

Appendix L

No. 22-7695

Related Application No. 22A981

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In the Matter of Meghan Kelly in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania
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

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

12/7/2023

/s/Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Pro Se
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 278-2975
US Supreme Court No 283696

QUESTION PRESENTED

I. Whether the Court should limit the purview federal judges, specifically the US Supreme Court justices may only be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits of cases and controversy and impeachment in order not to vitiate my right as applied to an impartial fair forum to petition to safeguard not merely my license but my fundamental right to religious belief, speech, association, exercise or belief and other claims but for petitioning the courts to alleviate a substantial government burden upon my religious belief, regarding bar dues, and to correct court misconduct or mistakes, given the great imminent threat to the court arising **November 13, 2023** of its own foolish passing of an Ethics Code and Congressional subpoenas authorized **November 30, 2023** to incriminate Justice Thomas and the court to control and corrupt the court under the guise of cleaning it to ultimately set up a foundation to eliminate it, to eliminate the rule of law and the governments which restrain collective peoples who associate within entities who have no power to do any good by their conditional collective group purpose to unconditionally love unrestrained by the love or the just rule of law from oppressing, stealing, killing and destroying human life, health or liberty to gain the world to lose their souls in the second death hell if the courts through the rule of law do not reverse and stop it.

II. Whether regulating the US Supreme Court, Appellate Courts and District Court judges through Judicial disciplinary proceedings, or an ethics code, including the November 13, 2023 Ethics Code violate Americans and my asserted right to an impartial forum to petition for relief because the courts will be biased towards the regulators even self-regulators instead of the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law.

III. Whether the adoption of a Code of Ethics and the threats to and actual vote authorized to issue subpoenas to Crow and Leo to incriminate Justice Thomas in particular and

the Court in general to pressure it to regulate it, to eliminate it down the line poses a danger to the rule of law that binds our diverse peoples together with respect for one another's freedom to individual diverse exercise of rights, allowing for the overthrow schemed after 2050 by intentional-schemed design.

IV. Whether it is preferable for judges to judge in a case or controversy to impartially not partially consider whether its members or state court sister judges violated the Constitutional asserted rights of the parties to uphold the rule of law and improve the administration of justice, not to destroy the courts while maintaining the authority of the court's power rests on, jurisdiction in a case or controversy to render the impartial rule of law, as opposed bureaucrats, self-regulation, even by professional or judicial partial boards unrestrained by laws in a case or controversy where temptations of partial selfish whims and favoritism to self under the marketing the image of justice becomes more important as opposed to actually seeking to uphold the impartial rule of law to the point it snowballs in the cover up injustices transforming it into many more injustices like the DE case where the court fired court staff, sealed pleadings incited attacks against me to cause me to forgo my right to petition in *Kelly v Trump* because the court cared about its image not truth or the rule of law and the procedural due process violations so great as to void the proceeding

V. Whether the case manager committed a clerical error in not docketing a petition to exempt additional copies of documents despite the fact this US Supreme Court noted it had authority to entertain such motions in *Snider v. All State Administrators*, 414 U.S. 685 (1974), and whether this may be cured by docketing future same motion for the justices of the court to deny or allow.

VI. Whether the Courts staff committed clerical errors that may be cured by neither accepting or rejecting Supplemental Brief submitted in good faith attached hereto without exhibits filed to and necessary to be considered simultaneously with the First Petition for rehearing in deprivation of my 1st, 5th and 6th Amendment fair open access to the courts by not even docketing it or rejecting it with a letter of deficiency with opportunity to correct it pursuant to its custom based on disparate denial in violation of the Equal protections component based on view point and partiality to the courts and not the asserted not waived application of the Constitution to the rule of law. Whether this Court must cure the defect by considering the attached to safeguard not only my rights, but its own position and the rule of law that United States under the imminent threat of an intentional plan to overthrow it sometime after 2050, where the conditions that force the overthrow are made now.

VII. Whether this Court's staff committed a clerical error that may be cured by this courts petition now when it deprived me of access to the courts in deprivation of the 1st Amendment when it refused to docket 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 & license. I also desired clarification on why the submission on 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.*

VIII. Whether the court erred in depriving me access to the courts by delay in docketing cases especially in the civil rights case Kelly v Swartz, 21-3198 by failing to docket a petition for rehearing to Justice Jackson dated March 13, 2023 until about March 28, 2023, about 15 days later in Matter which deprived me of access to this Court to overturn the original disability order this reciprocal order is based, depriving me of an impartial forum to overturn the Order rendering collateral attacks in this case necessary for consideration not deference without deprivation to my access to the courts based on viewpoint of speech with courts rendering partiality to itself instead of the impartial application to the rule of law in my case as applied.

