

MEGHAN KELLY, ESQ.

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

Meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

(302) 493-6693

Clerk of Court

Robert Meek or

Chief Justice John Roberts

1 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20543

US Supreme Court Application No. 23A596

RE: Petition to cure defects to prevent deprivation of my asserted 1st, 5th, 6th Amendments rights/Request to cure US Supreme Court erroring mailing me back documents under consideration of this court/Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania Application No. 23A596

January 23, 2024

Dear Robert Meek or Honorable Chief Justice Roberts:

On 1/22/2024 I called Danny Bickel and left a message since I wanted to make sure this filing would be accepted. Please docket this letter on the above referenced case. Please give this request to Chief Justice Roberts and if he determines he is not the proper person, please give this to Robert Meek. Thank you.

I write to request help to please cure this US Supreme Court's denial of my 1st Amendment right to fair access to the court without partiality to the government [including itself] in violation of the 5th Amendment, in my 1st Amendment right to petition on a public record in accordance of the 6th Amendment in this quasi criminal proceeding to prevent irreparable injury in terms of vitiation of a number of asserted not waived fundamental rights and other claims but for this court's obstruction to my access to the courts. US Amend I, V, VI.

On December 26, 2023, I physically dropped off a petition for leave to exceed the page limits in a writ of certiorari to appeal Third Circuit Orders in 22-3372, a motion for leave to file in forma pauperis, a letter to the Clerk of Court for Rule 12.6 relief, and a writ of certiorari to appeal the Orders in the 3rd Circuit Case No. 22-3372, Kelly v Eastern District Court of PA.

On December 26, 2023, I also electronically submitted most of the documents to the Court. I could not fit all of the exhibits on the public docket including the attached draft of a motion to exempt the right to a speedy proceeding I never filed with the Delaware Supreme Court I attached to show how lawyers are partial towards maintaining problems to maintain their positions and profit streams arising from the problems as opposed to preventing them.

I also could not fit the certificate of service that shows I mailed the papers to opposing counsel, because it exceeds the 20 page limit. I attach hereto and incorporate herein.

I invoked and continue to invoke the 1st, 5th and 6th Amendment rights to a full, fair and public proceeding in this quasi-criminal proceeding regarding the elimination of my right to buy and sell but for finding my religious beliefs in Jesus contained in the speech in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act petition against former President Trump repugnant, based on my association as a lawyer, democrat, Catholic, Christian. US Amend I, XIV.

So, I of course did not waive my asserted 1st, 5th, and 6th Amendment rights by eliminating exhibits in favor of a mere certificate of service when I submitted the electronic filing on December 26, 2023. I attach the certificate of service hereto.

Per the attached exhibit, I emailed all of the documents to both US Supreme Court Clerk Donald Baker and opposing counsel in light of the fact this US Supreme Court lost my Supplemental brief submitted in 11 boxes in person on November 6, 2023 necessary for the court's consideration of a petition for a rehearing for US Supreme Court Case No. 22-7695 *Kelly v Pennsylvania Office of Disciplinary Counsel* which deprived me of a full and fair opportunity to petition, access to the courts, in violation of the courts own rules and case law as I outlined in the exhibits on the public docket of this matter and incorporate herein.

This Court considered my December 26, 2023 filings as an Application (23A596) to file petition for a writ of certiorari in excess of page limits in *Kelly v District Court, Eastern District of PA*, and submitted it to Justice Alito.

On January 3, 2024 Justice Alito denied the application.

On January 3, 2024 I immediately drafted a written request to the Honorable Chief Justice Roberts by placing 1 original and ten copies in an envelope and placed this and a copy to opposing counsel in the US mail that same day for pick up the next day.

On January 16, 2024, my father's birthday, this United States Supreme Court erred in sending me another person's filings, which I mailed back, and all of the documents relating to *Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania* Application No. 23A596.

On January 16, 2023 I also received documents from this Court for another matter, *Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.* Application No. 23A361.

This Court also mailed back the attached Exhibit showing "NO IFP Motion" on my petition for more pages denied by this Honorable Court on January 12, 2024 in *Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.* Application No. 23A361.

This note drafted by a US Supreme Court staff gave me hope that the judges or their staff may actually review my physical documents during distribution for conference, making it critical

physical documents are available for the court's ease. They do not appear to rely on the public docket which contains submissions that may not be filed. Even if they did, not all of my documents are on the public filing making this Court's accommodation to cure defects even more pressing.

I am impoverished and do not have the means to attach all exhibits containing assertions. I incorporate them in haste in fear of God that Chief Justice Roberts may vitiate my fair access to the courts by ruling too quick. So I attach a few including the Petitions for more pages in the application for this case and in Kelly v Swartz, et all, and incorporate herein in its entirety.

I act in haste to prevent vitiation of my rights. I am alarmed by the attached note on the petition for more pages as shown in the attached picture for a different application in Kelly v Swartz averring "NO IFP Motion."

In the attached Petition for leave for more pages in Case No. 23A596, the appeal of the Eastern District of PA case, I protected myself by attaching and incorporating the petition for writ of cert and the pet for permission to file Informa pauperis into the petition for more pages by stating:

"Petitioner Plaintiff Meghan Kelly, Esq. pro se pursuant to the 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding, the 1st Amendment right to petition, the Court's equitable powers and Supreme Court Rules 22 and 32, and any other applicable rule this Court deems just, move this Court to permit me to exceed the page limit under Rule 34 (2)(b) in my petition for writ of certiorari of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit Case No 22-3372 decisions. I file the Petition for writ of certiorari, and Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion for Leave to file in Forma Pauperis simultaneously herewith and incorporate them herein, and state:"

I look at the appeal for our case Kelly v Swartz, US Supreme Court No. 23A361 and attach my petition for leave for more pages hereto and incorporate it herein and see I incorporated the in forma pauperis and the petition for writ of cert too by stating, "I file the Petition for writ of certiorari, and Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion for Leave to file in Forma Pauperis simultaneously herewith and incorporate them herein, and state:" (Emphasis intended)

It is possible the members of the US Supreme Court attempted to review everything but was prejudiced because the staff did not physically hand them the documents in advance when it was transferred to the Court as noted on the public docket on December 6, 2023 :DISTRIBUTED for Conference of 1/5/2024." In this separate case.

