartiality by the courts as opposed to partiality to selfish convenience or gain eliminating asserted Constitutional law’s limits upon government and government private and foreign agents through partnerships to render oneself above the law. Also see, 19th and 93rd Affidavits regarding economics and debt to be used to eliminate the courts by the lie of self-regulation by eliminating the courts and the rule of law that creates the governments to be controlled by those who control the resources or the channels to access them in a digital slave system that teaches a lie of freedom by eliminating laws after 2050. Look at Exhibit to the 93rd aff with focus on 14th amendment arguments to void debts designed to overthrow the government, and temporary relief under 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) and additional arguments. I do not want the courts to draft the law. I want the courts to say what the law is in the form of limiting the other two branches to prevent slavery and require they coin lawfully not in violation of US Amend XIII or my religious belief as applied as a party of one. US Amend I. See, *2052: A Global Forecast for the Next Forty Years* by Jørgen Randers, Published by Chelsea Green Publishing, 2012. *The Report from Iron Mountain on the Possibility & Desirability of Peace* by Leonard C. Lewin, published in 1967 (during the Johnson Administration) by Dial Press, The New World Order, by H.G. Wells, published by Secker & Warburg in January 1940. Also see App 107th Affidavit.

doctor did to me in my youth. I have sincere religious objections to deferment to science, experts or professionals and believe people sin against God by making man and man's creation God in place of God. *Romans* 1:25 ("They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen.").

I assert my First Amendment right to exercise my religious belief against human sacrifice to live for God not the vanity of man even medical knowledge. I have religious objections to evaluations and healthcare and mental healthcare, which is scary to share since Justice Jackson's husband is a doctor. So, this Court obviously may and most likely does disagree with my private religious beliefs. The question is will you safeguard my individual liberty to believe differently from this Court and to exercise my religious beliefs according to the dictates of my conscience, even if every judge on this court finds my religious belief in Jesus as God, not money, man or man's technology, product, studies aka science or professional service God repugnant. Should anything happen to me and I should die it is not by free choice.

During *Kelly v Trump* the Delaware Supreme Court sealed pleadings in my favor where I asserted the Delaware Chancery, Supreme Court and its arms or agents committed procedural due process violations. The Court sent agents and its arms to threaten me to compel me to forgo my appeal to the US Supreme Court. Later the Delaware Supreme Court through Staff-Attorney Robinson signed off on terminating two material witnesses and colluded to prevent me from subpoenaing them in the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding despite my motion of my intent to do so, while preventing me 10 days required in order to subpoena the hidden witness by rescheduling the hearing to 8 days to evade discovery. US Amend VI, Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 12 (h). If the DE Courts will sacrifice their own people for their vanity, the mere appearance of justice while committing great injustice, I fear for my safety in the

exercise of my religious belief in Delaware and in the world. My freedom to believe Jesus without government incited persecution may forever be eliminated in Delaware if the courts do not save me and others from the elimination of free exercise of religion in exchange with the ability to buy and sell. *See, Revelation 13:17* (“And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.”)

I incorporate herein by reference any District-Court Item (“DI”) or Third Circuit Court Docket Item (“3DI”) or any other document I refer to even if not attached hereto in its entirety, the entire records below especially since the papers were mis-docketed and all Exhibits contained in the Appendix, attached exhibits contained in the individual appendix items and any other document referred to herein or attached hereto.

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

This reciprocal case arises based on an order placing my Delaware License to practice law on inactive disabled in retaliation by Delaware for my exercise of private fundamental rights, which initiated the reciprocal lawsuit brought by the Eastern District Court through Judge Diamond against me concerning my license to practice law.

The State of DE placed my DE license to practice law on disability inactive but for my religious beliefs contained in my private speech in my private religious freedom restoration act

petitions in *Kelly v Trump*, and other petitions to safeguard my genuinely held exercise of religious beliefs from a government incited substantial burden. US Amend I, XIV.²

I am a Christian lawyer who was attacked by the state by the request of the Delaware Supreme Court members through its arms and agents to cause me to forgo my lawsuit against former President Donald J. Trump (“Trump”) to punish me for my exercise of the private 1st Amendment rights to petition, private-speech contained in the private-petitions, affiliation, private religious beliefs and exercise of religious beliefs and in retaliation for my 1/7/2021 and 2/5/2021 petitions to exempt bar dues for all attorneys facing economic hardship.

I filed a private Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 USCS § 2000bb (1-4) (“RFRA”) lawsuit *Kelly v Trump* in the Chancery, No. 2020-0809, Delaware Supreme Court, No. 119-2021, and the United States Supreme Court, No. 21-5522, as a private party to protect my private-First Amendment free exercise of religion, speech, and association from government sponsored persecution for such exercise, and to dissolve the establishment of government religion by seeking to enjoin former President Donald J. Trump and current President Joseph R. Biden from enforcing executive orders creating a union of government-religious entity partnerships, including enjoinderment of Executive Order No. 13798, maintained and reestablished by President Biden by his enforcement of E.O. 13798, and President Biden’s enforcement of Ex. Or. No. 13198, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021; Ex. Or. No. 13199, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018; Ex. Or. No. 13279, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No. 13559, November 17, 2010; Ex. Or. No. 13559, Nov. 17, 2010; Ex

² (3DI-56, See A-4, A-5 Complaints *Kelly v Trump*, *Kelly v Democrats* and *Kelly v Swartz*, and petitions to run for office without exchanging one fundamental right for the relinquishment of another by compelled violation of my religious beliefs therein)

Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018, and Biden's enactment of Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021 ("executive orders").³

These executive orders allow money or support to be transferred between government agents and religious organizations to perform government business. I believe the money or support in the bought or bartered for, not free union of church and state, is one reason why religious-political attacks seemed to have increased in recent years, including government incited religious-political attacks against me. President Biden's Valentine's Day executive Order, Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021, is troubling since it appears to allow government money to be bestowed to religious organizations, like churches in other countries, to perform government business under the guise of charity.

I believe Jesus teaches people commit lawlessness in the eyes of God for teaching business is charity, help, good or love. It violates God's command of loving one another by driving out unconditional love from the hearts of men replaced with the love of money and material gain, or productivity extracted from others. *Matthew* 6:1-4. It also makes mammon God and savior which causes people who seek to gain the world now to lose their eternal soul in hell. *Matthew* 16:26. I believe many of the churches mislead people to hell as they exploit need to serve greed by collections and fundraising from others under the lie of giving from self. This is the reflection of the image of the dead, those without eternal life should they not be born of spirit by living on bread alone like the world. *John* 3, *Matthew* 4:4, *Citing Deuteronomy* 8:3. Also see Acts and distinguish secular government from spiritual governance, and please note the Bible is not the Word of God. The father, son and holy spirit is the word, including the holy spirit

³ See 3DI-56 initial complaint and US Supreme Court brief in *Kelly v Trump* at Case No 21-5522 on docket

contained in people, including people in the bible.⁴ Jesus teaches you cannot serve God and money. *Matthew* 6:24 Only those who do God's will are saved from death. *Matthew* 7:21–23. So, I believe those misled by the government-church business partnerships to exploiting the needy to serve the greedy will go to hell on judgment day should they not repent by committing deceptive lawlessness under the color of the law in an unfair, partial forced slave economy. I believe Jesus teaches people commit lawlessness (“sin”) for giving charity seen or for giving to get like fundraising for elections, car washes or girl scout cookies leading to loss of eternal life in hell should they not repent. *Matt* 6:1-4.⁵ It is no small sin to mislead others to believing a lie as truth, to believe business is freedom when it makes rights for sale to those who unjustly barter favor in contravention of 8 U.S.C. § 201. The lie of the public good creates injustice by government partiality towards material gain at the cost of sacrificing a free people and their individual Constitutional rights under the deception of the common good, welfare or material gain. Jesus teaches those who worship by business are not welcome in his father's house. *John* 2:16.

“The Establishment Clause prohibits government from establishing a religion in the sense of *sponsorship, financial support, or active involvement of the sovereign in religious activity.*”
Kalman v. Cortes, 723 F. Supp. 2d 766, 769, (2010)

⁴ In *Matthew* 28:19 Jesus commanded, “Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” Jesus did not say the Bible. Even if Bibles cease to be or are distorted my God still is. See, *Exodus* 3:14 “God said to Moses, “I AM WHO I AM. This is what you are to say to the Israelites: ‘I AM has sent me to you.’”). God still is even if no Bibles or Torahs exist in paper form. The Word of God is written on the hearts of man to accept and reflect or to reject in perish in hell to be no more without eternal life. See, *Jeremiah* 31.

2 Corinthians 3:3 (“You show that you are a letter from Christ, the result of our ministry, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts.”)

⁵ 3DI-56, Affidavit 107 with focus on arguments against fundraising in the exhibits thereto, where I sought an exemption from signatures and see requirements in order not to violate my religious belief to run for office.

I reasonably believed the Executive Orders violated the establishment clause, especially Trump's E.O. 13798 which permits churches to back candidates and parties using the donations from parishioners to serve the political vanity of men which I believe is blasphemy by making man God's anointed instead of Jesus. I believe the executive orders also violates Jesus's teachings in *Matthew* 6:1-4, and 6:24 misleading people to hell under the guise of salvation, which caused me foreseeable emotional distress. I love people. It is a religious exercise of my belief to love others. I do not want them to be misled to harm or hell. *See Bible Isaiah 9:16* ("For the leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed [in the fires of hell on judgment day as too corrupt to live into eternity in heaven]").

President Trump also incited religious-political persecution against me as a party of one and other people for their projected religious beliefs based on not supporting him in his formal government position, or his Republican party, or the religious organizations which supported his presidential candidacy, including me as a party of one, (as a Christian, Catholic, Democrat who exhibited opposition to Trump by drafting 5 proposed articles of impeachment which I contacted all 541 federal law makers to impeach on), substantially burdening my free exercise of religious belief, **by a course of conduct which I argue also establishes government-religion**, causing people to attack me, **talk about shooting me**, throw things at my vehicle, actually shooting two bullets in the home of Delawarean Greg Layton based on political beliefs, kill, harm or attack others based on religious or political belief substantially burdening my free exercise of religion, speech, and political-religious affiliation, as I outlined in *Kelly v Trump* to this Supreme Court at pages 23-25, including but not limited to:⁶

⁶3DI-56, See App. K, Exhibit C thereto

- “1. appointing a personal spiritual advisor, and alleged Christian leaders to advise the President, creating the religious backing and the appearance of Godly guidance supporting Defendant’s government authority;
2. holding up a Bible in front of a church for a photo op after people were gassed in response to their Constitutional exercise of affiliation and speech at a protest;
3. hypocritically claiming “Biden will hurt the Bible;
4. persecuting people who exercised their freedom to worship or not by the dictates of their own conscience, not government-religious commands, by demeaning those who omitted the word God in the pledge of the allegiance;
5. improperly sharing his alleged prayer to God, while acting under the color of the law;
6. creating the illusion there is a war on Christmas, by liberals like me;
7. repeating the government-religious belief that he may be the chosen one by God, contributing to the government-religious belief Trump is anointed by God;
8. moving the US embassy in Israel to Jerusalem for a religious group, Evangelicals;
9. sponsoring and inciting private persecution towards liberals by churches and its parishioners, by buying loyalty by barter or exchange, even by praise, for a little something down the line, such as bailouts, or power to persuade politicians, at the cost of teaching some preachers and parishioners to persecute non-Trump supporting liberals like me, and including me;
10. tweeting fabrications making it appear democrats like me are attacking the church including the tweet. ‘DEMS WANT TO SHUT YOUR CHURCHES DOWN, PERMANENTLY. HOPE YOU SEE WHAT IS HAPPENING. VOTE NOW;’
11. signing another Executive Order, Ex. Or No. 13831, May 3, 2018, which increases the temptation for government employees, including the President, to back religions financially or otherwise, in hopes to receive their government backing and government support in return under E.O. 13798; and
12. using his son to glorify him as the savior of Christianity, when I believe Jesus the Christ is the savior under Christianity. Eric Trump said his “father ‘literally saved Christianity...there is a full war on faith on the other side, (meaning my democrat side). (Eric continued), ‘The Democrat Party, the far left, has become the party of atheists, and they want to attack Christianity”

The state of Delaware attacked me based on my religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions based on affiliation associated with a license to practice law, affiliation as a democratic, as a Christian and as a Catholic, who does not defer to the Pope or the Church but God through the father, son and holy spirit. This is 4 violations of the 1st Amendment pursuant to the 14th Amendment applicable to the state. My private petitions to alleviate a government incited substantial burden upon my religious exercise contained in petitions relating to bar dues and in a religious freedom restoration act lawsuit, without disparate treatment, collusion by the

government to cause me to forgo my private petitions in *Kelly v Trump* US Case No. 21-5522, witness tampering, and other insidious attacks by the state including but not limited to sending Court of Common Pleas Judge Clark to attack and threaten me at a grocery store is a right all people residing in the United States must be free to exercise without government retaliation based on viewpoint of speech, including licensed professionals. US Amend I, XIV, 42 USC §1985

A license requirement by the Court that compels me to waive my asserted Constitutional rights to private religious beliefs, the exercise of the right to petition to uphold and assert this freedom to exercise religious belief without government incited persecution alleged for my protected speech containing my religious beliefs in petitions to alleviate a substantial burden upon President Trump's establishment of government religion in exchange for the license to buy and sell or otherwise be associated as a lawyer must be found unconstitutional. US Amend I, XIV. "Such license requirements are struck down...when they affect the "enjoyment of freedoms which the Constitution guarantees *Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.*, 486 U.S. 750, 777 (1988). "[T]he constitutional principles ...**forbid the judiciary**, as well as the legislature, of a State **to interfere with the free exercise of religion**. Pp. 190-191." *Kreshik v. St. Nicholas Cathedral*, 363 U.S. 190 (1960).

I must not be compelled to violate my religious belief in order to regain my license as State Court's opinion requires. Nor should I be punished for my exercise of the right to access to the courts to exercise my private First Amendment right to petition the courts to defend my religious beliefs because the original disciplinary Court finds my citations to the Bible and religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions illogical. Per *Thomas v. Review Board*, 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981), even if the courts find my faith in Jesus illogical "religious

beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit First Amendment protection.").

“To be sure, a state may not condition the grant of a privilege, [a license,] or benefit upon the surrender of a constitutional right.” *Citing, Western Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of Equalization*, 451 U.S. 648, 657-58, 664-65 (1981)

State held my religious beliefs contained in my petitions in *Kelly v Trump* is the reason for declaring me mentally unfit to practice law. *See, Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 682. (“Courts have no business addressing whether sincerely held religious beliefs asserted in a RFRA case are reasonable.”); (See e.g. 3DI 24-11-3DI 24-12, regarding religious belief and citations to bible as source of DE discipline)

The State labels my religious belief contained in my speech in my petitions to be a disability. The United States Supreme Court held in *Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer*, 137 S. Ct. 2012, 2019 (2017); “The Free Exercise Clause "protect[s] religious observers against **unequal treatment**" and subjects to the strictest scrutiny laws that **target the religious** for ‘**special disabilities**’ based on their "**religious status**." *Citing Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 533, (1993); (“In *McDaniel v. Paty*, 435 U.S. 618 (1978), ‘for example, we invalidated a state law that disqualified members of the clergy from holding certain public offices, because it "impose[d] **special disabilities** on the basis of . . . **religious status**."”)

The State Court applies discipline in an unconstitutional manner while treating other attorneys who exercised the same rights for which I am punished more favorably without state discipline so long as they align with the government’s belief in money and material gain.

I have been selectively targeted based on subject matter of speech contained in my petitions, without a compelling state interest more important than the protection of my Constitutional rights, which if left unprotected makes other professionals no longer free under the threat of government retaliation.

The object of the application of the state's discipline is to "infringe upon or restrict [my] practices because of their religious motivation, the law is not neutral," as violating the Equal Protections clause as applied to me a party of one. *Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 533-534 (1993), US Amend I, XIV.

The United States Supreme Court held in *Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 543, 546, 561 (1993),

"The principle that government, in pursuit of legitimate interests, cannot in a [selective manner impose burdens only on conduct motivated by religious belief] is essential to the protection of the rights guaranteed by the Free Exercise Clause. ...A law [as applied to me as a party of one] burdening religious practice that is not neutral or not of general application must undergo the most rigorous of scrutiny. To satisfy the commands of the First Amendment, a law restrictive of religious practice must advance "interests of the highest order," and must be narrowly tailored in pursuit of those interests....A law that is religion neutral on its face or in its purpose may lack neutrality in its effect by forbidding something that religion requires or requiring something that religion forbids. "

A lawyer's right, my right to pursue my profession constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the 5th and 14th Amendment, and of which I cannot be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the government's disagreement with my Constitutionally protected religious-political beliefs.

The State placed my license to practice law on disabled to chill my 1st Amendment rights to religious belief, exercise, speech, association and petition but for their religious-political-poverty animus. Conditioning my ability to petition under the threat of government compelled

religious violations and loss of other Constitutional rights such as access to other courts to exercise the 1st Amendment right to petition prejudices me. I must not be compelled to violate my religious belief against debt in order to regain my licenses, safeguard my Constitutional liberties or preserve my other claims. Nor should I be punished for my exercise of the right to access to the courts to defend my religious beliefs because courts and the original disciplinary Court finds my citations to the Bible and religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions illogical.

“The doctrine that a government, state or federal, may not grant a benefit or privilege on conditions requiring the recipient to relinquish his constitutional rights is now well established.” *Citing, Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 34 (1970); (internal quotes omitted) Nor may the government “prohibit any kind of expression because it does not like what is being said.” *Id.* at 35-36.

The United States Supreme Court in *Kennedy v. Bremerton School Dist.*, No. 21-418, at *15 (June 27, 2022) held, “Where the Free Exercise Clause protects religious exercises, whether communicative or not, the Free Speech Clause provides overlapping protection for expressive religious activities.”

In that case, the Court granted a professional coach the right to exercise private religious belief and speech, indicating the state’s punishment violated the Coach’s first Amendment right applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment, despite his association as a government employee or agent.

This case must be extended to me to prevent the state, federal government and additional governments’ including Judge Diamond of the Eastern District Court of PA punishment of me, but for the exercise of my exercise of my religious belief, as outlined in my speech in my

petitions, no matter how repugnant or illogical my religious beliefs appear to the state and Federal government.

My private religious beliefs may not be deemed a disability preventing me from buying and selling but for my religious beliefs, nor may the petitions I submitted in good faith to assert my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts via the 5th and 14th amendments without insidious disparate denial based on religious-political or poverty animus

There is no legitimate interest in restraining my license to practice law to 1. conceal government violations of the law or to punish me for the exercise of Constitutionally protected rights. This Supreme Court held in *Illinois Elections Bd. v. Socialist Workers Party*, 440 U.S. 173, 185 (1979) held, “even when pursuing a legitimate interest, a State may not choose means that unnecessarily restrict constitutionally protected liberty,” *Kusper v. Pontikes*, 414 U.S. 51, 58-59 (1973), and we have required that States adopt the least drastic means to achieve their ends. *Lubin v. Panish*, *supra*, at 716; *Williams v. Rhodes*, *supra*, at 31-33.”

Infringing upon Constitutional liberties to cover up state misconduct to protect the deceptive appearance of the Court by covering up its actual infringement on my asserted constitutional rights is not a legitimate state interest, and even if it was it unnecessarily violated my Constitutional rights, without considering the least restrictive means.

The freedom to associate as a professional with a license to buy and sell must not eliminate every other individual Constitutional liberty by government backed compelled force to gain the necessities of life including but not limited to Equal Protections, Notice, opportunity to be heard, fair proceeding, and other Due Process, First Amendment rights to speech, petition, access to courts, belief, and exercise of belief, 6th Amendment right to cross examine witnesses, and other liberties.

The doctrine forbidding unbridled discretion was violated. The decision makers rely upon no more than their purely subjective ideas of public welfare, peace, safety, health, decency, good order, morals or ethics. *See Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham*, 394 U.S. 147 (1969).

The US Supreme Court held in *Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada*, 501 U.S. 1030, 1054 (1991)

“At the very least, our cases recognize that disciplinary rules governing the legal profession cannot punish activity protected by the First Amendment, and that First Amendment protection survives even when the attorney violates a disciplinary rule he swore to obey when admitted to the practice of law.....We have not in recent years accepted our colleagues' apparent theory that the practice of law brings with it comprehensive restrictions, or that we will defer to professional bodies when those restrictions impinge upon First Amendment freedoms.”

The restrictions on my license to practice law must not be deferred to in this case because the reason to punish me violates the Constitutional rule of law which protects my exercise of First Amendment rights applicable to the state via the 14th and the federal government via the 5th without favoritism to the courts and government especially when the courts itself through its members and staff violate the law and punish me to cover up and conceal lawlessness by the judiciary under the deception of upholding the impartial rule of law.

The Court's staff prevented service to local counsel and misled me in hopes I would miss the filing deadline based on religious-political associations. The Court then sent its agents to attack me to cause me to forgo my petitions. I petitioned the court to prevent further infringement of my asserted 1st Amendment right to access to the courts applicable to the state via the 14th Amendment. The Court then secretly sealed my petitions regarding insidious disparate treatment by the Court in deprivation to my access to the courts during *Kelly v Trump* without providing me with notice or an opportunity to be heard. Then, the Court fired two staff during the RFRA lawsuit or days after I filed the civil rights suit to conceal their testimony and

to cover up instead of correct them to improve and uphold the administration of Justice. I was denied 14th Amendment procedural due process in DE case and the DE disciplinary proceeding which occurred after I filed the civil rights suit as I describe in more detail below. The Court prevented me from cross examining my accusers by denying my motions to call them. US Amend 6, XIV. The State concealed evidence in my favor and fired two court staff by forcing them into retirement to conceal their testimony in my favor. In *Greene v. McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959), this US Supreme Court held, “this court will not hold that a person may be deprived of the right to follow his chosen profession without full hearings where accusers may be confronted and cross-examined” Therefore the denial of my asserted 6th Amendment right to cross examine Arline Simmons a Chancery Court staff was a structural error in the originating DE disciplinary proceeding.

The Delaware Supreme Court members concealment of the Court’s misconduct by concealing evidence material and necessary to my case is not a **legitimate purpose** narrowly tailored to meet a government purpose. Colluding to fix the partial, unfair sham disciplinary proceeding to punish me for my protected private religious beliefs contained in my speech violates the First Amendment, 14th Amendment Due process and my Equal protections under the law as a party of one, based on religious-political animus ⁷ Then the state brought a disciplinary proceeding against me after I filed a civil rights law suit for the state’s violations of my Constitutional rights and other claims related to *Kelly v Trump* to defame my name and

⁷ See, *In re Hey*, 192 W. Va. 221, 227-28 (W. Va. 1994) (“It is the same approach we have taken in considering the impact of disciplinary rules on lawyers’ speech. See *Committee on Legal Ethics v. Douglas*, 179 W. Va. 490, 497, 370 S.E.2d 325, 332 (1988) (“the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment protects a lawyer’s criticism of the legal system and its judges, but this protection is not absolute”); *Pushinsky v. Board of Law Examiners*, 164 W. Va. 736, 266 S.E.2d 444 (1980) (Bar admission process may not inquire into an applicant’s beliefs, advocacy, or associational activities). That is: the State may accomplish its legitimate interests and restrain the public expression of its judges through narrowly tailored limitations where those interests outweigh the judges’ free speech interests.”)

credibility to cover up the State Court's own misconduct. The state denied me the asserted right to call one of the fired staff as a witnesses and other asserted and not waived rights as discussed below.

I believe collectively we can do no good by conditionally compelled caring. I believe only individually do we have the power to do any good by unconditional love. While the freedom to associate is protected under the 1st Amendment applicable to the states via the 14th Amendment. All other freedoms should not be eliminated by associations or the individual liberty of speech, belief, exercise of belief and petition are not protected in exchange to buy and sell as an associated professional.

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

This reciprocal case arises based on my petitions in *Kelly v Trump* to the Chancery Court and the Delaware Supreme Court to correct judicial misconduct or mistakes. I petitioned the Chancery Court to stop its staff from disparately treating me based on disdain for my religious-political beliefs or poverty. The staff wrote on a subpoena, dated 10/5/20 confusing the court and I, and directed me to cross off local counsel's address on a subpoena for an amended complaint dated 10/12/20 to prevent service to local counsel. Then the staff member misled me to cause me to miss an appeal date. (App. Letter dated 4/26/22 letter and attachments thereto); See, *Isaacs v. Caldwell*, 530 S.W.3d 449, 455 (Ky. 2017) ("Nothing in the civil rules or statutes governing the initiation of a civil action....permits the clerk to withhold issuance of the summons")

The Chancery Court would not accept any documents from me without notarized signature. Since Trump had covid at the time, I drafted a letter requesting relief from the notary requirements under the impression it may endanger my health, the court's health and the notaries who sign off on Trump's signature. The Delaware Supreme Court sent back a letter indicating the courts waived notary requirements for all during the pandemic. The DE Supreme Court copied the Disciplinary Board member in the letter, attached hereto, dated 10/21/20. Id.