XIV. Whether the court's staff's legal error in making a judicial as opposed to clerical decision by not docketing the application to reopen the case must be cured by considering this petition presented in good faith.

XV Whether PA Clerk committed grave injustice by not docketing my pleadings including a pleading which deprived me of not only access to the courts but deprivation of the fundamental rights for which my license is restrained which may be cured by vacating the PA reciprocal disability inactive order to place the license on retired

LIST OF PARTIES

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

CASES DIRECTLY RELATING TO THIS CASE

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

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

Kelly v Democrats Delaware Chancery Court No 2020-0157.

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

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

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

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

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Question presented.....	ii-iii
Parties.....	iv
Related Cases.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi-viii
Appendix.....	vii-xi
Table of Authorities.....	vii-xi
Statement of Case:.....	1-9
Certificate of Counsel.....	11

APPENDIX

5th Affidavit, filed 12/27/22, dated 12/20/22, regarding PA Supreme Court Clerk Nicole Traini refused to docket Motions, with exhibits thereto including

- Exhibit 1, *Respondent Meghan M Kelly's Second Motion for a stay due to circumstances increasing prejudice and harm, new facts arising necessary to my defense of reciprocal order, and additional questions that require answers in order to defend myself in response to the reciprocal order in the alternative a continuance of 6 months*, December 19, 2022
- Exhibit 2 Motion to correct an error of material fact which regarding discovery of sealed pleadings and efforts to confirm and correct it, regarding threats to the courts and why they are special and not replaceable by automation dated 12/18/22

7th Affidavit, filed dated December 22, 2022 regarding PA state court's unfair proceedings and refusal to docket computer issues, and other impediments requiring an accommodation by the PA State Court including severe dehydration in risk to health and life wherein I asserted my religious exercise to live and opposition to healthcare as that is what made me forever weak. And exhibits thereto

- Exhibit 1 December 28, 2022 letter to regarding PA State court proceeding and the Clerk's failure to docket my pleadings
- Exhibit 2 Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's Motion pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 105 for permission to file unconfirming documents and to compel the acceptance of rejected documents upon the date of their submission, with allowance for opposing counsel to respond,
- Exhibit 3 Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's Motion to compel the acceptance of a specific Motion, not previously identified in my Motion to accept undocketed pleadings
- Exhibit Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion to exempt costs or expenses to Pennsylvania Disciplinary Counsel and/or to the Board if applicable due to utter poverty, and due to foreseeable costs creating a substantial burden upon Petitioner's access to the courts and forced violation of her religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness and additional relief
- Certificate of service to 5 Five, PA Office of Disciplinary counsel or staff against me
- Exhibit 4 email grievance committee
- Cert of service for affidavit.....11

18th Affidavit regarding delay in docketing interim application for a stay to Justice Jackson until about 15 days later which deprived me of access to the courts for other matters including the appeal of the original DE Disciplinary Order for which this reciprocating order is based, and exhibits thereto

- Exhibit A Emergency application to Justice Jackson on March 13, 2023
- Exhibit B After about a week with no confirmation from the court of receipt of the March 13, 2023 filing which should have been received on March 16, 2023, I sent out the

second request for the Emergency Application to be resubmitted to Justice Jackson on March 21, 2023, which was physically received March 23, 2023, yet not recognized yet

- Exhibit C The postal tracking receipt Confirms second attempt to file without delay showing delivery information
- Exhibit D Court docket showing as of March 28, 2023 the applications submitted March 13 and March 21 were not docketed 15 days later as of March 28, 2023
- Exhibit E Emails to the court to alleviate prejudice by expediting review of the delayed docketing in order not to vitiate my access to other courts
- Exhibit F emails concerning the Clerk’s office staff noting there was a glitch in the system, and emails concerning the importance of the Third Circuit appeal the US Supreme Court denied
- Exhibit G After emailing and leaving messages it looks like the Court filed the March 13 application to Justice Jackson today, and rejected the March 21, 2023 as of March 28, 2023.
- Exhibit H emails to David Weiss.....10

