

Important/Emergency Meg received another person's filings/ USCA 7 22-1770, 22-1785 on 1/16/24/Lisa Nesbett correcting 23 A 596/will resubmit written request to Justice Alito tomorrow or asap given she is working from home today

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov

Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov

Date: Tuesday, January 16, 2024 at 02:47 PM GMT-5

Good afternoon,

Per my voice mail I received documents in error. I accidentally received the documents for another claimants matter USCA 7 22-1770, 22-1785 per the picture and care to preserve and not vitiate another parties First Amendment right to access to the courts and to petition.

Errors happen and that is why people court staff are important in correcting errors.

I also note when I initially filed an appeal on the original disciplinary case for which all of the cases relate this court rejected my petition since I filed the motion for more pages prior to and not simultaneously therewith.

I filed an in forma pauperis simultaneously with the pages and the petition in the civil rights case, despite the sticky note by a court representative indicating otherwise on a document received by mail today.

I called my case manager on Jan 3 to alert our case manager Lisa Nesbett I was mailing out a resubmission of Justice Alito's denial for pages to Chief Justice Roberts. I called on Jan, 4 with a message to affirm that. She previously confirmed that.

My case manager indicated she had to send out the papers because I told her I was thinking of filing an application for a stay in hopes of possibly retaining an attorney.

The attorney I was hoping to retain without compelling him unwillingly and without violating my religious beliefs is currently appealing a similar disciplinary proceeding and cannot accept clients at this time. Nor is 60 days a sufficient amount of time to discern whether he may be in a position.

Accordingly, I assert and do not waive my 1st Amendment right to petition fairly and fully pursuant to the 5th and 6th Amendments. Accordingly, the attached letter granting 60 days is not ripe as Chief Justice Roberts has not yet received or ruled on my written request to resubmit Justice Alito's denied application for pages yet.

Should Chief Justice Roberts deny my application I reserve the right to resubmit it to another judge or request it be sent to the entire court, along with the in forma pauperis which doesn't appear to have been submitted in the civil rights case as evidenced by the sticky note the court's staff placed on it. I also request 60 additional days should my request be denied.

I am quite distraught since I believe the courts are in trouble and do not want to be compelled to reduce pages in No. 23A 596, 23 A144 to reduce the arguments contained therein to protect and preserve the courts to preserve the rule of law that creates, sustains and maintains these United States.

Should the courts disagree with me, the courts should retain authority to say what the law is instead of Congress and others who seek to control a no longer free and impartial forum necessary to preserve my 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding.

Thank you for your kind consideration especially with regards to the receipt of another claimants filings.

Very truly,
Meg

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2024 at 01:17:39 PM EST

Subject: Emergency Meg wrong case wrong docs

Sent from my iPhone



IMG_3749.jpg
607kB



IMG_3750.jpg
731.5kB



IMG_3751.jpg
725.5kB



IMG_3753.jpg
699kB



IMG_3747.jpg
986.8kB

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2024 at 01:17:39 PM EST
Subject: Emergency Meg wrong case wrong docs

Sent from my iPhone



IMG_3749.jpg
607kB



IMG_3750.jpg
731.5kB



IMG_3751.jpg
725.5kB



IMG_3753.jpg
699kB



IMG_3747.jpg
986.8kB

No.
Application

IN THE SUPREME COURT

Meghan M.

Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, Disc

White, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, Office of

Responsibility of the Supreme Court of the

Committee, Attorne

No IFP
Motion

I.A.

al

**Petitioner Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Petition for Leave to exceed the page limit in her
Petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit**

Case No 21-3198

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

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

January 12, 2024

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

RE: Kelly v. USDC ED PA
(23A596)
No: 23A144

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The above-entitled petition for writ of certiorari was received December 26, 2023. The papers are returned for the following reason(s):

The petition exceeds the limit of 40 pages allowed. Rule 33.2(b).


Please correct and resubmit as soon as possible. Unless the petition is submitted to this Office in corrected form within 60 days of the date of this letter, the petition will not be filed. Rule 14.5.

