

MEGHAN KELLY, ESQ.

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

Meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Sent Via E-Mail (dbaker@supremecourt.gov)

Mr. Donald Baker

Supreme Court of the United States

Clerk's Office

1 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20543

RE: Case Number No. 22-7695 Meghan Marie Kelly, Applicant v. Pennsylvania Office of
Disciplinary Counsel, Supplemental Brief

December 4, 2023

Dear Clerk Baker:

US Supreme Court case manager Lisa Nesbett recommended I contact you concerning the Supplemental brief in Matter . When I spoke with her this morning she kindly indicated she was the one to contact regarding petitions for rehearing.

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

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* ("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. 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 Cour.

The Court receive 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 *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, and cases therein cited. "

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, despite the error in the US Police Court stamp dated November 31, 2023 on the docket. There are only 30 days in November this year.

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 almost an entire month ago.

Early morning on December 1, 2023 I dropped off and submitted a *PETITIONER MEGHAN KELLY' SECOND PETITON 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 November 30, 2023.

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).

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.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

December 4, 2023

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939,

(302) 278-2975

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com,

US Supreme Court Number 283696


(1,071 words)

Under Religious objection I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct

Dated: Dec. 4, 2023

Meghan Kelly

(printed)



(signed)

Advertisement



DeseretNews

Senate Judiciary Committee issues subpoenas to private citizens connected to Clarence Thomas

Eva Terry

Thu, November 30, 2023 at 8:28 PM EST · 4 min read



39



Members of the Supreme Court sit for a new group portrait at the Supreme Court building in Washington on Oct. 7, 2022. Bottom row, from left, Justice Sonia Sotomayor, Justice Clarence Thomas, Chief Justice John Roberts, Justice Samuel Alito, and Justice Elena Kagan. Top row, from left, Just ... [More](#)

The [Senate Judiciary Committee](#) authorized subpoenas Thursday morning for GOP donor [Harlan Crow](#) and co-chairman of The Federalist [Leonard Leo](#) over their paying for trips for Supreme Court Justices Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito.

Republicans, including Utah Sen. Mike Lee, said the subpoenas were politically motivated, given that the two private individuals who the senators are seeking information from are prominent conservatives.

“Democrats are breaking the Senate Judiciary Committee rules to issue

information, including the full extent of payments, gifts, travel and lodging given to Supreme Court justices, per the [committee's website](#).

In a Nov. 2 [press release](#), Durbin said he was requesting subpoenas to investigate news stories about trips and other gifts to the justices.

Clarence Thomas says he was advised personal trips need not be reported

Thomas released a [statement](#) on April 7 saying he did not report family trips due to being “advised that this sort of personal hospitality from close personal friends, who did not have business before the Court, was not reportable.” Since Supreme Court financial guidelines changed, Thomas said, “It is, of course, my intent to follow this guidance in the future.”

During the [Senate Judiciary Committee hearing](#) Thursday, Durbin said, “Both Leonard Leo and Harlan Crow are central players in this crisis. Their attempts to thwart the legitimate oversight efforts of Congress should concern all of us.”

Though Crow and Leo are connected to Alito and Thomas, [The Washington Examiner](#) reported there is zero evidence their travel together influenced the justices' votes.

GOP senators argued the subpoenas are partisan and unnecessary

During the hearing, Sen. Mike Lee, R-Utah., said though Crow was under no obligation to, he “offered five years of his documents” to the court, which were deemed insufficient.

Lee added that on Nov. 9, a committee chairman said ethics issues within the Supreme Court should be dealt with within the judicial branch, saying, “It is within the power of the chief justice and his fellow justices to solve this problem before noon today, and they should have done so a long time ago.”

The Supreme Court issued a new [code of conduct](#) on Nov. 13 that all nine Supreme Court justices signed. Lee said, “I haven't heard anyone describe it as inadequate or insufficient. Wasn't that the entire condition of precedent for this committee even considering that?”

The subpoenas are issued to private citizens, and Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas., asked Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., “Are you familiar with any legitimate legislative purpose for subpoenaing private citizens?”

Clarence Thomas' reputation," Graham responded. He claimed since both Leo and Crow are prominent, public conservatives who are on "the top of the 'guy I hate most' list," the subpoenas are "politically motivated, not legislatively motivated."

[ProPublica](#), a newsroom [funded by progressive donors](#), said on Aug. 10 that Thomas took trips paid for by friends "who share the ideology that drives his jurisprudence."

Durbin contrasts the subpoena request to Crossfire Hurricane

Durbin contrasted the request to subpoena Crow and Leo with Republicans authorizing subpoenas for over 50 named people and an unlimited number of unnamed people in 2020.

The difference between the two subpoena requests was that the Senate Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the FBI, and documents were needed to figure out how Crossfire Hurricane "got off the rails." Meanwhile, GOP Senate Judiciary Committee members argue that Thomas and Alito's personal travels are outside of their jurisdiction.

If Leo and Crow refuse the subpoenas, the Senate will vote on whether to enforce them. If fewer than 60 senators vote to move forward with enforcement, the subpoenas will be nullified.

 [View comments \(39\)](#)

Up next

Exhibit 1

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


**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF PETITIONER MEGHAN KELLY'S
SECOND PETITION FOR A REHEARING ON DENIAL OF A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
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**

I Meghan Kelly, Esq., certify that on Dec. 1, 2023 I sent the above

referenced document to the following addressee via US Mail

Harriet R. Brumberg
Office of Disciplinary Counsel
1601 Market Street 3320
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Dated Dec 1, 2023

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

Under Religious Protest, I declare that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

Dated: Dec. 1, 2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)

 (signed)



DAGSBORO
 28290 CLAYTON ST
 DAGSBORO, DE 19939-9998
 (800)275-8777

12/01/2023

01:45 PM

Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
Priority Mail® Med FR Box Philadelphia, PA 19103 Flat Rate Expected Delivery Date Mon 12/04/2023 Tracking #: 9505 5153 8866 3335 4676 71	1		\$17.10
Insurance Up to \$100.00 included			\$0.00
Affixed Postage Affixed Amount: \$15.18			-\$15.18
Total			\$1.92
Grand Total:			\$1.92
Cash			\$5.00
Change			-\$3.08

Text your tracking number to 28777 (2USPS) to get the latest status. Standard Message and Data rates may apply. You may also visit www.usps.com USPS Tracking or call 1-800-222-1811.

Save this receipt as evidence of insurance. For information on filing an insurance claim go to <https://www.usps.com/help/claims.htm> or call 1-800-222-1811

Preview your Mail
 Track your Packages
 Sign up for FREE @
<https://informedelivery.usps.com>

All sales final on stamps and postage.
 Refunds for guaranteed services only.
 Thank you for your business.

Tell us about your experience.
 Go to: <https://postalexperience.com/Pos>
 or scan this code with your mobile device,



or call 1-800-410-7420.

UFN: 091430-0939
 Receipt #: 840-50800226-1-4050040-2
 Clerk: 03

Shipping Labels
everything underneath

EP/382

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT U.S.
POLICE OFFICE

2023 NOV 31 A 9:34

EP/382

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT U.S.
POLICE OFFICE

2023 NOV 31 A 9:34

Dec. 1, 2023

there is no Nov. 31 this month

MK.



EP/382

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT U.S.
2023 NOV 21 A 9 28

EP/382

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT U.S.
2023 NOV 21 A 9 28

EP/382

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT U.S.
2023 NOV 21 A 9 28

EP/382

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT U.S.
2023 NOV 21 A 9 28

EP/382

EP/382

AT USPS.COM
supplies on line

TRACKED - MEDIA

MEDIUM



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' 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**

November 30, 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. Should this Court grant my request for a rehearing under Rule 44 because intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect have arisen relating to my arguments in the petition at Question IX, pages 6-14, wherein I argued this court must limit discipline of the US Supreme Court justices to the purview of the Constitution to 1) cases and controversies, 2) and impeachment, without waiver of the 5th Amendment right to self-incrimination in order not to violate my fundamental 1st Amendment right to petition to defend my religious beliefs as a party of one based on retaliation for correcting judicial mistakes or misconduct but for government animus for my religious-political beliefs by placing my retired license on inactive disabled retired, including the Court's passage of a judicial Code dated November 13, 2023.

II. Should this Court grant my request for a rehearing under Rule 44 because intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect have arisen relating to my arguments contained in the supplemental brief submitted to the court in person, via email to Emergency Clerk and electronically on November 6, 2023, which was neither accepted or rejected or reopened per my Application swiftly filed on November 15, 2023 in deprivation of my 1st Amendment right to petition and opportunity to be heard fully at the November 13, 2023 conference by not accepting or rejecting my Supplemental Brief containing new and additional information necessary for the outcome of the conference, or providing a rejection with sufficient notice of defects and opportunity to cure defects in accordance with case law.