Chancery Court and DE Supreme Court agents and members sought to impede and obstruct my access to the Courts in *Kelly v Trump*. The First Amendment prohibits state officials from retaliating against Claimants, such as myself, for exercising their right of access to the courts. "Retaliation by public officials against exercise of First Amendment rights is itself violation of the First Amendment." US. Amend. 1. *Zilich v. Longo*, 34 F.3d 359 (6th Cir. 1994).

The representatives at the Chancery Court demeaned me apparently based on poverty, association or religious beliefs. I petitioned Chancery Court Master Patricia Griffin for her help from disparate treatment. In addition, the DE Supreme Court through ODC impermissibly interfered with *Kelly v Trump* by contacting Judge Clark.

In mid-April, Judge Clark appeared to threaten me at BJ's, a store, located in Millsboro, Delaware, as if I was on trial for standing up for my faith in Jesus, solely based on my exercise of seeking relief in court based upon alleviating the government sponsored burden the establishment of government-religion Trump created upon my free exercise of religion. The ODC and Judge Clark clearly violated my right to access to the courts to defend my religious beliefs and exercise of belief, by seeking to use their government power to obstruct my case, showing partiality to the Defendant, the President of the United States. "Supreme Court's two-step Saucier analysis governs whether a government official is entitled to qualified immunity,

considering: (1) whether the facts alleged by the plaintiff show the violation of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the right at issue was clearly established at the time of the alleged misconduct.” *Werkheiser v. Pocono Twp.*, 780 F.3d 172 (3d Cir. 2015).

Judge Clark and the State knew or should have known that seeking to use the cloak of government authority, as a respected, fair judge, to chill or condemn or interfere with my ability to bring this case without government retaliation or pressure violates My 1st amendment right to petition, speech, religious belief, association, and exercise of belief. My right to a fair, unobstructed trial to alleviate a substantial burden upon my free exercise of religion is a constitutional right. I was standing up for my personal freedom to worship Jesus according to the dictates of my conscience, even if no one else shares the same beliefs, without government persecution. I am permitted to believe differently than the government through its agents, even if what Jesus teaches seems foolish to the world. 1 *Corinthians* 1:18, 2:14-16. Id.

“Government official's conduct violates “clearly established” law, so that the official is not entitled to qualified immunity, when, at the time of the challenged conduct, the contours of a right are sufficiently clear that every reasonable official would have understood that what he is doing violates that right.” Id. I desired fair access to the courts, without government persecution based on my exercise of redressing a grievance to alleviate the burden upon my free exercise of religion from Government sponsored religious persecution directly caused by government establishment of government-religion and government-religious views. I objected to disparate treatment based on religious affiliation, and reserved the issue for appeal on due process, first amendment and equal protection grounds in the civil rights case. Id.

During *Kelly v Trump* I received a threatening letter from DE-Lapp with information only the DE Supreme Court was privy to. (3DI 56 at A-4, A-5) I later realized it was the DE

Supreme Court who participated and caused the attacks. The Court copied the Board in a letter in response to a waiver of notary requirements. (Civil rights case DI 58 in 21-3198, prior to Chief Judge Colm F. Connelly's Order, attached hereto Letter 4/26). In addition, only the Supreme Court and Disciplinary counsel's uncle knew of my requests for exemptions from bar fees. I received 2 more letters from DE-ODC, for a total of three threatening letters prior to my petition in *Kelly v Trump* was denied at USSC. I filed my civil rights law suit before the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding began. (3DI 56 at A-5) After the civil case started, the USSC rejected my petition in *Kelly v Trump*. It was weeks later the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding initiated.

During the State disciplinary case suit additional violations of my Constitutional rights, federal law and common law arose, compelling me to move more than thrice to amend my complaint with no grant. Per the Brief, Reargument and State reply, I placed on the record below and attach hereto at App. 3DI56 additional facts, legal claims arose or were discovered since I initiated the civil rights case.

During *Kelly v Trump* the Delaware Supreme Court incited the Delaware Disciplinary Counsel, DE-Lapp another arm of the Court and Court of Common Pleas Judge Kenneth S. Clark to attack me to cause me to forgo my case. Judge Clark threatened me in a store BJ's in an attempt to cause me to forgo my case *Kelly v Trump*.

I petitioned the Delaware Supreme Court regarding the state attacks to cause me to forgo my 1st Amendment right to petition, I attach hereto as A-4. I discovered Judge Seitz incited the petition. So, I moved for his recusal as outlined in the attached exhibit A-5.

After *Kelly v Trump* was over I discovered the entire Court incited the state attacks against me. I also discovered the Delaware Supreme Court through staff attorney Robinson fired

the Court staff I complained about, and secretly sealed A-4 and A-5 during *Kelly v Trump* to conceal incriminating information against the Delaware supreme Court and necessary for my claims and defense in all lawsuits relating to this matter. I care about the staff. I did not want them to get punished. I merely sought to preserve my right to religious exercise of beliefs. After the case I noticed the DE Supreme Court did incite the attacks by copying the Disciplinary Board in a letter dated 10/2/20 attached to the 4/26/22 letter as an Exhibit hereto.

I was denied access to the Delaware Courts in *Kelly v Trump* in contravention of the 1st Amendment applicable to the states pursuant to the 14th Amendment. Delaware Judges and federal judges should be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits of a 1. A case or controversy or 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.

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

This reciprocal case arises based on my petitions in *Kelly v Trump* to the Delaware Chancery Court and the Delaware Supreme Court to correct judicial misconduct or mistakes, and to safeguard my exercise of religious beliefs substantially burdened by President Trump by the establishment of government religion exhibited by a course of conduct including but not limited to the passage and enforcement of certain executive orders.

If this US Supreme Court determines the DE State Court may not violate the Constitution by chilling the Constitutional check upon itself by vindictively punishing me for petitioning to

correct, not destroy the court to preserve Constitutional rights and claims based on the perceived Court agents' religious-political poverty animus than the basis for the reciprocal Order is eliminated. And this Court must overturn the District-Court Order infringing on my license. Otherwise the Courts do not uphold the Constitution by favoring justices' personal interest in marketing their work and preserving their pay by preserving their government positions in violation of the Equal Protections Clause and the rule of law, especially in my case where the State Court sealed the petitions to hide its misconduct on appeal to this court in *Kelly v Trump*, 21-5522.

Allowing the Constitutional check upon the Court in a case and controversy upholds justice and proves the Courts and justices are not above the law, but are bound to the Constitutional application of the rule of law without bias and favoritism to the personal interest of judges in marketing themselves and maintaining their personal pay in violation of the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component.

Since the Constitution applies to the Courts, Appellee and the DE State Court must not chill claimants, specifically me, for asserting my rights from infringement by the court to serve personal egos or material gain. *Salazar v. Buono*, 559 U.S. 700 (2010)

The deception that an ethics code or regulating US Supreme Court justices would uphold the Constitution by granting fair access will eliminate the Constitutional protections of claimants and allow for the elimination of the courts and permit the overthrow of the government down the line. These proposed disciplinary and ethics rules make the courts unfair since the rules focus is not on justice but preserving the deceptive fickle appearance of the courts and judges' positions for pay not freedoms which are not for sale, affording even judges limited Constitutional freedoms too. Judges merely may not violate the Constitution in asserting their individual

liberties. Should judges violate the Constitutional restraints and checks built into the Constitution, the Court must not violate the Constitution further by removing the check created to protect me and the people in a case and controversy either by retaliation against me and creating attacks by outside court agents such as Court of Common Pleas Judge Kenneth S. Clark who threatened me in a grocery store but for not only my religious beliefs contained in my petitions but for my exercise of the First Amendment right to petition the court to correct misconducts and mistakes or seeking an impartial forum to uphold the Constitution in the face of clear violations of the Constitution and the rule of law based on malicious intent of religious-political-and poverty animus.

I also assert even judges be allowed to make mistakes with the limit that they be corrected under Article III by appeals which includes cases and controversies or distinguished cases where parties and advocates may in good faith show how the courts erred as applied or per se. Should the parties fail, the courts may reconfirm with sound mind the position based on justice not ease or convenience. Judges are not held to perfection as God. Allowing mistakes without reprisal in the form of self-discipline or third party discipline affords judges the unobstructive authority to courageously do what is right instead of allowing professionals, science and experts to be above court correction by favoritism to marketing and making money while sacrificing the Constitutional rights and claims of those we serve by deference to professional boards including judicial and attorney boards.

Moreover attorney discipline and judicial disciplinary proceedings lack a case and controversy and are repugnant to the fair norms of an impartial judiciary since attacks may be based on lies, or deceptive appearance by third parties who secretly or wrongly openly complain as Senator Whitehouse did with an agenda to bend the law to their bias as opposed to the

impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law in violation of the 5th Amendment Equal protections component towards me as a party of one and others. Upholding impartial justice in the courts is a religious command by my God, and coincidentally is also required by the constitution to protect my right as a party of one for an impartial fair forum. See, *US Amend* I, V, XIII, XIV; *Leviticus* 19:15 ("You must not pervert justice; you must not show partiality to the poor or favoritism to the rich; you are to judge your neighbor fairly"); *Exodus* 23:6, ("You shall not deny justice to the poor in their lawsuits."); *Deuteronomy* 16:19, ("Do not deny justice or show partiality. Do not accept any bribes, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and twists the words of the righteous "); *Deuteronomy* 1:17, ("Show no partiality in judging; hear both small and great alike. Do not be intimidated by anyone, for judgment belongs to God. And bring to me any case too difficult for you, and I will hear it."); *James* 2:1, ("do not show favoritism."); *James* 2:9, ("But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as transgressors."); *Proverbs* 18:5, ("Showing partiality to the wicked is not good, nor is depriving the innocent of justice."); *Proverbs* 24:23, ("These also are sayings of the wise: To show partiality in judgment is not good."); *Malachi* 2:9, ("So I in turn have made you despised and humiliated before all the people, because you have not kept My ways, but have shown partiality in matters of the law."); *Job* 34:19, ("who shows no partiality to princes and does not favor the rich over the poor, for they are all the work of his hands?"); *Job* 13:10, ("Surely He would rebuke you if you secretly showed partiality.").

As applied the Attorney disciplinary proceedings and judicial disciplinary proceedings violate my 5th and 14th Amendment right to a fair proceeding and procedural due process as applied, since the judges fear reprisal and violate laws I assert for my protection to cover up misconduct out of fear of sanctions.

Moreover the attorney disciplinary proceeding and judicial disciplinary proceedings violate equal protections as applied to me as a party of one by tempting judges to be partial towards profit, positions and productivity which serve their private individual interest instead of the supreme preempting Constitution to the application of the rule of law. US Amend I, V, XIII.

The Court must make a decision in a case and controversy, even if it should disagree with my position. That way the Court says what the law is not bureaucrats who have partial interest. This issue may not be in your hands if you do not courageously look at yourself and your staff to care for and correct and protect your positions by humbly allowing Art III cases brought in good faith.

On 10/19/23, Congress announced its intent to take action in a committee to subpoena witnesses to attack Justice Thomas and this Court by compelling regulations that will endanger this Court and the impartiality it requires to uphold and not violate the parties it serves in discerning the rule of law in each case. Congress has taken concrete steps towards attacking the integrity of this US Supreme Court and its justices without a case or controversy or impeachment to pressure the court to become partial towards those who misuse ethics code or regulations to force their will and fix their cases by eliminating judges by threats or stealth.

I strongly oppose the inappropriate personal **publicly made** attacks by government agents in other branches including Senator Whitehouse's complaints and threats of sanctions or implicit threat of impeachment against US Supreme Court Judges and those who may be subpoenaed without a case or controversy in a judicial Article III forum, where any incriminating information will be used to impeach or control a no longer free or independent judiciary.

Arguably every case this Supreme Court decides affects each of us personally and individually with benefits and detriments with each new opinion. Does that mean there is a

conflict of interest depriving claimants of a fair proceeding under the 5th Amendment procedural Due Process component Does that mean justices should live in a box and not associate with loved ones, friends, or the public it serves. Thus, must we imprison the ones who are charged with safeguarding our freedom in our Democratic Republic. I think not. It is sufficient that claimants may assert violations of their right to a case or controversy in an actual proceeding without additional threats of sanctions by a disciplinary code to preserve justice and the courts by improvement not destruction.

Congress's improper attacks against Justice Thomas and the integrity of the court by subpoenaing witnesses to be used against Justice Thomas and the Court places the rule of law in danger by reign like mobsters by Congressional and also Executive threats to justices to serve the lobbyists (not the people) to serve themselves and their seats. Congress and the President make a mockery of the profession. I chose to serve God as an exercise of my religious belief by upholding by requiring impartiality in the courts, not the lawless vanity of men in high ranking positions of power like misguided congress people. *Matthew 23:23, Amos 5:15, US Amend. I*

The Courts are in danger of having no effect in a scheme to eliminate the courts to eliminate the laws to restrain those who control the resources from controlling to eliminate the government including these United States. I seek to preserve the Courts not destroy them when I petition to correct judges or staff within them. I seek to preserve my rights and the rights of others to buy and sell which should not be eliminated but for their religious belief in Jesus as God, not money as God or for some other Constitutionally asserted rights.

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.

In 2018 I ran for local DE office because non lawyers were practicing real estate law without an attorney license messing up the chain of title and harming the public while taking advantage of attorneys including my esteemed deceased friend Dick Goll, Esq.

In 2018, I learned lobbyists schemed to reduce to eliminate people lawyers and people judges which are required to protect individual liberties who do not conform to the majorities through standardized algorithms, like my unusual exercise of religious beliefs in Jesus which do not conform to any churches, though I associate with a religion and church. I place my faith in God not in man as commanded by the bible.⁸

I believe one way to prevent the schemed intentional overthrow of the government is to protect the courts from elimination by limiting correcting judges to 1. Cases and controversies and 2 impeachment without waiver to safeguard my 5th Amendment right to an impartial forum as I argued in my motions to recuse Scirica and Phipps below, as a party of one as applied. I have Constitutional and religious objections to attorney and judicial regulation that I provided in part on the docket below and more heavily in the civil rights case, albeit I do not have much space to plead it.

This US Supreme Court must hold that its members and the members the federal judiciary 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 to preserve my

⁸ See attached, 108th Affidavit, and attached Exhibits to eliminate people in the law

right 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, without waiver of individual justices' 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination so as not to be set up to eliminate judges schemed to fall by people who will lie to win, (especially Justice Kavanaugh who had 83 complaints against him made public in the 10th Circuit); and, relating to activity that will punish judges ex post facto since all lawyer and judge disciplinary rules have no statute of limitations in any state or federal court in this nation that I am aware of.

Neither this United States Supreme Court nor the Eastern District of PA Court below may 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 appellee, itself, and the original disciplinary forums to uphold the Constitutional law and improve the administration of justice not destroy the courts or individual judges by petitioning the Court for its agents' violations of my 1st Amendment rights to petition, religious belief, exercise of belief, speech, and association applicable to the state via the 14th Amendment, Equal protections and Due process via the 14th and 5th Amendments and other claims, including claims outlined in part in A-4 and A-5 contained on the docket and placing my license on inactive disabled but for the exercise of my rights outlined in a. See also Article 1 Section 9 and Article 1 Section 10.

I also realized more clearly now lawyers should not self-correct because lawyers' profit when laws harm the public or violate constitutional rights because that brings them business. We are the representation of the public in cases. Yet, we have conflict of interest in that we work for money, and clients' rights are not for sale. They become for sale when lawyers are blinded by

their desire for money and their training that they do not see clearly how some laws and practices violate the rights of those they represent. This blindness and dumbness Jesus the Christ speaks of dumbed down by desire, standardized training, education or experience is what I believe is the mark of the beast by those not saved by their desires and death in hell by learning to repent by unhardening their heads and hearts to lay down their desires by doing what is right, not what is profitable, convenient or productive. Sacrificing the lives, liberty, and health of others for material gain even knowledge under the pretty word, science, expert, professional, public interest, or common good is the common bad when convenience and the selfish desire for profit eliminates rights the Constitution demands we protect and do not infringe. I desire judges judge without threat to their seats outside the purview of the Constitution's clear limits.

Per the attached Meghan Kelly's waiver of a speedy trial not filed, but drafted during the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding incorporate herein by reference I note conflicts that harm the public by attorney self-regulation under the lie more bad work is better when it is more harm to the public.

The disciplinary proceedings violate Art III and separation of powers by allowing the professionals partiality towards self in Board proceedings in lawyer, dentistry, healthcare and other matters, which harm the public for selfish marketing to make money and sustain the positions or partial favor of those serving on boards.

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 of my access to the courts and the underlying fundamental rights I sought to defend, assert and preserve and no willfully lose.

I have additional religious and Constitutional objections to certain Delaware Disciplinary rules and the federal disciplinary rules and judicial rules authored by Chairperson 3rd Circuit Appellate Judge Scirica and Constitutional arguments against lawyer disciplinary proceedings

and disciplinary proceedings against federal judges too that I am preventing from asserting at this time, and yet I and the public have an important interest in maintaining fair impartial courts not controlled by partial selfish interests that inhibit their ability to uphold the impartial Constitutional application to the rule of law.

I sought to assert some of these claims in the DE original disciplinary proceeding and the PA Office of Disciplinary case before this court, but this Court's staff deprived me access to the courts in contravention of the 1st and 5th Amendments, I outline in the attached 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, Exhibits to Appendix L, 19th Affidavit, 26th Affidavit, 77th Affidavit, 116th Affidavit, 124th Affidavit, 127th Affidavit, and 133rd affidavit I incorporate in their entirety by reference and attachment hereto.*

A. US Supreme Court staff deprived me of access to the courts to appeal the original disciplinary matter by delays in. 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

I was denied access to the United States Supreme Court to appeal the original DE Disciplinary Order by delays by US Supreme Court in docketing my application for an interim stay to Justice Jackson in the related civil rights case by more than two weeks See US Supreme Court Case No. ("No."), No. 22A747, note the date 15 days later was not noted on the docket wherein the court started to make notations in another matter, also see No 22A981 (regarding

application to assert US Amend I, V, VI amendment right to a full, fair and public proceeding and record in these criminal like proceedings for exhibits not docketed, that Robert Meek appeared to remedy after the fact. Please note the notation of an alleged order shown on the docket was not visible at the time I filed and mailed the request for emergency relief. So the date of the order is suspect. Another claimant similarly situated alleged the same event happened to her to deprive her of access based on viewpoint of the petitions, to correct mis filings or errors of the US Supreme Court staff, which this court held in case law is permissible pleadings to file for the judge not the staff to consider)

I timely filed a resubmission of Justice Alito's denied application for an interim stay. The staff at the US Supreme Court delayed in docketing despite calls and emails concerning the irreparable injury I face in terms of loss of not only the 1st Amendment right to access to courts in other cases, including the original disciplinary case, but the underlying rights I sought to preserve and not lose, including but not limited to the 1st Amendment right to religious belief, exercise of belief, affiliation, speech and petition, 6th Amendment right to cross examine accusers, 6th Amendment right to self-represent, Equal Protections pursuant to the 5th and 14th, Amendments protections of Procedural Due Process, notice, opportunity to prepare and present my case and other norms that were violated in my original DE disciplinary proceeding. (19th, 26th, 77th, 127th and 133rd Affidavit)

In Case No. 22A747, I filed an application for resubmission of Justice Alito's rejected application of an interim stay to Justice Jackson on March 13, 2023. No one at the court confirmed receipt despite contacting the emergency clerk, Robert Meek without delay to expedite this important imperative matter. On March 21, 2023 I sent another application to Justice Jackson. It was not **until 15 days** later on or about March 28, 2023 that the original

pleading was docketed and the second one was rejected, and wrongly removed from the docket despite Danny Bickle indicating the staff would contact me if they had both to see which they should file. I indicate the later.

The Third Circuit in bad faith expedited consideration of my appeal knowing I asserted I needed time in order not to deprive me of access to the courts in other cases.

On April 1, 2023, I realized the US Supreme Court would not grant relief until it was too late. I filed a Motion to withdraw my petition and application for an interim stay with the Honorable Justice Jackson. I required a stay from the proceeding below to afford me time and resources to fight, not merely file the Delaware Disciplinary appeal. The Delaware Disciplinary appeal was due by or before April 8, 2023 with this Honorable Court. The US Supreme Court was not even scheduled to convene until April 13, 2023 to review the petition before judgment. April 13, 2023 is after the Delaware Disciplinary due date, and is after the Third Circuit's conference dated April 11, 2023. April 13, 2023 was too late for this Court to grant me relief.

I was denied access to petition this Court in another case, the Delaware Disciplinary law suit, due to the delays in the United States Supreme Court's docketing or the grant or denial of my appeal and the application for an interim stay pending this United States Supreme Court's final determination. US Amend I, V.

The Third Circuit's denial by Judge Phipp's of my requests for accommodations in the form of time or a stay in the Civil rights case to safeguard my access to other courts including the First Amendment right to petition the Delaware Disciplinary petition also substantially burdened my access to other courts so as to deny me the First Amendment right to petition the Delaware Disciplinary case too. 3DI 56

I filed documents in good faith requesting emergency relief to expedite the case before the United States Supreme Court. The United States Supreme Court did not docket or respond to my petitions in an emergency expedited manner as I hoped.

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

The US Supreme Court staff tampered with my filings relating to the interim stay in the Civil rights case depriving me of a full and fair opportunity to be heard as a party of one in violation of the 5th amendment Equal protections component in the exercise of my First Amendment rights in the interim civil rights appeal.

The staff at the US Supreme Court removed my submitted documents as shown in the 133rd Affidavit at Exhibit 5 Email to the court dated 12/9/23 and attachments thereto showing removed items in my pleading submitted 3/3/23 in an emergency application to Justice Alito to expedite consideration of an application in Kelly v Swartz for an interim stay pending the US Supreme court's decision on a stay, et. al, Case Number 22-6783. 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.

I submitted *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.

The US Supreme Court's staff's delays in docketing deprived me of my asserted 1st and 5th Amendment right to access this court fairly to appeal the original disciplinary matter I averred in the attached 19th, 26th, 77th so as to deprive me of the fair and full opportunity to be heard even before the current case in other courts and before the US Supreme Court in the first interim application and appeal of the civil rights case *Kelly v Swartz*, 21-3198.

My right to a fair, unobstructed trial to alleviate a substantial burden upon my free exercise of religion is a constitutional right.

“Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary all have a duty to support and defend the Constitution.” *Salazar v. Buono*, 559 U.S. 700 (2010)

“There is no ‘de minimis’ defense to a First Amendment violation.” *Doe v. Indian River Sch. Dist.*, 653 F.3d 256, 259, (3d Cir. 2011), *Citing, Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 374, (1976) (“The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.”); *see also Abington School Dist. v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203, 225 (1963) (“[I]t is no defense to urge that the religious practices here may be relatively minor encroachments on the First Amendment.”).

The delay in docketing vitiated my right to access to the court to petition the original disciplinary case by making relief moot.

“The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.” *Mullin v. Sussex County*, 861 F. Supp. 2d 411, 415, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67571, *1

I went to the courts to alleviate a substantial government incited burden against me that caused physical, social and economic threats against me including people who talked about shooting me which I reported to the police though they did not create a report, throwing things at my car and other threats. The Court increased and caused additional religious economic persecution instead of alleviating it based on disdain for my religious belief in Jesus.

“Government official's conduct violates “clearly established” law, so that the official is not entitled to qualified immunity, when, at the time of the challenged conduct, the contours of a right are sufficiently clear that every reasonable official would have understood that what he is doing violates that right.” *Werkheiser v. Pocono Twp.*, 780 F.3d 172 (3d Cir. 2015), (explaining Supreme Court's two-step Saucier test)]

Court violations of my 1st Amendment rights to religious beliefs, exercise of belief, petitions, speech and association applicable to the Courts via the 14th Amendment clearly violates law.

The US Supreme Court’s delays in docketing in the civil rights Interim application for a stay vitiated my access to the courts and deprived me of the 1st Amendment right to petition to appeal to void the original disciplinary case due to procedural due process violations.⁹

I was deprived of the 1st and 5th Amendment right to petition fully and fairly before the US Supreme Court by the editing and removal of my petitions by removing parts of them per the

⁹ See, *Stokes v. Delo*, 495 U.S. 320, 323 (1990) (“Delay or default by courts in the federal system must not be allowed to deprive parties...of the lawful process to which they are entitled. It is the duty of the courts...to adopt and follow procedures which ensure all parties expeditious determinations with respect to any request for a stay. Prompt review and determination is necessary to enable criminal processes to operate without undue interference from the federal courts, and to assure the proper functioning of the federal habeas procedure.”)

attached Exhibits I incorporate herein by reference 133rd Affidavit at Exhibit 5. Per an email the court indicated it was a glitch.