A copy of the corrected petition must be served on opposing counsel.

When making the required corrections to a petition, no change to the substance of the petition may be made.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:



Lisa Nesbitt
(202) 479-3038

Enclosures

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

of

Petitioner Meghan Kelly's petition for writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit Case No 22-3372, Motion for leave to file in forma pauperis, Petition for leave to exceed the page limit in her Petition for Writ of Certiorari of the Appellate Court Orders, letter to the Clerk of Court of Supreme Court Rule 12.6 Notice

I, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire, hereby certify that on

12/26/2023

_____, I had a true and correct copy of the above referenced document sent to all Defendants through their attorneys, served via US Mail, and to

Elizabeth B. Prelogar
Solicitor General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Dated 12/26/2023

Respectfully submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly *Meghan Kelly*
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
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, Defending my First Amendment
Right to religious belief in Jesus as God, not
money as God. Matthew 6:24

USCA7 # 1779, 22-1785

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jose Israel Leon - PETITIONER

*(Jose Leon)
The Respondent
is to be written on a
separate piece of paper*

— RESPONDENT

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

The petitioner asks leave to file the attached petition for a writ of certiorari without prepayment of costs and to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Please check the appropriate boxes.

Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in
United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia

Petitioner has not previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in any other court.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration in support of this motion is attached hereto.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration is not attached because the court below appointed counsel in the current proceeding, and

The appointment was made under the following provision of law _____

A copy of the order of appointment is appended.

[Signature]

RECEIVED
NOV -7 2023
CLERK OF COURT

Lisa Nesbett corrected the problem resubmit to Chief Justice Roberts/Re: Important/Emergency Meg received another person's filings/ USCA 7 22-1770, 22-1785 on 1/16/24/Lisa Nesbett correcting 23 A 596/will resubmit written request to Justice Alito tomorrow or asap given she is working form home today

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov

Cc: zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Tuesday, January 16, 2024 at 02:56 PM EST

Good afternoon,

My apologies for the omission.

My case manager kindly spoke with me on the phone today from home. She said she would resolve the error by resubmitting the written request submitted on Jan 3, 2024 in Case No. 23A596 to Chief Justice Roberts tomorrow or ASAP since she is working form home today.

This shows why people staff are so important.

Thank you,
Meg

On Tuesday, January 16, 2024 at 02:47:29 PM EST, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Per my voice mail I received documents in error. I accidentally received the documents for another claimants matter USCA 7 22-1770, 22-1785 per the picture and care to preserve and not vitiate another parties First Amendment right to access to the courts and to petition.

Errors happen and that is why people court staff are important in correcting errors.

I also note when I initially filed an appeal on the original disciplinary case for which all of the cases relate this court rejected my petition since I filed the motion for more pages prior to and not simultaneously therewith.

I filed an in forma pauperis simultaneously with the pages and the petition in the civil rights case, despite the sticky note by a court representative indicating otherwise on a document received by mail today.

I called my case manager on Jan 3 to alert our case manager Lisa Nesbett I was mailing out a resubmission of Justice Alito's denial for pages to Chief Justice Roberts. I called on Jan, 4 with a message to affirm that. She previously confirmed that.

My case manager indicated she had to send out the papers because I told her I was thinking of filing an application for a stay in hopes of possibly retaining an attorney.

The attorney I was hoping to retain without compelling him unwillingly and without violating my religious beliefs is currently appealing a similar disciplinary proceeding and cannot accept clients at this time. Nor is 60 days a sufficient amount of time to discern whether he may be in a position.

Accordingly, I assert and do not waive my 1st Amendment right to petition fairly and fully pursuant to the 5th and

6th Amendments. Accordingly, the attached letter granting 60 days is not ripe as Chief Justice Roberts has not yet received or ruled on my written request to resubmit Justice Alito's denied application for pages yet.

Should Chief Justice Roberts deny my application I reserve the right to resubmit it to another judge or request it be sent to the entire court, along with the in forma pauperis which doesn't appear to have been submitted in the civil rights case as evidenced by the sticky note the court's staff placed on it. I also request 60 additional days should my request be denied.