III. Whether this Court violated my right to procedural due process by not docketing previous petitions it docketed in other cases without sufficient notice as to the reasons why the items were not docketed but mere vague cites the rules do not permit filing of this, given this

Court indicated it has jurisdiction to hear a certain petition in another case in violation of Equal protections, procedural due process and the 1st Amendment right to petition before vitiating underlying fundamental rights and other claims,

IV. Given I preserved the claim Justice Alito's denial of time prevented me from including additional claims should I be permitted to include the additional claims including the Claim the Clerk of the PA Supreme Court violated my right to procedural due process by committing a structural error by not docketing certain motions in violation of my 1st Amendment right to petition applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th, and the 14th Amendment right to a fair proceeding.

V. Whether the PA reciprocal Order, which is based on a defective DE Order is void or voidable due to clear violations of my Constitutional rights by the State of Delaware's Supreme Court and the Board the reciprocal PA Order of disability retired is based given I was not previously able to provide these arguments due to the deprivation of a time needed due to Justice Alito's denial of time.

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

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

- Exhibit 1 docket Petitioner’s Motion to Correct an error in Kelly’s petition for writ of certiorari in Kelly v PA ODC No. 22-7695, dated 9/6/23
- Exhibit A thereto, the Federal reserve reduced the limit of reserves to 0 instead of the normal 10 percent setting up banks to crash
- Exhibit B Great Narrative excerpts about eliminating paper money, and eliminating the rule of law’s restraints on central banks control of money and debt
- Exhibit C Senator Whitehouse’s complaint and Attorney Rivken’s Rebuttal
- Exhibit 2 Email to Robert Meek and opposing counsel with copies of the November 6, 2023 filings dated Sept. 6, 2023
- Exhibit 3 Proof of Mailing the Sept. 6, 2023 supplemental brief to opposing counsel sheet for Kelly v PA ODC, 22A478.....4, 5

104th Affidavit and Exhibits thereto including

- Exhibit A Email notification indicating my petition was converted into a mere application of for more pages. In Kelly v Patricia B. Swartz, No. 23A361, with docket.
- Exhibit B January 27, 2023 rejection of my Petition to exceed the page limit for the appeal of the original DE Disciplinary rejected with other motions
- Exhibit February 7, 2023 rejection of my petition in the DE case since I filed the petition of more pages prior to and not simultaneously therewith
- Exhibit December 2, 2022 letter rejecting leave to file a different motion for in forma pauperis dated December 2, 2022
- Exhibit D 101st Affidavit, with exhibits thereto including the 3 electronic receipts of filing in the civil rights case in Exhibits 1,
- Exhibit 2, email, with attachments of submission if civil rights case
- Exhibit 3, Docket PA this matter as of 5/9/2023, docket corrected, Certificate of Compliance PA case
- Exhibit 4 US Supreme Court drop of receipts dated October 18, 2023 of PA and civil rights filings
- Exhibit 5 pictures of the boxes I dropped off, Exhibit 6 Pictures of vultures destroying the house by ripping off shingles
- Exhibit D Robert Meek Corrected PA filing defect to preserve my 1st, 5th and 6th Amendment rights
- Exhibit E 30th Affidavit regarding the 11th and 12th Affidavits in this PA case missing
- Letter to resubmit Justice Alito denied application to correct the docket to Justice Jackson

- 96th Affidavit US Supreme Court clerk indicated I may use more than one electronic filing
- Exhibit 1 email with petition for a rehearing
- Exhibit 2 October 5, 2023 letter Box 3, and email
- Exhibit 3 October 5, 2023 letter Box 2, and email
- Exhibit 4 Electronic filings connected with civil rights submission of 33 boxes
- Exhibit 5 October 2, 2023 Letter petition denied
- Exhibit 6 Docket sheet in this case
- Cert of service of internal exhibit
- Exhibit F email regarding filing civil rights case
- Exhibit G electronic copies of civil rights case submitted to Robert Meek of the US Supreme Court
- And Cert of Service.....4, 5, 9

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

- Receipt of November 6, 2023 11 boxes of the supplemental brief stating “Received Supreme Court Police Office November 6 P 7:19
- Email to Emergency Supreme Court Clerk Robert Meek, dated November 15, 2023 regarding I submitted and mailed out an Emergency Application to reopen 22-7695 to consider Supplemental Brief filed 11/6/23 in order not to deprive me of 1st Amend right to petition fully & fairly in accordance w/5th Amend before eliminating 1st Amend rights to religious beliefs & license
- Attachment of Emergency Application to reopen 22-7695 to consider Supplemental Brief filed 11/6/23 in order not to deprive me of 1st Amend right to petition fully & fairly in accordance w/5th Amend before eliminating 1st Amend rights to religious beliefs & license
- Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly’s Supplemental Brief to provide additional information not previously available on how private partnerships with the UN is schemed to be used to eliminate judicial authority in open and by stealth, Petitioner’s belief the courts are in danger especially with the debt ceiling approaching November 17, 2023 with no agreement to date, and the convening of Congress October 19, 2023 to attack Justice Thomas and the integrity of the court by subpoenaing witnesses to be used against Justice Thomas and the Court, submitted November 6, 2023, excluding the exhibits thereto
- PDF of US Police Office’s receipt dated Nov. 6, 2023
- PETITION FOR A REHEARING ON DENIAL OF A WRIT OF CERTIORI LIMITED TO INTERVENING CAUSES OF SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT CONCERNING MY ARGUMENTS WHICH MAY VITIATE MY RIGHTS SHOULD THE COURT NOT HEAR THIS REHEARING, dated 10/10/23
- Petitioner Respondent Meghan Kelly’s petition for writ of certiorari to appeal the Pennsylvania Supreme Court dated February 28, 2023, submitted May 30, 2023
- Email to Lisa Dolph DE Supreme Court Clerk regarding an update on public status
- 14th Affidavit exhibits thereto,

- Exhibit 1 thereto US Supreme Court docket Sheet dated 11/13/23 showing the Nov 6, 2023 Supplemental Brief was not docketed to be considered,
- Exhibit 2 News Article US Supreme Court passed a code of ethics,
- Attached code of ethics, dated November 13, 2023
- Exhibit 3 Newspaper articles regarding Congress’s censorship of Congress person Rashida Tlaib’s representative viewpoint in deprivation of a segment of her constituents representation,
- Exhibit 4 and 5 concerning the creation of the Federal Reserve, 16th Amendment and Income Tax in 1913, the creation of the IRS in 1953 regarding beliefs contained in affidavit
- E-mail to Robert Meek Nov 6, 2023 email request that Robert Meek present the emailed version to the justices and my request they be submitted in an expedited fashion so as not to deprive me of the opportunity to be heard
- 92nd Affidavit regarding meg’s concerning about preserving the checks and balances by preserving the pay of the court in a shut down and thoughts on a lawsuit against Biden and Yellen to preserve their pay
- Certificate of Service of Application with postage receipt.....2, 3
- **121st Affidavit, dated 11/19/23, (DI 257) regarding the DE District Court preserved and did not violate the 1st and 5th Amendment by deprivation by constructively staying and not assigning the disciplinary case as outlined in the 72nd affidavit which is attached, and exhibits thereto including**
- Email to David Rivkin concerning joining the PA case with forwarded emails from opposing counsel and the court,
- Article concerning the Senate Judiciary delays votes on subpoenas over Supreme Court Ethics, dated Nov. 9, 2023,
- the 72nd affidavit dated 8/24/23
- Civil Case Reciprocal docket IMO Kelly 22-341 in DE District Court
- Docket Item 13 of Case 22-341, Order /28/23 transferring my retired PA license which has been retired from PA since 2018 from retired to inactive disabled retired
- Docket Item 14 from PA order denying a slew of motions including motion to place on the docket motions not docketed.
- Certificate of service dated 11/19/23.....

