

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 133 AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I am very scared.
2. O 12/8/2023 I checked the docket, and saw the 127th Affidavit was removed from Kelly V PA ODC Matter Number 22-7695.
3. On 12/8/2023 I sent the following email contained in Exhibit 1 with pictures showing a different amount in the December 7, 2023 Filings to Clerks Meek and Baker, and opposing counsel.

“No. 22-7695/127th Affidavit for Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Petition for a rehearing on the 11/13/23 order denying petition for a rehearing submitted 10/18/23, denied on 11/13/23 to consider intervening causes of substantial or controlling effect concerning my arguments and other claims not previously considered which will vitiate my rights should the court not hear this rehearing
 From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)
 To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov; dbaker@supremecourt.gov
 Cc: harriet.brumberg@pacourts.us; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us; zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; drivkin@bakerlaw.com
 Date: Friday, December 8, 2023 at 05:50 PM EST
 Good evening,

I see the he 127th Affidavit was removed by the court in No. 22-7695 for Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Petition for a rehearing on the 11/13/23 order denying petition for a rehearing submitted 10/18/23, denied on 11/13/23 to consider intervening causes of substantial or controlling effect concerning my arguments and other claims not previously considered which will vitiate my rights should the court not hear this rehearing.

The 127th Affidavit is the document I referred to in the email to this court below. I previously thought it may be hacks. Attorney Shao indicated the same thing happened to her in her law suits before the United States Supreme Court. She said it was the courts who removed or sealed items.

Thankfully, this is docketed twice because I thought it went on top of the wrongfully deleted item. I called Case Manager Lisa Nesbitt and indicated I thought I filed it under the incorrect button, and asked her what I should do. She said she could not help me. I indicated I was acting in good faith. She understood. I did not know whether I should have used with the leave to file for rehearing button. Thankfully, the second docket entry has all documents including Affidavit 127 which I referred to in another email to Clerks Meek and Baker copied here, per below and hereto.

Please docket the one with all entries or please make sure the 127th Affidavit is made public to rpreserve my 6th Amendment right to a public proceeding in this criminal-like case. This is not the first time this has happened to me before the US Supreme Court or to another person similarly situated based on viewpoint as opposing court misconduct, especially the DE Supreme Court and PA Supreme Court which I argue deprived me of access to the courts to defend every Constitutional liberty. There is no rule of law when courts act based on self interest under the lie productivity, convenience money or material gain is the common good, when it sacrifices life and liberty for the court, not the people it serves.

Thank you. Have a good night,
Meg

On Wednesday, December 6, 2023 at 01:50:21 PM EST, Meg Kelly
<meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

I forgot to copy Donald Baker. Please forgive the typos. I am trying to act fast to assert and not lose my rights due to bad faith deprivations of access to the courts.

Thank you,
meg

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: Robert Meek <rmeek@supremecourt.gov>

Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov
<supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov>; Harriet Brumberg <harriet.brumberg@pacourts.us>;

Anthony Sodroski <anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us>; Shen Zi-Xiang (DOJ) <zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov>; david.weiss@usdoj.gov <david.weiss@usdoj.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, December 6, 2023 at 01:38:26 PM EST

Subject: 25 days from Nov 13 to include additional and new information not previously reviewed material and necessary to defend my fundamental rights from vitiation and access to the courts

Donald Baker and Robert Meek,

This is an emergency wherein I request your immediate assistance to correct a clerical mistake by Lisa Nesbitt.

I saw online she denied my second motion for a petition for rehearing. Supreme Court rule 44 allows for additional hearings intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect concerning my arguments and other claims not previously considered which have arisen since I submitted for docketing the October 18, 2023 Petition for rehearing. There are a slew of cases where the US Supreme Court permitted addition petitions for rehearing. With regards to my case with the new information after October 18, 2023 filing of the first Petition, neither acceptance or rejection of the brief containing material new and different information not previously considered necessary for my case's consideration.

Please see the attached law review for examples. Also see in the law review on page 17, the US Supreme Court in US v Ohio Power Co, 353 U.S. 98, denied Certiorari on 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.

There was a total of 3 petitions for rehearing by the US Supreme Court permitted in that case. It is not fair I am deprived of access to the courts in violation of the 1st Amendment fairly per the 5th by disparate treatment by the court. In the Second Petition attached hereto I note the court erred in no docketing other pleadings and cited case law where the Supreme Court clearly had jurisdiction and authority to make a ruling on pleading this Court did not docket. The clerks err by rendering judgments that may only be rendered by a judge.

I am deprived of my fundamental rights not merely my license and access to the courts fairly but for the viewpoint should this not be corrected.

Please ask her to hold onto the documents. I may drive up there with a petition for rehearing but have no means to print out all of the documents before the 25 day due date Friday December 8, 2023.

Please ask her not to mail them back. I have not drafted anything yet.

Please look over the Second petition which is filed in good faith in the other documents without exhibits herein not sent back at this time.

Please hold on and examine because she is in clear error.

Thank you,”

4. I informed the Court the 127th Affidavit showed incriminating information evidencing the United State Supreme Court’s past alleged misconduct of removing public docket items or allegedly changing dates in cases involving Attorney Yin Tai Shao’s cases based on viewpoint of speech.

5. Attached, please find the docket and two docket items Dated December 7, 2023. Recall I called my case manager about refileing under petition under leave to refile since it gave me a weird message, and I was scared of filing on top of the filing I argue was errantly rejected for docketing.

6. My case manager indicated she could not advise me on what to do. I indicated I was acting in good faith. She understood. I filed it again under petition for leave to file a petition for rehearing.

7. Please see the first filing contains only 12 items, whereas the second one has 13. Both originally had 13 filings. Exhibit 2. The missing Exhibit is the 127th Affidavit found at docket item 265 of this matter Kelly v Swartz et al, 21-1490.

8. Also please find the electronic submissions, showing the 127th Affidavit is missing from the first submission, in the attached Exhibit 3. Thankfully I submitted it twice to prevent a 6th Amendment violation of a public forum in this criminal-like proceeding.

9. In the 127th Affidavit I attached Attorney Yin Tai Shao’s pleadings and cited her Motion for rehearing wherein she averred:

“On 10/23/2017, Petitioner telephoned Mr. Baker to ask why the Amicus Curiae motion was not filed. Mr. Baker transferred the call to Mr. Bickell (telephone number of 202-479-3263). He stated that it was the joint decision between Mr. Baker and him

not to file the Amicus Curiae motion. He asserted that pursuant to Rule 37.2, the time to file an Amicus Curiae Brief could not be extended. When corrected, he later acknowledged that Rule 37.2 applies only to Amicus Curiae Briefs, not Amicus Curiae Motions. He stated that he decided not to file the corrected Amicus Curiae Motion since it had "too much deficiency" but he was unable to identify what such deficiencies were. Mr. Brickell argued that the same exact motion had been filed in 17-256 so the court had had a chance to consider its contents there. He was unable to explain why if the Amicus motion was too deficient to file in this matter, it had been deemed acceptable to be filed in 17-256"

10. This is not fair or just, especially because it appears to be on viewpoint grounds in violation of the 1st Amendment right to speech.

11. I tried to find the servicer of the electronic forum to file in the US Supreme Court. Galen Wilson indicated Lexis's filings for court connect had access to US Supreme Court cases. Should you pull the docket on court connect the red link on top will show the day after the last day of access the Court pulled it, this allows you to see whether the court opened it up.

12. However, although this aided me in pulling the information from Delaware's electronic servicer File and Serve, I am having difficulty contacting or even knowing who the electronic provider is for the US Supreme Court. PACER indicated they do not service the US Supreme Court.

13. Shao indicated only the US Supreme Court staff had access to the US Supreme Court filings to make changes, no one else.

14. I am sleep deprived and super upset. I woke up with severe dehydration and diarrhea and tears.

15. I looked through my filings and saw the court removed filings previously docketed for another matter, I previously docketed with this court.

16. I also looked at an email from Attorney Shao a beautiful, brilliant kind attorney similarly placed on inactive. I incorrectly stated she was barred before the US Supreme Court. I think I am wrong and write to correct the error.

17. She requested the Head law librarian's assistance in retrieving the following:

“Would you please help provide the docket alterations records for 17-82 (removing individual names from being Respondents)
17-256 (removing individual names of respondents from docket in 2017 then added “et Al” in or about 2022)
17-613 (alterations on “decision date”) and many entries
18-344 where is the Motion for Judicial notice
18-569 (the removal record of Amicus Curiae motion filed on 11/8/2018)
19-613 (alterations of entries in the docket on Request for Recusal
20-524 please track down records of three time removal of court order and judgment between 1/12/2021 and 1/17/2021
21-881 7 filings blocked
22-28 record of removal of Petition for rehearing then put back many docket entries were altered.”

18. I saw the US Supreme Court similarly removed exhibits previously on the public docket to prejudice my case, and I attached the same to DI 124-2 in US Supreme Court matters No. 22-6783, Application No. 22A747, Kelly v Swartz relating to an interim stay application and a petition before judgment for a stay by the entire court.

19. The missing exhibits relating to expediting the emergency application and petition before judgment for a stay in this civil rights case prejudiced me by depriving me of access to the Courts to appeal the US Supreme Court for the original disciplinary Delaware proceeding which caused the basis of reciprocal law suits. I attach the motion I submitted to restore the Exhibits, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Application to the Honorable Justice Alito to place removed exhibits back on the Docket to prevent the deprivation of her 5th Amendment Equal Protections

and procedural due process right to a full and fair opportunity to be heard without selective, arbitrary, disparate, unfavorable treatment towards her as applied

20. I sent the attached email at Exhibit 5, to the US Supreme Court and opposing counsel under great duress on 12/9/23, with Attorney Shao's email communication and the docket items showing 3 changes to one docket item contained in US Supreme Court matters No. 22-6783, Application No. 22A747, Kelly v Swartz relating to an interim stay application and a petition before judgment for a stay by the entire court.