I am quite distraught since I believe the courts are in trouble and do not want to be compelled to reduce pages in No. 23A 596, 23 A144 to reduce the arguments contained therein to protect and preserve the courts to preserve the rule of law that creates, sustains and maintains these United States.

Should the courts disagree with me, the courts should retain authority to say what the law is instead of Congress and others who seek to control a no longer free and impartial forum necessary to preserve my 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding.

Thank you for your kind consideration especially with regards to the receipt of another claimants filings.

Very truly,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2024 at 01:17:39 PM EST
Subject: Emergency Meg wrong case wrong docs

Sent from my iPhone

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

January 27, 2023

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

RE: Motion to Exempt Costs; Motion to Exceed Word/Page Limit
Motion to Submit Appeal in Unconforming Form
No: 22A476

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The enclosed motions were received January 26, 2023 and are returned for the following reasons:

The motion to exceed word/page limit must be submitted with the petition for a writ of certiorari. If you are filing a paid petition, you have a 9,000 word limit. If you are proceeding in forma pauperis, you have a 40 page limit. Based on how you will be filing, you must specify if you are seeking to exceed the word limit or the page limit.

The motion to exempt costs must be submitted with your petition as a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Forms are enclosed for your use.

The Rules of this Court make no provision for the filing of a motion for leave to submit an appeal in unconforming form and to appeal on the record in lieu of including an appendix.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk
By: [Signature]

Lisa Nesbitt
(202) 479-3038

I filed an IFP with this application for more pages, but it was sent back

Enclosures

But why are the petitions for more pages treated separately now as applications?
No. 23A361 and 23A596

Why did a staff send back a note on my application for more pages in 23A361 as pretured stating

No IFP.

I submitted an IFP simultaneously therewith

In accordance with the instructions by my case manager,

I and the IFP was not accepted with the petition

for more pages in 22A476

filed prior to my pet forward of

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

February 7, 2023

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

RE: Kelly v. DE Office of Disciplinary Counsel
No: 22A476

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The above-entitled petition for writ of certiorari was postmarked January 30, 2023 and received February 2, 2023. The papers are returned for the following reason(s):

The petition exceeds the limit of 40 pages allowed. Rule 33.2(b).

Please correct and resubmit as soon as possible. Unless the petition is submitted to this Office in corrected form within 60 days of the date of this letter, the petition will not be filed. Rule 14.5.

A copy of the corrected petition must be served on opposing counsel.

When making the required corrections to a petition, no change to the substance of the petition may be made.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By



Lisa Nesbitt
(202) 479-3038

Enclosures

Rejected since
I filed IFF of
Pet. for more pages
first not
later.

4

**Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001**

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

February 15, 2023

Ms. Meghan Marie Kelly
Attorney at Law
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

Re: Meghan M. Kelly
v. Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, et al.
No. 22-6783

Dear Ms. Kelly:


The petition for a writ of certiorari in the above entitled case was filed on February 6, 2023 and placed on the docket February 15, 2023 as No. 22-6783.

A form is enclosed for notifying opposing counsel that the case was docketed.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

by


Lisa Nesbitt
Case Analyst

Enclosures

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

February 7, 2023

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

RE: Kelly v. DE Office of Disciplinary Counsel
No: 22A476

Dear Ms. Kelly:

The above-entitled petition for writ of certiorari was postmarked January 30, 2023 and received February 2, 2023. The papers are returned for the following reason(s):

The petition exceeds the limit of 40 pages allowed. Rule 33.2(b).


Please correct and resubmit as soon as possible. Unless the petition is submitted to this Office in corrected form within 60 days of the date of this letter, the petition will not be filed. Rule 14.5.

A copy of the corrected petition must be served on opposing counsel.