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

- Exhibit A Emails delay in docketing and the irreparable injury I face at delays
- Exhibit 1 Proof submission 3/21/23, second application to justice Jackson disparately deleted
- Exhibit 2 Different electronic proof of electronic submission rejected from filing but not deleted
- Exhibit B Letter dated July 21, 2021 in *Kelly v Trump* where I expressed concerns to the Delaware Supreme Court concerning the elimination of fiat currency in the letter
- Exhibit C Fed Now Central bank eliminating small banks and the human component down the line
- Press Release by Federal reserve dated March 15, 2023 indicating FedNow would be unleashed April 2023
- BlackRock Delaware entity information
- Artesian and other water sources information
- Wireless entity information stocks
- Exhibit E letter indiacting March 28 2023 application to Justice Jackson were removed and returned from the docket for case Numbers 22A747 and 22-6783

- Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Application to the Honorable Justice Alito to place exhibits back on the Docket to prevent the deprivation of her 5th Amendment Equal Protections and procedural due process right to a full and fair opportunity to be heard without selective, arbitrary, disparate, unfavorable treatment towards her as applied, and to preserve her 6th Amendment right, No. 22-6783, No 22A 747
- March 28, 2023 letter returning second letter, with note March 13 letter not docketed until March 28, delays deprived me of access to other courts as I alleged, irreparable injury occurred and worsens.....10

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

- Exhibit A, Third Circuit update by letter dated April 18, 2023 per their order requesting updates
- Exhibit B Docket No 22A747 and 22-6783 conference was moved but still too late
- Exhibit C April 17, 2023 letter by US Supreme Court
- Application to withdraw petition before judgment and application since relief is too late opportunity to exercise asserted right to access to other courts already vitiated with the 3rd Circuit expedition and pending due dates an impossibility for me
- Exhibit D Feb 7, 2023 Letter, writ of cert postmarked Jan 30, 2023 and received Feb 2, 2023 returned because I filed the petition for more pages first and not with the petition which broke my heart
- Exhibit E PA Retirement dated 5/16/18
- Exhibit F Eastern District Court for the District of PA proof showing I thought I was retired and noted it in its pleadings
- Exhibit G Order setting me up indicating retirement in PA makes me retired in Eastern District Court which is untrue, Court setting me up knowing the law and the fact I did not have easy access to it especially since I turned in my tags as car insurance was unaffordable at te time along with gas
- Exhibit H letter confirming I was not disciplined by its court, email confirming I was not disciplined
- Exhibit I Letter Oct 10, 2022 letter status of motions and advising the court of my needs to sustain my life and health and my assertion of my religious right to live not to harm my health of life for the wicked vanity, convenience and material gain of those who commit human sacrifice for moth and rust, the mark of the beast, noting collapsing at the post office and being rescued by a stranger with water from my bike
- Exhibit A email my transportation bike got a flat
- Exhibit B email to opposing counsel and pictures of the bike
- Exhibit C Sept 3, 2022 Letter to where PA ODC Anthony Sodroski requesting a stay to prevent irreparable injury.
- Exhibit D PA ODC response by Anthony Sodroksi unreasonably opposing my request for a stay

- Exhibit E proof and assertion of my belief people will be thrown into the fires of hell for not respecting my assertions of health and life and my religious objection to healthcare and mental healthcare, and proposal of improving are terrible healthcare, transcripts, bad treatment record that weakened me for life
- Exhibit F Police showing someone tried to shoot and kill my friend and his wife by two bullets entering their home as they sat at the table and they went over their head for their political beliefs, this is not normal
- Picture someone threw substance at my car for my political religious speech contained on the stickers on my car
- Proof submission to Eastern District Court
- Opinion by Third Circuit, delay in docketing made it too late for me to petition DE order. I needed time given my meager resources, and use of those resources for one thing at a time.
- Exhibit K eye injury I was scared I might go blind, in the petition for more time Alito denied it despite injury to my health.
- Exhibit L E-mail
- Cert of Service.....10
- **126th Affidavit** regarding belief of an overthrow which will use bankruptcy remote entities, concern about the Spicer case, and the PA judges who imprisoned black children for profit in PA.....**2**
- **127th affidavit** concern of deprivation of access to the US Supreme Court and notation of another case where documents were denied due to delays in docketing.....**2**