123rd Affidavit, dated Nov 22, 2023, DI 259 regarding concerns about government backed religious views, mistakes by Courts that are deadly and the use of bankruptcy remote entities to conceal bad debt to be resold in a criminal scheme to prevent central banks and non-government entities from being scathed in an economic crash and to be used as a tool to overthrow the government, filed under seal under DI 260.....2, 3, 4, 6

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

- Exhibit A filings in red not accessible to me on the electronic filing system

- Exhibit B , *Petitioner Meghan M. Kelly’s Motion for an exemption from the requirement to serve 10 paper copies of pleadings with this Court pursuant to Rule 12(2), 29(1), and 39(2), by the filing of one paper copy, and in addition to, or in the alternative of, permission to serve the United States Supreme Court electronically without a paper copy for future filings, due to costs relating to printing, mailing and transporting pleadings to the Post Office, creating a substantial burden upon my access to the Court’s to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, and forced violation of religious beliefs by the threat of indebtedness* submitted to the US Supreme Court but not docketed and letter of return
- Exhibit C *Petitioner Meghan M Kelly’s Motion for permission to use electronic filing before this Honorable Court, even if my active license to practice law is suspended, in representing myself, in appeals of State Disability Proceedings and in a potential Disability proceeding before this Court, and in all proceedings I act pro se in, including civil rights proceedings and for a waiver of the paper original requirement, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights* was similarly rejected for filing per the attached letter.
- Exhibit D *undocketed Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Motion for Leave to file Different in Forma Pauperis Motion to waive costs due to utter poverty, and due to foreseeable costs creating a substantial burden upon Petitioner’s access to the courts and forced violation of her religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness*
- Exhibit E *undocketed Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Motion to exempt costs and waive Court fees under Supreme Court Rules 38 and 43 eliminate people lawyers and people judges by creating a foundation of immunity from debt or responsibility*
- Letter to the US Supreme Court invoking the 5th Amendment wherein the US Supreme Court indicated they did not want any more boxes and to stop sending them reciprocal discipline or disciplinary documents. The Court indicated my invocation of the 5th was sufficient.
- Law review article where the US Supreme Court accepted multiple petitions for rehearing and sua sponte accepted previously denied petitions by reopening cases
- Email to opposing counsel.....2, 3, 5

125th Affidavit (DI 263) regarding US Supreme Court Emergency Clerk’s return of application submitted November 15, 2023 *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.....2*

Petitioner Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Civil rights complaints and District Court Exhibits excluding exhibits relating to the filings available on the public Docket 22-5522 Kelly v Trump, US Supreme Court.....8

Petitioner Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Petition for Leave to exceed the page limit in her Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit Case No 21-3198, Kelly v Swartz US Supreme Court appeal in the civil rights case, and Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Opening Brief moving the US Supreme Court to vacate the Third Circuit’s Orders dismissing the case under Younger, denying recusals of Judge Scirica and Phipps and to remand the matter to the Delaware District Court for consideration in the civil rights case.....8-9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Bible

Isaiah 14.....5
Matthew 6:24.....8

Case Law

Arizona v. Fulminante, 499 U.S. 279, 309 (1991).....7
Becker v. Montgomery, 532 U.S. 757, 767 (2001).....3
Borough of Duryea v. Guarnieri, 564 U.S. 379 (2011).....3, 4, 8
Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada, 501 U.S. 1030, 1054 (1991).....9
Greene v. McElroy, 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959).....8-9
In Greer v. United States, 141 S. Ct. 2090, 2100 (2021).....7
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 177, 2 L. Ed. 60 (1803).....3
Snider v. All State Administrators, 414 U.S. 685 (1974).....4
Stokes v. Delo, 495 U.S. 320, 323 (1990).....4
United States v. Finnell, 185 U.S. 236 (1902).....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.....9

US Supreme Court Rules

Supreme Court Rule 25.6..... 2-3

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 its decision denying my Petition of writ of certiorari to vacate a PA judgement dated 2/28/2023 (“petition”) placing my license on inactive retired disabled, denying the petition for a rehearing submitted 10/18/23 on 11/13/23 while depriving me of the 1st Amendment right to petition by neither accepting or rejecting the supplemental brief provided in good faith prior to the 11/13/23 conference, necessary and material for this court’s determination at the 11/13/23 conference in deprivation of my 5th Amendment right to procedural due process applicable to this Court and in denial of my 1st Amendment right to petition and opportunity to be heard fairly and fully before vitiating my fundamental rights and property interest in my retired PA license to practice law. I further move this Court for a rehearing pursuant to Rule 44 based on new information occurring or discovered after I filed the Petition for a rehearing and other information I was obstructed from including material to the issues on appeal before this court, and restricted to the new matters in order to safeguard my Constitutional liberties under the 1st, 5th, 6th, 13th and 14th Amendments and other claims. I incorporate herein by reference the petition, the Motion for leave to file in forma pauperis filed with the Petition for writ of Certiorari, the First Petition for rehearing and the Supplemental brief (hereinafter “Petition”) herein by reference and all exhibits attached hereto and referred to herein in their entirety and aver:

1. Since I filed the petition for a rehearing additional intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect have arisen relating to arguments in the petition and additional arguments as to whether the PA reciprocal Order, which is based on a defective DE Order is void or voidable due to clear violations of my Constitutional rights by the State of Delaware’s

Supreme Court and the Board the reciprocal PA Order of disability retired is based. I was not previously able to provide these arguments due to the deprivation of a time needed due to Justice Alito's denial of time. (116th, 123rd, 124th and 125th Affidavits)

2. On 11/13/23 this Court passed a Code of ethics which I argue violates my 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding by the partiality to the code of Ethics of the regulator even self-regulator's interests instead of the impartial application of the rule of law depriving me and others of a fair proceeding. (116th-Aff). Considering this new evidence this court must overturn its Order and find the courts may only be corrected within the purview of Constitutional limits of 1. Cases and controversies, or impeachment, without vindictive punishing me for exercising my Constitutional right to require the courts uphold not violate my asserted Constitutional, federal and state rights.

3. Further this US Supreme Court violated my 1st and 5th Amendments by denying me fair access to the courts since I filed the October 18, 2023 petition for rehearing. The Court scheduled a conference to consider the rehearing on 11/13/23. On 11/6/23, I submitted by hand delivering 11 boxes containing a Supplemental brief containing other grounds to overturn the PA Supreme Court Order. (116th-Aff) Justice Alito's denial of an accommodation in the form of time prevented me from asserting new and additional claims. (Petition).

4. I also averred material circumstances of substantial and controlling effect to the Petition that arose after the 10/18/23 appeal 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 vitiation 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.").

5. 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.

6. 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 in time, per the docket sheet attached hereto. (116th Affidavit).

7. 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 25th Affidavits)

8. 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. ”)

9. I respectfully request 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.

10. 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, focus on exhibits in D therein, 123rd Affidavit)

11. 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.

12. 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. (DI 77, DI 104, DI 124).

13. 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. 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 teaches 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.

14. Despite my good faith invocation of the right to a fair proceeding under the 14th, the 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 clerk to deprive me of asserted fundamental rights by performing a judicial function. This error is structural.

15. I seek to preserve the Courts not destroy them when I petition to correct judges or staff within them to preserve my rights and the rights of others to buy and sell which should not be eliminated but for religious belief in Jesus as God, not money as God or for some other Constitutionally asserted right as in the Delaware attorney Richard Abbott’s case.

16. Richard Abbott is a Delaware Attorney who was similarly punished on November 9, 2023 for asserting the right to petition without the Court’s violations of Equal Protections by deeming attorneys unprotected by the law based on viewpoint of the speech, with partiality towards the government and itself. Abbott has colorable claims and should be afforded a stay as Chief Judge Colm F Connely constructively granted me per Affidavit 121 attached hereto so as not to deprive Abbott of the 1st Amendment right to petition in the only impartial forum that may grant him relief by compelling his guilt is assumed and he must be proven innocent. Abbott was

punished for representing a rich client who previously retained 4 or 5 other lawyers and glutted Chancellor Vice Glascock's docket. He was punished for his client's annoyance which is wrong. His duty is to represent his client's interest, even I suspect in his case personal interest against psychological pressure by assigning the property right in issue to another to alleviate the burden upon the one he represents.

17. It is unfortunate clients may turn on their counsel too, and believe because of their wealth they may buy justice. Abbott should not be penalized for he misconduct of his client who wore the court out with 4-5 other attorneys and years of litigation before Abbott accepted the case, nor is Abbott unworthy of Equal Protections to all attorneys similarly before the court regardless of the amount of revenue brought in and firm size. He is not a throw away product. He is a person worthy of dignity and respect.

18. I was thinking about interpleading in the Abbott's case to prevent his disbarment to represent me though he is free to say no. He is not a slave. US Amend XIII. Nevertheless, this Court held there is a fundamental right to counsel of one's choice. In *Greer v. United States*, 141 S. Ct. 2090, 2100 (2021), this Court held, "Structural errors are errors that affect the 'entire conduct of the [proceeding] from beginning to end.'" *Arizona v. Fulminante*, 499 U.S. 279, 309 (1991). "The 'highly exceptional' category of structural errors includes, for example, the 'denial of counsel of choice, denial of self-representation, denial of a public trial, and failure to convey to a jury that guilt must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.'" *Id.* Per this cite, the DE order violates procedural due process by denying me the right to self-represent until fewer than two work weeks before the hearing when I fell ill with the shingles and asserted I needed time to prepare to gather the hidden evidence. *Id.* Thus, the PA Order must be vacated.

19. I seek additional new claims to vacate the PA Order on disability based on the original Disciplinary proceeding depriving me of a fair opportunity to be heard per the attached Civil rights Complaint and civil rights appeal and petition for additional pages I incorporate herein.