However, I discovered the staff at the US Supreme Court denied access to another lawyer based on viewpoint of speech in her petitions same as me per the attached 127th Affidavit I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety.

The US Supreme Court's staff deprived me of access to the courts in the PA Case, and the staff made judicial decisions which are left to the judges in error which caused irreparable injury in term of the loss of my fundamental rights not merely an infringement on my retired PA license

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

This US Supreme Court violated my 1st and 5th Amendments by denying me fair access to the courts again in another case, in a different case, Kelly v PA ODC, Case No. 22-7695.

On October 18, 2023, I filed a petition for rehearing in 22-7695.

The Court scheduled a conference to consider the rehearing on 11/9/23.

On November 6, 2023, I submitted *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 in Meghan M. Kelly v Pennsylvania Disciplinary Counsel, No. 22-7695 by hand delivering 11 boxes containing a Supplemental brief containing new and additional other grounds to overturn the PA Supreme Court Order, which previously could not have been asserted. (“Supplemental Brief”) (116th-Aff)

I also sent Clerk Robert Meek electronic versions of the Supplemental Brief via email on November 7, 2023, with an email on November 6, 2023 indicating I requested emergency immediate relief and was driving up to hand deliver the supplemental brief.

I averred material circumstances of substantial and controlling effect to the Petition No. 22-7695 that arose after the 10/18/23 submission of the petition for a rehearing in the 11/6/23 Supplemental Brief that must be considered simultaneously with the petition for rehearing in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 25.6 in order not to deprive me of the 1st Amendment right to petition and the 5th Amendment full and fair opportunity to be heard before violation of my fundamental rights and property interest in my retired PA license to practice law in deprivation of procedural due process. US Amend I, V. Should the court reject my good faith submission of the 11/6/23 Supplemental Brief, the US Supreme Court requires the clerk to provide me a letter noting a delinquency with time to correct any flaw, per *Becker v. Montgomery*, 532 U.S. 757, 767 (2001), given I filed the supplemental brief in good faith. That did not happen. I was denied access to the courts in submission of the supplemental brief. See, *Borough of Duryea v. Guarnieri*, 564 U.S. 379, 387 (2011) (“[T]he right of access to courts for redress of wrongs is an aspect of the First Amendment right to petition the government.”).

Since I filed a petition for a rehearing on 10/18/2023, I reasonably thought a supplemental brief as opposed to another petition for a rehearing was an appropriate means to

include material information necessary for this Court's determination at the conference since Rule 25.6 provides:

“A party wishing to present ...other intervening matter that was not available in time to be included in a brief may file... a supplemental brief, restricted to such new matter and otherwise presented in conformity with these Rules, up to the time the case is called for oral argument.

Nevertheless, the Court did not docket my Supplemental Brief despite timely filing it days before the submission with assurance by the police officer it would be filed prior to 11/9/23, per the docket sheet attached hereto. (116th Affidavit).

On 11/15/23, I filed an Emergency Application 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, other fundamental rights & license(s). The Court rejected this. (116th, 124th and 127th Affidavits)

On December 1, 2023 I filed a petition for rehearing of the November 13, 2023 order but misnamed it a Second Petition for a rehearing on the denial of the petition.

The Court rejected this and I had a day or two to draft something and file it with the US Supreme Court, which I did the attached pleading contained in App. L.

In the pleadings I strongly argue against regulating the US Supreme Court as violating my right to a fair not partial forum, biased towards regulators as opposed to the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law.

This delay in docketing prejudiced me and vitiated my First Amendment right to petition and 5th Amendment right to be heard fairly and fully. So, on November 15, 2023 I filed *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.

The Court receive Application to Justice Alito to reopen the case on November 20, 2023 but returned it in error. In *Stokes v. Delo*, 495 U.S. 320, 323 (1990) this US Supreme Court held, “Delay or default by courts in the federal system must not be allowed to deprive parties, including States, of the lawful process to which they are entitled.”

Robert Meek indicated the application as returned due to lack of jurisdiction, a legal determination in conflict with prior US Supreme Court case law. .

The US Supreme Court held in *St. L. S.F.R.R. v. Spiller*, 275 U.S. 156 (1927), “Errors by court “due to mistake of the clerk **may be corrected after expiration of the term at which the judgment was entered.**” (“emphasis intended”)

Robert Meek indicated incorrectly this court did not have jurisdiction which is a determination which must be made by the Supreme Court justices not be clerks. *See, United States v. Finnell*, 185 U.S. 236, 249 (1902) (“The clerk is a ministerial officer, and, without statutory authority, can exercise no judicial functions. ”)

The US Supreme Court held in *Wetmore v. Karrick*, 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907) “The judgment of dismissal of June 12, 1899, having been entered **improvidently through a mistake or oversight** as to an entry of record, the Massachusetts court **did not thereby lose jurisdiction**, and had the power to vacate the dismissal and restore the case to the docket after the term. The *Palmyra*, 12 Wheat. 1; *Alviso v. United States*, 6 Wall. 457. *Rice v. Railroad Co.*, 21 How. 82, distinguished. ” *Also see, Isaacs v. Caldwell*, 530 S.W.3d 449, 455 (Ky. 2017)

The US Supreme Court in *Wetmore v. Karrick*, 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907), further held, “In almost every case in which the rule is laid down by this court that judgments cannot be

vacated after the term, **judgments of dismissal by mistake are excepted.**” See *Phillips v. Negley*, 117 U.S. 665 (1886) (“Final judgments at law cannot, by proceedings taken after the close of the term at which they were entered, be reversed or annulled for errors of fact or law by the court which rendered them; **except that clerical mistakes**, and such mistakes of fact not put in issue or passed upon as may be corrected by writ of error coram vobis (or on motion in place of that writ where such practice prevails), and a mistake in the dismissal of a cause, **may be corrected after that time:**”); *Sibbald v. The United States*, 12 Pet. 488, 492, “no court can reverse or annul its own final decrees or judgments, for errors of fact or law, after the term in which they have been rendered, **unless for clerical mistakes;**” *Phillips v. Negley*, 117 U.S. 665, 674 (1886); *BANK OF KENTUCKY v. WISTAR ET AL* 28 U.S. 431 (1830) (Clerk and staff’s clerical error allowed reform of judgment after the fact)

However, I am deprived of the First Amendment access to the courts when the courts do not docket colorable pleadings by mistake. I am prejudiced by an unfair deprivation of my fundamental rights outlined in the Supplemental Brief by denial of access to the courts. Accordingly, I sought to ask the Court to cure the defect on Friday December 1, 2023 by an in person filing but misnamed the pleading and the substance was not heard. Thus I filed a petition for a rehearing of the November 13, 2023 order timely submitted by a 4th drive to the US Supreme Court by submitting pleadings December 7, 2023, I attach in part in Exhibit L and the exhibits thereto, as well as Affidavits 77, 116, 124, 127 and 133 I attach hereto and incorporate herein in entirety.

The Court did not accept or reject my Supplemental brief in a timely fashion, nor did the court reject the Supplemental Brief by providing me with a letter or notice of the reason why it was rejected with opportunity to cure any defects in accordance to this court’s past case law.

Instead a month and a half later the court noted on the electronic docket rejection, dated December 14, 2023. When I called for notice Case Manager Lisa Nesbitt indicated had no idea why it was rejected or who rejected it. She directed me to talk with Donald Baker, as she previously directed me to do. I previously called him in front of Peggy Naylor the law librarian on December 15, 2023, with the door at the court ajar so the Delaware bailiff may hear.

Donald Baker inappropriately indicated I seek relief from congress or the news people regarding my concerns when only the court may grant me relief. I asked Donald Baker for the letter outlining reasons why my supplemental brief was not timely docketed and why I was not afforded time to correct any alleged deficiencies. Donald Baker evaded answering my questions. He left me on hold, on and off again, read the docket as if to acknowledge he sought to cover up a mistake under the pretense he did not know what is going on.

After about an hour of wasting my time Donald Baker indicated I call Danny Bickle. I told him I already previously did, and Danny Bickle did not address my question.

The extreme delay in docketing my pleadings amount to a violation of due process and a total deprivation of my opportunity to be heard before I may be deprived of fundamental rights in a criminal-like proceeding.¹⁰

¹⁰ *US. v. Mohawk*, 20 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1994) *Rheuark v. Shaw*, 628 F.2d 297, 303 (5th Cir. 1980); *Harris v. Champion*, 15 F.3d 1538, 1557 (10th Cir. 1994) (“See Way, 421 F.2d at 146-47 (conditionally excusing petitioner from having to raise issue of delay to “the very courts which are responsible, on the face of the pleadings, for the very delay of which he complains”); *Brooks v. Jones*, 875 F.2d 30, 31 (2d Cir. 1989) (“When the petitioner can substantiate his complaint that his right to appeal is being violated by inattention and time-consuming procedures, to require one more technical step would be to tolerate the frustration of the petitioner’s due process rights.”); *United States ex rel. Hankins*, 582 F. Supp. at 182 (“[W]here the [government] process is itself the basis for the claim[ed] denial of due process the issue has properly been presented” [to the judges]).” Id. (“The Supreme Court stated in *Bartone v. United States*, 375 U.S. 52, 54 (1963), “where state procedural snarls or obstacles preclude an effective state remedy against unconstitutional convictions, federal courts have no other choice but to grant relief in the collateral proceedings.” The Third Circuit in *Zicarelli v. Gray*, 543 F.2d 466, 472 (3rd Cir. 1977) emphasized the rationale of *Stone v. Powell*, 428 U.S. 465, 96 S.Ct. 3037, 49 L.Ed.2d 1067 (1976), and the necessity of a federal court to scrutinize whether the state system granted a fair opportunity to consider arguments that are raised in a petition for federal habeas corpus. *Ray v. Howard*, 486 F. Supp. 638 (E.D.Pa. 1980). ”)

In *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 147 (1803) this Court held, “ It is a settled and invariable principle, that every right, when withheld, must have a remedy, and every injury its proper redress. 3 Bl. Com. 109. ” I am prejudiced by the denial of access to the courts. Structural error includes deterrence of right to appeal. See, *Borough of Duryea v. Guarnieri*, 564 U.S. 379, 387 (2011) (“This Court's precedents confirm that the Petition Clause protects the right of individuals to appeal to courts and other forums established by the government for resolution of legal disputes. ‘[T]he right of access to courts for redress of wrongs is an aspect of the First Amendment right to petition the government.’”); *Stokes v. Delo*, 495 U.S. 320, 323 (1990) (“Delay or default by courts in the federal system must not be allowed to deprive parties, including States, of the lawful process to which they are entitled. ”)

I respectfully requested this court consider the Supplemental Brief to cure my invoked 1st and 5th Amendment rights from deprivations. I attach it hereto in part in the 116th Amendment. But this Court retains the physical copies and has not sent them back to me.

This Court previously appeared to deny my right to petition and access to the courts by not docketed a slew of other motions I attach hereto and incorporate herein including a petition it appeared to docket in another case. (77th Affidavit, 104th affidavit not attached, focus on exhibits in D therein, 124th Affidavit)

For one example, the US Supreme Court previously docketed a petition to excuse the paper copies requirement, held it had authority to grant it, but denied it based on the facts of the case. *Snider v. All State Administrators*, 414 U.S. 685 (1974). If the Court previously docketed a petition regarding exemption from additional paper copies, indicated it had authority to consider it, it arguably has authority to consider it and docket it in my case too. It was structural error to not docket the motion.

Nevertheless the US Supreme Court did not docket my similar filing I attach hereto as 124th Affidavit in Exhibit B. This Court did not docket a series of filings I believe should have been docketed included in part as attachments to the 124th Affidavit..

Similarly, the PA Supreme Court Clerk Nicole Traini did not docket a number motions I discuss and attached to the Supplemental Brief including the 5th and 7th Affidavits available at 21-1490 Kelly v Swartz. One concerns whether PA's denial of my asserted ADA claims relating to physical limitations where I require time not only for a fair proceeding but sought a religious objection where I assert my right to preserve my life and health as a religious exercise and asserted religious objections to professional examination and treatment violating my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts applicable to the state via the 14th Amendment and 14th Amendment right to a fair proceeding. I believe more people go to hell and harm others by blindly adhering to the science, experts and professionals in the medical profession than many other professions. I have sincere not fake, but genuine religious objections to making man and man's work by making science guide, master and God to preserve both my life and eternal life. I encourage studying and examining issues, but I sincerely believe people are misled into ignorantly harming others on their own way to hell for even teaching people to trust the experts, the doctors and the science. They may harm them to serve material gain even knowledge. I believe this makes fallible imperfect man and his work God and reflects the image of the evil one outlined in *Isaiah* 14, where he sought to be his own God.

The devil and misguided people teach getting it wrong is okay so long as you learned and did not know. My God teaches many are damned to hell the last day for getting it wrong and for not knowing, not caring to know in order to love one, even those outside of your own another not commit human sacrifice of life, liberty and health to serve your own at the expense of violating

the Constitutional rights of others. Slavery should not be permitted by non-government entities and the human sacrifice by selling products that kill, or produce them in a manner that slowly poisons people to death should be corrected not ignored. Because I believe people go to hell for blindly doing what they are trained to do, their job requires, or their narrow experience requires without thinking things out to care to love others they harm, I believe Court correction may save lives of innocent victims and the souls blind wrong doers.

Despite my good faith invocation of the right to a fair proceeding under the 14th Amendment the PA Clerk refused to docket my petition because my 1st Amendment rights to religious beliefs were “unusual.” This Court in *United States v. Finnell*, 185 U.S. 236, 249 (1902) held, “The clerk is a ministerial officer, and, without statutory authority, can exercise no judicial functions.”

Accordingly, it was improper for the PA clerk and this United States Supreme Court’s staff to deprive me of asserted fundamental rights by performing a judicial function. This error is structural. Just as it was structural error for this United States Supreme court’s staff to not docket the attached Supplemental Brief contained in the appendix as an Exhibit to App. L.

Nicole Traini, the Clerk of Court for the PA Supreme Court in Pittsburgh, PA indicated the clerks talk to one another. The PA Court inappropriately denied docketing my motions relating to my assertions for accommodations for my religious beliefs and health, which I averred in the Supplemental brief while attaching proof of the deprivation of my procedural due process applicable to the state via the 14th Amendment. I even asserted an ADA accommodation because I do not want to die for the vanity of lawless man whose evil eyes are focused on convenience, avoidance of costs, at the exchange of sacrificing of the lives and liberties they swore an oath to protect by upholding the constitution. See Matthew 6:22-23

concerning Jesus's teachings of the evil eye revealing a dirty covetous heart not full of love but yucky lusts for comfort and material gain indifferent of harm or human sacrifice of life, liberty or health of other people God loves. This is a type of lawlessness that leads to certain damnation in the fires of hell without repentance, even thinking this way is sin to God.

I believe it was wrong for the US Supreme Court staff to reject motions I filed by not docketing them, just like I believe it was wrong for the PA Supreme Court to not docket motions I filed merely because they thought my accommodations for time based on religious beliefs in part my exercise of the right to live without harm to health is a religious exercise and to prevent vitiating my access to the courts to fairly petition to defend fundamental rights but for the denial of the accommodation in the form of time, and exemptions of costs on religious grounds against compelled violations of one fundamental right in exchange for another when freedoms are not for sale despite the lies of the devil which misguided, lawless people aka children of the devil teach that you must buy or earn that which is free. Not everyone is a child of God. We are all born children of the devil, in need of salvation from death. *Psalm 51:5* states that we all come into the world as sinners: "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me." *Ephesians 2:2* says that all people who are not in Christ are "sons of disobedience." *Ephesians 2:3* also establishes this, saying that we are all "by nature children of wrath." Not all people are born again and made clean by repentance, but we all have a choice we must independently each make. See, *Deuteronomy 30:19* ("I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live").

The PA Clerk did not docket the motions. Josh the case manager for the matter indicated the judges will not review items not docketed as filed. Similarly, the supplemental brief was not

docketed or rejected. It matters not that the US Supreme Court may choose to look at undocketed submissions. Just like Josh indicated they placed my undocketed PA Supreme Court motions in the sleeve of the file as opposed to returning them to me with a letter indicating why they were returned doesn't mean the PA Court will ever look at the. Similarly, the US Supreme Court will not review undocketed information especially in light of reviewing hundreds of filings at one conference. I was deprived of a fair opportunity to be heard in violation of procedural due process applicable to the US Supreme Court because it neither accepted or rejected the November 6th filing . It was not docketed as of the date of the conference despite the rules indicating it would be deemed considered so long as I submitted it prior to the date of finality. Rule 25.6.

I am concerned the US Supreme Court staff may be trying to insulate the lower courts from being bound by the Constitutional Rule of law to aide PA Courts and itself as a partial forum to rebut an argument contained in the unaccounted for Nov. 6, 2023 petition, *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, dated 11/6/23, regarding denying the 1st Amendment right to petition by not docketing pleadings.*

I filed a bunch of motions with the US Supreme Court which I believe were not docketed in error as a matter of law I suspect to create precedent for the PA Supreme Court clerk's error, including a petition to exempt the paper copy requirement.

As I previously mentioned the US Supreme Court previously docketed a petition to excuse the paper copies requirement, held it had authority to grant it, but denied it based on the facts of the case. *Snider v. All State Administrators*, 414 U.S. 685 (1974) (“While we undoubtedly have authority to waive the application of particular rules in appropriate circumstances, we have during this Term denied a considerable number of similar motions. Typically in each of these cases the moving petitioner made generalized allegations of inability to afford payment of printing costs, but made no showing sufficient”) My case is distinguished from the case where the court denied the request to eliminate paper copies in order to assert the need is to protect my 1st Amendment right to religious belief in addition to access to the courts and other claims, which this claimant did not appear to do sufficiently. See, *Snider v. All State Administrators*, 414 U.S. 685 (1974) (“Petitioner Snider has filed a motion to dispense with the printing of the petition for certiorari as required by our Rule 39. He has filed no motion and affidavit”) If the Court previously docketed a petition regarding exemption from additional paper copies, indicated it had authority to consider it, it arguably has authority to consider it and docket it in my case too.

Nevertheless the US Supreme Court did not docket my similar filing I attach to the 124th Affidavit at Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference please find, *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 and per the US Supreme Court letter rejecting the filing for docketing also attached hereto.

On November 20, 2023 I called Lisa Nesbett the US Supreme Court case manager concerning the whereabouts of the Supplemental Brief.

She asked whether I want the documents back should they be rejected. I said I required a letter indicating why they were rejected with time to cure for a reason should they be returned in accordance with case law and Supreme Court Rule 25.6.

I also indicated no one knew where the documents were when I called previously. She provided me with one person's name, Donald Baker at the US whose number is 202-479-3035 in the briefing department to check on the whereabouts of the documents.

When I did a google search, I discovered this gentleman appeared to deprive another lawyer of the 1st Amendment right to petition per the attached brief and denial of rehearing, per the documents attached to Affidavit 127th included herein.

No good may come by contacting him when I plead the Court itself deprived me of the 1st Amendment right to petition by neither accepting or rejecting the Supplemental Brief for a legal reason, and my right to be fully and fairly heard before deprivation of my fundamental rights and my interests in the PA license in accordance with the 5th Amendment when the US Supreme Court has created the beginning of a course of conduct that not all applicants have Equal access to the US Supreme Court in violation of the 1st Amendment right to petition.

Yet, I called him on December 15, 2023 from the law library anyways. My internet was out and I saw after a month and a half in delays the court noted the filing was rejected on December 14, 2023. But no staff could tell me why it was rejected or indicate why there is no letter indicating defects with opportunity to cure any alleged deficiency.

Injustice is guaranteed and there is no Equal protection of rights in accordance with the 5th applicable to the Federal government or the 14th Applicable to the states when petitions are not accepted or rejected for lawful reasons providing constitutionally sufficient notice for defects to allow for cure in good faith cases to prevent injustice.

With regards to the attached case Supreme Court Number 17-256 it appears the lawyer was concerned with conflict of interests with the Court regarding associations being used by justices to eliminate individual rights by account of their partiality towards associations at the cost of human sacrifice of life, liberty, or health of the individual people US Supreme Court justices serve. 127th Affidavit.

I think the better course of the lawyer's allegation that neither Clerk Baker or Clerk Bickell's agreement not to docket a Motion was to docket it and allow it to be considered by the US Supreme Court as not to deprive the petitioner of the right to petition under the 1st Amendment even if it forced the US Supreme Court to analyze its own behavior as upholding or violating the Constitution.

I cite the attached Attorney Shao's Motion contained in the 127th Affidavit attached hereto:

On 10/23/2017, Petitioner telephoned Mr. Baker to ask why the Amicus Curiae motion was not filed. Mr. Baker transferred the call to Mr. Bickell (telephone number of 202-479-3263). He stated that it was the joint decision between Mr. Baker and him not to file the Amicus Curiae motion. He asserted that pursuant to Rule 37.2, the time to file an Amicus Curiae Brief could not be extended. When corrected, he later acknowledged that Rule 37.2 applies only to Amicus Curiae Briefs, not Amicus Curiae Motions. He stated that he decided not to file the corrected Amicus Curiae Motion since it had "too much deficiency" but he was unable to identify what such deficiencies were. Mr. Brickell argued that

the same exact motion had been filed in 17-256 so the court had had a chance to consider its contents there. He was unable to explain why if the Amicus motion was too deficient to file in this matter, it had been deemed acceptable to be filed in 17-256

This is not fair or just, especially because it appears to be on viewpoint grounds in violation of the 1st Amendment right to speech. Regardless, I told my case manager I requested a letter outlining the deficiency and opportunity to cure in accordance with Rule 25.6.

I also indicated to Lisa Nesbitt I may want to file documents under seal, but I could not file redacted versions since the documents themselves I seek to seal in full.

I believe the bankruptcy remote entities will be used by Non-government entities (“NGOs”) down the line to overthrow the government by controlling the resources including the channels and the debt credit through block chain tokens and bids on data and other resources, to control the government to overtake the government sometime after 2050.

Bankruptcy remote entities by their creation are not dissolved should its managing member be dissolved in bankruptcy because a springing member hops into their place upon the occurrence of bankruptcy protected by the Contract Clause of the US applicable to the states to allow the criminal activity of reselling securitized debt at a profit into infinity that is nothing but discharged debts that no one will ever pay. It is a Ponzi scheme similar to the 80 trillion dollar US debt owed predominantly to government workers pensions that was written off in debt swaps, meaning tax breaks not to be paid off by design in a controlled crash that will harm the baby boomers and the world if the courts do not save us. Bankruptcy remote entities allow banks and other entities to resell bad debt that will never be paid that was previously written off into infinity.

I outlined how I would coin correctly without violating the 1st and 13th Amendment as applied to my concerning my religious beliefs against enslaving other free people in the attached civil rights complaint. 3DI56.

I believe the courts are in trouble, and the new way money will be coined increases the threat. I seek to preserve the courts by requiring they adhere to the Constitution and the rule of law with mercy, not violate it to serve marketing their selfish positions to sustain profit which is the mark of lawlessness leading to hell per Jesus Christ. Human sacrifice of life, liberty and health by compelled government backed force for material gain under the lie of the common good or public good does not protect freedom or the public but is the type of controlled order children of the devil implement.

Children of the devil are controlled by human desires not yet saved from hell. They are blinded by the desires of man. So they do not impartially do what is right. I believe God who is even if the Bible ceases to be. Yet, God teaches us that we are to shed light on unjust laws to prevent the wrong doers from being destroyed in hell just like God does *See, Isaiah 10:1-2*: (“Woe to those who make unjust laws, to those who issue oppressive decrees, to deprive the poor of their rights and withhold justice from the oppressed of my people, making widows their prey and robbing the fatherless.”) I sit up straight when God says Woe to you and hear Damned to hell are you should you not turn away from lawless lusts leading us to become too dirty and disgusting to have eternal life by compromising what is right for what is convenient, profitable etc.... *Isaiah 28:13* provides: “But the word of the LORD was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; rule upon rule, line upon line; here a little, and there a little; that they might go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken.” I understand this to mean that judges and law makers make compelled rigid sameness the law without understanding

protecting preempting laws against slavery to the mob's lawless lusts, safeguarding lives and freedom from compelled conformity of belief. My God teaches me to be separate by not sinning even if the majority praises lawless lusts business greed, organized charity in violation of Matthew 6:1-4 and other things that I believe damn people to hell as good.

The Constitutional law that protects freedom must not be sacrificed for national interests, the lie of the public good, or the lie of the common good as Justice Jackson indicated in *Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943) rather brilliantly explained:

At Page 640 "National unity as an end which officials may foster by persuasion and example is not in question. The problem is whether under our Constitution compulsion as here employed is a permissible means for its achievement"

At Page 641 "As governmental pressure toward unity becomes greater, so strife becomes more bitter as to whose unity it shall be."