“OFF THE RECORD invocation of the 1st, 5th and 6th amendment rights Fw: 22-6783
Fw: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System
From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)
To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; dbaker@supremecourt.gov
Cc: david.weiss@usdoj.gov; drivkin@bakerlaw.com; zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov;
harriet.brumberg@pacourts.us; anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us;
matthewkosiorek@comcast.net; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; iadams@sidley.com;
aggiekelly@comcast.net; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov;
shaolawfirm_emails@yahoo.com

Date: Saturday, December 9, 2023 at 12:21 PM EST

Below, please find an email I received in response to the removal of documents alleging a glitch. Attached, please find one example where my documents were removed or otherwise changed. Attached, please find case number's where another attorney alleges the same thing happened, and that dates were changed to deny her access allegedly by court staff's deception. I invoke my 6th Amendment right to an open proceeding in this criminal like proceeding where my license to buy and sell as a lawyer is infringed upon but for my religious beliefs in Jesus not money or mammon as guide and God. The state attacked me based on my religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions based on affiliation associated with a license to practice law, affiliation as a democratic, as a Christian and as a Catholic, who does not defer to the Pope or the Church but God through the father, son and holy spirit. This is 4 violations of the 1st Amendment pursuant to the 14th Amendment applicable to the state. My private petitions to alleviate a government incited substantial burden upon my religious exercise contained in petitions relating to bar dues and in a religious freedom restoration act lawsuit, without disparate treatment, collusion by the government to cause me to forgo, witness tampering, and other insidious attacks by the state including but not limited to sending Court of Common Pleas Judge Clark to attack and threaten me at a grocery store is a right all people residing in the United States must be free to exercise without government retaliation based on viewpoint of speech. I invoke my rights against disparate treatment applicable to the United States Supreme court's staff via the 5th and my 1st Amendment right to

access to the courts under the 1st apart from the record to cure defects. For some reason I am having difficulty drafting this email and am unable to hit enter for paragraphs. My computer email is freezing and I am quite scared. Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter. Very truly yours, Meg

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: eFilingSupport <efiling-support@supremecourt.gov>
To: 'Meg Kelly' <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 9, 2023 at 09:13:17 AM EST
Subject: RE: 22-6783 Fw: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

Good morning,
We are currently experiencing a system-wide computer glitch and it should be resolved shortly.
Thanks,
Clerk's Office
Supreme Court of the United States
One First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543
efiling-support@supremecourt.gov

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:09 AM
To: eFilingSupport <efiling-support@supremecourt.gov>; Robert Meek <rmeek@supremecourt.gov>; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; Radinson-Blasucci Caneel (DOJ) <caneel.radinson-blasucci@delaware.gov>; Shen Zi-Xiang (DOJ) <zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov>; Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: 22-6783 Fw: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Supreme Court of the United States. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe and relevant.

Good morning,

My case, Number 22-6783 was removed and the docket was deleted from the US Supreme Court's web site.

What is worse, it looks like my corrected motion that grants statutory not merely equitable authority to present my motion for an interim stay to the entire court as opposed to merely Justice Alito appears to have misdirected to Southern Maryland's distribution center. It was supposed to arrive today.

The tracking Number is 9505514998633066985670.

I do not safe. I am pleading to safeguard my life, my private right to believe in Jesus, my eternal life, not merely for damages, nominal relief and my license.

I am scared. Someone talked about shooting me. The threats have subsided with my loud voice asking for help in this law suit, but my voice is silenced when my petitions are removed from this Court's web site, removing my cries for help should my life be threatened again.

Please place my material back on the web site. I am a little scared.

Thank you....”

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "no-reply@sc-us.gov" <no-reply@sc-us.gov>
To: "meghankellyesq@yahoo.com" <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 at 10:12:54 AM EST
Subject: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System
A new docket entry, "[othertext] of Meghan Kelly submitted." has been added for Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner v. Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al..”
Thank you for your time and consideration.

21. Sometime after or around 4 PM on Saturday Dec 9, 2023, I received one copy of the 11 copies of the Dec. 1, 2023 submission. So, the Court kindly deferred to my request by holding onto 10 copies should my December 7, 2023 submission reopen the case to allow its review and more pressing matters I averred in the December 7, 2023 submission.

22. Per Exhibit 7, the warranty department alleviated my concerns I had alerted the court about previously.

23. Per Exhibit 8, the removed docket items were never placed on back of the March 3, 2023 submission in US Supreme Court matters No. 22-6783, Application No. 22A747, Kelly v Swartz relating to an interim stay application and a petition before judgment for a stay by the entire court.

24. I was compelled to file the attached motion to withdraw my petition and application before judgment due to the delay in docketing and the bad faith expedition of the

matter by the Third Circuit. I cry as I type this because I was deprived of access to the US Supreme Court to appeal the original DE disciplinary order. It is not fair. It is not by free choice but government compelled choice and impossibility given my circumstances.

25. The most important part of my life is my faith in God the Father, the Son, and the holy spirit. The government not only failed to uphold the Constitutional laws that protect my First Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus Christ, the government eliminated my right to buy and sell but for my faith in God due to the governments' worship of the beast, which is their desires convenience, productivity, material gain and avoidance of costs at the cost of human sacrifice of life and liberty under the lie of the evil one called the devil, the public good, common good or alleged greater good. It is lawless lusts, satanic sacrifice like throwing people into volcanoes for crops. Eliminating human life and preempting Constitutional liberty in exchange for mere licenses is not freely bargained for.

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

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

partiality to itself instead of the impartial application to the rule of law in my case as applied.
(18th, 19th, 26th, Affidavits attached hereto)

28. Similarly, the PA Supreme Court Clerk Nicole Traini did not docket a number motions I discussed in 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.

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

30. Despite my good faith invocation of the right to a fair proceeding under the 14th, the PA Clerk refused to docket my petition because my 1st Amendment rights applicable to the Sate via the 14th to religious beliefs were "unusual." This Court in *United States v. Finnell*, 185 U.S. 236, 249 (1902) held, "The clerk is a ministerial officer, and, without statutory authority, can exercise no judicial functions." Accordingly, it was improper for the clerk to deprive me of asserted fundamental rights by performing a judicial function. This error is structural requiring the PA Order be vacated.

31. We will see what happens before the US Supreme Court. Remember the contract clause will be used lawlessly based on lusts like Satan the devil. We deal with powers and

principalities temptations. This Court must consider taming the beast sin to save the world down the line. The courts must not believe the lie of Lucifer the devil that people's souls also known as lives are slave property to buy and sell by the government to be sacrificed to slaughter the fat of the sheep to government backed partners, wolves, aka children of the devil not saved by hell by their unjust gain based on slavery by government grants and contracts or loans should they not be made clean. The way money is coined based on slavery is the problem. We face an exacerbated problem by digital currency created by private partners not limited to the Federal Reserve and Central and global banks. They will eliminate the governments sometime after 2050 and usher in a time of lawlessness untamed by the rule of law by the rule of force and threat without restraint in the form of love as collective groups have no power to do good by unconditional love. Instead they are easily controlled by the beast sin conditionally caring with no ability to lay down their desires to do what is right by unconditional love for God and one another not sacrificing people for moth and rust. Only individuals can reflect the image of God not collective conforming conditionally compelled groups. That makes individual people judges more powerful than armies. Judges can save the world. Armies destroy other people's children and die in vain. Biden wickedly believes he may buy his will be done with money for Ukraine and Israel. Instead he increases slavery debt in violation of my belief against slavery to sin and death in hell by making mammon master, savior and god. The courts may expunge the debts by requiring they be paid off by coining correctly. The mighty brains of judges are more powerful than bullets or bucks. The new system not only violates my religious beliefs by Matthew 6:1-4 violations. It violates my God's laws on a whole more horrific level of lawlessness never seen before. We are in trouble. We need the courts to save us.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Dated 12/9//23

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

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

Dated: Dec. 9, 2023
Meghan Kelly

(printed)

CMeghan Kelly

(signed)

Exhibit 1

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: Robert Meek <rmeek@supremecourt.gov>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov <supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov>; Harriet Brumberg <harriet.brumberg@pacourts.us>; Anthony Sodroski <anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us>; Shen Zi-Xiang (DOJ) <zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov>; david.weiss@usdoj.gov <david.weiss@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 6, 2023 at 01:38:26 PM EST
Subject: 25 days from Nov 13 to include additional and new information not previously reviewed material and necessary to defend my fundamental rights from vitiation and access to the courts

Donald Baker and Robert Meek,

This is an emergency wherein I request your immediate assistance to correct a clerical mistake by Lisa Nesbitt.

I saw online she denied my second motion for a petition for rehearing. Supreme Court rule 44 allows for additional rehearings intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect concerning my arguments and other claims not previously considered which have arisen since I submitted for docketing the October 18, 2023 Petition for rehearing. There are a slew of cases where the US Supreme Court permitted addition petitions for rehearing. With regards to my case with the new information after October 18, 2023 filing of the first Petition, neither acceptance or rejection of the brief containing material new and different information not previously considered necessary for my case's consideration.

Please see the attached law review for examples. Also see in the law review on page 17, the US Supreme Court in US v Ohio Power Co, 353 U.S. 98, denied Certiorari on 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.

There was a total of 3 petitions for rehearing by the US Supreme Court permitted in that case. It is not fair I am deprived of access to the courts in violation of the 1st Amendment fairly per the 5th by disparate treatment by the court. In the Second Petition attached hereto I note the court erred in no docketing other pleadings and cited case law whe Supreme Court clearly had jurisdiction and authority to make a ruling on pleading this Court did not docket. The clerks err by rendering judgments that may only be rendered by a judge.

I am deprived of my fundamental rights not merely my license and access to the courts fairly but for the viewpoint should this not be corrected.

Please ask her to hold onto the documents. I may drive up there with a petition for rehearing but have no means to print out all of the documents before the 25 day due date Friday December 8, 2023.

Please ask her not to mail them back. I have not drafted anything yet.

Please look over the Second petition which is filed in good faith in the other documents without exhibits herein not sent back at this time.

Please hold on and examine because she is in clear error.

Thank you,
Meg
34012 Shawnee Dr
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

 IMG_3455.jpg
1.2MB



IMG_3456.jpg
1.2MB

https://file.supremecourt.gov/Request/RequestSummaryGet/292615

A Voice In The Desert - ... LexisNexis® Product ... 204 Pa. Code Chapter ... Pennsylvania Code - T... Rule 561 - Form of IFP ... HP Office20 8.5" x 11" ... Casetext 2F77E81-ADDEND

Motion - Motion for Leave to File Petition for Rehearing

Docket # 22-7695

Documents

- Main Document - [Part 1 petition for a rehearing on Nov 13th Order.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [part 2 declation certification of Rule 44 motion.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [5th affidavit second motion for a stay PA not filed.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [7th affidavit Other Motions PA refused to file.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [18th affidavit DI 126 Delay in Jackson application.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [19th Affidavit DI 127 Jackson Application.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [26th Affidavit DI 134 big.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [126th affidavit DI 264 big.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [127th Affidavit DI 265 Big.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Main Document - [Emergency filing meg Multiple exhibits.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Other - [Compliance of Word limits.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Other - [Petition for leave to file In forma pauperis.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed
- Proof of Service - [Dec 7 cert of serv.pdf](#) Virus Scan Completed

ere to search 51°F Clear 12/



Exhibit 2

Exhibit 3

Welcome Meghan Kelly | Sign Out

Summary

* Your Electronic Filing was submitted on 12/7/2023 12:37 PM.