20. DE punished me in retaliation for my exercise of fundamental First Amendment rights of the right to petition, religious belief, association, exercise of belief, and speech by eliminating my right to buy and sell by deeming my religious belief in Jesus not mammon as God. *Matthew 6:24*.

21. In *Borough of Duryea v. Guarnieri*, 564 U.S. 379, 386-387 (2011) This Court held,

“There are some rights and freedoms so fundamental to liberty that they cannot be bargained away in a contract for public employment. ‘Our responsibility is to ensure that citizens are not deprived of [these] fundamental rights by virtue of working for the government.’...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.’”(omitted internal citations)

22. This Court must extend *Guarnieri* to mean the government may not contract away my right to petition to assert 1st, 5th, 6th, 13th and 14th Amendment rights and other claims including my 1st Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus in exchange for a license to buy and sell as a lawyer.

22. Moreover I was denied 14th Amendment procedural due process in DE proceeding. The Court prevented me from cross examining my accusers by denying my motions to call them concealed evidence in my favor and fired two court staff by forcing them into retirement to conceal their testimony in my favor. (See Civil rights Appeal) In *Greene v. McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959), “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 was a structural error in the originating DE disciplinary proceeding.

23. This Supreme Court deprived me of an opportunity to appeal DE decision by denying me time in the form of a stay and by vitiating my rights to access to this court in the original DE proceeding by depriving me of time in this case too. Per the attached petition for more pages the DE Supreme Court violated its own rules by providing me with fewer days than the rules require to reasonably subpoena the witnesses and ignored motions until 2 days before the proceeding, while permitting the DE ODC to violate rules which prejudiced me.

24. This appeal also relates to Delaware’s punishment of me disparately in contravention of the 1st Amendment for private speech, religious beliefs, association and claims outlined in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act petitions, where my religious belief is material to the issues therein. The disparate treatment, denying me access to pleadings in a case against me IMO appointment of counsel No 541, and other deprivations was based on subject matter grounds of disagreeing with my religious belief. This 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.” By denying me the opportunity to be heard fairly and fully at the DE Order is void, and the PA order must be vacated.

Wherefore I pray this Court grants this petition.

11/30/23

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

Under Religious objection I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

Dated: 11/30/23

(printed) Meghan Kelly

(signed) 

CERTIFICATION OF COUNSEL (RULE 44)

I certify that the Petition for Rehearing from Denial of Certiorari is presented in good faith and not for delay and is restricted to the grounds specified in Supreme Court Rule 44.

Dated: 11/30/2023

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

Under Religious objection I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

Dated: 11/30/23

Meghan Kelly
(printed) Meghan Kelly
(signed) Meghan Kelly

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Meghan Kelly) Civil Action No.: 1:21-1490 (CFC)
Plaintiff,)
v.)
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.)
Swartz, et.al)
Defendants.)

PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY’S 124th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

Comes now Plaintiff Meghan Kelly, I declare and affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

1. I apologize for the typos in the 123rd affidavit. I was writing in haste without sleep I was so upset and remain upset.

2. On November 23, 2023 I checked the electronic filing side and saw that my application to emergency clerk Robert Meek and Justice Alito were rejected for filing as of November 23, 2023. (Exhibit A). Since I was eagerly checking every day and this is the first I saw rejection. It is possible it may have been rejected because it was in letter format, but other applications to emergency clerk’s were similarly submitted and accepted.

3. I left a message with Lisa Nesbitt and Robert Meek to gain clarification on the rejection and to swiftly correct any deficiency so as not to waive my rights on November 23, 2023.

4. On November 23, 2023 I also called the efilng staff at the US Supreme Court regarding another issue why I could not access the electronic filing on the Nov 6th Supplemental brief that I dropped off at the US Supreme Court in person, which to date has not been accounted for. Per Exhibit A, you can see the documents in red are inaccessible to me on the electronic filing system. The efilng clerk sought to dissuade me from exercising my 1st Amendment right to petition regarding the application to Alito indicating the case was closed and was over. I

responded I must assert my right, and reopen it. Then she indicated that was off topic since it was not electronic filing, while I remained silent and she quickly concluded and hung up on me before I could say good bye. As an attorney, I know some argue if you do not dispute allegations they may be deemed admissions incorrectly, though they shouldn't be. I was not off topic merely rebutting her assertions.

5. I am freaked out Nicole Traini, the Clerk of Court for the PA Supreme Court in Pittsburgh, PA indicated the clerk's talk to one another. The PA Court inappropriately denied 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 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.

6. I believe it was wrong for the US Supreme Court staff to reject motions I filed simultaneously with petitions for writ of certiorari by not docketing it, 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 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. *Psalms* 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")

7. 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 in PA Supreme Court motions in the sleeve of the file, 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.

8. I am eager to see whether the court explained the deficiency with regards to the application to reopen the case as not to deprive me of procedural due process in the US Supreme Court matter.

9. I am concerned the Court 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.*

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Nevertheless the US Supreme Court did not docket my similar filing I attach hereto as 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. (Exhibit B).

13. Similarly the attached *Petitioner Meghan M Kelly’s Motion for permission to use electronic filing before this Honorable Court, even if my active license to practice law is suspended, in representing myself, in appeals of State Disability Proceedings and in a potential Disability proceeding before this Court, and in all proceedings I act pro se in, including civil rights proceedings and for a waiver of the paper original requirement, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation*

of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights was similarly rejected for filing per the attached letter. (Exhibit C)

14. The attached *Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion for Leave to file Different in Forma Pauperis Motion to waive costs due to utter poverty, and due to foreseeable costs creating a substantial burden upon Petitioner's access to the courts and forced violation of her religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness* was also rejected for filing, per the letter rejecting it.

15. The attached *Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion to exempt costs and waive Court fees under Supreme Court Rules 38 and 43 eliminate people lawyers and people judges by creating a foundation of immunity from debt or responsibility* incorporated herein as Exhibit E was also rejected for filing. My case manager indicated I would be required to exempt costs in my *informa pauperis* motion which I have complied with since learning she would not accept it despite my belief the Court should judge the motion, not the clerk. After all the Supreme Court has held every injury should have a resolution. *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 147 (1803) (“ 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. ”). There is no resolution when petitions are not docketed just injustice by partiality by those who value lawless lusts convenience and material gain at the cost of human sacrifice of life, health or liberty. Lawyers and parties must require the courts uphold and not violate the Constitutional rule of law as well.

16. I also attach the letter to the US Supreme Court regarding asserting the 5th Amendment. The staff kindly indicated they accepted my 5th and to please sending boxes of filings to them.

17. I discovered the bad news that my application was rejected and realized I had to tell this Delaware District court my belief it was in imminent danger by legal entities lawyers in DE create. I provided this court forms in hopes it may understand how banks and their partners may conceal and resell nothingness debt no one will pay into infinity artificially creating value in something without worth to enslave the people to pay back what those in businesses have written off in debt swaps into infinity. The entities are preserved and are bankruptcy proof, liability proof, and above the law if you will by the nature of the springing member that hops into the place of the dissolved member or manager by operation of contract, allegedly arguably shielded by the contracts clause of the Constitution at the instant of dissolution or bankruptcy. I believe these “bankruptcy remote” entities will create a foundation for an economic overthrow I believe is schemed to transition in phases, with a worse transition after 2050. These will be utilized in the Ponzi scheme fashioned off of Bank of England who fashioned it off of the Knights of Templar who fashioned it off of Babylon’s slave banking system, coining money out of nothing to require debt slavery to be paid back with interest to keep people enslaved to work to pay back the interest which can never be paid back because it does not exist. Every dollar is a federal reserve note an I owe you to the federal reserve. The Government and the people are essentially debtor slaves and not free people for every dollar the government uses by borrowing from an entity that gains more power the worse off we are in by debt money the government gives to other entities, private who accept unjust gain government contracts or grants, in a forced not fair or free economy with limits in the form of the just rule of law that tame the beast sin business greed to prevent killing, oppressing, enslaving, stealing and destroying human life, health and liberty for the bottom line with justice in the courts to correct, preserve life and liberty, not destroy humanity.

18. Understand, the time to pay debt owed for the biggest bill falling due globally for the baby boomers retirement, and healthcare is falling due, but the banks, and the empty stocks with noting but I owe you that are not likely to be paid should a bankruptcy boom occur and we move towards these dreadful beneficial entities that violate Matthew 6:1-4 which will mislead humanity to harm one another under the lie of helping the world, die to be doomed to hell should the courts not save us.

19. So, I am embarrassed for typing like the speed of lightening with my sausage fingers making typos trying to warn the court in haste. I am sorry. I am sorry for typos in this too as I write under duress.

20. Having not received a message back from my case manager, Lisa Nesbitt or Robert Meek from 11/22/23, I called both on 11/24/23 to gain clarity as to why my *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*. No one answered their phone and I did not leave a message.