At page 641 "As governmental pressure toward unity becomes greater, so strife becomes more bitter as to whose unity it shall be. Probably no deeper division of our people could proceed from any provocation than from finding it necessary to choose what doctrine and whose program public educational officials shall compel youth to unite in embracing. Ultimate futility of such attempts to compel coherence is the lesson of every such effort from the Roman drive to stamp out Christianity as a disturber of its pagan unity, the Inquisition, as a means to religious and dynastic unity, the Siberian exiles as a means to Russian unity, down to the fast failing efforts of our present totalitarian enemies. Those who begin coercive elimination of dissent soon find themselves exterminating dissenters. Compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard."

I especially liked how Justice Jackson rebutted arguments relating to competency and elimination of individual 1st Amendment rights to be sacrificed for national unity which eliminates every freedom for the collective compelled not freely chosen goal in his spicy opinion.

I do not believe governments exist by consent of the governed. Government exists by the rule of law. Our freer fairer government is sustained by people judges. They are not dissolved by the argument consent may be revoked, when there is no consent in the lie of a social

contract constructed by Lucifer the devil and lawless men acting based on lusts under the feign of the just rule of law. By upholding individual liberty from being sacrificed by the representative vote in the other two branches of government, the courts give us actual freedom that our freedoms will also be protected. The actual upholding of justice and the rule of law is what unifies this country.

It is the court which grants us liberty and freedom and a democracy in our democratic republic. Without courts, the law of Satan, Darwin and even Economists Keynes and Adam Smith taught money and might makes right, and reign by mobsters who use money, connections or power to rule a no longer free people would occur.

I was reading about how churches used the fallacy of consent of the governed with regards to the Scots through a friar's opposition of the papal rule by Edward I or II of England in support of King or Lord Roberts of Scotland in the 1300s. I believe it is based on a fallacy.

The Bible teaches owe nothing to anyone but to love them. When you make man or money to care for your own your master as opposed to greater laws, including the superseding Constitutional law, you became a slave to the world's will. It makes fallible replaceable lawless lustful men demi-gods who mislead people to harm for material gain if unrestrained by the just rule of law. The courts make our government more just by restraining the conduct of officials within all three branches to obey the Constitutional law without immunity to restrict government authority to protect Constitutional freedoms form being sacrificed under the lie of the common good, public or material gain even knowledge. Human sacrifice of life, liberty or health to serve government seats, government popularity or government profit or positions is lawlessness and must not be condoned and rewarded by the courts.

Plus Locke was wrong. There is no consent of the governed when the government and government backed private or foreign partners oppress, enslave, kill, steal or destroy. There is no meeting of the minds of the common people to form a government or to allow government condoned human sacrifice for material gain in exchange for government's protections of freedom. Freedom is not for sale or it is not free by barter or exchange in contract law, even the lie of social contracts the devil teaches. The lie of Satan and his children is that people must barter for freedom by making mammon God is not true. Jesus teaches this is the way to hell in *Matthew 6:24*. Other people's souls are not for sale making them for sale by involuntary government backed physical, social or economic force according to arguments by Plato for a Republic as opposed to our greater institution a democratic republic.

The falsehood Locke rests on of a social compelled contract where people are enslaved as human capital to give the fat of their labor of sheep to wolves who devour them is likened to men saying she dressed pretty. So, she contracted agreed to be raped as the people did not consent to be exploited or oppressed to serve the material gain of those Plato likened to Philosopher kings backed by force and social pressure not the just rule of law.

Our democratic-republic is fashioned to protect certain freedoms, including the right to petition, speech, religious belief, against involuntary servitude even by government backed partners like the UN makes our union more indestructible in the face of a planned overthrow. We are protected by the just rule of law that prevents human sacrifice for material gain. People judges not money or might are our only hope of a hero to sustain the freedoms that make this country already great.

Our United States is held together by the rule of law. It is degraded when Courts violate the rule of law, but is strengthened when the courts humbly correct even the courts in cases and controversies.

Justice is not a matter of popularity. Injustice is guaranteed under the Roman traditions of majority vote that killed my savior Lord Jesus Christ. Justice is a matter of truth which protects freedoms of speech, association, petition of religious beliefs and other beliefs the courts may even disagree with. This disagreement humbles us and innovates by helping us learn from one another. Our nation is strengthened when the courts protect people who believe differently by showing even minorities under the threat of government backed physical, social and economic force including physical threats or harm because of my religious-political belief are still safeguarded not enslaved to the compelled beliefs of the most popular fickle fads of the majority. It helps us to care about people we may have overlooked instead of sacrificing people by valuing moth and rust more than humanity and liberty which I the mark of the beast spoken of in Revelation. Courts can tame that beast sin that enslaves many to lawless lusts leading to harming others to lose their own lives in the second death the last day.

I do not want any of the staff at the US Supreme Court to be harmed. I am disappointed because my petitions were not docketed and I was deprived of Due Process and an opportunity to be heard. In the petitions I not only asserting my rights to prevent vitiation but I also sought to alert this US Supreme Court that I believe it is in danger. So, our freedoms are not protected without protecting our freedom to petition to assert them before you. The PA case is a better forum to analyze attorney and lawyer disciplinary rules, but this Court denied me access.

This Court may reopen that case. In *United States v. Ohio Power Co.*, 353 U.S. 98 (1957) (“Certiorari denied October 17, 1955. Rehearing denied December 5, 1955. Rehearing

again denied May 26, 1956. Order denying rehearing vacated June 11, 1956. Rehearing and certiorari granted and case decided April 1, 1957), this Court rejected a third petition for rehearing by sua sponte reopening the case to hear. Yet the court removed the Supplemental Brief from the docket and from electronic filing. As of December 24, 2023 it has not returned the Supplemental brief in its physical form and I emailed the brief with all the exhibits in full to the Emergency Clerk Robert Meek in full while copying opposing counsel in that case. So, this court may sua sponte reopen that petition yet to cure defects.

On December 8, 2023 I emailed Donald Baker:

“I am appealing the 11/13/23 decision denying the rehearing to grant cert, NOT the denial rendered previously.

No case law I have found states that I am not permitted to file a petition for a rehearing on denial of a rehearing in fact case appears to indicate I am permitted to do so. If it is done in other cases, I must not be deprived of the opportunity to do so in this case without disparate treatment by the Federal government through this Court's staff in contravention of the 1st and 5th Amendments denial of access to the courts in this criminal like proceeding based on viewpoint.

In the 5th case cited to the Lexis annotations to Rule 44 the United States Supreme Court cited a case where the Court granted petitions for rehearing from denial of the rehearing order to hear and allowed it to be docketed again exceeding the 25 day limit of the writ of cert which does not matter filed within the deadline

In *United States v. Ohio Power Co.*, 353 U.S. 98 (1957), This United States Supreme Court “Certiorari denied October 17, 1955. Rehearing denied December 5, 1955. Rehearing again denied May 26, 1956. Order denying rehearing vacated June 11, 1956. Rehearing and certiorari granted and case decided April 1, 1957. ”

I believe it would be unlawful for clerks to make judicial determinations. I believe this must be submitted and docketed for the Court to make that legal determination, not the staff who are not the judges.

Further, I believe the courts are in imminent danger and I desire the courts to say what the law is as a court not self-regulation by each judge nor regulation compelled by congress which forced justices to be below the law by compelling 5th amendment self-incrimination violations nor by lobbyists who threaten their seats to create a partial unfair to me and other claimants in violation of the 5th Amendment's equal protection component.

The new information occurred after I filed the Oct 18, 2023 initial petition for rehearing which I am seeking a rehearing on based on the court's Order.

Rule 44.1 provides:

1. Any petition for the rehearing of **any judgment or decision of the Court on the merits shall be filed within 25 days** after entry of the judgment or decision, unless the Court or a Justice shortens or extends the time. The petitioner shall file 40 copies of the rehearing petition and shall pay the filing fee prescribed by **Rule 38(b)**, except that a petitioner proceeding *in forma pauperis* under **Rule 39**, including an inmate of an institution, shall file the number of copies required for a petition by such a person under **Rule 12.2**. The petition shall state its grounds briefly and distinctly and shall be served as required by **Rule 29**. The petition shall be presented together with certification of counsel (or of a party unrepresented by counsel) that it is presented in good faith and not for delay; one copy of the certificate shall bear the signature of counsel (or of a party unrepresented by counsel). A copy of the certificate shall follow and be attached to each copy of the petition. A petition for rehearing is not subject to oral argument and will not be granted except by a majority of the Court, at the instance of a Justice who concurred in the judgment or decision.

A denial of the petition is on the merits. 44.2 deals specifically and separately with rehearings of an order denying a petition for a writ of certiorari.

They are distinguished separately.

Moreover, the Court granted petitions for rehearing even when it exceeded 25 days in the interest of justice in another case. Thus, my petition must in the interest of justice be docketed so as not to deprive me of access to the courts to not only vitiate property interests but the liberties I am being labeled disabled and unable to buy and sell as an attorney for my private 1st Amendment rights to religious belief, exercise of religious belief, association and petition, without insidious disparate treatment based on viewpoint of speech contained in my petitions.

This Court held, Respondent was entitled to obtain a recall and amendment of Supreme Court's erroneous judgment, even after the denial of a motion for rehearing, notwithstanding this rule barring consecutive and out of time petitions for rehearing. *Cahill v. New York, N.H. & H.R. Co.*, Conn.1956, 76 S.Ct. 758, 351 U.S. 183, 100 L.Ed. 1075

This Court held, the interest in finality of litigation must yield where interests of justice would make strict application of rules unfair with regards to Rule 44. *Gondeck v. Pan Am. World Airways, Inc.*, Fla.1965, 86 S.Ct. 153, 382 U.S. 25, 15 L.Ed.2d 21

A petition for rehearing after denial of petition for certiorari is not an empty formality and denial of certiorari should not be treated as a definitive determination, subject to all the consequences of such an interpretation, but, on an appropriate showing that a

substantial matter is to be presented on rehearing, appropriate opportunity should be given for doing so. *Flynn v. U.S.*, N.Y.1955, 75 S.Ct. 285

Yet, my first petition was rendered an empty formality and I was deprived of a full and fair opportunity to be heard by this Courts failure to include the timely filed Supplemental Brief containing material information necessary for the court's determination before depriving me of my right to buy and sell as a lawyer but for my religious beliefs in Jesus Christ as God not money and material gain. In fact I believe those who make money and material gain, even convenience their guide and God are led astray to lose eternal life per Matthew 6:24 should they not repent.

All I ask is for the Court to honor and uphold the Constitutional right to access to the courts which is never a guarantee of justice, but injustice is cemented when claimants are deprived of a fair and impartial forum to address their grievances.”

I not only was deprived of access to the courts by this Supreme Court’s staff for the November 6, 2023 Supplemental Brief, I was denied access to the courts for the Petition for rehearing submitted December 1, 2023, and the petition for rehearing of the November 13, 2023 order, I attach in part in the appendix.

I submitted the petition for a rehearing contained in Appendix L timely within the 25 days of the decision I seek a rehearing on the 11/13/23 decision **denying the first petition for rehearing** in accordance with the time frame of Rule 44.2 to include 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 since the date of the first Petition of rehearing was submitted 10/18/23. The deadline is 12/8/23.

This Court has accepted subsequent petitions for petitions rehearing. For example in *United States v. Ohio Power Co.*, 353 U.S. 98 (1957) this Court considered 3 petitions for rehearing by claimant, denied all three, then vacated its order a year later, and granted rehearing and certiorari *sua sponte*.

With that important doctrine this US Supreme Court may reopen any of my petitions sua sponte to address the issues that endanger courts by third party and self-regulation by limiting discipline of judges to the purview of what this court says is law in an actual case that binds congress and the president within their limits. See, Chicago Kent Law review, *Rehearing SUA Sponte in the U.S. Supreme Court: A Procedure for Judicial Policymaking*, by Rosemary Krimbel, dated October 1989.

On 11/13/23 to my horror this Court passed an ethics code. Some members of Congress seek to use a code or regulations to control the courts. I oppose regulating the US Supreme Court, District Courts and Appellate Courts. The only manner to correct judges is within the purview of the Constitutional limits including in cases or controversies such as this one as I am doing now or impeachment. Regulating the Court, even by self-regulation violates my 5th Amendment right to an impartial forum as applied by creating a forum that is partial towards its appearance before regulators, even itself, instead of the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law.

The rule of law, not money or might is the glue that holds this nation together no matter how richly fragmented. I believe requiring the courts do what is right by upholding the impartial rule of law as applied to itself will safeguard the judiciary and these United States from a very real-intentional-unnatural-schemed overthrow.

When I ran for office in 2018 I discovered a scheme to eliminate people lawyers and people judges to eliminate the rule of law that restrains individuals in collective entities from enslaving, killing, stealing and destroying human life, health or liberty for material gain under the lie of Lucifer the common good or public good. I believe the bankruptcy remote entities will be used to maintain debt slavery in a Ponzi scheme of reselling what does not exist to maintain

slavery debt first by carbon credit control and later by utter control of every person and everything with no government to restrain entities with the just rule of law. (126th and 127th attached affidavits)

To my horror after I drafted the Second Petition for a rehearing dated 11/30/23, for reconsidering of the 11/13/23 Order submitted 12/1/23 and attached hereto for a rehearing on matters subsequent to October 18, 2023, the Senate authorized subpoenas to Leonard Leo and Harlan Crow, per the attached newspaper article. I believe Leonard Leo and Harlan Crow are being set up to fall or to make the court fall, through incriminating individual judges. I am concerned they may be criminally prosecuted or sued under the bribery statute 18 USC 201, even if they did nothing wrong. Regardless they will be incriminated by social attacks incited by the whims of congressmen to garner support for their election seats by making a horse and pony show out of incriminating the justices of the US Supreme Court. I believe they must invoke the 5th to protect not only themselves from a set up, but the courts and the rule of law too. The goal of the testimony is to incriminate them and the court.

This new information relates to two issues I asserted the Court rejected consideration on 11/13/23: where I argue this Court hold here and now that 1) the 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 to preserve my right 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) the Courts may not violate the Constitution by impeding and chilling the checks upon its own branch, and its own justices via punishing me in terms of

petitioning the courts to uphold and not violate the Constitutional law based on viewpoint of speech, and partiality to courts at the bias against those who petition for relief against them.

This reciprocal case arises based on my petitions in *Kelly v Trump* to the Delaware Chancery Court and the Delaware Supreme Court to correct judicial misconduct or mistakes, and to safeguard my exercise of religious beliefs substantially burdened by President Trump by the establishment of government religion exhibited by a course of conduct including but not limited to the passage and enforcement of certain executive orders.

If this US Supreme Court determines the DE State Court may not violate the Constitution by chilling the Constitutional check upon itself by vindictively punishing me for petitioning to correct, not destroy the court to preserve my 1st Amendment access to the courts and other Constitutional rights and claims based on the perceived Court agents' religious-political poverty animus than the basis for the reciprocal Orders are eliminated. And this Court must overturn the Order placing my license on inactive disabled or disbarred. Otherwise the Courts do not uphold the Constitution by favoring justices' personal interest in marketing their work and preserving their pay by preserving their government positions in violation of the Equal Protections Clause and the rule of law.

Nevertheless, I am deprived of fairly and fully petitioning in this case concerning the important issues by petitioning to assert and not willingly waive my rights in the PA case which were unfairly vitiated anyways by partial whims of staff not the impartial rule of law. See, *Borough of Duryea v. Guarnieri*, 564 U.S. 379, 387 (2011) ("This Court's precedents confirm that the Petition Clause protects the right of individuals to appeal to courts and other forums established by the government for resolution of legal disputes. '[T]he right of access to courts for redress of wrongs is an aspect of the First Amendment right to petition the government.'")

The fact mistakes are made, including by me not merely staff show how necessary this United States Courts staff are to the judiciary. People staff are indispensable, without them claimants are deprived of any justice by overlooked papers that automation would never resolve.

I applaud the court when it upholds justice, even if delayed. Doing the right thing matters, and actually is more important than winning or losing on petitions. How you got there matters more than winning or losing, and unfair even mistaken deprivations of access to the courts cause injustices.

I seek to protect and preserve the court by preserving the rule of law that upholds these United states.

Per *State ex rel. Citizens National Bank v. Superior Court*, 236 Ind. 135, 139-40 (Ind. 1956),

“it is well settled that although a clerk of the court may perform acts of a ministerial and nondiscretionary character with respect to judicial proceedings, such clerk has no judicial powers in the absence of specific statutory or constitutional authority. When judicial or quasi-judicial powers are expressly conferred upon clerks of court, the clerk's authority is strictly limited within the terms of the statutory or constitutional provision conferring it. See: 14 C.J.S., Clerks of Courts, §§ 35 and 36, p. 1243. ”)

Unfortunately, the Staff at the US Supreme Court not only removed exhibits in one case, but wiped out my contested undocketed filings by not only removing it from the public docket but removing it from the electronic filing receipt, while not similarly removing other documents rejected from the US Supreme Court filing system, intentionally making it more difficult to cure or petition to cure, despite an entire law review article full of cases reopened sua sponte by this US Supreme Court. Given I believe this United States Supreme Court is in danger, making us all in danger not only do I but the country and the world faces irreparable injury, but for this Court's denial of access to the courts in my other cases.

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.

This appeal also relates to Delaware's punishment of me disparately in contravention of the 1st via the 14th Amendment for private speech outlined in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act petition petitions, where my religious belief is material to the issues therein, based on subject matter grounds of disagreeing with my religious beliefs and disciplining me for asserting my right to believe differently as a private individual.

DE Courts not only deprived me of access to the courts and violated my First Amendment rights applicable to the state via the 14th Amendment during *Kelly v Trump*, but later, after I filed a civil rights case, the state initiated a disciplinary proceeding, where it treated me unfairly, deprived me of a fair opportunity to be heard my asserted right to notice, asserted not waived right to prepare, to call witnesses, to perform discovery, 6th Amendment right to self-representation applicable to the Courts via the 14th, to notice in conformity with the DE rules and other by punishing me and attacking me in *Kelly v Trump*

The State Court violated my right to notice by affording insufficient notice in fewer days than the state rules required prejudicing me, ignored motions and did not docket them, than ruled I had no right to what was docketed in *Matter 541* regarding appointment of counsel where I am the party. It is my religious belief that Jesus commands us to allow God through the holy spirit to be our advocate when we are brought wrongly to the courts but for our faith in Jesus. Citing, *Luke 12:11*. The Court did not allow me the asserted 1st and 6th Amendment to self-represent on the espoused religious grounds until late December 30, 2021, fewer than two weeks before the alleged hearing without ruling on my motions for discovery, objecting to notice and other matters at all until 2 days before the initial hearing date by email the hearing was on. I was so distraught about the appointment of counsel I got the shingles. The Court scheduled the hearing 8 days by postponement in response to my emergency motions and appeal to the DE State Court to deprive

me of the more than 10 days required to adhere to the Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 12 (h) in subpoenaing witnesses to call my suspected accuser Arline Simmons. While the ODC violated the same rule by failing to provide material 10 days in advance pursuant to Rule 12(h) which prejudiced me of a fair proceeding in the rushed fixed proceeding against me. This Court in *Greene v. McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959), held “this Court will not hold that a person may be deprived of the right to follow his chosen profession without full hearings where accusers may be confronted and cross-examined”. Thus, this Court must not deprive me of my the DE Court nor the Appellee below afforded a full hearing where I could confront accusers and cross examine them in this criminal like proceeding. Thus, this Court must void the District-Court order based on deprivations of procedural due process in the original case and this case.

The only notice I received concerning original discipline was I was being disciplined for my religious beliefs which allegedly was illogical and did not make sense to the state. My protected exercise of religious belief in Jesus by keeping myself separate from the world by not sinning which is committing lawlessness in the eyes of God is my most important aim in my life. I reasonably was upset and became quite sick during the DE Board proceeding. Without haste, in response to the Board’s 8 days I filed a motion to call Arline Simmons and Court of Common Pleas Judge Clark to the hearing. The Board never responded. I also filed a motion for reconsideration by the Board, and appealed the denial of my motions to suspend the hearing while continuing it for 8 days for a reason I did not state in my motion to suspend the proceeding to the DE Supreme Court. I demanded I be afforded time to adhere to the rules to call witnesses, collect discovery and prepare my defense. The 8 days did not waive my objection to the 20 day notice required by *Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc.* Rule 9 (d)(3):of which I was deprived causing prejudice. The DE Supreme Court members Reeves, Vaughn and Traynor called my

interlocutory appeal frivolous to cover up its lawless acts I was not aware of at the time of the trial Board proceeding including to 1. firing two court staff and 2. concealing evidence in my favor by sealing petitions in *Kelly v Trump*. I was compelled to attend a hearing ill, without sleep, opportunity to prepare and present my case in order not to violate another rule creating default judgment or contempt of court. I asserted and did not waive my right to a fair proceeding. I maintained objections at the DE Disciplinary hearing, but more violations arose. The Court reporter accused me falsely of reading documents, possibly to help herself look at them to draft the transcript. The Court reporter made up outrageous things I did not say. The entire transcript of the hearing was inaccurate and prejudicial. Reporter said she could not hear me. I objected to the transcript, and maintained my objections even after I noted some cursory changes. There were too numerous and the transcript was too faulty to correct.

Moreover DE ODC Vavala took over the case despite not attending the hearing, predictably because the other two ODC may be called as witnesses should this case be brought to court. Judge Traynor appeared to be aiding the court in preparing a case against me as I averred in the civil rights case. So, using the 2 ODC as witnesses against me in a potential proceeding is the plan. The procedural due process defects and deprivation of my asserted 1, 6th, 13th, 14th Amendment Constitutional rights applicable to the state via the 14th cause reciprocal discipline to be unwarranted.

The hearings and actions taken against my professional license by Delaware in retaliation for my exercise of Constitutional rights are in violation of the First Amendment, the Procedural and Substantive Due Process Clause and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. They must be rejected as by “rule of law” rather than personal vendetta for my personal-religious-political speech contained in the petitions. (US Amend I, XIV)

The State denied me of substantive and procedural due process rights in this disciplinary proceeding. The record shows clear and convincing evidence that the proceedings were brought, with religious-political animus, in retaliation against me for filing Kelly v Trump and for petitioning the court regarding bar dues to safeguard my liberties.

The state abused its discretion by 1. Vindictive prosecution, which constitutes a violation of due process, and by Selective prosecution, which constitutes a denial of equal protection.

I have a right to petition the courts when I believe a transgression has been committed against me by the establishment of government religion by President Trump.

I uphold my oath by requesting government agents, judges, presidents and members of congress to adhere to rule of law by allowing me to exercise my Constitutional rights. The steps taken to orchestrate this proceeding circumvent due process protections and, thereby, manifest selective; targeted; unjust persecution.

Reciprocal discipline is not warranted and I should not be denied a fair opportunity to prove this by the District-Court's own violation of my 5th Amendment procedural Due Process rights under the facts of this case.

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

The District Court for the Eastern District of PA ("District-Court") ordered me to draft a motion for cause to explain why reciprocal discipline would not be warranted before its Court. (District-Court Docket Item ("DI") DI-2). I drafted a motion for a stay and a corrected motion for a stay. (DI 4, 6) District-Court denied my motion for a stay and corrected motion for a stay.

(DI 3-7), Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI”) 3DI-27, incorporated herein by reference. Every DI and 3DI cited is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety). In the same Order, the court denied ECF access not ripe for a decision since I did not request ECF at that time. (DI-7)

The Court requested I file a motion for ECF access. Id. I was concerned the District Court may be booby trapping me. 3DI-27. The Court did booby trap me to waste resources to vitiate my access to the courts. I filed a motion for ECF access District Court Case Manager Gail Olson (“Gail”) indicated the court would allow per the emails on the record on 6/21/23, but the court denied it on 8/7/23 as moot. (DI 31-34)

On 8/7/23, I emailed and mailed an amended notice of appeal to District Court to include the 8/8/23 Order. (App. H). Neither the District or Third-Circuit filed it as a notice, despite both courts confirming receipt.

Third-Circuit refused to docket the Amended Notice I filed with the District-Court it received from the District-Court on this case’s record. I placed the amended notice of appeal on the record at 3DI-62 beneath the transcript because I suspected foul play by the Courts, after all the Delaware Supreme Court sealed my petitions and fired witnesses to conceal testimony in my favor to fix the outcome in the sham original disciplinary case against me. (App. H-1) I seek to hold judges are not above the law and that court correction by appeals or law suits must be permitted to preserve the Constitutional rule of law. The Court in bad faith seeks to prevent judges from being accountable to the purview of the Constitutional laws’ limits.

The District-Court did not file the 8/7/23 Amended Notice of appeal. I required it to be docketed to preserve my rights should the case be remanded back to the District Court to prevent vitiation of my fundamental right to religious beliefs against debt by compelled waste of

resources. The clerk confirmed it gave it to the Third Circuit. Third Circuit confirmed receipt, but did not file it. I drafted **another** Amended Notice of Appeal I mailed out and sent electronically on 8/11/23 to preserve the issues and not waive my claims and rights should this US Supreme Court remand the case back to Third Circuit. District-Court filed it per the attached App H-2, but changed electronic notice from “IFP granted” to “No fee paid, no IFP filed” on the electronic notice. District Court granted IFP on 2/8/23 per the attached Order. (App. H-3, H-4, H-5). District-Court filed the second amended Notice appealing denial of ECF access on 8/14/23.