Petition For Rehearing:

Docket #:

22-7695

Documents

Main Document - [Third petition for a rehearing on Nov 13th Order.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [part 2 declation certification of Rule 44 motion.pdf](#)
Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [5th affidavit second motion for a stay PA not filed.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [7th affidavit Other Motions PA refused to file.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [18th affidavit DI 126 Delay in Jackson application.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [19th Affidavit DI 127 Jackson Application.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [26th Affidavit DI 134 big.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [126th affidavit DI 264 big.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [Emergency filing meg Multiple exhibits.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Certificate Word Count - [Compliance of Word limits.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Other - [Petition for leave to file In forma pauperis.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Proof of Service - [Dec 7 cert of serv.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

*127th
affidavit
is now
missed*

Supreme Court of the United States

Welcome Meghan Kelly | Sign Out

Summary

* Your Electronic Filing was submitted on 12/7/2023 12:58 PM.

Motion - Motion for Leave to File Petition for Rehearing

Docket

22-7695

Documents

Main Document - [Part 1 petition for a rehearing on Nov 13th Order.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [part 2 declation certification of Rule 44 motion.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [5th affidavit second motion for a stay PA not filed.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [7th affidavit Other Motions PA refused to file.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [18th affidavit DI 126 Delay in Jackson application.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [19th Affidavit DI 127 Jackson Application.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [26th Affidavit DI 134 big.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [126th affidavit DI 264 big.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [127th Affidavit DI 265 Big.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Main Document - [Emergency filing meg Multiple exhibits.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Other - [Compliance of Word limits.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Other - [Petition for leave to file In forma pauperis.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

Proof of Service - [Dec 7 cert of serv.pdf](#)

Virus Scan Completed

It is
here.
The
127th
Affidavit
is here

Supreme Court of the United States

Exhibit 4

No. 22-6783, Application No. 22A747

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, Disciplinary Counsel Kathleen M. Vavala; David A. White, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, Office of Disciplinary Counsel, Board on Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware, Preliminary Investigatory Committee, Attorney General Delaware

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Application to the Honorable Justice Alito to place removed exhibits back on the Docket to prevent the deprivation of her 5th Amendment Equal Protections and procedural due process right to a full and fair opportunity to be heard without selective, arbitrary, disparate, unfavorable treatment towards her as applied

Pursuant to the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component, the 5th Amendment Due Process Clause, the 1st Amendment right to petition, 28 USC § 1651, Supreme Court Rule 22 (a) or other applicable authority, I, Appellant Meghan Kelly apply to the Honorable Justice Alito for the Court to place the removed exhibits from my March 3, 2023 filing back on the docket for application Number 22-6783.

1. Pursuant to 28 USC § 1651

“a The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law.

(b) An alternative writ or rule nisi may be issued by a justice **or judge** of a court which has jurisdiction.” (emphasis intended)

2. Accordingly, I argue that Justice Alito has jurisdiction to determine the issue at hand to prevent 1. disparate, arbitrary, unfavorable treatment against me, as a party of one, in violation of the 5th Amendment's Equal Protections component, 2. 5th Amendment Due Process right to a full and fair opportunity to be heard before this Honorable United States Supreme Court, and the 1st Amendment right to petition.

3. An application, not a motion is the only means I have to seek this relief under the circumstances. A motion would likely be reviewed too late to grant relief.

4. On March 3, 2023, I mailed out Appellant's Emergency Application to the Honorable Justice Samuel A. Alito, Junior to expedite this Court's decision, with exhibits thereto.

5. On March 9, 2023, my docket for US Supreme Court appeal 22-6783 disappeared for this matter, not other matters 21-5522 or 22-6584. (Exhibit 1) When the docket reappeared later on March 9, 2023, my exhibits for the March 3, 2023 Emergency Application to Justice Alito were removed from the docket, (Exhibit 2).

6. I sent emails to Robert Meek, and efilng, opposing Counsel and US Attorney General David Weiss, concerning the issues. I also spoke with the Emergency Clerk Robert Meek. I lamented the Exhibits were removed, and an empty Main Docket was left on the system for the March 3, 2023 filing. Robert Meek kindly removed the empty Main Document (Exhibit 3) However, I also saw he also converted my emergency application to a Non-Emergency motion to expedite. While Robert Meek apprised me the application would be converted to a motion in advance, the elimination of the emergency prejudices me by slowing down the US Supreme Court's review until it will be likely too late. I sought a fair amount of time to work on other pleadings including another petition with knowledge as to whether I would have time to fight it, not merely file it. This may not be secured, through no fault of my own as I am not sitting on my rights. I have in good faith filed petitions this Court has rejected, including the removal of a letter Robert Meek kindly suggested, and a Different application I recalled he initially suggested, but since then either changed his mind or I misunderstood. (See Exhibit 4, the Different Application, I incorporate herein without the signature or exhibits thereto).

7. On March 10, 2023, I sent the Court a letter I attach hereto as Exhibit 5, where I describe the problem and respectfully requested the Court place the Exhibits back on the docket.

I noted therein,

“I received an E-mail from this Honorable Court indicating “We are currently experiencing a **system-wide computer glitch** and it should be resolved shortly.”

Later March 9, 2023, my docket reappeared, but my pleadings were missing in part. I incorporated my exhibits into my Motion to Expedite. My exhibits are missing. I invoke my right to be heard under the Fifth Amendment applicable to this federal Court in full, not in part.

I previously submitted my Exhibits physically to this Court and opposing Counsel. I also uploaded them on the system. On the Docket it appears when you click on the last document before the proof of service it is unavailable. The electronic filings, the exhibits to the motion to expedite, were deleted.

I am uploading the previously served documents again on the electronic system to prevent a denial of my opportunity to be heard, in full, not in part. US Amend I, V. These documents were already served. It took about a week to print out the documents. Due to the prior service, and the emergency nature of my case, I cannot delay.”

8. I called efilng for help uploading the March 10th letter. Efilng noted they may be able to help me with the issue of the exhibits. Upon belief they had access to the efilng side. However, when I asked about efilng the letter correctly, the Efilng clerk hung up on me. I did not want to alert the courts of this. If the efilng staff had a system shut down, which I do not necessarily believe since my other two dockets were available on March 9, 2023, then I understood they may not have enough time to help me if they were fixing other dockets.

9. Since then, I sent Robert Meek and Efilng emails concerning the selective disappearance of pleadings on my efilng side, and the notation that a rejected March 7, 2023 Motion was electronically marked as accepted when it was deemed rejected, per the attached Exhibits incorporated herein as Exhibit 6.

10. On March 23, 2023, I sent Robert Meek and the Efilng clerks a video of other efilng issues. I showed the Court the disappearing exhibits which were removed on March 3,

2023 still existed on the efilings side. I attempted to show them they were the same as the uploaded documents on the March 10, 2023 filing. (Exhibit 6).

11. On March 23, 2023, I called Efilings again after the Clerk allegedly assigned to the Motion to Expedite, Daniel Bickle, failed to return my message left last week, this Monday March 20, and Thursday March 23, 2023 to prevent immediate irreparable injury in terms of loss of the right to petition, licenses and harm to life and eternal life.

12. A Clerk indicated they were not uploading the exhibits. I indicated I needed to fight this. So, they hung up on me before I could continue.

13. I concede the Court physically attaches only the Order to petitions for non efilings pro se claimants. However, this is not a petition. Even if it was a petition, this Court has previously allowed all of my appendices and exhibits in three other docketed cases since I electronically uploaded all of the exhibits myself, which is distinguished from other pro se claimants who do not electronically file. I am an efilings attorney claimant, not practicing law, but defending my life, liberty, life and eternal life from harm. I should not be prejudiced due to an alleged "system computer glitch" by denial of a full and fair opportunity to be heard. I sent Efilings, Robert Meek, US Attorney General David Weiss additional emails regarding other pleadings that were selectively removed on the efilings side which is unusual for rejected documents. (Exhibit 8) This makes me concerned that it may not be a system glitch. It may be selective deletion of my confirmation of receipt of filings to conceal I ever made petitions.

14. This Court has also accepted my exhibits to applications for extensions of time. I should not be selectively, irrational denied the same expectation of a full and fair opportunity to be heard on a motion to expedite, which includes the exhibits. US Amend V.

15. I will lose my 1st Amendment right to petition if immediate relief is not granted. I incorporate my Third Circuit Motion to dispense of a hearing herein, as Exhibit 7 to include additional explanations of why the right to petition may be removed by government force, not based on me free will. My motion to expedite is less persuasive without the exhibits which prejudices the outcome of this case.

16. This Court may direct the filings on March 10 to be incorporated into the March 3, 2023 motion to dispense of the need for the Efiling staff to upload the exhibits again instead of having them place the exhibits back on the March 3 Docket entry. It is not burdensome for the Court. Alleged glitches in the system show the court's staff is not replaceable by automation too. Please see the attached article showing China has eliminated people judges replaced by automation in some courts. (Exhibit 9). There are real plans to eliminate people judges.

17. Further, I asked the Delaware courts for help when people threatened me with perceived bodily harm. The Court punished me for asking, deeming me not credible as disabled. If I am in danger, I am left at risk without using my voice on public record to fight it. Having a public record showing I am not disabled or at least I argued against it, makes me more credible and safer. This Court received the second Application to Justice Jackson physically yesterday, but I am running out of time. (Exhibit 10)

Wherefore I pray this Court grants me relief.

Dated: March 23, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com, 302-493-6693
US Supreme Court Number 283696

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

Petitioner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (f) respectfully prays that an interim stay pursuant to be granted in the Third Circuit, Case Number Case Numbers 22-8037 and 22-2079, pending this Court’s decision on a Writ of Certiorari before judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (e) in Kelly v Swartz No. 22-6783

OPINIONS BELOW

The order by Judge Phipps of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals denying an interim stay is attached hereto as **Appendix A**, dated 2/9/2023. There is no opinion to publish.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254 and 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. BACKGROUND OF THIS CASE ELIMINATION OF FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS IN EXCHANGE FOR LICENSE TO BUY AND SELL AS AN ATTORNEY, AND THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT CASE SHOULD NOT BE DENIED FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION BY THIRD CIRCUIT’S OBSTRUCTION TO MY MEANINGFUL ACCESS TO OTHER COURTS UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES

1. This case relates to a petition I brought against former-President Donald J. Trump under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to protect my exercise of belief in Jesus Christ without government sponsored persecution. I attach the Complaint herein in its entirety and incorporate it herein by reference as **Exhibit A**.