21. November 6, 2023 was rejected for filing and not docketed as of the date of submission. I do not know what the US Supreme Court will advise as to my undocketed rejected application dated November 15, 2023. I cannot waive my rights.

22. So, I googled the attached law review article and learned I needed to file a second Motion for a Rehearing under Rule 44.2. That is what I did in this case, I filed 3 or 4 Motions for a rehearing or reargument.

23. One Supreme Court case a petitioner filed 3 Motions for rehearing, the US Supreme Court denied it thrice, a year later the US Supreme Court vacated the denial sua sponte to address a petition. See, *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.”)

24. I have been in tears since November 13, 2023, ever since the US Supreme Court denied my Petition for Writ of Cert in the PA case while depriving me of 5th Amendment Procedural Due Process by simply not accepting or rejecting the supplemental brief that must be considered with or before the Petition for rehearing per Supreme Court Rule 25.6. Should it be rejected the Court is required to permit me to cure any defects with notice of rejection. *Citing, Becker v. Montgomery*, 532 U.S. 757, 767 (2001)

25. I hope the court’s staff and opposing counsel enjoyed their time this Thanksgiving. I do not celebrate holidays because it violates God’s laws revealed to me in part through the Bible.

26. In *Mark 7:7-9* King James version Jesus explains

“7Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. 8For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the

washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do. 9And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition.”

27. In Jeremiah Chapter 10 the Old testament provides:

“1Hear the word that the LORD speaks to you, O house of Israel. 2This is what the LORD says: ‘Do not learn the ways of the nations or be terrified by the signs in the heavens, though the nations themselves are terrified by them. 3For the customs of the peoples are worthless; **they cut down a tree from the forest**; it is shaped with a chisel by the hands of a craftsman. **4They adorn it with silver and gold and fasten it with hammer and nails, so that it will not totter.** 5Like scarecrows in a cucumber patch, their idols cannot speak. They must be carried because they cannot walk. Do not fear them, for they can do no harm, and neither can they do any good.” 6There is none like You, O LORD. You are great, and Your name is mighty in power. 7Who would not fear You, O King of nations? This is Your due. For among all the wise men of the nations, and in all their kingdoms, there is none like You. **8But they are altogether senseless and foolish, instructed by worthless idols made of wood!** **9Hammered silver is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Uphaz**— the work of a craftsman from the hands of a goldsmith. Their clothes are blue and purple, all fashioned by skilled workers. 10But the LORD is the true God; He is the living God and eternal King. The earth quakes at His wrath, and the nations cannot endure His indignation”

28. In Jeremiah Chapter 6 God says:

“6For this is what the LORD of Hosts says: ‘Cut down the trees and raise a siege ramp against Jerusalem. This city must be punished; there is nothing but oppression in her midst.”

29. I do not know what God means by cut down the trees. I think that men distort the word of God to give the deceptive appearance man’s will reflecting the image of the lawless one the devil is God’s will. Did you that in Israel people cut down trees because they taxed them?

30. Back to my religious beliefs. Jesus in Mark 7:8 says not to disobey God’s law to please men by their traditions. God’s laws in Jeremiah 10 says do not decorate trees with silver and gold to back the pagan worship of material things which includes Christmas trees.

31. I did not know I violated the law until Trump complained about it. He is the naughtiest most lawful man I ever observed in real life. He is likened to the dreaded King

Leopald of the Congo, Hitler or even Nero. So, I had to unhardened my heart and head and discern why Trump distorted God's word and traditions for his political material vanity.

32. The courts are misguided when they rely on England's laws or Plato's instead of a more ancient people's laws by thinking things out to discern what upholds Constitutional laws as applied to the facts of each case. 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"). We must protect free choice under the law, even God does that or at least the Israelites did, or there is no freedom, certainly to escape the way to hell by laying down our desires, to think, to care to unconditionally love. Those who make everything a matter of barter or exchange are lawless people enslaved to lusts and death in hell, not free. And yet, the courts must protect their freedom to make bad choices with the limit they may not enslave others by oppression, killing, stealing or destroying other constitutionally protected people's lives, health or liberty.

33. The entire carbon credit debit system removes government power from the government to its private and foreign partners who will eliminate the government down the line should the courts not stop it.

34. In order to maintain freedom there must be independence not deferral to the other two branches, and independence from private and foreign partners.

35. On an aside, attached please find an email to confirm I sent the sealed documents to opposing counsel.

36. Thank you for your time and consideration of my beliefs and thoughts. I truly believe the courts are in trouble, meaning we all are in trouble. There is no freedom without people judges, just reign by lawless lusts by those who enslave a no longer free people to bend to

their dictates or go without the necessities of life. We face lawlessness under the veil of freedom by utter control and complete order, Satan's design. 1 John 5:19

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 11/24/23

Meghan M. Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

EXHIBIT B

Some are placed on 3DI 105 not all in 21-3198, not including toc, appendices and citations
which I printed out separately

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

In the Matter of Meghan Kelly in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

No Respondent

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

I, Meghan M. Kelly, pro se petitioner filing in forma pauperis, move this honorable Court for an exemption from the requirement to serve 10 paper copies of pleadings with this Court pursuant to US Supreme Court Rules 12 (2), 29(1), and 39(2), by the filing of one paper copy to this Court, and in addition to or in the alternative of, an exemption from serving paper pleadings to the US Supreme Court, due to costs relating to printing, mailing and transporting pleadings to the Post Office, 1. creating a substantial burden upon my access to the Court to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, 2. and forced violation of religious beliefs by the threat of indebtedness.

1. Pursuant to U.S. Sup. Ct. R. 39:

“If leave to proceed in forma pauperis is sought for the purpose of filing a document, the motion, and an affidavit or declaration if required, shall be filed together with that document and shall comply in every respect with Rule 21. As provided in that Rule, it suffices to file an original and 10 copies, unless the party is an inmate confined in an institution and is not represented by counsel, in which case the original, alone, suffices. A copy of the motion, and affidavit or declaration if required, shall precede and be attached to each copy of the accompanying document.”

2. A statutory exception is crafted for indigent, unrepresented imprisoned petitioners. Thus, a similar exception may reasonably be crafted to permit me to file the original copy electronically, or in the alternative, the same single original paper copy requirement afforded to indigent, unrepresented, imprisoned parties, which I argue still substantially burdens my access to the courts, and exercise of fundamental rights. *Id.*

3. There is no Respondent prejudiced by my request, nor is this Court prejudiced. Whereas, I am deeply prejudiced should my request be denied. I have allergies that mimic other sicknesses. I believe this Court is kept safer during this global pandemic, with increases in monkey pox, polio and covid-19 cases globally. Touching paper touched by sick people, even postal people, may possibly spread germs to this honorable court. I sadly recall reading about postal workers dying during the pandemic.

4. It is against my religious belief to go into debt.

5. I cannot afford to pay for printing, ink, postage and transportation costs relating to delivery of paper pleadings. Requiring I adhere to the paper requirements would compel me to go into debt, in violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness.

6. The foreseeable costs relating to printing, transporting and mailing pleadings create a substantial burden upon my access to the Courts and forced violation of my religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness, as I seek to protect the exercise of my fundamental rights from retaliation by the government, but for the exercise of my rights, in the present case.

7. This Court has inherent equitable powers over their 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. (3 Wall.) 334 (1866).

8. This Court must grant my request to prevent government abuse against my person, oppression, and injustice.

9. The Court appears also appears to have statutory authority to waive unconforming pleading requirements for just cause so long as it does not enlarge Constitutional rights, but safeguards and upholds the Constitutional laws. See for example, Fed. R. App. P. 2, 28 U.S. Code § 2072.

10. I am utterly poor. The costs relating to serving paper copies create a substantial burden and obstacle to my access to the Courts in contravention to my Equal Protection to the First Amendment right to access to the Courts to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, applicable to the Federal Courts via the Equal Protection component of the 5th Amendment, as applied to 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. Neither prisoners nor indigents are suspect classes.”) *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.”)

11. “Because this case implicates the [Constitutionally protected rights of exercise of religion, speech, petition, belief and association and the] right of access to the courts,” 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).

12. 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)

13. 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. Delaware Disciplinary Counsel violated my Fundamental rights of religious beliefs, religious-political speech, religious-political petitions, religious-political-association, religious-political exercise, procedural and substantive due process opportunity to be heard, to prepare and present evidence, to subpoena witnesses, and to cross examine my accuser.

14. Delaware Disciplinary Counsel and reciprocating courts persecute me and seek to defame my character by taking away my property interest in my active license to practice law but for my exercise of Constitutionally protected conduct, in violation of my freedom to petition concerning my religious-political speech, religious-political exercise, religious-political belief, religious-political association, and association as a party, attorney, Democrat, Catholic and Christian when I believe there has been a grievance committed against me.

15. 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](#)

16. The Court's normal service of original pleadings by paper requirements, violate my religious beliefs, religious practices and religious exercise against incurring debt, and costs, as applied.