On 8/24/23, the Eastern District Court and the Third Circuit laid another booby trap by creating a new case number, knowing I filed an amended notice I desired the Court to file in this case to preserve my arguments should the case be remanded or reopened. I am shaking I am so upset. The Third Circuit and Justice Diamond are well aware of my genuinely held religious beliefs and how upset the tomfoolery of deceiving me into waste resources against my religious beliefs has been for me. The Court indicates in forma pauperis is not granted and this is a different proceeding.

The additional paper, ink and postage required to file the same documents are a cost so great in term of costs as to vitiate my access to the courts. The reason why I filed the motion was to avoid the costs the court in bad faith compels me to pay despite the fact it required I filed the motion it denied in bad faith.

The Delaware Disciplinary Order and this reciprocal orders prevent me from returning to my former law firm, and may prevent me from getting a job as a lawyer to render any fees impossible to pay back. In addition, asking for donations is against my religious beliefs as I believe people are misled to hell by *Matthew* 6:1-4 violations of organized charity, fundraising and pro bono.

Going into debt, of even a few dollars, is against my religious belief, and the additional costs of even a few dollars to pay for postage, stamps, ink and paper is a substantial burden upon my access to the courts due to my utter poverty, and my inability to pay back any fees should my appeal fail. . In addition, asking for donations is against my religious beliefs as I believe people are misled to hell by *Matthew* 6:1-4 violations of organized charity, fundraising and pro bono.

I am a Christian, a child of God. I attend a Catholic church, but place my faith in God, not man, or money. I do not want to sin against God by incurring debt. I believe people sin against God by incurring debt. God teaches in *Romans* 13:8, “Owe no one anything, except to love each other, for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law.” Since it compromises our loyalty to God towards the pursuit of money to free us from bondage of sin, as savior instead of God. Jesus teaches you cannot serve both God and money as savior. *Matthew* 6:24. I choose God. Earning money is not sin. When our desire to earn money takes the place of our desire to do God’s will, by hardening our heads, hardening our hearts and hardening our hands preventing us loving God foremost and subordinately loving others as ourselves, I believe we sin.

I believe “the love of money is the root of all evil. 1 *Timothy* 6:10.

I believe people go to hell for blindly doing their job, doing what they are trained to do to gain money to care for their family, not seeing clearly when they ignorantly harm others, even through delegation of duties. I believe not knowing is guilt. *Hosea* 4:6 I believe that Court correction can help them know and save their souls from being thrown unworthy into the fires of hell on the last day. I do believe courts have the power to save lives and eternal lives. I believe every time the court prevents individuals, entities, charities and even religious organizations from oppressing, killing, stealing and destroying human life, health or liberty, judges save souls from lawless lusts called sins. *Amos* 5:15, *Matthew* 23:23.

I believe creditors will be damned to hell for not forgiving monetary debts. (*See, Matthew 6:12*, “And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors.”); (*Matthew 6:14-15*, “For if you forgive other people when they sin against you, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if you do not forgive others their sins, your Father will not forgive your sins.”); (*Deuteronomy, 15:1* “At the end of every seven years you must cancel debts.”); (*See also, Matthew, 18:21-35*. Debts once forgiven will be remembered if we do not forgive others.); (Jesus teaches “What good will it be for someone to gain the whole world, yet forfeit their soul? Or what can anyone give in exchange for their soul?” *Matthew 16:26*); (Jesus teaches us do not seek after material things, “but seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things will be given to you as well.” *Matthew 6:30-33*.); (With regards to eternal treasure we are commanded to share his word without pay as without pay we received the gift of the way to eternal life, through the word. *Citing, Matthew 10:8*).

If people don't forgive monetary debts by those who have no means to pay, other than selling their souls for labor, I believe creditors and their paid agents will be damned to hell for loving money and material gain more than one another as commanded to the extent they enslave others to involuntary servitude to pay it off. I am commanded to love people, not money and the things it can buy. (*See, John 13:34-35*, “A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another.”)

Since I am commanded to love people, I do not want to create a situation where I increase the odds, they will be damned to hell by accruing profit off of debt. I do not want to be damned to hell by seeking money in place of God as my savior due to indebtedness. Debt is against my religious beliefs because it makes money guide and savior instead of Jesus as guide and savior.

Interest on alleged debt, and debt is against my religious beliefs as I believe it increases servitude to Satan by teaching people to be enslaved to earning money to pay artificial interest or debt, instead of being free in Christ, essentially making money the savior in place of God. (See, *Leviticus 25:36-37*, "Do not take interest or any profit from them, but fear your God, so that they may continue to live among you. You must not lend them money at interest or sell them food at a profit." and *Exodus 22:24-26*).

It is my genuine religious belief charging interest or a fee on money lent or artificial debt is a sin against God, I believe misleading many to hell by indebtedness to the pursuit of money, instead of God. (*Ezekiel 18:13*, "He lends at an interest and takes at a profit. Will such a man live [By live, I believe it means losing eternal life in the second death should he not repent]. He will not! Because he has done all these detestable things, he is put to death; his blood will be on his own head."); (*Deuteronomy 23:19*, "Do not charge your brother interest on money, food, or any other type of loan."); (*Proverbs 28:8*, He who increases his wealth by interest and usury lays it up for one who is kind to the poor.); (*Exodus 22:25*, "If you lend money to one of my people among you who is needy, do not treat it like a business deal; charge no interest."); (*Deuteronomy 15:2* "This is the manner of remission: Every creditor shall cancel what he has loaned to his neighbor. He is not to collect anything from his neighbor or brother, because the LORD's time of release has been proclaimed.")

I believe it is a great sin to go into debt, and an even greater sin to require a person to go into debt to exercise fundamental freedoms, that are no longer free, but for sale to those who can afford to buy the ability to exercise Constitutional 1st Amendment liberties, the wealthy, rendering the poor less equal, no longer free, but for sale bought people, as wage slaves, in violation of the 13th Amendment, and Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment

applicable to the states, and the Equal Protections component of the 5th Amendment applicable to the Federal government, with government support.

The Delaware Disciplinary Order and this reciprocal orders prevent me from returning to my former law firm, and may prevent me from getting a job as a lawyer to render any fees impossible to pay back. In addition, asking for donations is against my religious beliefs as I believe people are misled to hell by *Matthew* 6:1-4 violations of organized charity, fundraising and pro bono.

I appeal the Order of both the Eastern District Court and the Third Circuit refusing to grant ECF access to file before the District Court and the decision not to even docket the order the Amended notice of appeal the District-Court indicated it transmitted to it on its electronic filing receipt below, and seek to prevent the court from causing an obstacle so great as to deny me access to this court and other courts. US Amend I, V.

I am required to exercise my right to petition and appeal within the purview of FRAP R 4, 30 days within the Order to preserve my claims in order not to vitiate my right to religious belief against debt, 1st Amendment right to petition and invocation of the 13th Amendment to prevent needless costs by refileing paper copies by US Postage of my denied Motion for ECF should the case be remanded back to the Appellate Court and ultimately back to the District Court.¹¹

¹¹ On August 24, 2023, the Third Circuit Court and District-Court sought to booby trap me based on the amended order by requiring I expend resources I do not have in the same District Court case 22-45 for a separate appeal case number opened 8/24/23 No. 23-8425 that by filing an amended notice of appeal for case No 22-3372 I sought to avoid from being created as an obstacle so great as to deny me access to this court by preserving my appeal on the record below. Such an appeal in a separate case matter where I would be required to file in forma pauperis motions and other documents would be fruitless, and I am not falling for the trap meant to harm me into running out of resources, time, stamps, paper as to cause me not to appeal by appealing separately. I should not be denied my fundamental rights I seek to preserve on the record by such entrapment by the court, but assert and do not waive my claims with the intent to preserve my rights not extinguish them by losing the rights and resources I sought to preserve by requiring I appeal separately effectively vitiating the rights I appealed to protect. To make the matter

If a District-Court may enter an Order, than I the claimant must be permitted to appeal the Order on the record to preserve my claims to prevent the Court from bad faith causing needless costs in order to create a burden based on my poverty and asserted rights as to deny me access to the courts in my exercise of my First Amendment right to petition to preserve my claim should the case be reopened or this Court remand it back. US Amend I, V, VI.

The original order prevents me from working in the profession of my choice and requires time to fight reciprocal cases. It is against my religious beliefs to go in to debt per the petition to file in forma pauperis I incorporate herein. I assert the 1st and 13th Amendment against involuntary servitude to sin and death in hell. I also invoke my right to access to the courts under the 1st Amendment without disparate treatment in violation of the 5th Amendment based on lack of accommodation due to poverty, religious accommodation, and asserted not waived religious beliefs and assertions against involuntary servitude. US Amend I, V, XIII.

This court must overturn the Eastern District Court's denial of access to electronic filing in order not to deprive me of access to the courts due to poverty creating a burden so great as to vitiate my 1st Amendment right to petition should this order be remanded and not simply vacated.

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 violation of my liberties not merely my licenses, unfairly and denied me Constitutionally sufficient notice on hearing

worse. It looks like counsel would be appointed by the Eastern District of PA, PA ODC on an appeal that is not ripe to determine whether it is frivolous as this Court has not decided to hear or potentially remand the case. The Court threatened PA ODC with sanctions for an appeal that if filed would be frivolous as vitiating the rights I seek to preserve by filing an appeal. I refuse to willfully be booby trapped as I was unwilfully booby trapped previously.

I filed a Motion for a rehearing on denial of the stay DI 12. The District-Court misfiled the exhibits to the Motion for reargument on denial of a stay and other motions including over 2,000 misfiled pages. The items were out of order and some appeared missing. The Court placed another's person's medical exhibits on my docket. So, I filed a letter at DI 13 for corrections. I think the District-Court made some corrections, but other documents appear to be out of order which prejudices me and the appellate courts. This denied me procedural due process of a fair, complete, accurate opportunity to be heard by prejudicing me and this appellate court because the court cannot easily find the documents I referred to in my Motion for a rehearing on the Court's Order denying a stay in the voluminous misfiled exhibits. US Amend V. Gail requested a list to aid in correcting the filings. So, I spent hours over a weekend resending each and every exhibit in order, with a document list outlining the order with the title of each email. I do not have ECF access, but upon information and belief the docket remains a mess.

I filed a Motion before the Third Circuit Court to correct the docket below regarding my Motion for a rehearing on a motion for a stay, since a motion for a stay is required in my case. 3DI-29-34, 3DI-36-41. I am required to show my efforts below in requesting a motion for a reargument on the Court's order denying a stay. I have shown a motion for a stay having been made, the District-Court denied the motion or failed to afford the relief requested by not addressing my Motion for reargument on the Court's Order denying a motion for a stay. See, FRAP Rule 8 (b) and 18 (b), See, DI 6-7, DI 12-24.

The Court below seemed to give up on correcting the docket relating to my motion for a rehearing on the denial of stay and scheduled a hearing. (DI-14) I had a number of outstanding motions. I requested the subject matter of the hearing. I asked the Court what the hearing was

about and indicated my intent to call witnesses should it be on the reciprocal discipline as opposed to a hearing on whether a stay or my other motions was required. The Court evaded responding on the telephone or by email. So, I filed a letter asking for notice. I pled on other issues below including the fact ECF access was not ripe because I had not asked for it at any time prior to the Order dated October 6, 2022 denying ECF rights. So, there are a variety of issues the hearing may have related to. I requested notice of the topic of the hearing in conformity with procedural due process requirements applicable to the Appellee pursuant to the 5th at DI 15. I sent an email to follow up on exhibits and expressing the need to correct them as I assumed the Court would make a determination on outstanding motions I incorporate herein at DI 16.

The Court appeared to ignore that too. On November 3, 2023, I filed Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for an Order on her Motion for good cause, to waive record, transcript fees, filing fees and other court costs by the Clerk and this Court in order not to compel me to violate my religious beliefs against debt in exchange for access to the courts in defense of her First Amendment rights. DI-17

On November 3, 2023, I filed Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for an Order on her Motion pursuant to Local Rule 7.1 (g), FRCP 52, and in addition to or in the alternative of FRCP 59(e), for a rehearing on the Court Order Denying Request for ECF access, and my corrected Motion to Stay the Proceeding until the conclusion of both Respondent's originating disciplinary proceeding, and civil rights proceeding until final non-appealable determinations are made or the time of appeal has lapsed. DI-18

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

The District-Court evaded addressing the outstanding motions and instead set me up in a booby trap by issuing an order requiring I draft a memorandum on why my retirement in PA would not affect my standing in its court. DI-21 I retired from the bar of the state of PA in 2018. (App. I, certificate of retirement) Throughout the proceeding I believed I was retired in the District Court. I averred I was retired before the District Court in my motion and corrected motion for a stay. In pleadings and in emails I noted retired status. I thought I was retired, and became confused.

The District-Court knew I was not retired. The Court knew I was retired in PA since 2018. It pulled that data from the PA web site. The Court knew I believed I was retired before the District Court since I was retired in PA since 2018. I indicated I was retired at the signature line of my pleadings (App J)

The District Court also knew I did not have easy access to transportation to travel to the law library to research. DI-9. I was so poor I rode my bike and did not have access to a vehicle around that time. Even worse my bike got a flat tire. DI-9 (App K)

The District Court knew I was impoverished and could not afford or pay for Lexis or Westlaw too in order to research either.

The District Court knew I was under great duress. I am fighting for my licenses, liberties, life, health and eternal life from the fires of hell. The District Court knew I was having life threatening health issues as I noted I collapsed due to severe dehydration related to a bad surgery I had as a youth. DI-9. (App K) I require time to care for my health in order not to

diminish it or die for the vanity of others. DI-9. I attempted to assert my religious right to live. I alerted the Court to the fact I require time to sustain my health by including my health records and assertions in order not to harm my health or die at App K too. PA ODC did not care that I collapsed at the post office but for his and the Court's denial of a physical accommodation in the form of time in violation of the ADA regarding to physical not mental accommodations.

The Court also knew I desired to subpoena witnesses should the hearing be on discipline. I was not afforded that asserted right to subpoena witnesses in the DE proceeding.

The Court knew I was not retired, but attempted to set me up to fall, which may cause 6 new law suits relating to a new order. At the time I drafted the letter at DI 22, I was fighting for my life and eternal life, not merely my licenses in other cases simultaneously with this case. I believe differently than others. I believe many things lead to certain loss of eternal life in the fires of hell. I do not believe many people go to heaven. Jesus teaches few people have eternal life at the resurrection of the bodies from their graves the last day. *Mathew 7:13-15*. I believe compromising my belief in Jesus for the vanity of men misleads others to hell and may damn me to hell. It is no small matter. I do not want to mislead others or miss out on sharing a fuller type of love with God on judgement day for eternity.

I was utterly confused because Gail indicated I was not retired and I thought I was. Then, I just did not know. The District Court knew I thought I was retired. I stated the same in pleadings. The District Court knew I have been retired from PA since 2018. That was confirmable public knowledge at the time of the Order. Moreover the District Court cited the public state web site. DI 21. The District Court also knew due to lack of time, poverty and limited means of transportation, broken electronics and lack of resources I could not easily research.

Despite that the Court ordered me to draft a memorandum of law as to why my retirement in PA would not retire my license in its Court. DI-21. The Court booby trapped me based on an error of fact, an error of law creating manifest injustice against me by using retirement as a reason to disbar me. In response to the Order for a memorandum, while acting under great duress, I fell into the misleading trap of the Court. I filed a letter asking to be placed on retirement, as not admitted in the Eastern District Court of PA District Court to practice because I was confused as to whether I was retired or not. I thought my assumption of retirement might be wrong, but then the Court asked why I should not be retired. DI-22. To my horror, the Court disbarred me instead of placing me on retirement. DI-23. I was surprised because I thought I would be retired.

I immediately called Gail noting my confusion. I asked if this was punishment. I exclaimed my confusion as I thought I would be placed on retirement. She responded no, it was merely placing my license as disbarred due to retirement, not punishment. Gail Olsen said the Court was not disciplining me, per the letter confirming our conversation at DI-24. Having multiple law suits where Courts sought to discipline me for my faith in Jesus, I drafted a letter confirming our conversation, but remained confused. DI- 24.

At the time, just like now, I was under water in other cases as I fought for my eternal soul from the pits of hell by defending my faith in Jesus Christ from government persecution but for the exercise of religious beliefs. I did not have easy access to research. During the case I could not even afford car insurance and gas and was compelled to hand in my tags since the DE Order and law suits arising from it preventing me from working in the occupation of my choice and I assert my 13th Amendment rights.

After researching I discovered I was not automatically retired since disbarred PA attorneys are not automatically disbarred and may have an office to practice before the Federal courts. *See, Theard v. United States*, 354 U.S. 278, 282 (1957); *Selling v. Radford*, 243 U.S. 46, 49 (1917), *Frazier v. Heebe*, 482 U.S. 641, 648 n.7 (1987); *also see, In re Surrick*, 338 F.3d 224, 231 (3d Cir. 2003), (disbarment by the [s]tate does not result in automatic disbarment by the federal court." *In re Ruffalo*, 390 U.S. 544, 547, 88 S.Ct. 1222, 20 L.Ed.2d 117 (1968)). *Surrick v. Killion*, 449 F.3d 520, 530 (3d Cir. 2006), ("The question in this case is whether a state may prohibit an attorney admitted to the bar of a federal district court, but suspended from the state bar, from maintaining a legal office for the sole purpose of supporting a practice before the federal court.").

Judge Diamond of District-Court booby trapped me by creating the assumption I was retired by asking me to draft a memorandum on why I should not be retired in its court too. Judge Diamond sought to entrap me into requesting retirement in order to disbar me for conduct I would not have otherwise committed but for the trap he laid out to get out of work. I have limited time, resources and ability to research. The Court should not have placed me as disbarred instead of as retired. Moreover it is clear error of law, of fact creating manifest injustice against me to place me on retirement too, even if the order should be changed. I did not have notice of disbarment, and the District-Court had reason to believe I did not understand the consequences of retirement. The District-Court knew I was confused and exploited that confusion to get out of analyzing the voluminous amount of Constitutional issues in the underlying original disciplinary case the reciprocal case is based on. The Orders below violate my 5th Amendment right to notice, and a fair proceeding.

The US Supreme Court held in, *In re Ruffalo*, 390 U.S. 544, 551 (1968), “The charge must be known before the proceedings commence. They become a trap when, after they are underway, the charges are amended on the basis of testimony of the accused. He can then be given no opportunity to expunge the earlier statements and start afresh.” I was not given advance notice on the matter of the hearing or notice of disbarment based on retirement. I was without access to legal resources and under great duress. The court took advantage of my hardship to vitiate my license to practice law in bad faith.

The US Supreme Court indicates in *Herring v. New York*, 422 U.S. 853, 866-867, “Due has long been recognized as assuring “fundamental fairness”... the elements of fairness vary with the circumstances of particular proceedings... What is fair in one set of circumstances may be an act of tyranny in others.” As applied the court acted unjustly creating irreparable injury to me in terms of punishing me even more harshly for the 1st Amendment rights to petition, religious belief, exercise of belief, association and speech and asserted other Constitutional rights including the 6th Amendment right to cross examine my accusers which I alerted the court I reserved my right to do since I was deprived of the right in the original DE Disciplinary proceeding. I asserted my 6th Amendment right to call witnesses.

I did not know the Eastern District Court would disbar me when I did not draft a memorandum as to why retirement in PA would not retire my license in its Court. I asked the Court be placed on retirement so as not to be barred as active, but I thought I might have been wrong on my assumption of retirement. I was confused without ability to research the issue due to lack of time and resources. My conduct was not done knowingly or voluntarily but under great duress. It was a booby trap based on a misunderstanding similar to the entrapped lawyer relating to the disciplinary proceeding in *In re Ruffalo*, where I was denied fair notice and a fair

and fair opportunity to be heard given my unique situation of facing 6 law suits, limited access to the courts given lack of time, health limitations and poverty creating a substantial burden to my access to the courts and religious belief against debt. The Order should be overturned, and my license should be placed on retirement either..

While, I do not have easy access to resources, the District Court should have known retirement in state does not automatically retire my federal license unless specifically drafted in its rules. The rules do not require reciprocal retirement in my case. So, the District Court appears to have set me up to fall which is not fair or just. I gave the court notice I lacked time and resources to investigate. DI-9. I was under duress having noticed the District Court of my collapse upon the floor of the post office due to lack of time to care for my health to sustain it. I noticed the District Court of my lack of resources to pay for car insurance, and my limited resources too.

I did not have the means to research until later. I discovered and realized I must appeal the Eastern District of PA Order or potentially face 6 new law suits. That is important to prevent in order not to certainly vitiate my Constitutional rights. Costs of needless additional law suits are so great given my poverty and religious beliefs against debt as to effectively to deprive me of my ability to petition to defend the loss of Constitutional rights and claims including but not limited to my private 1st Amendment rights 1. to religious belief in Jesus as God not money as God, 2. Exercise of religious belief, petition, speech, association and other claims. US Amend I, V, XIV, XIII.

“The standard of due process is that no one may be deprived of liberty or property without such reasonable notice and hearing as fairness requires.” *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 124.

I was deprived of procedural due process by the unfair trap the court laid to entice me to eliminate work caused by its staff's messing up on docketing when the case manager Gail was out and lack of notice and an opportunity to be heard fully and fairly as written on the docket.

The vitiating of my rights not to be deprived of my license but for the entrapment of the court was not knowingly or voluntarily given. "Due process must be respected in periods of calm and in times of trouble," even during a global pandemic, war in Ukraine and Israel and global economic crisis. *Id*

I was not predisposed to violating rules against retirement. "The entrapment defense prohibits the government from instigating a criminal like violation of the disciplinary rules by persons otherwise innocent in order to lure them to its commission and to punish them. I was not predisposed to place my license I thought was on retired by automatic rule of law with the 2018 retirement in PA onto retirement. Justice Diamond set me up with an evil selfish biased motive of person trying to get out of upholding Constitutional rights to get of work which is required to uphold justice for all, even me as a party of one with unique religious beliefs that no one is above the law nor below, even Presidents, judges and law makers. *United States v. Russell*, 411 U.S. 423, 424. I face irreparable injury before the partial forum to itself and its case law instead of the impartial application to the rule of law in violation of my right to an impartial forum. I request acquittal and vacation of the order disbaring me due to retirement.

The Government through the Court, "may not issue commands to its citizens, under criminal [or disciplinary] sanctions, in language so vague and undefined as to afford no fair warning of what conduct might transgress them." *U.S. v. Levin*, 973 F.2d 463, 466 (6th Cir. 1992) *Citing Lanzetta v. State of New Jersey*, 306 U.S. 451 (1939).

The government, the court, lured me in bad faith by trickery to disbar me to get out of work its staff created by misfiling my pleadings. I did not knowingly nor voluntarily relinquish my license to practice law. The court knew or should have known I was confused, and entrapped me in bad faith. Accordingly, the order below must be vacated.

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

Injustice results when the courts do business instead of upholding the Constitution which protects the people and their exercise of individual liberties including petitioning the government to correct mistakes and misconduct which is smarter and upholds the rule of law as opposed to lawless lusts such as desire for profit, avoidance of costs, convenience, productivity material gain, profit and such. Compromising what is right for what is profitable creates injustice by making freedoms for sale to only those who can afford to buy the lie of liberty.

Courts violate the Constitutional requirements of Due Process and Equal Protections component of the 5th when it is partial towards itself, the government, convenience, productivity, avoidance of costs, profit under the deception of the common good, welfare of the state, or public good. Parties and attorneys place a check upon judges too to uphold the fair impartial application of the constitution to the rule of law.

I petition to protect constitutional liberties and require the courts to uphold the rule of law, without waiver, not destroy those who administer or who I petition to uphold it, including Justice Diamond.

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 a court's error, which

includes not retaliating against me by this petition to cure the defects in this case by the entrapment by Justice Diamond.

I seek to improve the administration of justice by requiring courts and its staff obey and adhere to the rule of law without sacrificing claimants' interests for the courts' partial whim, which eliminates the impartiality required for fairness under the 5th Amendment procedural due process and Equal protections component based on view point.

The US Supreme Court held "the constitutional principles there applied forbid the judiciary, as well as the legislature, of a State to interfere with the free exercise of religion."

Kreshik v. St. Nicholas Cathedral, 363 U.S. 190 (1960)

The US Supreme Court held "license requirements are struck down only when they affect the 'enjoyment of freedoms which the Constitution guarantees. *See, Staub v. City of Baxley*, 355 U.S. 313, 322 (1958)." *Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.*, 486 U.S. 750, 777 (1988).