2. This case represents an example of persecution based on my exercise of religious beliefs, contained in my speech in my petitions to the Delaware Courts.

3. This civil rights case arises but for the Defendants persecution and punishment of me by placing my license to practice law on disabled inactive in retaliation for the exercise of my

private First amendment right to petition the Courts to defend my private religious-political beliefs, private-religious exercise of beliefs, right to association as a lawyer-Catholic-Christian-Democrat with private rights to believe, private religious speech contained in my private petitions with the Delaware Courts, and my private right to petition the Courts to safeguard my right to belief in Jesus no matter how repugnant or illogical the Defendants deem my private beliefs. US Amend I, XIV.

4. Defendants admit they brought a law suit against me for my religious beliefs contained in one petition my Religious Freedom Restoration Act petition against former President Donald J. Trump to alleviate a substantial burden upon my exercise of religious beliefs, attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein. In the August 23, 2021 letter attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, Defendant Disciplinary Counsel indicated my religious beliefs contained in my speech contained in my private-religious petitions is the source of their concern of my mental fitness to practice law. In the State's petition at 7, the Disciplinary Counsel points to my references to the bible, as evidence of a disability, incorporated herein by reference as **Exhibit C**.

5. I have not exchanged the elimination of my private first amendment rights to petition, to religious belief, private speech reflecting those private religious beliefs, private exercise of beliefs or private exercise of the right to petition in exchange for my Delaware license to practice law and other licenses.

6. I must be afforded a fair opportunity to be heard to defend my licenses and my fundamental rights without being denied access to this court and other courts by the Third Circuit Court's bad faith expedition of its case below, which may render my petition with this Court moot if this interim stay is denied, to protect not only me, but others beyond me from professional government backed persecution based on exercise of fundamental rights.

7. A professional's private exercise of First Amendment exercise of speech, association, religious belief, religious exercise, and the right to petition to defend the exercise of Constitutional freedom in their private capacity must not be eliminated in exchange for a mere license.

8. I must not be compelled to violate my religious belief by compelled religious violations of my belief in order to regain my license, nor should I be foreclosed the opportunity to defend my licenses by the third Circuit Court's thwarting my appeal by expedition of its case so as to deny me an opportunity to be heard in other courts, this Court as well as other as in other cases.

9. Nor should I be punished for my exercise of the right to access to the courts to defend my religious beliefs because the Court finds my citations to the Bible and religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions illogical. ¹

¹ See, *Brief of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, the Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission, the International Mission Board, and Dr. R. Albert Mohler, Jr. as amici curiae in Support of Petitions before the US Supreme Court by the Little Sisters of the Poor Home for the aged, Denver Colorado, et.al, Petitioners v. Sylvia Matthews Burwell, Secretary of Health and Human Serviced, et. al*, No.15-105, 2015 WL 5013734 (US).(This Court allowed references to the bible in other RFRA petitions); See, *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 682. ("Courts have no business addressing whether sincerely held religious beliefs asserted in a RFRA case are reasonable.") Also see, *Africa v. Pennsylvania*, 662 F.2d 1025, 1025 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 456 U.S. 908 (1982); ("Judges are not oracles of theological verity, and the founders did not intend for them to be declarants of religious orthodoxy."); *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872, 887, ("Repeatedly and in many different contexts, we have warned that courts must not presume to determine the place of a particular belief in a religion or the plausibility of a religious claim."); *Cantwell v. State of Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 60 S. Ct. 900, 84 L. Ed. 1213 (1940); *Remmers v. Brewer*, 361 F. Supp. 537, 540 (S.D.Iowa 1973) (court must give "religion" wide latitude to ensure that state approval never becomes prerequisite to practice of faith); *Presbyterian Church in U. S. v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church*, 393 U. S. 440, 450, (1969) (holding that "the First Amendment forbids civil courts from" interpreting "particular church doctrines" and determining "the importance of those doctrines to the religion."); *Ben-Levi v. Brown*, 136 S. Ct. 930, 934; See, *Holt v. Hobbs*, 574 U.S. 352; *In re Eternal Word Television Network, Inc.*, 818

10. “To be sure, a state may not condition the grant of a privilege, [a license,] or benefit upon the surrender of a constitutional right.” *Minn. Ass’n, Health Care v. Minn. Dept.*, P.W, 742 F.2d 442, 446 (8th Cir. 1984); Citing, *Western Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of Equalization*, 451 U.S. 648, 657-58, 664-65 (1981); *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404-05, (1963).

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

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

F.3d 1122, 1140 (11th Cir. 2016)(“The Supreme Court cautioned that "federal courts have no business addressing" such questions of religion and moral philosophy.” (Internal citation omitted)); *Thomas v. Review Board*, 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981), "religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit First Amendment protection.”).

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

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

15. I must be afforded a fair opportunity to argue this by a grant of an interim stay to prevent the state’s punishment of me, but for the exercise of my exercise of my religious belief, as outlined in my speech in my petitions, no matter how repugnant or illogical my religious beliefs appear to the state.

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

II. AN INTERIM STAY IS REQUIRED TO PREVENT FORECLOSING THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION AND FIFTH AND FOUTEENTH AMENDMENT OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD IN OTHER FORUMS TO PREVENT IRREPARABLE INJURY IN TERMS OF LOSS OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, LICENSES, AND HARM TO LIFE

17. An interim stay is required since on February 16 2023, the Third Circuit Court expedited its proceeding to evade review by making the petition of writ of certiorari before judgement moot. This Court will not likely hear my petition before judgment until it is too late, and my petition is dismissed as moot. If an interim stay is not granted the Third Circuit’s bad

faith expedition of this case would deny me due process opportunity to be heard in this case, increasing the likelihood of denial of the right to petition in other courts including one new Pennsylvania Court ruling, on February 28, 2023 and other disciplinary appeals which have different Constitutional arguments.

18. Albeit a stay would decrease duplicity of judgments on similar issues, conserve resources by preventing potentially needless costs for the courts, and parties. A stay would also help to prevent the denial of a fair opportunity to be heard in other forums by encouraging other courts to grant me time needed for a meaningful opportunity to petition to prevent the loss of irreparable injury to me.

19. Sadly, the reciprocal disciplinary cases have new and additional Constitutional issues to address. Nevertheless, some issues are the same. If I could just get time to proof read and research, and to care for my health, I would be afforded a fairer opportunity in other courts. I have not even had time to shower or change my clothes the past couple of days. I am prejudiced by being compelled to assert my rights in a subpar manner in order not to waive them. I am asserting my rights imperfectly, without opportunity to proof read or adequately research because government compelled threat not by free will, but forced will.

20. The Third Circuit is aware that I have reciprocal disciplinary matters that require assertions in order not to waive rights. I have updated both the Delaware District Court and Third Circuit Court of appeals since the other proceedings go to damages and material issues in the case below.

21. Whether a court may knowingly or in reckless disregard deprive a claimant, me of the right to petition in other courts in violation of 5th Amendment due process by expediting its case to cause me to forgo the First Amendment opportunity to petition in other cases due to my

unique circumstances, health, poverty, religious objections to debt, and defense of religious beliefs against servitude to Satan by making money God, in violation of the 13th Amendment appears to be a novel issue of first impression this Court must address to protect the exercise of fundamental rights including the right to petition. (US Amend I, V, XIII, XIV)

22. I cannot assert my rights in all cases, and require time because I do not have the capacity to defend all cases simultaneously. A denial of a stay would certainly deny me of the right to petition by required time and resources in other forums.

23. I do not have the ability to print, research or even proof-read documents to defend my life, liberty, licenses and eternal life in all courts. I am prejudiced by denial of an interim stay in that I face likely irreparable injury in terms of loss of the fundamental right to petition and loss of my right to exercise First amendment rights as well as harm to life and health. I have already developed the shingles in the Delaware disciplinary case, and collapsed at the post office due to lack of time I asserted I need to live, as well as to defend my fundamental rights. I asserted my right to life below too. I do not have the capacity to fight all cases simultaneously and should not be foreclosed the opportunity by the Third Circuit Court's bad faith expedition of this case.

24. I should not be denied the 5th and 14th amendment opportunity to be heard or be denied the First Amendment right to petition in other forums for the partial pleasures of the Third Circuit Court's mere convenience at the sacrifice of loss of my exercise of First Amendment rights, health and my licenses.

III NEW COURT ACTION IN BAD FAITH TO DENY MEG THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION AND OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD ON APPEAL TO THIS COURT

25. On or about February 6, 2023, I filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari before judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (e) to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Case Numbers 22-8037 and 22-2079 to vacate a denial of a stay pending this Honorable Court's determination or denial of writ of certiorari of both the Third Circuit Reciprocal Disciplinary Case US Supreme Court Number 22-6584 and the Delaware Disciplinary case. US Supreme Court No. 22-6783.

26. On February 7, 2023, I filed Appellant Plaintiff Meghan M Kelly's Motion for an interim stay of the Proceeding until the conclusion of the appeal of this Court's Order at Third Circuit Docket Item Number (hereinafter "3DI") 3DI 131 denying a stay. (3D-138)

27. On February 9, 2023, Judge Phipps of the Third Circuit denied my motion for an interim stay. (3DI-141). Pursuant to Supreme Court 23 (3) "the relief sought [an interim stay] is not available from any other court or judge," since Justice Phipps denied it.

28. On or about February 9, 2023, I submitted an interim application for a stay to prevent irreparable injury to my life, liberty, licenses and eternal life that this Honor denied, I incorporate herein by reference. Your Honor denied my application for an interim stay on or about February 22, 2023.

29. I filed a variety of motions with the Third Circuit since I filed a petition for writ of certiorari, including but not limited to a renewed motion to recuse Justice Montgomery Reeves, since I sought to place the former Delaware Supreme Court justice as a Defendant in this action in her personal and professional capacity which shocks the conscience. (3DI-145).

30. Justice Montgomery-Reeves appeared to collude in inciting the witness intimidation against me in *Kelly v Trump* to cause me to forgo my appeal in this Court, by

terminating two Court staff by forced retirement to conceal material evidence in *Kelly v Trump* and the Delaware Disciplinary matter, for sealing my pleadings, denying me access to papers in a case against my person where I am the party, deprivations of procedural due process, First Amendment violations, 6th Amendment right to self-represent, intentional or reckless infliction of emotional duress damages and other claims I seek in the case below. (3DI-145)

31. My Motion to amend the Complaint as a matter of right at Delaware District Docket Item (hereinafter “DI”) DI 43, dated January 24, 2021, to include her, was not denied or granted, but was simply ignored by Chief Judge Colm F. Connelly of the Delaware District Court. (3DI-154-11, motion to amend, 3DI-154-12 Order by Delaware District Court Judge Chief Colm F. Connelly not addressing my motion, DI 60)

32. It would not be fair to have the Third Circuit judge, Justice Tamika Montgomery Reeves as a judge in his case. She ruled against me in two orders in *Kelly v Trump* I seek void due to procedural due process violations she appeared to cause. (D.I. 4, orders by former Delaware Supreme Court Justice Tamika Montgomery Reeves, also see, **A-4, and A-5** attached, incorporated herein) She will not likely void two orders she signed or supported.