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

- Letter To Donald Baker dated December 4, 2023
- News Article posted in Desert News, *Senate Judiciary Committee issues subpoenas to private citizens connected to Clarence Thomas*, By Eva Terry, dated Thu, November 30, 2023 at 8:28 PM EST
- Exhibit 1 Certificate of Receipt of December 1, 2023 filing of Second Petition for a rehearing, postal tracking, pictures of boxes dropped off, US Police receipt
- *PETITIONER MEGHAN KELLY' SECOND PETITION FOR A REHEARING ON DENIAL OF A WRIT OF CERTIORI LIMITED TO INTERVENING CAUSES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT CONCERNING MY ARGUMENTS AND OTHER CLAIMS NOT PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED WHICH MAY VITIATE MY RIGHTS SHOULD THE COURT NOT HEAR THIS REHEARING*, dated Nov. 30, 2023
- *124th Affidavit*, dated 11/24//23, wherein I discuss denials of other documents which appeared in deprivation of my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts by PA Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court including the attached motion at
- Exhibit B, *Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly's Motion for an exemption from the requirement to serve 10 paper copies of pleadings with this Court pursuant to Rule 12(2), 29(1), and 39(2), by the filing of one paper copy, and in addition to, or in the alternative of, permission to serve the United States Supreme Court electronically without a paper copy for future filings, due to costs relating to printing, mailing and transporting pleadings to*

the Post Office, creating a substantial burden upon my access to the Court's to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, and forced violation of religious beliefs by the threat of indebtedness

- Letter denying motion despite case indicating the court has jurisdiction to grant the relief, Snider v. All State Administrators, 414 U.S. 685 (1974), albeit it denied it under the facts of that case.
- Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly's Supplemental Brief to provide additional information not previously available on how private partnerships with the UN is schemed to be used to eliminate judicial authority in open and by stealth, Petitioner's belief the courts are in danger especially with the debt ceiling approaching November 17, 2023 with no agreement to date, and the convening of Congress October 19, 2023 to attack Justice Thomas and the integrity of the court by subpoenaing witnesses to be used against Justice Thomas and the Court, submitted Nov. 6, 2023.....3, 4, 6, 7, 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Article

Chicago Kent Law review, Volume 65 Issue 3, Art 13. *Rehearing SUA Sponte in the U.S. Supreme Court: A Procedure for Judicial Policymaking*, by Rosemary Krimbel, dated October 1989.....2.

Case Law

Becker v. Montgomery, 532 U.S. 757, 767 (2001).....7

Borough of Duryea v. Guarnieri, 564 U.S. 379 (2011).....8-9

Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada, 501 U.S. 1030, 1054 (1991).....12.

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 177, 2 L. Ed. 60 (1803).....8

Phillips v. Negley, 117 U.S. 665.....6

Snider v. All State Administrators, 414 U.S. 685 (1974).....10

St. L. S.F.R.R. v. Spiller, 275 U.S. 156 (1927).....6

Stokes v. Delo, 495 U.S. 320, 323 (1990).....6, 9

United States v. Finnell, 185 U.S. 236 (1902).....6, 12

United States v. Mitchell, 20 F.3d 1480.....7

U.S. v. Mohawk, 20 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1994)7

Wetmore v. Karrick, 205 U.S. 141, 142 (1907).....6

Constitution

US Amend I.....1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8

US Amend V.....1, 2, 8

US Amend VI.....1, 8

US Amend XIII.....1, 8

US Amend XIV.....1, 5, 6, 8

Statute

42 USCS § 2000bb-bb4 RFRA.....1

US Supreme Court Rules

Supreme Court Rule 441

STATEMENT OF CASE

I, Meghan Kelly, Esq., pro se pursuant to Rule 44 respectfully move this Court for a rehearing on the **November 13th Order** denying petition for rehearing on this court's order denying my petition of writ of certiorari, **submitted October 18, 2023** to consider intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect concerning my arguments and other claims not previously considered **which have arisen since I submitted the First Petition for Rehearing dated 10/18/23 to** overturn the PA Supreme Court Order reciprocating DE discipline by placing my license to practice law on inactive disabled but for my petitions relating to bar dues and in a Religious Freedom Restoration law suit *Kelly v Trump*. (See US Supreme Court Case No. 21-5522)

I submit this petition 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 PA reciprocal Order is eliminated. And this Court must overturn the PA Order placing my license on inactive disabled. 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.

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 State Courts must not chill claimants, specifically me, for asserting my rights from infringement by the court to serve personal interests in egos or material gain.

On October 18, 2023, I filed a petition for rehearing.

On November 6, 2023, I submitted *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* ("Supplemental Brief").