And yet, my license is restricted or eliminated but for my religious beliefs and my petitions to require the courts and its staff adhere to the Constitution as I assert and defend my religious belief in Jesus, not money and material gain as God.

I seek a fair opportunity without willful or voluntary waiver by the substantial burdens this court and other courts have caused upon my exercise of religious beliefs and fundamental rights. RFRA.

"Justice in the courts" is a command by my God. *Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23*.

I do not regret suing former President Trump and seeking to substitute current President Biden by certain conduct that establishes government religion. I am disappointed in the courts for not upholding the Constitution but for violating it, and yet the courts may be made clean by doing what is right now without compromising justice for partial convenience or selfish whims.

XII District-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

The proceeding involves questions of exceptional importance which to my knowledge have not previously been addressed by any Court. The answers the Court provides may promote the impartiality of the federal courts and preserve the United States from an unnaturally schemed overthrow. The answers may also preserve not only my Constitutional liberties but the Constitutional liberties of the people from the government backed foreign and private partners elimination of all Constitutional protections under the threat of removing the ability of people to buy and sell but for their exercise of religious belief in Jesus's teachings which do not conform to the secular or religious belief of the government, or the government backed foreign of private partners.

The proceeding also involves the important question as to whether anyone with a license to practice law has any First Amendment private freedoms to 1) petition, 2) religious belief, 3) association as a Christian, Catholic, Democrat without removal of the association as a lawyer but for the exercise of the right to petition to safeguard religious beliefs contained in private speech the government finds repugnant, or speech to petition to correct government misconduct or mistakes without retaliation but for the exercise of the 1st Amendment right to petition or 1st Amendment right of speech petitioning the courts for grievances of caused by government misconduct and mistakes based on subject matter making the government above the law and lawyers below the law 4) Private speech outlining my religious beliefs in Jesus as God not money or mammon or professional collective gain as God which is the mark of lawlessness leading to damnation in hell, 5) and other private claims and rights from government infringements and violations of including, but not limited to, Equal Protections under the 5th and 14th, 6th Amendment right to self-represent, claims for a fair trial, claims for a right to pleadings

in a case against me Case Number 541, claims relating to a conspiracy under 1985 to cause me to forgo *Kelly v Trump* by Delaware supreme Court incited witnesses intimidation, threats, concealing evidence by sealing evidence in my favor to cover up procedural due process and misconduct by the state court, preventing my ability to call witnesses by ignoring my motions where I assert the right to self-represent, to perform discovery, scheduling the hearing within fewer days required to subpoena witnesses 8 days as opposed to 10 required by the state disciplinary rules and other harm such as firing two court staff to conceal evidence necessary to my defense, the reciprocal proceedings and this case, and other claims.

Per 3DI56 attached hereto and incorporated herein shows my petitions in *Kelly v Trump* were sealed by the Court to prejudice my appeal to the USSC, and to conceal evidence in my favor in the disciplinary proceedings and this civil rights case in violation of my right to a fair trial, notice and an opportunity to be heard and my First Amendment right to petition against the Delaware Courts' conspiracy to threaten me by inciting attacks against me to cause me to forgo my case against Former President Trump and current President Biden to alleviate a substantial burden upon my religious exercise caused by their establishment of government religion based on barter or exchange not freedom, making our rights for sale to be exercised by only those who may legally barter the government through its private or foreign partners to exercise. US Amend I, XIV.

My Reply to the ODC's response to my objections to the Board's determination, my appellate brief, Objections, and Answers incorporated herein by reference to the dockets or as attached hereto in 3DI-56. These exhibits show Constitutional violations and aver facts if taken in the light most favorable to me show evidence the DE Supreme Court incited the violations of my first Amendment right to petition, violations against witness tampering, reckless or

intentional infliction of emotional distress and bodily harm, procedural due process violations in Kelly v Trump and procedural due process violations in the Disciplinary proceeding making the DE Supreme Court the judge and jury, and other claims.

Per the attached April 26 letter, along with two DE Disciplinary Motions where I aver Constitutional violations of by adherence to the disciplinary rules, the Supreme Court showed it colluded in bringing the disciplinary petition by copying the Disciplinary Board on a letter providing me with the waiver of notary requirements in the pandemic. The Delaware Supreme Court incited the collusion to violate my right to petition in Kelly v Trump and to punish me for my belief in Jesus by sending its arms to attack me. The information the arms used in their attacks were only in the possession of the DE Supreme Court, including but not limited to my private petition for an exemption of bar fees I ended up paying. The Delaware Supreme Court referred to a case in its disciplinary opinion of the requirement of exemptions of bar fees in its order unnecessarily showing its disdain for my petitions for an exemption on bar fees for all attorneys facing hardship. The State Court cared more serving partial business and money not individuals and individual Constitutional liberties in violation of US Amend I, XIV, XIII. As a Christian I believe this is the type of lawless lusts serving material gain at the cost of human sacrifice of life or liberty will damn each justice to hell under the color of law should they not repent with the help of court correction. The lawless partiality to cover up its own misconduct to serve the mere appearance of justice while committing lawlessness will allow more lawlessness to fester and spread should judges remain above the law instead of under the law within the purview of the constitutional limits of 1. Cases and controversies such as mine and 2. Impeachment.

I have religious beliefs against partiality by the government.

The State Board's and federal disciplinary panel's function as a group of professionals serving the professionals' interests by making justice a business as opposed to a matter of truth as a matter of law regardless as to whether citizens are poor and have nothing to barter with violates my religious belief, as applied, Equal protections and Due process, as applied and per se.

I believe government partiality towards business and interest groups is sin. (See, *Isaiah* 10:1-3). That is why I sued the democrats and asked for a waiver from filing requirements.

Just like I do not want to go to hell for favoritism, I do not want judges to go to hell based on partiality to those who serve their seats, or who may take them away by judicial discipline, nor do I desire the courts to be placed in a position of temptation to violate the rights of those they serve.

Judge Scirica has a conflict of interest with my case I was not aware of until after June 3, 2023.

I moved to recuse him pursuant to my 5th Amendment right to a fair trial to defend the exercise of my private 1st Amendment rights of petitioning, speech, religious belief, exercise, and association, 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68.

Judge Scirica chairs the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability.

I contest the federal judicial disciplinary rules Judge Scirica drafts on Constitutional grounds. I oppose the elimination of life time limits and believe district court and Circuit Court judges should have life time appointments to prevent them from the temptation to normalize injustice by partiality to the Disciplinary rules as opposed to the preempting Constitutional application of the law. I declared my belief regulating the Court violates the constitutional rights of citizens the court serves and allows for the schemed overthrow to occur in the District Court prior to discovering the conflict. Favoritism towards those who serve the alleged

professions' collective convenience, productivity or the individual judge's future or current seat or highly esteemed position creates unfair proceedings when conflicts arise. I seek to declare the disciplinary rules Judge Scirica Drafts are unlawful.

The fact I argued on the record below and in other records including the original disciplinary law suit and other cases, my desire to eliminate or prevent disciplinary rules of federal judges and the United States Supreme Court creates a conflict of interest. The appearance of a conflict requires a recusal and a new panel who is not swayed by Judge's Brilliant mind and perceived expertise in a subject I disagree.

I sought to amend my complaint in the civil rights case to include Constitutional arguments against the disciplinary rules and proceedings against attorneys.

I oppose attorney self-regulation and third-party professional regulation through professional boards on Constitutional grounds, on religious grounds and on grounds the rules violate the Constitution. Standardized compelled practice eliminates free will needed to protect Constitutional freedoms of clients and professionals who do not conform to the standards. Standards makes professional practices above the law by deference of the courts to the standards even when such standards harm, oppress, kill, steal and destroy human life and health for the bottom line. The standards create partiality to profit, productivity not justice.

The state proceeding and state disciplinary rules reflect the rules Judge Scirica works on in his capacity as Chair of the federal disciplinary rules. I should be afforded the right to assert my right to include reasons why the state and federal disciplinary rules violate the Constitution before an impartial forum, as opposed to a Judge who supports disciplinary rules by actively drafting rules for disciplinary proceedings.

Judge Scirica privately opposes my view due to his stakeholder interest he has in upholding rules that mirror his work. This conflict of interest violates my procedural due process rights and Equal Protections rights as applied, as a party of one with unique religious-political beliefs in unbiased justice as a religious command by God.

I believe there is an attack on judges to eliminate the judiciary to eliminate the rule of law, as I mentioned previously.

I believe the courts must limit the purview of correcting federal judges to the purview of the Constitutional limits without waiver, 1. Cases and controversies such as mine, 2. or impeachment, to preserve these United States from schemed overthrow. Allow attorneys to fulfill their duty by requiring in cases that judges do not vitiate Constitutional rights for business. The judiciary has a duty to uphold and not violate the Constitution in order to adhere to less important interests such as appearance to the mob or fickle fads. *Salazar v. Buono*, 559 U.S. 700, 717 (2010).

Judges' loyalty to Boards and regulators, even self-regulation must not supersede the Constitution to create actual injustice not mere the appearance.

I believe regulations will be used to assist the other two branches to exceed the Constitutional limits to impeach and control a no longer free, independent and impartial judiciary. I believe this will be used to eliminate the courts down the line if left unstopped.

Upon information and belief there is not only a schemed overthrow of our economic system but there is also an unnatural, man-made designed overthrow and elimination of governments to allow entities who control the resources through technology to enslave the population to live based on their whim with no restraint in the form of law to prevent their oppressing, killing, sealing and destroying liberty and human life.

I informed the courts of belief lobbyists scheme to eliminate people judges and people lawyers to eliminate the rule of law at both the World Government Summit (“WGS”) and the World Economic Forum (“WEF”). Speaker Sebastian Thrun at the WGS mentioned lawyers and judges would be replaced by automation at Day 2 of WGS in 2018 you may see on youtube by clicking:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NsdmPiBc9TI>

Also see the attached exhibits in the agenda to eliminate people judges where it appears villains who receive unjust gains through banking, grants, charities and government contracts seek to cover up the fact there is no money to pay out for the boomers for their eared retirement, healthcare and social security. The manner money is coined enslaves the people to debt in violation of my religious belief against debt which I believe damns people to hell. I proposed a way to coin correctly without violating my 1st Amendment exercise of religious belief as applied or the 13th Amendment as applied to all by enslaving the masses to pay the Central and other banks back for the money the government grants and contracts money with interest.

Attached hereto in the appendix the Agenda to eliminate people judges, I provide an article where a lobbyists boldly stated:

“How can the use of Laws be eliminated? Today we try to control human behavior by enacting laws or signing treaties without changing the physical conditions responsible for aberrant behavior. When Earth’s resources are seen as the common heritage of all people, irrelevant laws and social contracts will vanish. In a resource-based economy, social responsibility would not be a function of artificial laws or force.”

I understand the plan is to control the resources people require to live to control a no longer free people’s behavior to bend to the dictates of those who control the technology and resources required for life. The scheme is to control the government by controlling the resources for it to function before eliminating the need of government to govern and guide.

Professional control through standardized discipline of professionals allows for the schemed government overthrow to take place by allowing professional practices and business to supersede Constitutional laws, making business above the law, unchecked by the courts or government via the governments backing of it.

I believe the courts are in trouble. Allowing cases like mine to show judges are not above the law but may be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits will prevent the overthrow should I persuade the courts regulating the judiciary creates injustice and should be deemed unconstitutional.

Judges must not waive the 5th Amendment against self-incrimination by allowing self-regulation or Board regulations because they eliminate the 5th Amendment right to Equal protections of claimants' they serve by the temptation of judges to be partial towards disciplinary rules which may conflict with the Constitutional application of the rule of law

Judicial disciplinary rules also will likely allow ex post facto activity to create cases against Judges to allow congress to more easily impeach judges or create a horse and pony show and mockery of justice by hanging judges they disagree with based on fickle fads. My God teaches impartiality is a command. I must protect the court, even when I disagree with them.

Please see the attached article showing there are automated peopleless courts in China. Please see some excerpts from the WEF books, including the note of eliminating the job of attorneys by 2027 or so. This is real life. I read information by those I disagree with to understand their plans.

The issue of whether the practice of law should be regulated within the purview of the Constitution so as not to prejudice the public by creating injustice by partiality to serve ourselves may very well save the courts from a very real planned overthrow. The attacks against the US

Supreme Court are not normal. They are hypocritical since the Congress and the President commit the same acts unashamed. I have religious beliefs against partiality. Regulating professionals and the courts through disciplinary proceedings guarantees injustice by chilling attorneys' duty to require judges adhere to the rule of law without vindictive retaliation based on court correction needed to preserve the judiciary and the government.

Under objective standards in my case, "the probability of actual bias on the part of the judge or decisionmaker is too high to be constitutionally tolerable." Citing, *Rippo v. Baker*, 137 S. Ct. 905, 907 (2017), Citing *Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 U.S. 35, 47 (1975); *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 872 (2009)). "The Tumey Court concluded that the Due Process Clause incorporated the common-law rule that a judge must recuse himself when he has "a direct, personal, substantial, pecuniary interest" in a case. Ibi" *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 876 (2009). In this matter, Judge Scirica's personal interest in opposition to my claims is too prejudicial to my case to afford me a fair proceeding. US Amend I, V.

"A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process." *Murchison, supra*, at 136, 75 S.Ct. 623" *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 876 (2009). The Court cannot grant a fair proceeding with Judge Scirica's participation.

"The Court asks not whether a judge harbors an actual, subjective bias, but instead whether, as an objective matter, the average judge in his position is likely to be neutral, or whether there is an unconstitutional potential for bias" *Williams v. Pennsylvania*, 579 U.S. —, —, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 1905, 195 L.Ed.2d 132 (2016) (" (internal quotation marks omitted))."; *See, Rippo v. Baker*, 137 S. Ct. 905, 907 (2017) ("we did not hold that a litigant must show as a matter of course that a judge was "actually biased in [the litigant's] case")

Judge Scirica Chairs the Federal Discipline rules for judges. I seek to prevent regulation of the US Supreme Court, federal judges and seek to overturn lawyer disciplinary proceedings and rules that mirror the rules Judge Scirica works on. An objective person would deem Judge Scirica's participation unfair to me under the unique facts of this case.

Justice Scirica's participation violates due process. This court must vacate the order below and recuse him should this case be remanded back to the District-Court to prevent further deprivation of procedural due process. US Amend V.

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

The failure to recuse Judge Phipps ("Phipps") deprives me of a fair opportunity to be heard in violation of my 5th Amendment procedural due process rights requiring Phipps's orders to be overturned, including the denial of a stay which would vitiate the dismissal for failure to prosecute.

I am being disciplined for suing President Trump to dissolve the establishment of government religion. Phipps was included as a potential nominee twice by President Trump to be placed on the list of candidates to become US Supreme Court Justice. Trump will likely be the next President and nominate Phipps again should a justice retire as one may be pressured to do by abnormal attacks by lobbyists pressuring Congress to impeach or regulate the courts.

Phipps ruled against me in the Civil rights case based on the state's false and misleading allegations. The false claims and misleading allegations of the State unbacked by the record allow witnesses to testify in Phipps's head without affording me an opportunity to cross examine in the Eastern District case.

Phipps's has a conflict of interest that would tempt the common man to partiality to rule against me and effectively for Trump to gain a seat at the most powerful place the US Supreme Court.

The Third Circuit committed an abuse of discretion in denying recusal of Phipps by an impartial panel. Judge Phipps is on the panel of all orders denying me relief rendering me an unfair biased proceeding.

Judge Phipp's participation violated my right to a fair trial by creating the actual prejudice I sought to avoid. An objective observer would deem the temptation for Phipps to be biased towards his own self interest and likely nomination as a United States Supreme Court Judge, with partiality towards Trump and against me is too great and unfair under Procedural due process. I am being disciplined for suing President Trump, the one who may reward Judge Phipps.

Further, per the tv news video, newspaper articles and reference in my attached civil rights case, I averred I was previously retaliated against by a Christian law school Duquesne for petitioning the school to eliminate its rat problem. Phipps taught at this school and is loyal and partial to it and those within it or connected to Duquesne School of law, who I arguably esteem too including Judge Thomas Hardiman, my schoolmate District Court Hudge Bill Stickman, and President Gormely, my former Constitutional law professor. So, Phipp's is tempted to be biased against me for other additional reasons to serve those who serve or support his position which unfairly conflict with my petitions.

To my horror, Judge Phipps participated in 5 judgments against me at Third Docket Item Number ("3DI") 3DI-47, which provided:

“Present: SHWARTZ, MATEY and PHIPPS, Circuit Judges

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.

The motion to exceed word limit is GRANTED. The motion to correct the record is DISMISSED. All other foregoing motions are DENIED.”

My motion to recuse Judge Phipps was denied on June 20, 2030.

I was taken by surprise, given the notice of my legitimate concern that Judge Phipps’ acting as a member of the panel actually granting an adverse decision based on actual prejudice relating to a conflict of interest so great as to tempt the common person to rule against me as he did.

6/4/23 I filed the following documents that I incorporate in their entirety, including exhibits:

1. Appellant Meghan Kelly’s motion for reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for a new panel to re-consider motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023

2. Petitioner Meghan Kelly Affidavit in Support of Recusal of Judge Phipps, and Judge Scirica
3. Appellant Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for leave to exceed the word and page limit in her motion for reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for a new panel to re-consider motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023

On July 5, 2023 I filed Motion to Expedite Consideration of Appellant Meghan Kelly's motion for reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for a new panel to re-consider motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023

The denial of Phipps violated my right to a fair and impartial forum under basic norms of procedural due process and created actual prejudice against me. US Amend V. The "Federal Rules of Civil Procedure treat orders that are entered without due process as void, permitting reopening of the case. U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 5; Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 60(b)(4).

The panel's inclusion of Judge Scarica and Phipps violates Due process and must be rendered void under the facts of this case. US Amend I, V.

I further argue that legislators may not legislate and regulate the Federal Judiciary as violative of separation of powers.

This Christmas my laptop stopped working. I had to piece together things arguments based on what I had on memory sticks. There is case law indicated the courts may not be regulated by the legislator albeit it was from a lower state court if I recall correctly.

Nevertheless, this brief is due tomorrow. So, I assert 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 deception of appearance instead of actual justice. Constitutional requirements of Procedural Due process and Equal Protections arguments are sufficient to require recusal of judges or to overturn decisions based on unfair partial participants of the court which the appellate court, and the entire forum wherein a party requests recusal must determine whether the failure to recuse makes the proceeding constitutionally defective.

It is unfair for a judge to determine whether he or she is biased in a case. There is a temptation to truly believe we are above temptation to give into self-interests. It is quite unfair for a judge to be forced to confess this.

It is more fair and just to have an impartial full court or panel not the person attacked as partial to decide these matters.

With regards to recusal demand of Justice Thomas, I do not think that is fair or just given half the nation supported Trump. Judges are allowed to have individual beliefs. They are not allowed to create case law partial towards personal self-interests instead of the impartial application of the rule of law. Do I think he should be recused no. Do I think he will be impeached wrongly if the courts do not draw the line to say what the law is. Yes. There is an agenda to eliminate this court. I am not mentally disabled because I care, even for this I disagree with.

Whether this court agrees or disagrees with me is not as important as whether this court says what the rule of law is per Marbury. This case or the civil rights case may be the only opportunity to do so in an actual case and controversy where this court has authority and power

to do so. You will not have a say if there is a constitutional crisis by compelled disciplinary proceeding before non-article III disciplinary forums that are unfair.

Further, in *Wisconsin Dept. of Industry v. Gould Inc.*, 475 U.S. 282 (1986), the US Supreme Court held that federal statutory or regulatory law, specifically NLRA preempted the state disbarment statute. Thus, an argument may be made that the Constitutional law including the right to petition, opportunity to receive notice on disbarment and the 5th Amendment should preempt disbarment statutes or rules too.

I argue the Disciplinary proceedings and rules are Unconstitutional for many reasons too voluminous to expand upon now. The record in the DE Civil rights case contains many of my arguments, though I did not have time or room to include them in my Oct. 18, 2023 appeal of that case before this court.

XIV. The system of reciprocity violates Case and Controversy Requirements

Federal reciprocity requires the Court to be the prosecutor, the judge and witness too, not an outside adverse party, violating the case or controversy requirements of U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 3, § 2, cl. 1.

In federal reciprocity cases, the District-Court who is both the prosecutor and the judge is the named party in this case. I am defending myself against required Court prosecution where I, the accused bear the burden by clear and convincing evidence as to why the Court must not prosecute me, in potential violation of my Fifth Amendment rights by reporting requirements and fair notions of due process and procedural due process applicable to federal courts.

The Third Circuit held,

“The existence of a case or controversy requires: (1) a legal controversy that is real and not hypothetical; (2) a legal controversy that affects an individual in a concrete manner so as to provide the factual predicate for reasoned adjudication; and (3) a legal controversy with sufficiently adverse parties so as to sharpen the issues for judicial resolution. *Rendell v. Rumsfeld*, 484 F.3d 236 (3d Cir. 2007)

The Third element is not met in all cases before federal disciplinary hearings. There is no adversarial party when the entity prosecuting is judge and jury, including mine. This system of reporting must be overturned to preserve the Constitutional liberties of the accused. This issue is capable of repetition, yet evading review, and should be, in the interest of justice be considered by an impartial judicial forum who has not reciprocated discipline, by this US Supreme Court. A federal court, District-Court will not admit it violates the Constitution by blindly adhering to its internal procedures. This Court must, in the interest of justice, consider these important issues.

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

There arguably is no controversy in my case, just a cover up of court misconduct, elimination of witnesses, the wrongful removal of four public documents material to my defense from public records, and government persecution towards me, but for my First Amendment exercise of or assertion of my protected Constitutional rights

The record shows, I do not intend to practice law before the District-Court should the restriction on my license be lifted. I intend to seek to rejoin my former law firm where I would perform real estate settlements. Nevertheless, the infringement upon my license in the District-Court prevents me from the chance to regain employment as a real estate lawyer with my former law firm.

There is no harm to the District-Court showing a case or controversy.

The record also shows the State laments I discuss the bible as a source of my religious belief relating to petitions where I assert and defend my religious exercise. My religious beliefs and compelled violation of those beliefs and exercise of my religious beliefs are in issue as the protected liberty interest I sought to protect in *Kelly v Trump*, and one of the liberty interests I seek to defend in this present case. It is unconstitutional for the Court to persecute me, because I invoke my First Amendment right of belief, religious-political-belief, religious-political exercise, religious-political-association, religious-political-speech, and my right to petition the Court to uphold these religious-political fundamental rights, despite the State's disagreement with my beliefs, typos, or inconvenience that my poverty creates to the court.

The State is aware of my circumstance. Due to lack of resources, working computers, printers, paper and other luxuries, I had typos and run on sentences in some of my pleadings. I did not have the luxury of time or resources to proof read or correct documents. I typed desperately wherever I could use computers or print documents, including at libraries, with limited time at the computer. I was required to file timely or waive my rights. I do not regret imperfectly standing up for my religious belief from government persecution.

I would regret doing nothing. If I am unable to exercise the most basic First Amendment rights, speech, belief, association, exercise of belief and petition, then I may logically assume others are not free. Standing up for myself, now, no matter how imperfectly, may create precedent to stand up for the rights of others, well past my fleeting, soon to be forgotten life here.

The State also grasps at straws by holding there is evidence of either a physical or mental disability. The state appears to be claiming my belief in Jesus is a disability, or there is a physical

disability alluding to a possible physical disability as a harm to the state, with unclean hands, as the State has notice of my limitations. The state rushed the proceeding in violation of my right for an opportunity to be heard, notice, an opportunity to prepare and defend perform discovery, call witnesses, having motions ignored, left unaddressed, in the forum below, or above, and intentionally caused foreseeable emotional distress, in hopes to make me physically ill to use it against me, like heartless monsters.

I dispute the allegation of physical disabilities as an “or” source for this Court’s holding. The record excludes sufficient evidence to make such a finding. Even if on appeal, the Court finds physical limitations, such as the shingles temporarily caused in my case or otherwise including my asserted religious right to live by accommodations that harmed my health due to harmful healthcare, such limitations would not limit my ability to practice law. And if such limitations are found, I invoke the protections of ADA protecting me from government discrimination, either by denial of meaningful access to the courts based on alleged disability, or denial of First amendment rights based on such disability, or my license to practice law based on any such alleged disability, without accommodation by the state. I reserved this issue for appeal in the DE matter, but the US Supreme Court denied me access to its own court by delays in docketing my case.

Whether Constitutional protections are violated by the reciprocity system is a more important issue than mere appearance, and productivity, in terms of material gain for professions or businesses, at the cost of sacrificing freedoms.

The Courts, as government servants, work for justice, not money. If government judges, law makers and presidents care more about money and draft, enforce, and uphold rules that violate the more important Constitutional laws, than none of us are free.

If money is the law, then the people are slaves to the government by artificially indebtedness, under the guise of freedom.