33. On or about February 15, 2023, I alerted my case manager and opposing counsel that the United States Supreme Court docketed my appeals of this Court’s Orders denying my motion for a stay to slow down the matter to prevent irreparable injury to me in the form of loss of fundamental rights, loss of the opportunity to be heard and to petition, harm to health, life and other injuries. I incorporate herein by reference Third Circuit Docket Items (hereinafter “3DI” 3DI-131, 3DI-141, also see and incorporated herein 3DI-119, 3DI-126, 3DI-129, 3DI-130, 3DI-138, regarding harm and 3DI-133 regarding to appeal to the US Supreme Court where the Third Circuit is a party, No. 22-6584).

34. On February 16, 2023, I filed Appellant Meghan Kelly's Motion for this Court to waive costs for preparation and transmittal of the record to the US Supreme Court, should the Court require the record and other costs, fees, expenses, taxes or charges at 3DI- 146 incorporated herein by reference. I argued therein at paragraph 38:

"I respectfully request this Court render on Order on my motion to exempt any charges, fees, taxes, and costs (1). in order not to compel me to violate my religious beliefs in exchange for access to the courts or (2). suffer an economic substantial burden so great as to deny me access to the courts in defense of my First Amendment liberties, license and related interests and (3). to prevent government compelled involuntary servitude to sin by making money savior in place of God, prior to scheduling a new hearing date. 3DI-137."

35. Later that day, February 16, 2023 the Court expedited scheduling, and filed the attached letter, **Exhibit D**, indicating this case is "tentatively listed on the merits on Tuesday, April 11, 2023 in Philadelphia, PA." (3DI-147)

36. Despite my two appeals requesting a stay to this Court to prevent irreparable injury harm to health and life, reputation, licenses and loss of fundamental rights as well as other injury, in bad faith the Third Circuit filed a notice of a hearing unusually before briefing was complete, and before rendering orders on outstanding motions with the intent to eliminate my right to petition and opportunity to be heard at the US Supreme Court in utter disregard for the irreparable injury to me.

37. This was scheduled prior to the completion of briefing. The due date for my reply brief was not yet due.

38. The court knew I am seeking to slow down the case to prevent irreparable injury to me. As a response the Court retaliated by expediting the case, in hopes to evade review by the United States Supreme Court by rendering the issue of a stay moot. (3DI 131, 3DI 141)

39. Later the same day, February 16, 2023, the Court entered a docket entry a 3DI-138 “NOTICE from U.S. Supreme Court. Petition for Writ of Certiorari filed by Meghan M. Kelly on 02/06/2023 and placed on the docket 02/15/2023. Supreme Court Case No. 22-6783.”

40. I immediately filed a motion with the Third Circuit on the same day, February 16, 2023 to move the Court to postpone scheduling the hearing so I may be afforded access to other courts including but not limited to this United States Supreme Court should this Court accept my appeal on 22-6584 to prevent irreparable injury in terms of loss of fundamental rights and other irreparable harm. (3DI-149)

41. On March 3, 2023, I talked with my case manager and indicated it had been about 4 days or so since the time for opposing counsel had lapsed to address my motion objecting to the hearing date and other outstanding motions relating to recusals since Judge Phipps was in charge to the best of my knowledge. I did not understand why my motion to postpone the hearing so as not to deprive me of an opportunity to petition and be heard and other harm was not referred to a panel. She did not have an answer other stating it was pending or being reviewed. She noted on other motions “referred to a panel,” after the time for opposing counsel to respond had lapsed. No such notation was on the docket for the outstanding motions on the docket despite it being past time for opposing counsel to respond, unlike other motions.

42. It appears the hearing at 3DI-147 was scheduled in bad faith to cause me to forgo my access to other courts, to harm my health and to pressure me into forgoing my right to petition the courts in violation of the 5th Amendment’s Equal Protections component as applied to me based on my genuine religious beliefs for which Defendants appeared to discipline me for too.

43. On February 16, 2023, my case manager indicated the scheduler was charged with scheduling, not her.

44. I called the scheduler on February 16, 2023. He directed me to talk with my case manager to discern who requests the scheduler to schedule. He mentioned in passing case managers at time contact him to schedule, but could not answer my question as to who directed him to schedule the hearing in bad faith, knowing I face irreparable injury for the expedition of this matter.

45. I have multiple law suits against my person due to the Defendants' bad faith disciplinary case against me. I face irreparable injury, the foreclosure to access to other courts by wrongful expedition of the Third Circuit case, loss of fundamental rights, and harm to health. My case manager knows I seek to eliminate the threat of compelled debt, and compelled violations of religious belief against debt before it is too late and a compelled violation occurs denying me of the opportunity to petition against it. US Amend 1, V.

46. And yet, I do not have an answer of how this scheduling occurred.

47. The scheduler indicated Third Circuit Linda Blank usually sends out a letter to pro se and attorneys on cases to pick a good week for hearing. I did not get a letter. The scheduler could not pull a letter for me, but Linda Blank may have sent opposing counsel a letter January 25, 2023.

48. On February 16, 2023, I requested to speak with Linda Blank. My request was denied.

49. I note for good cause I have moved to recuse Justice Phipps, Hardiman and Montgomery Reese I incorporate herein by reference at 3DI-128, 3DI-132, 3DI-142, 3DI-143.

50. No judge has been assigned my case in place of Justice Phipps. So it was likely my case manager who expedited the case.

51. Instead of discerning why and by whom the matter was scheduled in bad faith, I seek for good cause to stay the Third Circuit case in **the interim** in order for this Court to prevent irreparable injury, not to deny me the opportunity to be heard on appeal and in other courts, harm health, lose fundamental liberties, or to cause me to violate my religious belief in exchange for the opportunity to exercise my right to be heard in defense of my assertion of my right to property interests, liberties, damages, nominal relief and equitable relief to be compensated by harm done against me.

52. As previously noted, I filed a motion with the Third Circuit, a motion to exempt costs. My case manager did not submit this motion to the panel, despite the time for opposing counsel having lapsed.

IV. POVERTY CREATING AN OBSTACLE SO GREAT AS TO DENY ME ACCESS TO THE COURTS, RELIGIOUS OBJECTIONS TO DEBT, ASSERTION OF THE 13TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AGAINST INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE TO MONEY TO PAY DEBT, WHICH I SEE AS SERVITUDE TO SATAN SINCE JESUS TEACHES YOU CANNOT MAKE BOTH MONEY AND GOD YOUR MASTER *MATTHEW 6:24*

53. Defendants' state proceeding against me creates a government incited economic substantial burden upon me, and prejudices me by forcing me into a maintained state of poverty by preventing me from seeking to get my former position back at my old law firm as an attorney, or any work as a law firm, and harms my reputation to make me less attractive to employers should I alert my former firm or other firms of this proceeding against me, harming my prospects of employment by the libelous accusations against me.

54. The potential needless costs in denying an interim stay create a substantial burden and obstacle to my access to the Courts in contravention to my First Amendment right to access

to the Courts applicable to the Federal Courts via the Equal Protection component of the 5th Amendment, for me, a member of class of one due to religious beliefs against incurring debt combined and due to utter poverty. *See, Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie*, 239 F.3d 307, 317 (3d Cir. 2001) (“This requires us first to determine whether Appellant is a member of a suspect class or whether a fundamental right is implicated. 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.”).

55. Should I be afforded an opportunity to petition this Court the original disciplinary proceeding or other proceedings with the same or similar issues, by granting an interim stay, then costs would be reduced decreasing, albeit possibly not eliminating the likelihood they become so great as to deny me access to the courts given my poverty, religious objection to debt, and assertion of the 13th Amendment involuntary servitude to making money to pay off debt God, I believe potentially leading to damnation in hell.

56. 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 is protected. I believe that you cannot serve God and Money, and object to debt by being compelled to serve Satan by making money savior to eliminate slavery to masters other than God. *Matthew* 6:24. My religious beliefs against debt are genuine. I also have religious beliefs against organized charity, fundraising and volunteering as misleading people to exploit need to serve greed leading to damnation in hell. *Matthew* 6:1-4. The government need not adopt my religion as government religion but must

protect my religious beliefs under the First Amendment. (3DI 146). See, *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004). (“Because this case implicates 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.)

57. The expedition of this case by the Third Circuit creates needless costs and duplicity of judgements for multiple courts so as to deprive me fair access to other courts, and its own to safeguard my fundamental rights.

58. “Because this case implicates the [Constitutionally protected] 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).

59. 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).

60. 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

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

62. The Third Circuit's Order by Circuit Judges Smith, Krause, and Restrepo at Third Circuit Docket Item (herein referred to as "3DI") 90 threatening me with sanctions, in known violation of my religious beliefs against debt shows their utter disregard for the First Amendment exercise of my religious belief, as applied to me, in favor of selling the souls of the people by eliminating freedom in exchange for convenience. US Amend I, V, XIII. The threat of costs and sanctions to compel me not to exercise my right to access to the Courts to defend my exercise of First Amendment rights, Fifth and Fourteenth property interests in my licenses, my life, eternal life and health, arguably may violate the Equal Clause component applicable to the Federal Courts pursuant to the 5th Amendment and the First Amendment based on religious association, exercise and belief.

63. In addition, fundamental rights are implicated. Defendants violated my procedural and substantive due process opportunity to be heard, to prepare and present evidence, to subpoena witnesses, to cross examine my accuser, and Defendants persecute me and seek to defame my character and take away my property interest in my 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 and Christian when I believe there has been a grievance committed against me.

64. So, the Third Circuit Court must have a compelling reason to expedite my cause, needlessly increasing costs, harm to health and likelihood of loss of the right to petition in other courts, causing loss of First Amendment rights, licenses, harm to reputation and other irreparable injury.

65. The Third Circuit Court does not have a compelling reason but may have a malicious reason to intentionally deny me the opportunity to be heard by the US Supreme Court, loss of my fundamental rights and other irreparable harm towards me. For evidence please note in my motion to postpone the scheduled date at 3DI at 13 149, I averred:

I assert my right to be heard, in other courts. US Amend I, V. I assert my right to life, health, and the exercise of fundamental rights without a government compelled exchange for the mere opportunity to be heard.