My eyes are full of tears because maybe the court attempted to grant me the opportunity to be heard, but in this important appeal now before Chief Justice Roberts I am prejudiced and the courts are in danger because they have no paper documents. I have arguments in No. 23A596 made to protect the courts.

I contacted the case manager Lisa Nesbitt and Danny Bickle during the week of January 16, 2024. They both indicated I did not need to drive back to the US Supreme Court to return the documents sent to me by US mail in error.

Nevertheless, I am prejudiced by the court staff's error.

Chief Justice Roberts may deny my application for more pages necessary to protect 6 fundamental rights from vitiation but for the denial, and necessary to make arguments required to safeguard the US Supreme Court and the rule of law from schemed harm in order to argue no prejudice was made by prejudicing me even more greatly in term of an unfair loss of fundamental rights by denial of the right to petition fully, fairly and effectively in this complicated case.

Chief Justice Roberts may give into temptation to do what serves the government's appearance instead of what is right by applying the impartial rule of law to the petition. This would violate the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component as applied to me in this case.

This Court did not docket filings its staff recommended in a different case. This court deleted proof of rejected electronic submissions disparately to cover up mistakes. Then a staff blamed it on technical issues. This Court did not docket filings I submitted in Case No. 22-7695 to cure the defects by its members, but instead sought to cover up its mistakes by more egregious Constitutional violations. This Court also removed exhibits in a filing, and would not docket the attached application to cure the defect, attached in part and incorporated herein.

I do not seek to destroy the court or its members. I petition to require the Court to uphold and not violate my protected asserted fundamental rights, its own case law analysis and its own rules by curing defects without insidious favoritism to ignore the rule of law with regards to the government, itself by depriving me of access to the courts based on viewpoint of speech contained in the petition.

When the Court makes mistakes petitioners not disciplinary boards should be permitted to exercise their 1st Amendment right to petition to cure defects to improve the administration of justice as opposed to destroying the court in its members in partial unfair disciplinary proceedings.

The Equal Protections component of the 5th applies to me as a class of people or a class of one in that I petition the court to examine whether its members erred and seek to correct the error not destroy the court or its agents in an actual case or controversy. I erred on the side of precaution by resending 11 copies of the written request to this court a second time by certified mail on January 18, 2024.

I sent the attached emails to opposing counsel and Robert Meek to keep the Court and opposing counsel apprised on the status of this matter I attach hereto and incorporate herein.

On January 18, 2024 I saw the written submission was filed as shown on the electronic side which shows the date submissions are filed 1/18/24 as opposed to the date of filing 1/3/24 on the public docket.

I applaud the court for seeking to correct the error. However, I remain prejudiced since Chief Justice Roberts may be tempted to be partial towards the government itself by denying the request to argue there was no prejudice in the court's error in sending me back the documents when denial of my ability to make arguments to preserve the courts from a schemed overthrow in addition to loss of my right to speak fully and fairly before deprivation of 6 fundamental rights is prejudicial.

I am further prejudiced by the error in that not all of the records are on the public docket. I could not fit the Motion to waive a speedy trial I never submitted to the DE Supreme Court which outlines injustices committed by lawyers based on partiality towards maintaining problems to maintain positions and a money stream.

In the Petition for leave for more pages in Case No. 23A596, the appeal of the Eastern District of PA case, I protected myself by attaching and incorporating the petition for writ of certiorari and the petition for permission to file Informa pauperis into the petition for more pages by stating in the opening paragraph, "I file the Petition for writ of certiorari, and Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion for Leave to file in Forma Pauperis simultaneously herewith and incorporate them herein, and state:"

All of the documents are required in order for Justice John Roberts and the Court to make a full and fair determination on the resubmission of the application ripe for review.

Since it was the Court's error and US Supreme Court Clerk Donald Baker has all of the physical documents electronically whereas the public docket does not contain them all, specifically the final Exhibit, the court should print out the voluminous amounts of documents and/or may email the documents I sent Donald Baker for the justices for ease.

Anything that eliminates prejudice to cure the Court's error in mailing me back the documents to prevent vitiation of my asserted not waived right of fair access to the courts under the 5th Amendment and my right to petition under the 1st before I am prejudiced by deprivation of 6 fundamental rights should be done.

I pray to God that Chief Justice Roberts grants me pages and that the Court considers my pleas to prevent irreparable loss to me and the harm to its own branch to prevent the schemed very real threat of dissolution to these United States.

I alluded to the fact that the United States and about 200 other countries agreed to the 30/30 agenda where about 30 percent of our land, water and resources would be controlled through the UN and the UN's private partners who are rendered immune from taxes, criminal, civil and Constitutional laws by 2030 in exhibits to the December 26, 2023 filings. There are many different agendas to weaken or eliminate our independence to allow for the overthrow. This is one.

Please cure the prejudice to give me a fair opportunity this Court may grant the Petition for pages to consider all of the pleas without compelled waiver due to government pressured reduction in pages. Thank you.