I have a duty to uphold the Constitutional laws that protect something more precious than all the money in the world, individual liberty from government incited private or public economic, physical or social burdens upon, but for the exercise of such Constitutional rights.

This Court's duty to uphold the same is even more stringent. The Constitution protects me, from the Government, including the United States Supreme Court, from persecuting me for the exercise of my fundamental rights.

Sameness is not fairness. Respecting people's individual liberty to believe, think, associate, live, exercise belief, and rights by the dictates of their conscience, no matter if it does not conform to the majority is a duty of this court.

In order to safeguard freedom, the government must let go of control, allowing lawful disorder the exercise of liberties and freedom creates in a world where not everyone is the same or chooses to believe the same or live the same.

The government's duty is to care for people, while protecting the people's freedom, not control and exploit the people for material gain and productivity, under the guise of order and improving the man-made-unnatural economy.

The issues relating to government compelled self-incrimination by the reporting requirements and the case and controversy issues are capable of repetition, yet, evading review. This Court must in the interest of justice consider these Constitutional issues. Otherwise, no other Court may and violations of freedom for the convenience of the government backed private business partners will continue into infinity, sacrificing humans for business greed, not good.

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

I seek to overturn a denial of a stay and the denial of time which vitiates my fair opportunity to petition in the Eastern District of PA case to effectively defend my licenses and my exercise of fundamental rights in the case below and in the civil rights.

The Court erred as a matter of law, as a matter of fact by denying a stay of this case pending the outcome of the civil rights case to allow me a fair opportunity to Petition in this case and access to another court the District Court in the civil rights case.

I potentially face 6 new law suits if I do not overturn the case below or the court merely places my licenses on inactive disabled. I do not have the resources to fight multiple law suits while fighting the most important law suit the civil rights case in order that Constitutional freedoms are not forever vitiated but for my religious belief in Jesus.

That is important to prevent in order not to certainly vitiate my access to the courts and the Constitutional rights I seek to preserve due to costs of needless additional law suits are so great given my poverty and religious beliefs against debt as to effectively to deprive me of my ability to petition to defend the loss of Constitutional rights and claims including but not limited to my private 1st Amendment rights 1. to religious belief in Jesus as God not money as God, 2. Exercise of religious belief, petition, speech, association and other claims. US Amend I, V, XIV, XIII.

I need a stay until the civil rights proceeding is concluded in order to have a fair opportunity to petition. It is in the interest of the courts and the public to allow a stay. I do not think this court or other courts desire to waste judicial resources by additional needless cases

which may be voided should the original case be deemed void for which this reciprocal case arises. I face the irreparable injury in terms of loss of health, life, constitutional liberties and eternal life. This court is apprised of my health requirements I asserted in order not to harm my health or die for sinful vanity and wicked convenience of mere men.

It is not fair that I must pick and choose which cases to defend since poverty creates a substantial burden upon my access to other courts. My religious beliefs against debt also creates an obstacle to my access to the courts. I believe debt damns people to hell by tempting them to make the pursuit of money instead of pursuit of God and God's will savior. I also invoked and continue to invoke the 13th Amendment against involuntary servitude to work for money to pay off government compelled debt to defend Constitutional liberties.

I have a good argument to overturn the original disciplinary case in the civil rights case. Additionally, I have many other claims for additional constitutional violations and claims for relief I make in good faith I should not be deprived of petitioning for but for government pressure to forcefully prevent my 1st Amendment access to the courts, including other courts fairly. US Amend I, V, XIV.

I need a stay in order to adequately and fairly in this case, potential additional reciprocal cases and the civil rights case. The Civil rights case is most important.

There is clear error of fact, of law, creating manifest injustice in the Courts below denying a stay. 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. Nevertheless, I face the risk of additional law suits, which interfere with access to current law suits.

A stay is required to allow me a fair and adequate focused amount of time to petition in other cases, including one outstanding disciplinary case which did the right thing by granting a stay in effect, the Delaware District Court so as not to vitiate the only impartial forum to assert my claims.

A stay is also required to give me a fighting chance in the civil rights case relating to this matter *Kelly v Swartz*. Denying a stay would deny me the First Amendment right to petition and the 5th Amendment fair opportunity to be heard in the civil rights case, without any important justification necessary to uphold a compelling interest somehow more important than my exercise of the First Amendment right to petition to safeguard the exercise of fundamental rights and other interests in another case.

On or about October 25, 2021, I filed a Civil rights case in the Delaware District Court, *Kelly v Swartz* for First Amendment violations, procedural due process violations, emotional distress, retaliation, witness tampering, defamation, and other claims relating to the State of Delaware's attacks in interference of *Kelly v Trump*, and retaliation for the exercise of my Constitutional rights, based on religious-political-poverty animus to punish cover up the state's violations of procedural due process and other laws ("civil rights").

I amended the civil rights complaint to include Delaware Supreme Court, and its members since it appeared it incited the attacks against me during *Kelly v Trump* to cause me to forgo my lawsuit based on the information of the attackers the State-Arms DE-Lapp and an agent of the ODC Judge of Court of Common Pleas, Kenneth S. Clark.

I also moved to amend the civil rights complaint once as a matter of right to include procedural due process violations, First Amendment violations, Equal Protections violations, 6th Amendment violations and other claims and injuries such as emotional duress that arose during the Delaware Disciplinary law suit.

Since then, I've moved to withdraw the amended complaint the DE District Court did not rule on, and moved to amend the complaint once as a matter of right, when the case is remanded back to the court at once with all of the new and additional claims, facts and information to prevent manifest injustice.

The law suit originally had about 9 Defendants. I intend to add the 5 DE Supreme Court members who incited the attacks against me in interference of *Kelly v Trump*, which may make up to 14 Defendants. Some of whom are brilliant researched, experienced judges.

The members sealed my pleadings where I alleged the state and the DE Supreme Court violated procedural due process protections. The DE Supreme Court participated in firing two material witnesses, Chancery Court Staff. DI 10-12 The DE Supreme Court prevented my requests for discovery and rejected my attempts to subpoena witnesses by rushing the Delaware Disciplinary hearing with fewer days required to subpoena them 8 days as opposed to ten required to call witnesses to conceal its own bad faith. Id. The Court sealed pleadings and concealed witnesses I sought to examine before the Board proceeding to cover up its misconduct. Id. The members of the Delaware Supreme Court intentionally sought to prejudice the DE disciplinary proceeding by obstructing access to material information in my favor necessary to my defense on the original Delaware Disciplinary proceeding.

The Civil rights case is now ripe to appeal before the US Supreme Court, *Kelly v Swartz*.

The State labels my religious belief contained in my speech in my petitions to be a disability. The United States Supreme Court held in *Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer*, 137 S. Ct. 2012, 2019 (2017); “The Free Exercise Clause “protect[s] religious observers against **unequal treatment**” and subjects to the strictest scrutiny laws that **target the religious** for ‘**special disabilities**’ based on their “**religious status.**” *Citing Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 533, (1993); (“*In McDaniel v. Paty*, 435 U.S. 618 (1978), “for example, we invalidated a state law that disqualified members of the clergy from holding certain public offices, because it “impose[d] **special disabilities** on the basis of . . . **religious status.**”

The State Court applies discipline in an unconstitutional manner while treating other attorneys who exercised the same rights for which I am punished more favorably without state discipline so long as they align with the government’s belief in money and material gain.

I have been selectively targeted based on subject matter of speech contained in my petitions, without a compelling state interest more important than the protection of my Constitutional rights, which if left unprotected makes other professionals no longer free under the threat of government retaliation.

The object of the application of the state’s discipline is to “infringe upon or restrict [my] practices because of their religious motivation, the law is not neutral,” as violating the Equal Protections clause as applied to me a party of one. *Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 533-534 (1993), US Amend I, XIV.

The United States Supreme Court held in *Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 543, 546, 561 (1993),

“The principle that government, in pursuit of legitimate interests, cannot in a [selective manner impose burdens only on conduct motivated by religious belief] is essential to the protection of the rights guaranteed by the Free Exercise Clause. ...A law [as applied to me as a party of one] burdening religious practice that is not neutral or not of general application must undergo the most rigorous of scrutiny. To satisfy the commands of the First Amendment, a law restrictive of religious practice must advance "interests of the highest order," and must be narrowly tailored in pursuit of those interests....A law that is religion neutral on its face or in its purpose may lack neutrality in its effect by forbidding something that religion requires or requiring something that religion forbids.” Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 561 (1993)

The Civil rights case is the only forum where I may seek relief.

This Court has inherent equitable powers over its process to prevent abuse, oppression, and injustice. *Gumbel v. Pitkin*, 124 U.S. 131 (1888); *Covell v. Heyman*, 111 U.S. 176 (1884); *Buck v. Colbath*, 70 U.S. 334 (1865); *Krippendorf v. Hyde*, 110 U.S. 276, 283 (1884) to grant me an interim Stay herein.

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

The Third Circuit denied a stay on June 30, 2023, and denied my motion for a rehearing on a stay on July 26, 2023 erring as a matter of law, as a matter of fact creating manifest injustice against me as to cause me to lose my First Amendment right to petition fairly pursuant to the 5th Amendment to defend my exercise of my 1st Amendment right to religious belief, speech, association and petition without loss of my license to practice law but for the state’s religious-political poverty animus. In the interest of justice for good cause to prevent irreparable this court must overturn the Order below and grant me a stay so as not to deny me a fighting chance to assert my rights in the only forum where relief may be had the civil rights case, to prevent 6 needless law suits and to prevent irreparable loss not only in terms of loss of licenses, claims, harm to health but loss of my First Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus without

government persecution, but for my belief in Jesus as God and savior not money as well as violation of other Constitutional liberties. Citing Matthew 6:24.

I request a stay of a determination of this US Supreme Court case too, should a petition be granted.

This Court must grant me a stay because denying a stay is essentially denying me the First Amendment right to petition in the civil rights case given my poverty, religious beliefs against debt, invocation of the 13th Amendment, limited amounts of stamps, paper, ink as to create access to research as to deny me access to the courts. It may be an impossibility to fight up to 14 defendants should this court not give me a fighting chance under the circumstances by granting a stay.

My health has diminished. A stay would grant me an opportunity to hydrate and restore my health. I am a little scared since I previously lost vision in my left eye. I am at high risk for a retinal detachment which causes permanent blindness if not addressed immediately. I require time in the amount a stay may afford to prevent blindness and to care for my health please.

I face irreparable injury should a stay be denied in terms of unconstitutional loss of my property interest in my licenses to practice law, loss of my fundamental rights and other injuries.

The public also faces a great loss making those within the government above the law, and those who hold licenses below the Constitutional law's protections under the threat of similar retaliation which would restrain their licenses to buy and sell but for the exercise of fundamental private rights.

The public is not harmed by a stay. I am not licensed before the District-Court at this time, and am not practicing law on behalf of another. However, the public may be harmed

should a stay be denied by punishing professionals for upholding the constitutional limits against state and actors, chilling correction needed to safeguard fundamental rights for all. The Appellee is not harmed by a stay. The Courts are not harmed by a stay, but may be harmed by a denial which may cause up to 6 additional needless law suits. The balance of the equities shows a stay is required to prevent manifest injustice and loss of my private First Amendment right to petition to defend the exercise of fundamental rights in the civil rights case.

The Third Circuit abused its discretion by denying my Motion for a stay until a final non-appealable decision is made in the civil rights case.

I respectfully request this Court pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 23 order this case stayed before the US Supreme Court should the petition be granted pending a final outcome in the civil rights case which is based on the same subject matter. In the alternative, I request this Court grant a stay should this case be remanded below pending a determination in the civil rights case.

The balance of the equities and case law regarding parallel proceedings show the Third Circuit Court committed clear error of law, clear error of fact, creating manifest injustice against me. I am not practicing law. I am acting as a private person standing up for my right to live, exercise First Amendment private speech, First Amendment private religious belief, First Amendment private exercise of religious belief, First Amendment right to association, First Amendment private exercise of the right to petition without government persecution, but for the exercise of my First Amendment rights, no matter if the State finds my belief in Jesus Christ illogical. It is not for the state to dictate who or what I worship, and my God teaches you can serve God and money. Do not seek material things what you will eat or what you will drink, seek the kingdom of God. (*Citing, Bible, Matthew 6:24-34*).

XVI. EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANT A STAY

Extraordinary circumstances warrant a stay. The Third Circuit abused its discretion in bad faith by denying my Motion to stay the proceeding and my motion for a rehearing for a stay, and the resulting dismissal Order filed as a result of the denial of a stay under the circumstances creating certain irreparable injury in terms of loss of fundamental rights, especially my Constitutionally protected 1st Amendment liberty to exercise my religious-belief in Jesus, by loss of the right to petition them should this court not overturn denying a stay, which would effectively vitiate the dismissal.

On 6/30/23 the Third Circuit Court entered 7 judgments against me near closing time on the 4th of July holiday weekend in this matter and the civil rights case, Kelly v Swartz. The denial of a stay, and a denial of more time caused the Clerk to file an Order dismissing the case immediately for failure to prosecute in the other case.

On 6/2/23, I filed a Motion for more time under prejudice in the other-case given the Clerk of Court Ordered that I may not exceed three pages despite good cause and requirement for more time under my unique situations. The Order effectively chilled my ability to effectively refer to all the facts and case law necessary to defend my 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding by the threat of the irreparable loss of my private right to religious belief, substantial burden to access to courts and involuntary servitude against my asserted invocation of the 13th Amendment in the attached Motion for reargument on this courts Denial of costs, fees or taxes with leave to reassert the Motion. I reassert the Motion to vacate 5/19/23 Order, motion to exempt costs and reargument on denial of motion to exempt costs now in full, and incorporate it herein, especially concerning the page-limit threatening Order compelling me to comply or risk

violating my religious beliefs, Motion to correct Motion to vacate, and related documents in their entirety.

I was compelled not to include legal arguments and facts under the threat of this Court forcing me to violate in violating my religious beliefs against Jesus Christ, and the right to petition to prevent irreparable injury in terms of loss of other Constitutional asserted rights given the threat of malicious bad faith fines and my religious beliefs against debt as shown in my leave to file in forma pauperis I incorporate herein and file contemporaneously herewith. At 3DI-55 I also note on the record evidence Third Circuit appeared to punish me in retaliation of exercising my right to petition in the civil rights case in bad faith to chill my speech and petitions. US Amend I.

The clerk's order 5/19/23 should be overturned in light of my motions to exempt fees and costs given my poverty, religious objections to debt, invocation of the 13th Amendment and debt creating an obstacle so great as to deny me the First Amendment right to petition the courts, effectively in bad faith denying me access to the courts in violation of the 5th Amendment and First Amendment.

I called Gail more than a week before the due date 6/13/23. She, Pamela Batts, assured me I would be granted more time in the other-case. I think I called her again on 6/13/23 because I was panicking. I had no reason to believe 3rd Circuit Court would deny my reasonable, necessary request for a stay or time to preserve my fundamental rights and the eliminating my licenses but for my exercise of fundamental rights of 1st Amendment right to petition, speech, associate believe, 6th Amendment right to self-representation, right to Equal Protection and a fair and meaningful opportunity to be heard under the 5th and 14th Amendments and Delaware claims.

I also filed Motion for a stay as I require time in order to effectively argue the Order below in the Other-case must be overturned under the threat of **6 new additional law suits against me should I fall short, including one by the US Supreme Court.** The Court denied a stay on 6/30/23 abusing its discretion creating manifest injustice against me by the severest of penalties dismissing the case, while denying me the right for a rehearing on outstanding motions and the 6 or more additional motions denied by an order filed simultaneously therewith therein or by failure to address. I believe if this court does not grant a stay 6 new law suits may be filed against me which would vitiate my fair and effective opportunity to petition to prevent not only 6 needless law suits in arising from this case but also to prevent the vitiation of my private First right religious belief, speech, association and other claims by allowing me to effectively exercising my First Amendment right to petition in the civil rights case to defend claims therein.

I filed motions for reargument after 6/30/23 to assert my 1st and 5th Amendment right to petition and be heard pursuant to FRAP 40 on motions for rehearing or reargument on the denied motions for a stay, time, vacating order, failure to recuse and dismissal for failure to prosecute, I incorporate herein.

The 3rd Circuit Court unreasonably and in bad faith denied my motion to reopen the case and all my motions filed after 6/30/23 effectively depriving me of the right to appeal and an opportunity to be heard to defend my exercise of Constitutional liberties and my interests in my licenses under US Amend I, V, and FRAP 40. I do not think anyone wants 6 new needless law suits, should the orders at Third Circuit not be vacated by this court. The new law suits would effectively vitiate my ability to protect my 1st Amendment Rights, 6th Amendment rights and other claims in this civil rights case. I do not have the resources to fight potentially 14 defendants in this case, the other-case or potentially 6 additional lawsuits simultaneously dur to

poverty, lack of time and resources. I was required petition before this Court regarding a reciprocal order case number 22-7695, which I was wrongly and unfairly deprived of by this US Supreme Court's staff. In addition, I have two outstanding cases. I must be afforded time to petition in other cases, as well as in this.

I am prejudiced without additional time. I require time under the 1st and 5th Amendments to prevent Third-Circuit from vitiating my 1st Amendment right to petition as Judge Phipps did below by denying my attached motion for a stay while granting the attached motion for additional time, and denying my attached motion of a stay pending the US Supreme Court's determination of whether denial of a stay was in error.

While I appealed before this USSC for an interim stay before judgment, the Supreme Court appeared confused between my petition before judgment before the court wherein I asked the Court for an interim stay pending the Original Delaware Disciplinary proceeding and the Third Circuit reciprocal before the Court from my application for a stay before Justice Alito wherein I requested a stay of this proceeding pending the US Supreme Court's determination as to whether Judge Phipps committed legal error by denying a stay vitiating my access to the courts. I at no time sat on my rights, but the US Supreme Court delayed in docketing as to render the relief requested unavailable. The government compelled obstacle was so great as to deprive me of the opportunity to petition the Delaware original order by government force, not free choice. I did not have the means to appeal the original disciplinary order as I fought multiple lawsuits simultaneously.

Third Circuit Order vitiates my rights by creating obstacles to petition in some cases in exchange with my fundamental first amendment right to petition in other cases by denying my

request for a stay and time, without a fair opportunity to reargue by the severest of penalties dismissing the case.

A lawyer's right, my right to pursue my profession constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the 5th and 14th Amendment, and of which I cannot be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the government's disagreement with my Constitutionally protected religious-political beliefs.

The State placed my license to practice law on disabled to chill my 1st Amendment rights to religious belief, exercise, speech, association and petition but for their religious-political-poverty animus. I must be afforded fair access to the courts to defend my licenses to practice law from being placed on inactive disabled or lost but for my faith in Jesus Christ, and exercise of fundamental rights. US Amend I, V, XIV.

Conditioning my ability to petition under the threat of government compelled religious violations and loss of other Constitutional rights such as access to other courts to exercise the 1st Amendment right to petition prejudices me. I must not be compelled to violate my religious belief against debt in order to regain my licenses, safeguard my Constitutional liberties or preserve my other claims. Nor should I be punished for my exercise of the right to access to the courts to defend my religious beliefs because the Defendants and the original disciplinary Court finds my citations to the Bible and religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions illogical. *See, 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).*(The Court

allowed references to the bible in other RFRA petitions); See, *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 682. (“Courts have no business addressing whether sincerely held religious beliefs asserted in a RFRA case are reasonable.”) *Also see, Africa v. Pennsylvania*, 662 F.2d 1025, 1025 (3d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 456 U.S. 908 (1982); (“Judges are not oracles of theological verity, and the founders did not intend for them to be declarants of religious orthodoxy.”); *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872, 887, (“Repeatedly and in many different contexts, we have warned that courts must not presume to determine the place of a particular belief in a religion or the plausibility of a religious claim.”); *Cantwell v. State of Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 60 S. Ct. 900, 84 L. Ed. 1213 (1940); *Remmers v. Brewer*, 361 F. Supp. 537, 540 (S.D.Iowa 1973) (court must give "religion" wide latitude to ensure that state approval never becomes prerequisite to practice of faith); *Presbyterian Church in U. S. v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church*, 393 U. S. 440, 450, (1969) (holding that “the First Amendment forbids civil courts from” interpreting “particular church doctrines” and determining “the importance of those doctrines to the religion.”); *Ben-Levi v. Brown*, 136 S. Ct. 930, 934; See, *Holt v. Hobbs*, 574 U.S. 352; *In re Eternal Word Television Network, Inc.*, 818 F.3d 1122, 1140 (11th Cir. 2016)(“The Supreme Court cautioned that "federal courts have no business addressing" such questions of religion and moral philosophy.” (Internal citation omitted)); *Thomas v. Review Board*, 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981), "religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit First Amendment protection.").

“To be sure, a state may not condition the grant of a privilege, [a license,] or benefit upon the surrender of a constitutional right.” *Minn. Ass’n, Health Care v. Minn. Dept.*, P.W, 742 F.2d 442, 446 (8th Cir. 1984); Citing, *Western Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of*

Equalization, 451 U.S. 648, 657-58, 664-65 (1981); *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404-05, (1963).

“The doctrine that a government, state or federal, may not grant a benefit or privilege on conditions requiring the recipient to relinquish his constitutional rights is now well established.” Citing, *Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 34 (1970); *E.g.*, *Cafeteria Workers v. McElroy*, 367 U.S. 886, 894; *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404; *Speiser v. Randall*, 357 U.S. 513, 519-520; *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493, 499-500; *Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding*, 344 U.S. 590, 597-598; *Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n*, 271 U.S. 583, 593-594; *see Van Alstyne, The Demise of the Right-Privilege Distinction in Constitutional Law*, 81 Harv. L. Rev. 1439, 1445-1454 (1968); *Comment, Another Look at Unconstitutional Conditions*, 117 U. Pa. L. Rev. 144 (1968). As stated in *Homer v. Richmond*, 292 F.2d 719, 722: (“One may not have a constitutional right to go to Baghdad, but the Government may not prohibit one from going there unless by means consonant with due process of law.”)

“Neither the state in general, nor the state university in particular, is free to prohibit any kind of expression because it does not like what is being said.” *Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 35-36 (1970)

The United States Supreme Court in *Kennedy v. Bremerton School Dist.*, No. 21-418, at *15 (June 27, 2022) held, “Where the Free Exercise Clause protects religious exercises, whether communicative or not, the Free Speech Clause provides overlapping protection for expressive religious activities.”

In that case, the Court granted a professional coach the right to exercise private religious belief and speech, indicating the state’s punishment violated the Coach’s first Amendment right

applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment, despite his association as a government employee or agent.

This case must be extended to me to prevent the state, federal government and additional governments' including Judge Diamond of the Eastern District Court of PA punishment of me, but for the exercise of my exercise of my religious belief, as outlined in my speech in my petitions, no matter how repugnant or illogical my religious beliefs appear to the state and Federal government.

I must be afforded a fair opportunity to be heard in defense of my license below and my civil rights claims, licenses and liberties without compelled religious violations placed upon me in the form of denial of time substantially chilling my speech causing me to ineffectively plead before this Court to safeguard my religious belief in Jesus and my licenses and other liberties. US Amend I, V, VI, XIII, XIV.

Freedoms are not for sale, in exchange for professional licenses. When the courts make business the law by making professionals the law, by self-regulating, mammon, not freedom, or the people is protected. Individuals and individual liberty are instead sacrificed under the lie money grants freedom when it creates slavery by how it is coined. US Amend I, XIII.

Lawyers and judges should be corrected within the purview of Constitutional limits without threats of enslaving them by fines in contravention of the 13th Amendment, as applied to me as a party of one with unique religious beliefs against debt, but also as applied to other professionals and federal judges.

I must be afforded fair access to the courts to defend my license to practice law from restrictions but for my faith in Jesus Christ, and exercise of fundamental rights, without

compelled denial by requiring I fight multiple law suits without the material means or time to pay for paper and postage simultaneously. US Amend I, V.

I am utterly poor. Denial of a stay increases the threat of multiple suits causing needless costs and a substantial burden and obstacle to my access to the Courts in contravention to my 1st and 5th Amendment rights to Petition and access to the Courts applicable to the Federal Courts via the Equal Protection component of the 5th Amendment, for me, a member of class of one due to religious beliefs against incurring debt combined, invocation of the 13th Amendment and due to utter poverty. Poverty creates a substantial burden to my access to this court requiring an accommodation in the form of time.

“Because this case implicates the [Constitutionally protected] right of access to the courts, [and First Amendment rights to free speech, religious belief, association and exercise of religious beliefs] the government’s disparate treatment towards me based on poverty, is still unconstitutional under a strict scrutiny basis test.” *Citing, Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004). I require an accommodations for fair access to this court under the circumstances in the form of additional time to avoid additional costs associated with the threat of additional law suits that will create an obstacle to access to the courts as to effectively deny me the first amendment right to petition fairly.

I expected to rejoin my old law firm after standing up for something more important than money in *Kelly v Trump*, my free exercise of religion, exercise of religious and political belief, exercise of religious and political speech, and association as a party, attorney, democrat, and Christian without government incited persecution, but for my exercise of fundamental rights.