14. At 3DI-146 I complained about the Third Circuit's threat of compelled violations of my religious belief, threat of involuntary servitude in violation of US Amend XIII, and government compelled violation of religious beliefs in exchange with the fundamental right to the right to petition based on disdain, indifference or animus in my religious belief in God as God, not money as God, and against debt, and stated at paragraphs 9-13:"

9. There appears to be a risk of government compelled violation of my religious belief against debt, involuntary servitude in violation of US Amend XIII, and a government compelled obstacle due to the threat of debt creating an obstacle so great as to deny me access to the Courts. I do not want to go to hell by servitude to Satan by making money God to pay off the threat of debt in exchange with my exercise of the right to access to the Courts applicable to this Federal Court pursuant to US Amend I, V."

10. I have religious belief against debt as leading those who create it and many enslaved to it to damnation in hell. A Court compelling a party not to assert her rights to access to the Courts, or the right to petition, which is similarly afforded to other parties and attorneys is different than threatening a lawyer since the Court acts as an advocate against a party.

11. My petitions are different than others because I am different by my exercise of individual private petitions, based on my First Amendment private religious belief, Private First Amendment exercise of belief, private First Amendment speech reflecting my private beliefs, and my private exercise of association.

12. It is rather peculiar being in a position as a party and have Court agents attempt to threaten me a witness and a party to cause me to forgo my case for example in *Kelly v Trump*.

13. I am concerned about setting precedent that pro se claimants may be treated as unworthy of Equal Protections under the law because the Court may eliminate all freedom by requiring only those who [have the means to] buy it are free. It appears the common people without money, materials or power have nothing to barter but their own souls, making them slaves as they seek to assert their freedom.” US Amend XIII.

66. Nor is any justification narrowly tailored to meet any compelling reason.

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

68. I also note my concern this expedited Third Circuit hearing scheduled before my Reply brief was due, despite my appeal to assert a stay, may be done in retaliation for my complaints that my case manager misstated the facts in another docket number where the Court accused me of sending a pleading by emergency email when it was sent by US mail as shown of the bottom of the pleading. (3DI-87-10, showing the pleading was mailed the Court when the order in bad faith alleged it was sent by emergency email, while threatening me with sanctions for us of emergency email).

V. NOT PERMITTED TO RESUBMIT JUSTICE ALITO’S DENIED APPLICATION FOR AN INTERIM STAY WITH NEW INFORMATION EXACERBATING AND WORSENING MY INJURIES REQUIRING IMMEDIATE RELIEF, THUS A NEW MOTION WAS REQUIRED

69. On Friday, March 3, 2023, I filed [Appellant Meghan Kelly’s] Emergency Application to the Honorable Justice Samuel A. Alito, Junior to expedite this Court’s decision in Kelly v Swartz Case Number 22-6783, due to the Third Circuit’s bad faith scheduling of the Third Circuit’s conference prior to this Court’s conference to evade review, so as not to deprive me of my 5th Amendment opportunity to be heard and irreparable injury in terms of loss of right

to exercise fundamental rights, my 5th and 14th Amend property interests in my licenses and loss to harm to health and life.

70. I called my case manager and the efilng staff at the US Supreme Court because I did not know how to upload it as an application to this case number 22-6783. Efilng kindly directed me to call Robert Meek, the emergency clerk. They indicated that Daniel Bickle filled in for Robert Meek when he was not available.

71. I was not able to reach Robert Meek. So, I called Daniel Bickle. He kindly and promptly answered. It appears I efiled it wrong. I am sorry. He said the Court will consider it a motion as opposed to an application. Thus, I must file this with ten copies as a Motion because I still do not know how to file an application to Justice Alito with this case number.

72. Daniel Bickle said I was not allowed to resubmit the new information exacerbating harm, the unaddressed motions, the bad faith expedition or the new reciprocal disciplinary order against me in another state, PA, which exacerbates and worsens and increases injury to me, should I resubmit the same previously filed application for an interim stay with the new information worsening irreparable injury. (3DI-161, 3DI 162, 3DI 163, 3DI-164). So, I am required to submit a different motion containing the new reasons an interim stay is required because the bad faith expedition of the Third Circuit's case will render this appeal moot if relief herein is not granted.

73. This Court will not likely decide the merits of my petition by or before April 11, 2023. With horror, I realized even if this court expedites my case, it may be too late and irreparable injury may result if an interim stay is not granted.

74. I move this Court to prevent additional irreparable harm, by granting an interim stay. Irreparable injury can never be fully healed.

75. I am communicating with opposing counsel and requested her stance albeit it may be under the impression of resubmitting the motion to another justice. She has not responded.

76. There is a reasonable probability that four Justices will grant certiorari, or agree to review the merits of the case since this case relates to affording me an opportunity to buy and sell but for m religious beliefs that will affect other professionals. I admit there is a risk that this Court may find my religious beliefs so repugnant that it may not deem me worthy of fundamental rights. I am not in government and lost an election in 2018. I do not force my religious beliefs by threat of government authority. If I was in government, I would protect people's freedom to say my ideas suck. Why? Because I would be charged with caring for them, not controlling them by alleviating burdens upon their back. Plus, I believe people must use their own brain to go to heaven, not the force-fed thoughts of leaders or professionals. I love people and do not want them to be harmed or go to hell. So, I encourage people to use their own brains.

77. There is a fair prospect that a majority of the Court will conclude upon review that the decision below on the merits was erroneous, under the facts of this case

VI. IRREPARABLE HARM INLCUDES HARM TO HEALTH, IN ADDITION TO LOSS OF FUNDAMENTAL FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS, REPUTATION, LICENCES TO WORK IN THE PROFESSION OF MY CHOICE AND OTHER HARM, NOTE RELIGIOUS OBJECTIONS TO HEALTHCARE AND MENTAL HEALTHCARE

78. Irreparable harm will result from the denial of an interim stay, time could prevent grave harm to my health, in addition to loss of fundamental rights.

79. I note that Religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare may be an issue for Judges related to healthcare professionals they love, including family. But I assert my

right to live not harm my health, die or be damned to hell in violation of my First Amendment religious belief as reasons for the interim stay.

80. I do not feel so well. I am very dehydrated. I require rest to sustain my health, but the Third Circuit twice denied my requests for a stay. I asserted my right to live, not die for the vanity of the Court as a religious exercise to live for God, not man or money. (DI-11, 3DI-141)

81. The Third Circuit is aware of this. (3DI-131, 3DI-141). Attached hereto and incorporated herein please find my healthcare record, and information regarding my proposals to improve our harmful healthcare. (Exhibit E)

82. I have religious objections to both healthcare and mental healthcare. I believe people go to hell for blindly adopting the beliefs of psychologists, behavioralists and other scientists affiliated with the mental and healthcare industries. I am not forcing my religious beliefs upon the government. I am asserting my right to live and not be harmed, or die to be damned to hell for the vanity of men whose studies they claim control my will, as opposed to God's will. US Amend I, V.

83. Government compelling private individuals to believe as the government endorsed private doctors or healthcare workers require makes imperfect men, whose imperfect work guide and master of the souls of men. This eliminates free will by government backed private forced will of private experts, scientists, professionals. These professionals or experts in turn are often rendered to be above the letter of the law, or the letter of the law because the courts often defer to the standards professional practice or the opinions of experts. This partiality by the courts towards paid professionals or those who have a conflict of interest in terms of prestige, power or position creates injustice by stagnating improving or preventing standardized harmful

healthcare and mental healthcare. The Courts partiality towards professionals, instead of the consumers they harm or who may not desire to be compelled to pay for services and products they do not freely choose, creates unfair bias towards business not freedom. This bias arguably in violations of the Equal Protections Component of the 5th Amendment towards sacrificing life and liberty to serve what I believe is the mark of the beast in the Bible, business greed, prevents Courts from correcting harmful businesses practices from oppressing, harming, destroying or even killing human life and liberty for the bottom line. US Amend I, V.

84. The danger is increased by the temptation for experts, scientists, professionals, and specifically healthcare and mental healthcare workers to gain or sustain profit, position, or power which arguably gives them incentive to render harmful business practices to maintain need to serve business greed while sacrificing the common man's liberty or health while requiring him to work to pay for bad healthcare. It rewards bad business including the rewarded made to repair and replace items where chips, under the Chips Act, which are designed to make printers or products to stop working for example. So consumers are compelled to work to pay for repairs or replaced parts. (See *Bible, Exodus 5:6-8*, It is sin to create jobs, busy work so people have no free time to worship or not.)

85. It is my religious belief justice in the courts is a command by God. *Citing Amos 5:15*. Jesus explains justice, mercy and faithfulness are greater commands protecting and correcting people than laws that deal property or material gain. *Matthew 23:23*.

86. It is my religious belief that people go to hell for harming others at work despite not knowing, despite doing what they were told to do, doing what the science showed them to do or what they were trained to do. (*Hosea 4:6, 2 Corinthians 4:4, Matthew 13:22, Matthew 15:14, Isaiah 9:16*). I believe they were blinded by their desire for money to care for their own, they

could not see clearly to care for others they harmed. Throughout the Bible the fact people did not know, were confused, misunderstood is why they would be thrown into the fires of hell the last day for making money God and guide. Jesus teaches you cannot serve money and God. *Matthew 6:24*. I make God my guide not money, merriment and material gain, mere lusts my guide. (US Amend I, V)

87. The Courts are not able to improve the world and save lives and eternal lives if they defer to mere scientists, doctors and mental health professionals who historically often sacrifice life and liberty for their material gain. I believe scientists wicked desire to be all knowing, in an attempt be their own God causes them to sin by using precious people as lab rats, statistics and data in their speculating scientific hypothesis and experiments. Science is learning. When the pupil declares himself the master, he stops learning and defeats science by the sin of Satan pride as opposed to humility.

88. It is my religious belief judges can save not only lives by preventing harm but eternal lives too by correcting philanthropists, scientists, doctors, mental health professionals when they harm people. *See Jeremiah 17:5* ("Cursed is the one who trusts in man" by cursed I think God means damned to hell as unworthy of eternal life the last day for making man or man's work God, should they not repent.)

89. The equities of granting a stay to safeguard the elimination of the right to religious belief, religious exercise of belief, association, to buy and sell, and the right to petition and due process to defend the same exceed any harm towards the respondent, court or the public.

90. The public is harmed should an interim stay be denied at the threat they too may lose their First Amendment right to religious belief in order for a license to buy and sell.