17. I temporarily turned in my vehicle tags to prevent being sinfully compelled to pay for insurance I was not able to afford when it fell due, in violation of my religious beliefs.

18. In March, 2022, in Delaware, the price of gas increased to over \$4.00 a gallon due to the planned Ukraine Russia crisis used as a contributing factor to intentionally crash the economy. This is a dramatic increase in cost for gas to fuel my vehicle to travel to your Honorable Court or to the post office to drop off original paper copies.

19. Since then, the price of gas has fallen, but remains unstable due to the limits of global gas relating to the sanctions on Russia's export of fuel, since the Ukraine-Russia war erupted in February 2022.

20. I got a flat tire on my bicycle and have been compelled to temporarily restate my car insurance and vehicle tags.

21. The price of stamps also went up from 58 cents to 60 cents this summer.

22. The cost of paper went up dramatically this year, and ink is expensive.

23. The additional costs of transporting paper original copies to the post office or in person, printing paper copies and mailing create a strenuous substantial burden upon my access to the courts which may be alleviated by an accommodation in the form of a waiver of paper copies.

24. I expected to rejoin my former 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, Catholic and Christian without government incited persecution, but for my exercise of fundamental rights.

25. The Delaware Supreme Court justices in collusion with the Delaware Office of Disciplinary Counsel wrongfully brought claims against me creating a government incited economic substantial burden upon me which 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 at a law firm. They harm my reputation to make me less attractive to employers.

26. Under my unique situation, the original paper copy and mailing costs cause a substantial burden upon my access to the courts to address Constitutionally protected activity relating to fundamental rights, creating an obstacle so great as to foreseeably prevent my access to the courts.

27 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.” I believe it compromises our loyalty to God towards the pursuit of money to free us from bondage, 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. I believe, 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 from loving God foremost and subordinately loving others as ourselves, that is sin. I believe “the love of money is the root of all evil”. 1 *Timothy* 6:10. I believe we are taught through temptations to worship sin, the mark of the beast spoken of in *Revelation* young, by praise and profit, glorifying

work and business, and conditional giving and conditional relationships, confusing many into believing conditionally caring is unconditional love damning most of humanity to hell the last day which is sad. (See, *Revelation* 16:2, *Revelation* 20:4. By worship of the image of the beast, I believe it means absence of love, unconcern, conditionally giving to get, caring based on conditional relationships with no unconditional love, no God in them for it is written “God is love.” 1 *John* 4:16. They glorify the punishments of sin written in *Genesis* 3 as the reason to live reflecting pride, sin, instead of receiving correction through humility leading to salvation from the lake of fire, the second death.). God calls his people whores when they committed adultery with God by chasing money and material gain to care for their own, as guide, in place of God. It teaches hardness of hearts towards God and others outside of our own which is the sin against the holy spirit. In *Jeremiah* 3:3, when God said “You have a forehead of a whore,” I think it means people have money, material gain, merriment, on their mind, not God’s word teaching us to love by overcoming the lusts of man. See, *Ezekiel* 16:33, *Ezekiel* 16:28. Jesus scolds us when we exchange our lives to gain the world through money. *Mark* 8:36-38

28. I believe creditors, merely doing what they are blindly paid to do, will be damned to hell for not forgiving monetary debts, should they not repent. (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).

29. If people don't forgive monetary debts, I believe people will be damned to hell for loving money and material gain more than one another as commanded. We are 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.”)

30. 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.

31. 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).

32. 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.”)

33. 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 them, 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 Fourteenth Amendment applicable to the states, and the Equal Protections component of the 5th Amendment applicable to the Federal government.

34. The Delaware Disciplinary Counsel petition against me prevent me from returning to my former law firm, and may prevent me from getting a job as to render any fees impossible to pay back, and 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.

35. Going into debt, of even a few dollars, is against my religious belief, and the additional costs of even a few dollars in transportation to appear in person is a substantial burden upon my access to the courts due to my utter poverty, and my inability to pay back any fees should I fail, ever.

36. I respectfully request that, due to original paper copy costs creating an economic strain upon my exercise of religious beliefs against indebtedness and exercise of my access to the courts to defend First Amendment rights, as a substantial burden due to my poverty and religious beliefs, with little prejudice to the Court, that I be permitted to serve original copies of pleadings electronically, without copies.

37. This Court must not require I violate my religious beliefs by agreeing to personal indebtedness as unaffordable costs for transportation arise, in order to exercise my First Amendment right applicable to the Court via the Fifth Amendment, to petition this Court to safeguard my exercise of Constitutionally protected activity from government interference or retaliation including the right, to petition, exercise religious beliefs, freely speak concerning my religious beliefs for which my petitions relate to and the freedom to associate as a party, attorney, Democrat, Christian, with independent, individual, unique political-religious beliefs.

38. In order for this Court to require I accrue additionally costs, which violate my religious beliefs, compromising my faith in Jesus to servitude to Satan by making money God, and guide, by withholding an exemption to filing paper copies, the Court must have a compelling interest somehow more important than the free exercise of religion, narrowly tailored to support such interest.

39. The Court must not require forced indebtedness, through costs, in violation of my religious beliefs because its justification to compel forced violations of my religion is not narrowly tailored in this case, since the Court may grant an exemption of paper copies to prevent the government forced violation of my religious beliefs.

Wherefore, I, Meghan M. Kelly, respectfully asserts this Court must grant this motion.

Dated

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693
(3,094 Words)

US Supreme Court Bar No. 283696

I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct under the penalty of perjury.

Dated:

_____ (printed)

_____ (signed)

**SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
WASHINGTON, DC 20543-0001**

December 2, 2022

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939


RE: Motion for an Exemption from Rule 12.2

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The motion for an exemption from the Court's Rule 12.2 was received November 29, 2022 and is returned for the following reason:

The Rules of this Court make no provision for this request. You must provide an original and 10 copies of your petition for a writ of certiorari and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Rule 12.2.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By:



Lisa Nesbitt
(202) 479-3038

Enclosures

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 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

November 6, 2023

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Pro Se, not represented by
counsel
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302)493-6693
US Supreme Court No 283696

QUESTION PRESENTED

1. 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, while covering up its own misconduct by eliminating proof of my existence as a lawyer and falsifying the facts **per the new additional information arising or discovered after I filed the petition for rehearing**, is the basis for the PA reciprocal Order eliminated, must this Court must overturn the PA Order placing my license on inactive disabled. (emphasis intended)

2. Considering the new and additional facts arising or pieced together after the date of filing the petition for a rehearing, whether 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

a. 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,

b. 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);

c. 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. So, there will be Equal Protections argument to apply similar rules in an equal manner against this court to discipline the Court,

d. And other Constitutional arguments I seek to preserve the right to be heard on in the Delaware District Court more thoroughly which are too numerous to include herein, and

3. Whether this Court must not violate the Constitution by impeding and chilling the checks upon its own branch, and its own justices via punishing me in terms of Alito denying my petitions for more time thrice in this case and twice in the civil rights case by denying a stay and denying 30 additional days for time, **or** by punishing me by placing a check on the Delaware Supreme Court for its willful violations of my Constitutional rights and other rights in judge's personal capacity by

a. 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-5 and A-5 attached hereto and

b. placing my license on inactive disabled but for the exercise of my rights outlined in 1. See also Article 1 Section 9 and Article 1 Section 10.

4. If this Court grants this petition to supplement the Court with information I was not previously able to provide due to insufficient time to outline all issues, given I asserted my fair right to be heard fairly and fully in an application for more time needed to Justice Alito in this case and I apprised the Court that his denial of my good faith effort deprived me of the opportunity to plead additional Constitutional defects in the underlying Delaware disciplinary

order the PA is based and unconstitutional defects in the PA proceeding, albeit the time and page limitations does not allow me to assert all claims still.

5. Whether the PA Supreme Court deprived me of my 1st 5th and 13th Amendment rights by refusing to docket items and to be heard on others, by incorporating those documents herein by attachment of the affidavits that discuss the same via reference.

6. Whether the Delaware Disciplinary procedure was so lacking in notice or opportunity to be heard before the Delaware original disciplinary proceeding as to constitute a deprivation of due process in the Delaware forum that the reciprocal order by the Supreme court must be voided because it deprives me of the 1st, 5th and 6th amendment rights of criminal like punishment without affording me the asserted not waived right to cross examine my accusers and present my case. There was such an infirmity of proof in the Delaware forum as to give rise to the clear conviction that the Pennsylvania court could not, consistent with its duty, accept as final the conclusion by the Delaware state court to reciprocate by placing my license on inactive discipline as outlined herein.