The Delaware Order against me and the reciprocating Order creates a government incited economic substantial burden upon me, and prejudices me by forcing me into a maintained state

of poverty by preventing me from seeking to get my former position back at my old law firm as an attorney, or any work as a law firm, and harms my reputation to make me less attractive to employers.

While, poverty is not a suspect class, my right to meaningful access to the courts, despite the inherent burden of poverty, and my religious beliefs and strongly held religious exercise relating to my religious belief against indebtedness are protected. In addition, fundamental rights are implicated.

So, Third-Circuit must have a compelling reason to deny my request for a stay to prevent costs to protect my access to the courts to defend the exercise of my fundamental rights including my religious beliefs narrowly tailored to meet the important justification.

There is no compelling reason to deny my request for a stay. Third-Circuit abused its discretion.

There is no justification narrowly tailored to meet any compelling reason to deny a stay for me to ascertain how I may effectively plead this case while preventing 6 new law suits without the substantial burden of immediate additional costs without adequate time to prevent the same from arising causing a burden so great as to vitiate my 1st Amendment right to petition and 5th Amendment right to access to the courts without intentional discrimination to prevent me from petitioning to defend and prevent the loss of my Constitutional rights.

I must be afforded equal access to the courts as a party of one with unique religious beliefs against money as God and guide, without disparate treatment in violation of my First Amendment right to religious belief and right to exercise my religious beliefs, and 5th Amendment Equal Protections component applicable to the Federal courts based on disdain for my unique religious beliefs.

I must be afforded access to the courts in the form of time and resources by a stay to defend my rights in the civil rights case. The civil rights case arises based on about 20 years of Delaware Courts, their arms or their agents' violations of my private exercise of the First Amendment right to petition, to religious belief, exercise of religious belief, association and unequal protections under the law based on religious-political-poverty or place of origin, and more recently procedural due process violations, witness tampering, intentional infliction of emotional distress resulting in physical manifestation and the 6th Amendment right to self-representation and defamation per se claiming my religious belief in Jesus is a mental disability. Please see 3DI 56 containing documentation of Delaware's misconduct over the course of about 20 years.

The attachments to 3DI 56 I incorporate by reference to the record below outline the State's retaliation against my exercise of the right to petition even before I was barred in DE, compelled violations of my asserted religious belief upon admission, loss of 2 million dollars in expected income over the course of the past two decades, and other compelled violations I incorporate herein by reference.

I will lose my liberties, livelihood, claims and be tempted to lose my eternal life if time is not granted. This law suit also has new and additional claims based on disciplinary proceeding brought by the state of Delaware ("State"), with religious-political-poverty animus to punish me for my exercise of the private 1st Amendment right to petition, religious belief, exercise of religious belief, associate, speech, and to cover up the State's retaliation against me for petitioning the Court to safeguard my rights, predominately of the 1st Amend. right to exercise my religious belief over the course of about 20-years. I incorporate in its entirety the initial-civil-rights complaint I filed, and exhibits thereto. The State retaliated against me for exercising

my 1st Amendment right to petition for relief even prior to bar admission by punishing me for petitioning its partner grant me relief when my DE bar materials were destroyed by a leaky ceiling at the dorm room I resided. I passed the DE Bar on the first try, but lost expected income in the amount of about 2 million dollars over the years based on retaliatory action by the state.

The DE-Supreme Court compelled me to violate my religious belief against swearing in despite my request to affirm upon my admissions to the DE bar . (3DI 56 at Exhibit E). After I learned affirming violates Jesus Christ's teachings I petitioned the DE Supreme Court to be excused from affirming too. (3DI 56 at Exhibit F). The court denied my request violating my 1st amendment right to exercise religious belief. Throughout the years DE Supreme Court members or agents have violated my Constitutional rights by disparate selective treatment. During my first appearance as a lawyer in Court, Judge Smalls called me a Philadelphia lawyer as if PA was a bad word. Former DE Supreme Court Justice told me to go back to PA after a CLE when I stole his thunder by answering a question on recent USSC proceedings not because I am smart, but because I care and listened to public radio. My friend Stephanie Noble had dear eyes. I drafted a contained in the record below petition with the DE Supreme Court and created the bumper-sticker related to this when I ran for office in 2018, attached hereto, along with newspaper articles, one of which shows government agents chilled my speech. (3DI-56 at Exhibit G-H-I)

The State disregarding my request against family-law appointments per my second request to be removed from the roster as against my religious belief, per two Court petitions in 3DI 56 at Exhibits J K.

I petitioned the court in *Kelly v Trump* to alleviate a substantial burden upon my religious belief, and instead of alleviating it, they worsened it and demeaned me for my Bible references per Petition at 7. (3DI 56 at-Ex L)

I ran for local office in 2018. After I lost in 2018, I petitioned the democrats to run for Federal House without violating my religious beliefs with regarding to filing requirements. *See Matthew 6:1-4*. They said no. I filed a lawsuit against the democrats to enjoin them from requiring a filing fee in compelled violation of my religious belief. (3DI-56-Exhibit M) Per a staff member's request I also sent a letter to the US Supreme Court concerning running for president without compelled religious violations. (3DI-56-Exhibit N). Please note in *Kelly v Democrats* I averred a Republican Representative Steve Smyk rescued me when Rep Ron Gray attacked me on Bury the Hatchet Day, despite the fact I am a democrat, showing impartiality and leadership. (3DI-56-Exhibit O).

I have religious and Constitutional objections to certain Delaware Disciplinary rules and the federal rules and Constitutional arguments against lawyer disciplinary proceedings and disciplinary proceedings against federal judges too that are too costly to attach at this time, and yet I and the public have an important interest in maintaining fair impartial courts not controlled by partial selfish interests that inhibit their ability to uphold the impartial Constitutional application to the rule of law.

I asserted these claims as well as new claims that arose after the civil rights case was filed on October 25, 2021 in the Delaware District Court pleadings I appealed, including in the attached Motions for rearguments under FRCP 52, 59 and 60 in the trial court which show I was not afforded notice of the initiation of the disciplinary suit on December 10, 2021 despite the Defendants averring such notice was given. Nor was I afforded an opportunity to self-represent in violations of the 6th Amendment by the appointment of counsel on December 13, 2023, apparently no notice was given to anyone on my behalf on December 10, 2023 as the Board averred. I asserted new compelled violations of my asserted religious exercise under the 1st

Amendment, denied motions to subpoena witnesses, the state's denial of its own rules, concealing evidence in my favor sealing my own pleadings, preventing me access to documents in a case where I am a party and other harm I noted below, but cannot attach them all herein due to printing and mailing costs making it unaffordable given my compelled state of poverty as Defendants prevent me from working in the occupation of my choice and I assert my right against involuntary servitude by invoking the 13th Amendment and the 1st Amendment on religious beliefs and exercise grounds.

I placed the Constitutional challenges to disciplinary proceedings on the record before Third Circuit below and I extended the arguments to prevent regulating the US Supreme Court and federal judges. 3DI-57-58.

Pursuant to US Amend V, I seek a reasonable fair opportunity in the form of additional time to defend the exercise my 1st Amendment right to petition to assert my claims in the civil rights case in order to prevent the permanent loss of the exercise of fundamental rights including my private 1st Amendment right to petition, speech, religious belief, exercise of religious belief, 6th Amendment right to self-represent in state Court, 13th Amendment right against involuntary servitude, harm to health, loss of property interests, 6 new law suit needless law suits with a certain one before the US Supreme Court, loss of licenses, Constitutional arguments against disciplinary proceedings and rules including but not limited to Rules 7, 13, 14, other Constitutional liberties and claims, not by free choice, but government compelled choice, should this court not accommodate me by allowing a stay so as not to forever deprive me of my

religious exercise of belief in Jesus without threat of punishment in DE, and other injuries caused by denial of a time. ¹²

A denial of time vitiates my ability to effectively exercise my 1st Amendment right to petition in this civil rights and in the other-case on appeal effectively vitiating my 1st Amendment right to religious belief, exercise of belief, speech, association, and other claims. Denial by this Court would compel me against my will to lose my First Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus, exercise of belief, 1st Amendment right to petition to safeguard Constitutional liberties and other claims forever in DE as the Delaware Courts and its arms will continue to consider me below the protection of the Constitutional law as they have deemed me unworthy for almost 20 years. (3DI-56)

A stay is required to prevent irreparable injury to me in terms of the loss of my freedom to exercise private 1st Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus Christ in DE, petition, speech, association, 6th Amendment right to self-defense, and licenses under the threat of not being able to buy and sell but for my religious beliefs the state finds repugnant.

I also require a stay to sustain my life and health. I asserted my right to live in all courts and have attached on the record health records and averred that I must assert my right to live under less strenuous circumstances because people have the sin against the holy spirit by the

¹² See, *Centifanti v. Nix*, 865 F.2d 1422 (3d Cir. 1989) (“Suspended attorney who had been denied reinstatement to bar brought civil rights action against Chief Justice and Justices of Pennsylvania Supreme Court alleging various constitutional defects in procedural rules under which Supreme Court considers petitions for reinstatement of suspended attorneys.....The Court of Appeals, Cowen, Circuit Judge, held that: (1) **federal district court had subject-matter jurisdiction**; (2) **district court abused its discretion in denying attorney's motion for leave to amend complaint**; (3) district court properly denied attorney's motion to compel discovery of privileged documents; and (4) attorney's complaint was **not barred by state statute of limitations for tort actions or by principles of res judicata.**”) (emphasis intended).

desire not to want to inconvenience their own for the few to sustain life and health. App. K I have religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare. Id.

A stay would prevent duplicity of potentially conflicting decisions in parallel disciplinary cases and 6 new law suits. All I ask is for a fighting a chance an opportunity to be heard fairly, not a guarantee of justice. US Amend I, V. A stay would 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.

A stay would 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 costs,

A stay would prevent government 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 reflected in my speech contained in my private petitions,

A stay would 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.

A stay would 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

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.

A stay would 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).

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.

The public, the Court and the Defendants are not prejudiced by the stay. 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.

The balance of the equities require a stay to prevent the loss of my fundamental rights

Accordingly, this Court must grant a stay before the United States Supreme Court should this petition be granted. In the alternative, this court must grant a stay should this case be remanded and not merely vacated.

I respectfully request the court order be vacated and my license restored even without remand.

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).

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 2, in the interest of justice, move this Honorable Court to exempt PACER fees for electronic filing before this Honorable Court for case number 22-3372, 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).

The Court not only denied my request but in bad faith based on viewpoint of the petitions to wherein I require the courts and court's staff adhere to and not violate the Constitution the staff and the court threatened me with forced violations of my religious belief but for the exercise of my right to petition and other fundamental rights.

Any costs, taxes or fees costs are unaffordable.

The original disciplinary order from Delaware from which the reciprocal suit by the Eastern District is based adjudicated me inactive/disabled.

The Delaware Order prevents me from working as an attorney. I am unable to seek employment at my former law firm where I would be performing real estate settlements. My former law firm is a great law firm McDonnell and Associates. The people there care about their clients and employees above money.

I am impoverished and am not allowed to work in my profession.

Even if the Order in DE is overturned, the Eastern District's Order may prevent my former firm from rehiring me. They work with others who perform their due diligence to protect clients and the large amounts of money in real estate transactions.

The firm does thorough background checks.

Having any blemish remaining on my license affecting my credibility or appearance of credibility may deem me unemployable.

Since I am poor and unemployed, I do not have money to pay fees. My parents have indicated they have decided to cut off or reduce my inheritance should they die, because of this litigation.

It is against my religious belief to go into debt, especially given I am not permitted to work for pay as an attorney in DE. (See, Bible Romans 13:8. "Owe nothing to anyone, but to love them")

I respectfully request this Court grant me an exemption from costs, fees and taxes in this case, too (1). in order not to compel me to violate my religious beliefs in exchange for access to the courts or (2). suffer an economic substantial burden so great as to deny me access to the courts in defense of my First Amendment liberties, license and related interests and (3). to

prevent government compelled involuntary servitude to sin by making money savior in place of God.

It is my religious belief people should buy and sell by free choice, not by forced choice by artificially man-made government compulsion to be exploited by government backed private or foreign partners in a fixed not free economy. ¹³

I argue compelled debt in my case not only violates the 13th Amendment against involuntary servitude, but violates my private, personal individual religious belief in Jesus, God the father and the holy spirit as guide and God, not money by government compelled force. US Amend I, XIII.

I believe the plans under the UN, G-7 and global agenda violates my religious belief against indebtedness to money and material gain as God at a greater more horrific level, and violates my First Amendment right to religious belief. Creating precedent in this case, may prevent the elimination of not only my Constitutional liberty but the liberty of all Americans protected under Constitutional law. I hope to somehow tie that in to other litigation.

¹³ By fixed I mean lawlessness, making business through entities the standard of care and the letter of the law. This makes businesses above the law and above Court correction. I desire laws that prevent businesses from killing, oppressing, and destroying human life, liberty and health for material gain. The fixed system allows businesses to be above the law by making the experts and the business's standards above government guidance and correction when they destroy and harm other people's lives and liberty. I desire the Judges to judge, not businesses through experts whose aims are exploiting people for money and material gain. Whereas Courts aim is to protect liberty and lives. US Amend I and preamble. Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution vests the judicial Power of the United States in the United States Supreme Court and the federal Courts. Powers may be waived if not exercised. When this Court's relinquishes its powers, it allows the other two branches to lawlessly rule as opposed to serve by lusts like business greed. The other two branches will sacrifice the people, land and resources to private and foreign powers if left unstopped and unrestrained by the rule of Constitutional law. You have the power and authority to prevent war, economic crash and the dismantling of our government, should someone with standing ask.

I believe people teach a lie, despite their ignorance of truth, and sin against God and man for teaching government is a social contract to govern. It is a forced choice upon the populace without a meeting of the minds or consideration. The people's souls are not to be sold by the government through the government backed private or foreign partners to be sacrificed to gain the world. Leaders are charged with caring for the people and protecting their liberty. Misleaders seek to control and exploit for material gain a no longer free people. It is written *Mark 8:36*, "What profits a man to gain the whole world [by money or material gain only to lose his eternal life in the second death to be no more.]"

The contract of government is by those governing who agree to more limited liberty in order to the authority to serve, govern and guide.

I seek to preserve our government with honesty by seeking to unrig the system of corruptions within by requiring the Courts place checks on the other branches of power and their own when those within branches exceed their Constitutional authority and violate the Constitutional laws that protect the people they are charged to serve, not exploit.

There appears to be a societal peer pressured attack against the courts to create lawlessness under the guise of freedom. There appears to be an attack to dismantle the government as opposed to unrig unjust practices which exceeds Constitutional laws that protect the common people.

I seek to preserve our system of government by upholding the Constitution and asking the courts to guide those misguided by lusts under the belief of laws.

I believe that people serve lawless lusts untamed by love or the rule of law when they seek to do what they want regardless on the impact on other people God loves, untamed by the

rule of law or by love. This lawlessness under the pretty words research, science, study, experts, professions or business allows oppression, killing, stealing and destroying the lives and health of others for the bottom line.

I believe we must protect people's seemingly wrong choices too, to disagree with us or think differently. After all we may be the ones who in the dark in need of guidance at times.

The diversity in allowing equal protections of the laws is not sameness but equal protections to believe and exercise belief by the dictates of our conscience within limits to protect other people's life and liberty.

Equal protections under the law is not the dictates of the equal compelled treatment by the US through the BIS, IMF, World Bank, UN or WHO or other entity to force its sameness under the guise of equality, freedom or sacrificing people's life to gain the world.

I believe differently than the UN's collaborative, conditional, conformed agenda which I believe misleads people to harm and I believe damnation in hell by driving out the ability of the people to unconditionally love, under a bank controlled environmental credit and debt system. The stakeholder system gives entities a stake in other people's lives by economic compelled force. A free people are not a piece of property to exploit as chattel for an alleged common interest. US Amend XIII

The global agenda violates my religious beliefs against debt, making every human in debt and indebted as stakeholders in someone else's plan, someone else's will which is not free will or God's will but an economically compelled will. It is so horrific. I am sorry if I am unable to discuss it in current litigation. My hope of a hero remains with the Court to unravel the lawlessness reigned by lusts and desires such as unbridled business greed. I believe there is a

plan in the years to come to eliminate the courts to eliminate the rule of law down the line if left unstopped.

With regards to my plea, the Government is not permitted to discriminate based on religious belief or the viewpoint of my petition wherein I require judges and court staff obey and not violate the law specifically Delaware Justices by denying me access to the courts by requiring my enslavement to debt. See 3DI 56, A-4, A-5

Given my poverty, any fee creates a substantial burden to my access to the courts and my religious-belief against indebtedness.

I am a Christian, a child of God, a believer of Jesus Christ. I believe people sin by debt, focusing their mind, and life towards the aim of gathering money as savior in place of God's desires.

I believe people sin for using money to control others, to do their will, or the government's will by reward, or punishment in terms of fines because I believe this misleads people to hell by making money master, God and guide.

I believe there is a difference between unjust decrees and just decrees. Just decrees care for the people, while protecting their liberty within limits so as to protect the liberty of others. Unjust decrees seek to control people by sacrificing individuals or individual liberty for money, material gain, cost, convenience and other superficial unjust reason, under the lie of caring for the many. See *Isaiah*10:1-3. Unjust laws also teach people to blind their eyes by desire for money gain as savior, from seeing clearly to love others beyond their own.

I believe the United States Supreme Court is misguided into sacrificing individual liberties and individuals for collective interests of businesses or organizations.

Collectively, united by shared interests, we can do no good. Only individuals may do good by unconditional love, reflecting the image of God. Collectively, by shared, united interest in business or other group or entity, we are enslaved to those who tempt us with reward or threat of harm towards our conditional, collective, interests. Entities are not free to do what is right by its bound unified, conditional, collective aims.

The individual is more powerful and may do more good than collective groups, organizations, entities, charities or businesses. Only an individual may lay down his desires, and the desires of men, to think, to know, in order to love, to do what is right to overcome the lusts of men.

I believe that the executive and legislative branch give us a republic by representation through the vote. I believe the Courts give us freedom, in the form of a democracy by protecting individuals and individual liberties from being sacrificed by the majority or collective groups through the vote. I believe the courts are our hope of a hero, in protecting independence required to safeguard Constitutional liberties from being sacrificed on a global level. See *Amos 5:15* and *Matthew 23:23*.

I am quite concerned how countries are sacrificing independence which gives leaders the freedom to care for their people in exchange for collective, conformed purposes, under the UN, the Paris Accord and other agreements which enslave the people by artificial indebtedness to do the will of collective, conditional groups, substantially burdening freedoms.

I believe people go to hell for creating artificial indebtedness which enslaves other people to pay back a debt. That is what the global plans will do if unstopped by the Courts to protect individual liberties. The plans appear to allow central banks, whose shareholders are banks to control the governments by monetary rewards and debts. It is an abomination. The more debt,

and the worse off the people are, the more profit on debt interest and debt control banks gain over governments, businesses, people and countries. The banks have incentive to make people worse off. There appears to be a trend to eliminate the just rule of law in place of the lawlessness spoken of in the bible, through unjust decrees, oppressing, killing, stealing and destroying human life and health to serve business greed, not good. Money and business should not be the law. Money is not freedom, and should not be used by the government to control a no longer free people

My case may grant the Court the ability to safeguard individuals and individual liberties of speech, religious belief, exercise, right to petition regardless of poverty or religious or political affiliation.

Please help me by removing an obstacle by preventing the foreseeable costs upon me that will vitiate my fair access to the courts. Usend I, V. I had no idea I would be fighting potentially up to 6 cases simultaneously, while I sought to defend my exercise of religious-political beliefs, religious-political speech, religious-political association and my religious-political petitions in the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding. Two Courts have decided not to reciprocate discipline.

These additional law suits have increased costs, and caused me to panic, lose sleep, and gain baby white hairs, and have harmed my health given my permanent weakened state due to bad healthcare in my youth wherein I assert my religious exercise to live for God and not die for the wicked evil convenience, vanity and material gain of men in place of God which is idolatry leading to hell by making man's desires and will God in place of God. If I expend all my resources in terms of time, paper and other costs, by defending all cases simultaneously only to

run out of resources, I would be prevented from defending my exercise of fundamental rights in any case to its conclusion.

A lawyer's right, my right to pursue my profession constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and of which I cannot be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the state's disagreement with my religious-political beliefs.

I must be afforded access to the courts to defend my license to practice law from being placed on inactive disabled but for my faith in Jesus Christ, and exercise of fundamental rights.

I am utterly poor. The costs, fees or taxes create a substantial burden and obstacle to my access to the Courts in contravention to my First Amendment right to access to the Courts applicable to the Federal Courts via the Equal Protection component of the 5th Amendment, for me, a member of class of one due to religious beliefs against incurring debt combined and due to utter poverty. See, *Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie*, 239 F.3d 307, 317 (3d Cir. 2001) ("This requires us first to determine whether Appellant is a member of a suspect class or whether a fundamental right is implicated."); *Harris v. McRae*, 448 U.S. 297, 323, (1980) (noting that poverty is not a suspect classification)." (*But see, Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 370 (1996) "[A]t all stages of the proceedings the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses protect [indigent persons] from invidious discriminations."))

"Because this case implicates the [Constitutionally protected] right of access to the courts, [and First Amendment rights to free speech, religious belief, association and exercise of religious beliefs] the government's disparate treatment towards me, based on poverty, is still unconstitutional under a strict scrutiny basis test." *Citing, Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004).

The Supreme Court noted, “There can be no equal justice where the kind of trial a man gets depends on the amount of money he has.” *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 370 (1996); (internal citations omitted)

Justice Stevens, with whom Justice Brennan, Justice Marshall, and Justice Blackmun joined, in dissenting of US Supreme Court in *Murray v. Giarratano*, 492 U.S. 1, 18 (1989) recognized,

“When an indigent is forced to run this gantlet of a preliminary showing of merit, the right to appeal does not comport with fair procedure. . . . [T]he discrimination is not between ‘possibly good and obviously bad cases,’ but between cases where the rich man can require the court to listen to argument of counsel before deciding on the merits, but a poor man cannot. . . . The indigent, where the record is unclear or the errors are hidden, has only the right to a meaningless ritual, while the rich man has a meaningful appeal.” *Douglas*, 372 U.S., at 357-358

I expected to rejoin my old law firm after standing up for something more important than money in *Kelly v Trump*, my free exercise of religion, exercise of religious and political belief, exercise of religious and political speech, and association as a party, attorney, democrat, and Christian without government incited persecution, but for my exercise of fundamental rights.

The Delaware Order against me and the reciprocating Order creates a government incited economic substantial burden upon me, and prejudices me by forcing me into a maintained state of poverty by preventing me from seeking to get my former position back at my old law firm as an attorney, or any work as a law firm, and harms my reputation to make me less attractive to employers.

While, poverty is not a suspect class, my right to meaningful access to the courts, despite the inherent burden of poverty, and my religious beliefs and strongly held religious exercise relating to my religious belief against indebtedness are protected. In addition, fundamental rights are implicated.

So, the Court must have a compelling reason to deny my request for an exemption of the PACER fees to protect my access to the courts to defend the exercise of my fundamental rights including my religious beliefs narrowly tailored to meet the important justification.

There is no compelling reason to deny my request for an extension for a PACER waiver, especially since it will prevent my need to contact the court should the one free glance fail to save.

Nor is any justification narrowly tailored to meet any compelling reason. The Court may grant an exemption and has granted an exemption in another case. This has prevented has the need to call the court to confirm documents were received and filed.

I face an undue burden should this court deny my request, including loss of my First Amendment rights, property interest in my license, loss to my reputation, other damages, loss of employment opportunities and a substantial burden to my access to the courts.

There is no opposing counsel to request a position on.

The United States Supreme Court indicated it is the Court itself I place as the Defendants, which is quite strange.

That is how the Court placed the parties on my appeal from the Third Circuit disciplinary Order, in United States Supreme Court No. 22A 478, which relates to one argument of a case and controversy.

Wherefore I pray this Court overturn the Order below to preserve and not collude in denying me fair access to the courts in contravention of US Amend I, V.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants this petition, vacates the orders below and grants any relief this court deems just including but not limited to granting a stay, remanding the case back

to Third Circuit to hear the merits, and mandating Judge Phipps and Scirica be recused in this case. I respectfully request this Court also limit disciplining the US Supreme Court members and federal judges within the purview of the Constitution of 1. Cases or controversies and 2. Impeachment. My case may very well be the only opportunity for the court to have a legal say outside of wrongfully submitted advisory opinions.

The Constitution affords two means to prevent partiality to self or regulators instead of the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law. That means lawyers and parties like me should be allowed to petition the courts to correct its own misconduct without fear of reprisal for seeking to uphold Constitutional limits and laws even judges are bound to.

Dated: December 26, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
302-493-6693

US Supreme Court Number 283696