VII. PRAYER NO BOND BE REQUIRED AS SUBSTANTIAL BURDEN DUE TO POVERTY, COMPELLED RELIGIOUS BELIEF AGAINST DEBT AND INVOCATION OF THE 13TH AMENDMENT AGAINST INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE

91. I pray no bond be required as a compelled violation of my religious belief against debt, as a substantial burden to my access to the courts due to poverty and as government compelled involuntary servitude in violation of US Amend I, V, XIII, applicable to me as a party of one with unique religious-political beliefs. Supreme Court Rule 23 (4)

VIII. I INVOKE THE COURT'S EQUITABLE POWER, BUT SHOULD THE COURT DEEM THIS TO BE A MOTION TO REAGUE UNDER SUPREME COURT RULE 44, I ASSERT MY RIGHTS UNDER THIS RULE

92. 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. 334 (1865); *Krippendorf v. Hyde*, 110 U.S. 276, 283 (1884).

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

94. Should this Court deem this motion to be under Supreme Court Rule 44 a motion for a rehearing as opposed to a different motion based on the guaranteed harm due to the bad faith expedition of the case below, in terms of loss of the right to petition in defense of my exercise of fundamental rights, thereby losing my First Amendment rights. I have pled within the 25 days required under this rule. I plead in good faith. However, a delay is needed in terms of a stay to prevent the loss of my ability to assert Constitutional rights by the obstruction of the Third Circuit Court to prevent the writ of certiorari before judgment from going forward, with utter disregard to harm to my health, licenses, liberty or eternal life, by rendering it moot by its wrongful expedition of the case below. Supreme Court Rule 44 (1)(2).

IX. CONCLUSION

95. If an interim stay is not granted, I may not be able to exercise the 1st and 5th Amendment right to access to other courts to petition in all cases, not be free choice but by government compelled choice to forgo my rights in some courts in exchange for exercising my Constitutional rights, including the right to petition in others. It is not fair or just to sacrifice liberty for partial desires of courts.

Wherefore I pray this Court grants this motion.

Dated: March 14, 2023

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

US Supreme Court Number 283696

Exhibit 5

OFF THE RECORD invocation of the 1st, 5th and 6th amendment rights Fw: 22-6783 Fw:
Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; dbaker@supremecourt.gov

Cc: david.weiss@usdoj.gov; drivkin@bakerlaw.com; zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; harriet.brumberg@pacourts.us;
anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us; matthewkosiorek@comcast.net; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com;
iadams@sidley.com; aggiekelly@comcast.net; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov;
shaolawfirm_emails@yahoo.com

Date: Saturday, December 9, 2023 at 12:21 PM EST

Below, please find an email I received in response to the removal of documents alleging a glitch. Attached, please find one example where my documents were removed or otherwise changed. Attached, please find case number's where another attorney alleges the same thing happened, and that dates were changed to deny her access allegedly by court staff's deception. I invoke my 6th Amendment right to an open proceeding in this criminal like proceeding where my license to buy and sell as a lawyer is infringed upon but for my religious beliefs in Jesus not money or mammon as guide and God. The state attacked me based on my religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions based on affiliation associated with a license to practice law, affiliation as a democratic, as a Christian and as a Catholic, who does not defer to the Pope or the Church but God through the father, son and holy spirit. This is 4 violations of the 1st Amendment pursuant to the 14th Amendment applicable to the state. My private petitions to alleviate a government incited substantial burden upon my religious exercise contained in petitions relating to bar dues and in a religious freedom restoration act lawsuit, without disparate treatment, collusion by the government to cause me to forgo, witness tampering, and other insidious attacks by the state including but not limited to sending Court of Common Pleas Judge Clark to attack and threaten me at a grocery store is a right all people residing in the United States must be free to exercise without government retaliation based on viewpoint of speech. I invoke my rights against disparate treatment applicable to the United States Supreme court's staff via the 5th and my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts under the 1st apart from the record to cure defects. For some reason I am having difficulty drafting this email and am unable to hit enter for paragraphs. My computer email is freezing and I am quite scared. Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter. Very truly yours, Meg

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: eFilingSupport <efilingssupport@supremecourt.gov>

To: 'Meg Kelly' <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, March 9, 2023 at 09:13:17 AM EST

Subject: RE: 22-6783 Fw: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

Good morning,

We are currently experiencing a system-wide computer glitch and it should be resolved shortly.

Thanks,

Clerk's Office

Supreme Court of the United States

One First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20543

efilingssupport@supremecourt.gov

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 9, 2023 8:09 AM
To: eFilingSupport <eFilingSupport@supremecourt.gov>; Robert Meek <rmeek@supremecourt.gov>; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; Radinson-Blasucci Caneel (DOJ) <caneel.radinson-blasucci@delaware.gov>; Shen Zi-Xiang (DOJ) <zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov>; Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: 22-6783 Fw: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the Supreme Court of the United States. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe and relevant.

Good morning,

My case, Number 22-6783 was removed and the docket was deleted from the US Supreme Court's web site.

What is worse, it looks like my corrected motion that grants statutory not merely equitable authority to present my motion for an interim stay to the entire court as opposed to merely Justice Alito appears to have misdirected to Southern Maryland's distribution center. It was supposed to arrive today.

The tracking Number is 9505514998633066985670.

I do not safe. I am pleading to safeguard my life, my private right to believe in Jesus, my eternal life, not merely for damages, nominal relief and my license.

I am scared. Someone talked about shooting me. The threats have subsided with my loud voice asking for help in this law suit, but my voice is silenced when my petitions are removed from this Court's web site, removing my cries for help should my life be threatened again.

Please place my material back on the web site. I am a little scared.

Thank you,

Meg

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

(302) 493-6693

Not acting as a lawyer on behalf of another

US Supreme Court No. 283696

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "no-reply@sc-us.gov" <no-reply@sc-us.gov>

To: "meghankellyesq@yahoo.com" <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, March 7, 2023 at 10:12:54 AM EST

Subject: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

A new docket entry, "[othertext] of Meghan Kelly submitted." has been added for [Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner v. Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.](#)

 Docket changes shown 124 2 Docket Exhibits 1 2 3.pdf
2.3MB

 Email from Shao to Galen.pdf
187.4kB

Attachment to
~~Exhibit 1~~ Email

DI 124-2

Search documents in this case:

No. 22-6783

Title: **Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner**
 v.
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.

Docketed: February 15, 2023

Lower Ct: United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

Case Numbers: (21-3198, 22-2079)

DATE	PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS
Feb 06 2023	<p>Petition for a writ of certiorari before judgment and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due March 17, 2023)</p> <p>Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis</p> <p>Service Appendix Petition Appendix Petition Appendix Petition Appendix Proof of Appendix Appendix</p>
Mar 03 2023	<p>Emergency Application to the Honorable Justice Samuel A. Alito, Junior to expedite this Court's decision in Kelly v Swartz Case Number 22-6783 so as not to deprive me of my 5th Amendment opportunity to be heard and irreparable injury in terms of loss of r of Meghan Kelly submitted.</p> <p>Other Service of Service Other Main Document Other Main Document Other Main Document Other Main Document Other Main Document Proof of Proof</p>
Mar 06 2023	<p>Different Emergency Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (f) to grant an interim stay of Third Circuit case Kelly v Swartz et al, No 21-3198 and 22-2079 for a different additional reasons, pending this courts determination on her Writ of Certiorari before of Meghan Kelly submitted.</p> <p>Main Document Document Document Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Proof of Service Proof of Service</p>
Mar 06 2023	<p>Letter to the Clerk of Court per Robert Meek's kind suggestion regarding submission of my motion filed today of Meghan Kelly submitted.</p> <p>Main Document of Service Main Document Proof of Service Other Other Other Proof</p>

These exhibits were removed March 9, 2023

~~Exhibit 2~~

DI 124-2

Search documents in this case:

No. 22-6783

Title: **Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner**
v.
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.

Docketed: February 15, 2023

Lower Ct: United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

Case Numbers: (21-3198, 22-2079)

DATE	PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS
Feb 06 2023	Petition for a writ of certiorari before judgment and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due March 17, 2023) Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis Service Appendix Petition Appendix Petition Appendix Proof of Appendix Appendix
Mar 03 2023	Motion to expedite consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari filed by petitioner Meghan Kelly. Proof of Service Document Main Document Proof of Service Main Document Main
Mar 06 2023	Letter to the Clerk of Court per Robert Meek's kind suggestion regarding submission of my motion filed today of Meghan Kelly not accepted for filing. (March 13, 2023)
Mar 06 2023	Different Emergency Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (f) to grant an interim stay of Third Circuit case Kelly v Swartz et al, No 21-3198 and 22-2079 for a different additional reasons, pending this courts determination on her Writ of Certiorari before of Meghan Kelly not accepted for filing. (March 13, 2023)
Mar 07 2023	(March 13, 2023)
Mar 10 2023	Addendum to Motion to Expedite Motion to expedite consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari of Meghan Kelly submitted.

*Empty
 All the other documents
 containing
 the exhibits
 were
 removed*

~~Exhibit 3~~

DI 124-2

Search documents in this case: Search

No. 22-6783

Title: **Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner**
 v.
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.

Docketed: February 15, 2023

Linked with 22A747

Lower Ct: United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

Case Numbers: (21-3198, 22-2079)

DATE	PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS
Feb 06 2023	Petition for a writ of certiorari before judgment and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due March 17, 2023) Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis Pauperis Service Petition Appendix Petition Appendix Petition Appendix Proof of Appendix Appendix
Feb 11 2023	Application (22A747) for a stay, submitted to Justice Alito. Lower Court Orders/Opinions Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Proof of Service
Feb 22 2023	Application (22A747) denied by Justice Alito.
Mar 03 2023	Motion to expedite consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari filed by petitioner Meghan Kelly. Proof of Service Main Document Main Document Proof of Service
Mar 06 2023	Letter to the Clerk of Court per Robert Meek's kind suggestion regarding submission of my motion filed today of Meghan Kelly not accepted for filing. (March 13, 2023)
Mar 06 2023	Different Emergency Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (f) to grant an interim stay of Third Circuit case Kelly v Swartz et al, No 21-3198 and 22-2079 for a different additional reasons, pending this courts determination on her Writ of Certiorari before of Meghan Kelly not accepted for filing. (March 13, 2023)

Empty Main Document - Remove!

Exhibits remain missing

Attachment to Email

RE: Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Delaware law librarians saving lives with the law

From: Wilson, Galen (Courts) (galen.wilson@delaware.gov)
To: shaolawfirm_emails@yahoo.com; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
Date: Monday, December 4, 2023 at 08:59 AM EST

Hello,

Unfortunately, this is more than I am going to be able to help with. While we can send a docket or a document or two here and there, the law libraries are not staffed to pull this much information for patrons. Additionally, we can only retrieve specific documents; we are unable to look for alterations in the docket, etc.