I also sent Clerk Robert Meek electronic versions of the Supplemental Brief via email on November 6, 2023.

Nevertheless, despite the US Police confirming it would be docketed prior to November 9, 2023, it was not.

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 received this November 20, 2023 but returned it in error. In *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."

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 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”

However, I am deprived of the First Amendment access to the courts when the courts do not docket colorable pleadings by mistake or by whim. 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 ask this Court to cure the defect by reopening the case to consider the Supplemental brief.

The Court in *United States v. Mitchell*, 20 F.3d 1480"held, “extreme delay in the processing of an appeal may amount to a violation of due process." *U.S. v. Mohawk*, 20 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1994)

To date, the court has neither docketed nor rejected my supplemental brief dated November 6, 2023 with a letter outlining any deficiency and an opportunity to cure. It has been more than an entire month.

Early morning on December 1, 2023 I dropped off and submitted a Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Second Petition for a rehearing, dated November 30, 2023, I attach hereto without exhibits.

In the petition, I request this Honorable Court cure its defect by considering the November 6, 2023 Supplemental Brief this court neither accepted nor rejected.

Should this Court reject the Supplemental brief as opposed to cure the defect in the lack of the judge's consideration by failure to docket I require notice and an opportunity to correct any deficiencies of my good faith submission. *See Becker v. Montgomery*, 532 U.S. 757, 767 (2001).

On December 6, 2023, I checked with Case Manager to check on the status of the Second Petition. I indicated further delays in docketing may vitiate my access to the courts in further violation of my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts causing irreparable injury in terms of loss of First Amendment right to religious belief without government persecution because my petitions to safeguard my belief is inconvenient to the government.

The Second Petition for a Rehearing on the Court's **11/13/23 determination** in denying rehearing by granting writ of cert. I submitted in good faith with additional arguments relating to other **matters arising after 10/18/23** I do not have room to fit in here was rejected.

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 request this court consider the Second Petition for a rehearing, attached hereto without exhibits to prevent manifest injustice by vitiating my fundamental rights without a full or fair opportunity to be heard given the disability status and the facts of this case.

I also sent Clerks Meek and Baker requests to hold onto the paper copies pending this petition, with a letter attached hereto sent separately to Baker. On 12/6/23, I also emailed Clerks Meek and Baker electronic copies of the Second Petition for rehearing that must be considered in the interest of justice so as not to vitiate my fundamental rights and to safeguard these United States from a schemed overthrow since it is an impossibility to print it out in a day to submit by the deadline under my circumstances.

I newly realized after looking at a similar case discussed in Affidavit 127 relating to similar issues, this Supreme Court’s staff previously appeared to deny my 1st Amendment right to petition and access to the courts fairly by not docketed a slew of other motions I refer to in attached to the Second Petition, and refer to in the 124th Affidavit attached hereto, including a motion to exempt copies under unique grounds.

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. I will likely need to file this again and defects may be cured by docketing and allowing the court to grant or deny it. It is unfair when I am denied access to the court. Permitting me to file this motion in future case with judicial consideration cures past wrongs with correction without destruction of those who make mistakes and prevents additional manifest injustice.

This Court erred in depriving me access to the courts by delay in docketing cases especially in the civil rights case *Kelly v Swartz*, 21-3198 by failing to docket a petition for rehearing to Justice Jackson dated March 13, 2023 until about March 28, 2023, about 15 days later in Matter which deprived me of access to this Court to overturn the original disability order this reciprocal order is based, depriving me of an impartial forum to overturn the Order rendering collateral attacks in this case necessary for consideration not deference without deprivation to my access to the courts based on viewpoint of speech with courts rendering partiality to itself instead of the impartial application to the rule of law in my case as applied. (18th, 19th, 26th, Affidavits attached hereto)

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 on the electronic docket incorporate herein by reference and in paper copies the Court retains. 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.

The denial of access to the courts deprived me of a fair proceeding and procedural due process under the facts and request the PA Order be vacated. *Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada*, 501 U.S. 1030.

Despite my good faith invocation of the right to a fair proceeding under the 14th, the PA Clerk refused to docket my petition because my 1st Amendment rights applicable to the Sate via the 14th 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 clerk to deprive me of asserted fundamental rights by performing a judicial function. This error is structural requiring the PA Order be vacated.

Wherefore I pray this Court grants this petition.

1/7/23

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939,
(302) 278-2975
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com,
US Supreme Court Number 283696