7. Should this Court grant my request for a supplemental brief under Rule 18.10 and Rule 25.6 because intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect have arisen relating to the arguments in the petition at Question IX, pages 6-14, wherein I argued this court must limit discipline of the US Supreme Court justices to the purview of the Constitution to 1) cases and controversies, 2) and impeachment, without waiver of the 5th Amendment right to self-incrimination in order not to violate my fundamental 1st Amendment right to petition to defend my religious beliefs as a party of one based on retaliation for correcting judicial mistakes or misconduct including:

1. 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,
2. Petitioner's belief the courts are in danger especially with the debt ceiling approaching November 17, 2023 with no agreement to date, which Congress will use to pressure the weakened court to concede to congressional control regulations that infringe upon my opportunity to be heard on the same issue in an actual case ad controversy,
3. the convening of a Congressional committee the day after I filed the petition for a rehearing on October 19, 2023 to attack Justice Thomas and the integrity of the court to subpoena witnesses to be used against Justice Thomas and the Court, nit to impeach, but to garner societal peer pressure and other threats to control a no longer free and independent branch into becoming a puppet to whoever has the power to sanction them via regulations compromising the integrity of the courts to uphold the impartial application of the rule of law to preserve their positions and mere appearance not actual justice.
4. New bad faith and fraud by the DE Supreme Court to conceal its lawless conduct uncorrected within the purview of the Constitutional limit.
5. Whether Courts violate the Constitution by chilling and retaliating against people, me as a party of one, for seeking to limit judges' authority and correct misconduct and mistakes by the Court by motions in motions I drafted to preserve my Constitutional rights not destroy the courts especially my most cherished liberty to exercise religious belief in Jesus as God not money as God without Government persecution but for believing differently than the court. And if so whether the Pennsylvania order which

is based on punishment for my religious beliefs, contained in my speech, in exercise of my right to petition, but for the professional association of a lawyer is constitutionally permissible, or whether the underlying order is void, making the reciprocal order void. US Amend I XIV.

6. Whether courts in cases and controversies per Art III are sufficient to correct the misconduct or mistakes of lawyers they judge and discipline be the only Constitutional means to correct misconduct or mistakes by lawyers [and judges, albeit judges may be impeached too] instead of by professionals [even judges] who sit on boards who by nature of their positions are biased against freedom to serve what I believe is lawlessness in the eyes of God called sin, towards marketing professions and making money and covering up wrongs in their profession allowing injustice to fester and spread instead of allowing Court correction to shed light on how standardized conduct and dumbed down training may blind professional's eyes to see clearly how they harm the public, especially with the threats by Boards, especially historically medical boards should professionals care to think outside of the box because they value patients health more than their position , profit and personal pay, and seek to improve the care patients receive. I believe people go to hell for valuing money and material gain more than other people especially and specifically at work or by engagement of organized charity. Matthew 6:1-4. Jesus teaches people not saved from loss of eternal life have evil eyes, revealing evil dirty hearts. Matthew 12:34-38, Matthew 6 entire chapter. They look at people for what they may extract, what they may contribute driving out love from the person valuing them based on material gain extracted from them. Jesus teaches you cannot serve God and

Mammon, money and material gain. Matthew 6:24. I follow Jesus not the world. That said the way money is coined is the reason why the world is tempted to go the way to hell by sin and becoming the darkness and evil by blinding their eyes from caring about others by their desire in storing up moth and rust to care for their own. They lose their souls in hell for committing human sacrifice should they not be made clean of their dumbness and blindness by court correction or otherwise. I proposed a way to coin correctly without violating the 13th Amendment or my 1st Amendment religious belief in the district Court. If the US will fall in this crash, this court may catch them and preserve and strengthen the US. It is the courts who are my hope of a hero, but if the courts blind their eyes to violations of the Constitutional limits and requirements without careful thought on how to preserve the lives, liberty and health of those they serve without slavery and profiteering compliance by those who eliminate lives, liberty and health for profit, than the judges do not judge, they bow down to professionals and their products and services making men God misleading the world to harm and hell per scripture. Citing Romans 1:25 We need judges to judge even courageously enough to make mistakes sometimes and to humbly correct not let money and convenience be the judge which allows professions and charities to kill, steal and destroy human life, health and liberty as opposed to protecting it. I believe judges have the power to save lives and eternal lives even if this Court does not believe it. It need not believe it to make the world a better place by improving it by court correction to guide those misguided by the mark of the beast convenience, productivity and material gain for their selfish own that they disobey God and do not love others, they oppress, ignore or exploit them for material gain.

7. Whether this Court will create case law granting a means to prevent nonlawyers from lawyering and nonjudges from exceeding this courts 'power by judging by permitting Office of Disciplinary Counsel authority to bring cases in court not before boards to allow an open forum to safeguard the courts and the administration of justice or by some other means. I require the assistance of the brilliant minds of judges to think this out to prevent the very real agenda to eliminate the courts, even if this court should disagree with my positions. I require time.

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-vii
Parties.....	viii
Related Cases.....	ix
Table of Contents.....	
Appendix.....	
Table of Authorities.....	
Statement of Case:.....	

APPENDIX

110th Affidavit, regarding removal of the existence of Meghan Kelly as an attorney to conceal DE Supreme Court’s misconduct against me by concealing me.....4

109th Affidavit, regarding DE Supreme Court fraudulently misrepresenting the facts in my case to commit Equal protections violations against Attorney Richard Abbott to again conceal their own misconduct against Abbott by depriving him of the First amendment right to petition in a fair forum pursuant to the 14th Amendment to safeguard his right, as a lawyer. A lawyer’s right to pursue the profession of one’s choice constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and of which neither I nor Abbott may be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the state’s violation of 1st Amendment rights to petition, speech based on viewpoint, religious belief, exercise of belief or association.....5

Meghan Kelly’s waiver of a speedy trial not filed, but drafted during the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding wherein I outline how lawyers infringe and do not preserve right while violating superseding Constitutional laws to enforce laws that violate the same or otherwise harm the public for profit, essentially human sacrifice for material gain which I believe is anti-Christ lawless lust not the impartial rule of law to preserve and protect life, liberty and health as opposed to harm it to create need to serve greed.....8

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

93rd Affidavit, regarding my belief in law that requires payment to judges and their staff in a shut down under the circumstance present.....9, 11

Article, *Senate Judiciary Committee to vote on subpoenas for Harlan Crow*, By Leonard Leo, Robin Arkley II The Hill, dared 10/30/2023.....9-10

No. 4, I CONVENTION ON THE PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 13 February 1946, outlining immunity laws.....8

Documents that will be used to eliminate the courts to allow the UN to control a no longer free people with immunity, **with the first document titled Sustainability Development Goals**.....8-9

Additional documents concerning a bank crash and factors setting up the United States to fall, I hope the Court catches and saves us, **with the first document titled Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s 86th Affidavit, US Supreme Court may not be paid in a default**.....9, 11

106th Affidavit, regarding Biden’s violation of the wars power act...../.....11

107th Affidavit, wherein Meg disagrees with Justice Scalia and assertions of political questions and believes the court may use words to prevent the use of weapons and wealth to be used to control a no longer free but for sale slave cattle people. Our only hope of a hero to prevent the overthrow of our government sometime after 2050 are the courts, but they cannot save us if they are eliminated or compromised by regulations.....11

5th Affidavit, wherein the PA Supreme Court through the Clerk of Court Nicole Traini refused to docket Meg’s pleading to stay the case.....26-27

7th Affidavit, wherein the PA Supreme Court through the Clerk of Court Nicole Traini refused to docket a number of attached pleadings to preserve and not waive her asserted Constitutional rights, no matter how repugnant or inconvenient her religious beliefs are to the court.....26-27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Bible

Amos 5:15.....10
Matthew 6:24.....8
Matthew 23:23.....10

Case Law

Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada, 501 U.S. 1030, 1054 (1991).....5
Kelly v Trump, 21-5522, US Supreme Court, Nov 1, 2021.....3

Constitution

US Amend I.....1, 2, 5-6
US Amend V.....1, 2
US Amend VI.....6
US Amend XIII.....1
US Amend XIV.....1, 5-6
US Art III.....1

Delaware Rules

Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 9 (d)(3).....5-6
Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 12 (h).....5-6

US Supreme Court Rules

Supreme Court Rule 18.10.....1
Supreme Court Rule 25.6.....1

STATEMENT OF CASE

I, Meghan Kelly, Esq., pro se pursuant to Rule 18.10 and Rule 25.6 and any other rule respectfully moves this Court for leave to file this supplemental brief based on new information occurring or discovered after I filed the Petition for a rehearing and other information I was obstructed from including material to the issues on appeal before this court, and restricted to the new matters I order to safeguard my Constitutional liberties under the 1st, 5th, 13th and 14th Amendments.

1. Since I filed the petition for a rehearing intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect have arisen relating to arguments in petition and whether the PA reciprocal Order, which is based on a defective DE Order is void or voidable due to clear violations of my Constitutional rights by the State of Delaware's Supreme Court and the Board.