If you would like specific dockets for a case, let me know the court and case number, and I can send you the docket; from there if there is a specific document listed that you would like, I can retrieve that for you, but unfortunately I will not be able to accommodate this volume. I am sorry that I could not be of more assistance.

Sincerely,

Galen Wilson, PhD
Senior Law Librarian/Self-Help Coordinator
Administrative Office of the Courts
500 N King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801-3760
(302) 255-0845

Yi Tai Shao's
docketing issues
with U.S. Supreme Court

From: Shaolawfirm emails <shaolawfirm_emails@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 3, 2023 8:02 AM
To: Wilson, Galen (Courts) <Galen.Wilson@delaware.gov>; Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fw: Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Delaware law librarians saving lives with the law

Dear Galan

Would you please help provide the docket alterations records for 17-82 (removing individual names from being Respondents)

17-256 (removing individual names of respondents from docket in 2017 then added "et Al" in or about 2022)

17-613 (alterations on "decision date") and many entries

18-344 where is the Motion for Judicial notice

18-569 (the removal record of Amicus Curiae motion filed on 11/8/2018)

19-613 (alterations of entries in the docket on Request for Recusal

20-524 please track down records of three time removal of court order and judgment between 1/12/2021 and 1/17/2021

21-881 7 filings blocked

22-28 record of removal of Petition for rehearing then put back many docket entries were altered

All appendixes for Requests for Recusal

Yi Tai Shao's case
issues with
U.S. Supreme Court

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: shaolawfirm_emails@yahoo.com <shaolawfirm_emails@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, December 2, 2023, 10:16:25 PM EST

Subject: Fw: Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Delaware law librarians saving lives with the law

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: Galen Wilson <galen.wilson@delaware.gov>; attorneyshao@outlook.com <attorneyshao@outlook.com>

Cc: Geleskie Bethany (Courts) <bethany.geleskie@delaware.gov>; Naylor Margaret (Courts) <margaret.naylor@delaware.gov>; attorneyshao@outlook.com <attorneyshao@outlook.com>

Sent: Saturday, December 2, 2023 at 09:41:29 PM EST

Subject: Yi Tai Shao aka Linda Delaware law librarians saving lives with the law

Good evening Galen, Bethany, Peggy,

Copied here is Shao. I am not her attorney. I discovered in her case another court concealed or doctored her filings same as I allege in my case. She lost not only her license, liberty but her little one her child too due to an alleged court cover up. It is so odd there is a similar case to mine.

Galen you are the only one with the special resource to check on dockets and to confirm date of changes with one day delays, would you guys please help her if she needs you?

Sorry to bother you over the weekend.

I have been in tears since I found she got into trouble for doing what is right seeking to uphold the impartial rule of law.

Thank you love,

meg

The law librarians numbers are

Contact

Galen Wilson, Senior Law Librarian/Self-Help Center Coordinator
Email: Galen.Wilson@delaware.gov

Phone: (302) 255-0844
Fax: (302) 255-2223

Margaret L. Naylor, Law Librarian
Email: Margaret.Naylor@delaware.gov
Phone: (302) 856-5483

Bethany Parker, Law Librarian
Email: bethany.parker@delaware.gov
Phone: (302) 674-7470
Fax: (302) 674-7471

Exhibit 6

P

COMMERCIAL BASE PRICING

VISIT US AT... ORDER FREE SUPPLIES

USPS PRIORITY MAIL®

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
1 1ST ST NE
WASHINGTON DC 20543

SHIP MEGHAN KELLY
TO: 34012 SHAWNEE DRIVE
DAGSBORO DE 19939

USPS TRACKING #



9205 5902 4503 8800 0000 2945 99

ELECTRONIC RATE APPROVED #902450388

BOX 1 OF 1

20543-0001

December 6, 2023

LARGE MAILING FOR DOMESTIC

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

RE: "Second Petition for Rehearing"
No: 22-7695

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The petition for rehearing received December 5, 2023 is herewith returned. Rehearing was denied in the above-entitled case on November 13, 2023. Pursuant to Rule 44.4 consecutive petitions for rehearing will not be received.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By:

Lisa Nesbitt

Exhibit 7

Yahoo Mail - Allstate Protection Plans Claim#0069222120:

<https://mail.yahoo.com/d/folders/1/messages/AG251LRHsQ40ZXPfXQrs4Efsejc>

Allstate Protection Plans Claim#0069222120:

From: Warranty Support (warrantysupport@squaretrade.com)

To: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Friday, December 8, 2023 at 08:41 PM EST



Plan#: **558564443669023**
Claim#: **0069222120**

Hello Meghan,

Thank you for contacting Allstate.

We reviewed your concern and as per our investigation there is nothing wrong with the warranty. There are some discounts on the warranty but you don't have to worry as the amount was calculated accordingly.

Thank you for being a valued customer.

If you have any more questions, please feel free to reply to this email. Otherwise you can also visit [help](#).

Thank you,
Hamdan
The Allstate Protection Plans Team

Yahoo Mail - Allstate Protection Plans Claim#0069222120:

<https://mail.yahoo.com/d/folders/1/messages/AG251LRHsQ40ZXPfXQrs4Efselj>

----- Original Message -----

From: Meg Kelly [meghankellyesq@yahoo.com]

Sent: 12/5/2023 5:28 AM

To: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; warrantysupport@squaretrade.com

Subject: warranty not sent a possibility Rep said it takes 3 days



I spoke with agent Emm. She said it takes three days to register the warranty.

She indicated it appears Square Trade accidentally sent the wrong plan. She said they could adjust the plan to the correct plan.

Thank you,
Meg

ref:!00D3006mMq.I5005Y02afefi:ref

Exhibit 8

 		Search documents in this case: <input type="text"/>	<input type="button" value="Search"/>
No. 22-6783			
Title:	Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner v. Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.		
Docketed:	February 15, 2023		
Linked with 22A747			
Lower Ct:	United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit		
Case Numbers:	(21-3198, 22-2079)		

DATE	PROCEEDINGS AND ORDERS
Feb 06 2023	Petition for a writ of certiorari before judgment and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due March 17, 2023) Motion for Leave to Proceed in Forma Pauperis Service Petition Petition Petition Proof of Appendix Appendix Appendix Appendix Appendix Appendix
Feb 11 2023	Application (22A747) for a stay, submitted to Justice Alito. Lower Court Orders/Opinions Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Document Main Document Main Document Proof of Service
Feb 22 2023	Application (22A747) denied by Justice Alito.
Mar 03 2023	Motion to expedite consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari filed by petitioner Meghan Kelly. Proof of Service Main Document Main Document Proof of Service
Mar 06 2023	Letter to the Clerk of Court per Robert Meek's kind suggestion regarding submission of my motion filed today of Meghan Kelly not accepted for filing. (March 13, 2023)
Mar 06 2023	Different Emergency Motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2101 (f) to grant an interim stay of Third Circuit case Kelly v Swartz et al, No 21-3198 and 22-2079 for a different additional reasons, pending this courts determination on her Writ of Certiorari before of Meghan Kelly not accepted for filing. (March 13, 2023)

Mar 10 2023	Letter from petitioner dated March 10, 2023 received. Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Document Proof of Service Proof of Service
Mar 13 2023	Application (22A747) refiled and submitted to Justice Jackson. Written Request Other Proof of Service Proof of Service
Mar 21 2023	Renewed application of Meghan Kelly not accepted for filing. (March 28, 2023)
Mar 24 2023	Motion to the Honorable Justice Alito to place removed exhibits back on the docket submitted. Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Document Main Document Main Document Proof of Service
Mar 25 2023	Letter to Clerk from petitioner submitted. Main Document Other Proof of Service
Mar 28 2023	Letter to Clerk from petitioner submitted. Main Document Other Proof of Service
Mar 30 2023	DISTRIBUTED for Conference of 4/14/2023.
Apr 01 2023	Motion of petitioner to dismiss the case under Rule 46.2 filed. Main Document Proof of Service
Apr 05 2023	Application (22A747) DISTRIBUTED for Conference of 4/21/2023.
Apr 05 2023	Letter to Withdraw Reapplication filed by applicant Meghan Kelly. Proof of Service Main Document
Apr 17 2023	Petition Dismissed - Rule 46.

NAME	ADDRESS	PHONE
Attorneys for Petitioner		

Meghan Marie Kelly
Counsel of Record

Attorney at Law
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

302-493-6693

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Party name: Meghan Kelly

No. 22-6783, Application No. 22A747

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, Disciplinary Counsel Kathleen M. Vavala; David A. White, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, Office of Disciplinary Counsel, Board on Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware, Preliminary Investigatory Committee, Attorney General Delaware

Appellant's Motion to withdraw her Petition before Judgment and Application to Justice Jackson since relief if granted will be too late

I, Appellant, Meghan Kelly withdraw my petition before judgment, No. 22-6783 and Application to Justice Jackson No. 22A747, as relief if granted will be too late, and essentially denied, and I aver.

1. I required a stay from the proceeding below to afford me time and resources to fight, not merely file the Delaware Disciplinary appeal.

2. The Delaware Disciplinary appeal is due by or before April 8, 2023 with this Honorable Court.

3. This Honorable Court is not even scheduled to convene until April 13, 2023 to review the petition before judgment.

4. April 13, 2023 is after the Delaware Disciplinary due date, and is after the Third Circuit's conference dated April 11, 2023.

5. April 13, 2023 is too late for this Court to grant me relief.

6. I am denied access to petition this Court in another case, the Delaware Disciplinary case, due to the delays in this Court's docketing or the grant or denial of this appeal and the application for an interim stay pending this Court's final determination. US Amend I, V. Yet, I am afforded another remedy. I seek to void *Kelly v Trump* and the Delaware Disciplinary

proceeding in the civil rights case below, due to procedural due process violations and clear error. So, I am not left without a remedy at this time.

7. I filed documents in good faith requesting emergency relief. I tried my best to expedite the case under the circumstances. I simply have not succeeded in persuading this Court. I thank the court for its time.

Wherefore, I pray this Court withdraws my petition and application.

Dated April 1, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(302) 493-6693

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
US Supreme Court Bar No. 283696
Not acting as an attorney on behalf of another

Under Religious objection I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct under penalty of law

Dated: April 1, 2023

(printed)

(signed)

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.)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE OF PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY'S 133rd Affidavit

I, Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire, hereby certify on 12/9/2023 I had a true and correct copy of the above referenced document, served to Defendants, through their counsel through email electronically:

Zi-Xiang Shen
Delaware Department of Justice
820 North French Street
6th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801


Dated Dec 9, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

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

Under religious protest as declaring and swearing violates God's teachings in the Bible, I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

Dated: 12/9/2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)

 (signed)