.2. On 10/18/23, I filed *Petition for a rehearing on denial of writ of certiorari limited to intervening causes of substantial or controlling effect concerning my arguments which may vitiate my rights should the court not hear this rehearing.*

3. Two of the issues of this appeal and of the petition for a rehearing are

1. whether 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
 - a. 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,
 - b. 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);
 - c. 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. So, there will be

Equal Protections argument to apply similar rules in an equal manner against this court to discipline the Court,

- d. And other Constitutional arguments I seek to preserve the right to be heard on in the Delaware District Court more thoroughly which are too numerous to include herein, and
2. Whether this Court must not violate the Constitution by impeding and chilling the checks upon its own branch, and its own justices via punishing me in terms of Alito denying my petitions for more time thrice in this case and twice in the civil rights case by denying a stay and denying 30 additional days for time, or via punishing me by placing a check on the Delaware Supreme Court for its willful violations of my Constitutional rights and other rights in judge's personal capacity by
 - a. 1. 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-5 and A-5 attached hereto and
 - b. 2. placing my license on inactive disabled but for the exercise of my rights outlined in 1. See also Article 1 Section 9 and Article 1 Section 10.

4. 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.

5. 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 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, 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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 ethic 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.

9. This appeal also relates to Delaware's punishment of me disparately in contravention of the 1st 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 belief. *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")

10. New information arose or was discovered relating to the misconduct, fraud and bad faith of the Delaware Supreme Court justices acting in their personal capacity to abuse the color of the law to conceal and shield themselves from liability for violating the law.

11. I discovered the Court eliminated me from existence on the official publicized roll as if I am disbarred instead of placing me on inactive per the attached affidavit, and exhibits contained therein labeled 110th Affidavit. I filed the letter attached therein on 11/2/23 with minor corrections relating to the date of filing to the DE Supreme Court to correct the lawyer roll to show I am inactive not eliminated as unworthy of the bar.

12. I also newly discovered that my case was cited fraudulently and in bad faith cited in a case involving another Delaware Attorney Richard Abbott to commit a fraud upon me, the public and Attorney Abbott by creating precedent to misrepresent the fact that citation to rules the Court violated is evidence and precedent to conceal the state judges' liability for violating my

right to a fair proceeding. I incorporate by reference the 109th Affidavit, attached hereto. The state Court in bad faith fraudulently misrepresented the facts as evidence by the facts. 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 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 PA license as neither the DE Court nor the PA Court afforded a full hearing where I could confront accusers and cross examine them in this criminal like proceeding. Thus, this Court must void the PA order.

13. The only notice I received concerning 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):either, of which I was deprived. 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 1. firing two court staff and 2. concealing evidence in my favor. 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. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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. I also assert even judges by allowed to make mistakes with the right that they be corrected. They are not held to perfection as God. Allowing mistakes without reprisal 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. We cannot prevent cancer causing products if health boards and mere regulators defer to those who use science to market drugs and products that murder people for money. I oppose professional boards and regulators, even the FDA and prefer judges judge, not bow down to those who worship the mark of the beast and mislead the people to harm and hell. Matthew 6:24.

16. Attached please find a letter I incorporate herein that I never filed with the DE State Court. I outline my concerns that lawyers never prevent problems because we profit off of them. When we cause the problems, we should allow cases and controversy to correct them and improve the administration of justice, not conceal problems in professions in secret proceedings to market the appearance of helping the public while covering up evil allowing it to fester and spread. I not only oppose regulating to control the court. I oppose regulating to control the bar to prevent the bar from upholding the rights of claimants by disparate favoritism towards those who enrich the profession in pay and possessions.

17. Nevertheless, I urge the US Supreme Court to grant PA ODC the power to correct non-lawyers from lawyering and non-judges judging, or at least grant all ODC's the authority in case law in this case and controversy to prevent the eliminations of the courts to eliminate the government. The slow overthrow of the government will use entities to practice law with regards to manipulating the chain of title in deeds to recoup property to an entity and its partners through association who asserts immunity by written agreement by the other branches of government by executive orders and congressional authorization of monies, the UN.

18. As a Delaware Attorney whose first job was drafting sneaky entities called bankruptcy remote entities which conceal assets and bad debt, I am cognizant that the law will be used to kill itself by hanging. I worked at the biggest home grown corporation in the corporate

capital of the world RLF in Delaware. We need impartial judges please to judge us and save us not boards.

19. On that related matter, as of 11/5/23 Congress has not passed a budget. 11/17/23 is the deadline. There is a high likelihood of default without pay to the courts during the holiday season. Congress previously threatened to weaken the courts and their staff by not paying the courts should a budget not pass, while violating the 5th Amendment Equal Protections Clause by paying the other two branches of government. This creates a clear and present danger by eliminating the courts check on the other two branches and allowing two branches to be above the law and the Constitution. Should this ripen or this Court consider this issue in the face of immediate threat to its own branch. I incorporate affidavits and papers attached hereto and incorporated herein regarding safeguarding the courts in the face of this threat. I face irreparable injury in terms of a weakened court who may reject my right to petition on issues to allow Congress to extort and bribe them with pay of the withheld sums to regulate a no longer impartial independent court by regulations I strongly oppose. See 93rd and 86th Affidavits where I aver payment to the judicial branch must be paid.

20. Since filing the petition for rehearing on 10/18/23, I discovered connections and information that was either not available or I was not aware of until after the filing of my last document in this open case that are material to this appeal. 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. Since that date, per the attached article I incorporate herein, 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 personal attacks against judges and those who may be subpoenaed. 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. 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.

21. 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

22. The Courts are in danger of having no effect in a scheme to eliminate it. Attached please find a bunch of documents I filed in the DE District Court which allude to how the overthrow of our government will occur if the Courts do not stop it. Please see the attached laws showing the UN is immune from lawsuits, and immune of losing real or personal property with allodial title, not bound by the Constitution or taxes.

23. Please see the attached agreements of private-UN partnerships where entities will act as agents of the UN and not be bound by our criminal or civil laws in the recoupment of properties including the property Trump has an ownership Black Rock and other documents I incorporate herein by reference to their attachment, or the first Document of its packet as attached uploaded and printed out for submission.

24. New and increasing threats of dangers have arisen since 10/18/23. Biden violated the Wars power act by retaliating against Iran without Congressional approval. I drafted two attached affidavits on my belief the courts may prevent a world war, I incorporate herein. The billions of additional dollars the other two branches grant to fund war threatens the payment of the federal courts with the looming November 17, 2023 budget deadline. It is likely a default will hit, and pressure the courts to regulate. See, 93rd and 86th Affidavit.

25. Relating to Justice Alito's denial of an application for time so as not to deprive me of the fair opportunity to exercise the first amendment right to petition fairly pursuant to the 5th the PA order in issue in this case I present new matters for Court consideration I was deprived of asserting previously in the petition of writ of certiorari.

26. In my writ of certiorari in this case I entitled an argument outlined in pages 6-12

“ii. Justice Alito unreasonably denied my application for more time which prejudices me due to inability to work based on this petition (wherein I waive claims by government compelled forced time limits without accommodations and am compelled to present subpar pleadings) based on my disagreement with his decisions and the decisions of the Court which I outlined in exhibits to my petition in violation of the Equal Protections Clause based on disdain towards my genuinely held religious belief”

27. I asserted and preserved my claims of denial of rights in the petition for writ of certiorari, and seek to correct them herein not destroy Justice Alito.

28. I request the Court consider the new information I presented regarding the defects in the Delaware Disciplinary case and I argue as follows: The Delaware Disciplinary procedure

was so lacking in notice or opportunity to be heard before the Delaware original disciplinary proceeding as to constitute a deprivation of due process in the Delaware forum that the reciprocal order by the Supreme court must be voided because it deprives me of the 1st, 5th and 6th amendment rights of criminal like punishment without affording me the asserted not waived right to cross examine my accusers and present my case. There was such an infirmity of proof in the Delaware forum as to give rise to the clear conviction that the Pennsylvania court could not, consistent with its duty, accept as final the conclusion by the Delaware state court to reciprocate by placing my license on inactive discipline as outlined herein.

29. PA Supreme Court refused to even file or docket for consideration a number motions I discuss and attach hereto in two affidavits, the 5th and 7th Affidavits I and incorporate herein, and 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. 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 who may harm them to serve material gain even knowledge. 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.

30. The devil teaches 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 of dumb and blind wring doers.

31. I seek to preserve the Courts not destroy them when I petition to correct judges within them 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 right as in the Delaware attorney Richard Abbott's case.

Wherefore I pray this Court considers this supplemental brief, and grants the relief I plead herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 11/6/23

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
US Bar Number 283696

Under Religious Protest, I declare that the foregoing statement is true and correct under the penalty of perjury.

Dated: Nov. 6, 2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan Kelly (signed)