When making the required corrections to a petition, no change to the substance of the petition may be made.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:



Lisa Nesbitt
(202) 479-3038

Enclosures

5
Re: 23A596 Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov

Cc: zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Wednesday, January 17, 2024 at 10:04 AM EST

Please find the attached picture of the court's note on the denied application "NO IFP Motion" and two letters relating to why the original DE Disciplinary Order was rejected.

I am sorry it did not make it. Thank you for correcting the error in the above referenced case and preventing them with regards to IFP Motion issues.

Have a good day.

Thank you,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939

On Wednesday, January 17, 2024 at 09:55:56 AM EST, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good morning Robert Meek,

Below and attached are copies of the written request to resubmit Justice Alito's denial of pages in the above referenced matter to Chief Justice Roberts.

I sent this to opposing counsel immediately after I stuck it in the mail, and left a message with my case manager and confirmed with follow ups that I mailed it out.

Also attached is a sticky note on a different application for more pages returned to me yesterday 1/16/24 in Kelly v Swartz US Supreme Court Case No.23A361 stating "No IFP Motion."

Please be advised I filed an IFP and submitted it simultaneously therewith. I also filed an IFP Motion in the above referenced matter I attach herewith without attaching the required affidavit and attachments theretowhich I filed with this court and is available on the docket to confirm so my access to the courts is not vitiated by any misunderstanding.

My case manager said the court retained a copy of the originals which includes the Motion IFP, and that I did not need to drive back up there to drop off all of the documents.

I am concerned because if you notice in the attached two letters by my case manager she rejected my petition for more pages filed with a motion IFP and to exempt costs for filing it along with other docs, whereas the attached sticky note reasonably leads me to believe the court's staff denied me an opportunity to be heard on the petition for more pages in error in 23A361 since I filed a motion IFP therewith.

This was heart breaking since the petition on the original DE Order was rejected solely because I filed my petition for leave for additional pages first with an IFP Motion not simultaneously with the petition for writ of cert.

I assert my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts fairly in accordance with the 5th Amendment by a full public record pursuant to the 6th Amendment right in this quasi criminal proceeding.

I was not able to electronically upload the last exhibit for the above referenced matter since there is a limit on the number of exhibits that may be uploaded. Nevertheless, I emailed them all to Robert Meek.

I thank the court for curing the error by promising to resubmit the application to Chief Justice Roberts. My intent is to prevent vitiation of my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts as it appears to have been done in the other case No. 23A361 based on confusion of whether I filed an IFP Motion. I did, and I complied with my case manager's instructions.

Please please please let Chief Justice Roberts know and provide him a copy of the IFP Motion on the docket and the original my case manager indicates the court retains so he may grant the petition for more pages. I don't want to delete the arguments I make to preserve the courts and my access to an impartial court because I must focus on other material issues relating to the above referenced case.

Thank you. I applaud the court when it corrects and cures defects.

Have a good day.
Very truly,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr
Dagsboro, DE 19939

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov <supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 at 09:32:53 PM EST
Subject: 23A596 Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Good evening,

I resubmitted the attached by placing the same in the mail. It will not be picked up until tomorrow.


Thank you and good night.

Best Regards,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr
Dagsboro, DE 19939

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

From: "no-reply@sc-us.gov" <no-reply@sc-us.gov>
To: "meghankellyesq@yahoo.com" <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 at 08:57:48 PM EST
Subject: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

A new docket entry, "Renewed application of Meghan Kelly submitted." has been added for [Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania](#).

 Meg concerned court staff note and other docs.pdf
556.1kB

Fw: 23A596 Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov

Cc: zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov

Date: Wednesday, January 17, 2024 at 09:55 AM EST

Good morning Robert Meek,

Below and attached are copies of the written request to resubmit Justice Alito's denial of pages in the above referenced matter to Chief Justice Roberts.

I sent this to opposing counsel immediately after I stuck it in the mail, and left a message with my case manager and confirmed with follow ups that I mailed it out.

Also attached is a sticky note on a different application for more pages returned to me yesterday 1/16/24 in Kelly v Swartz US Supreme Court Case No.23A361 stating "No IFP Motion."

Please be advised I filed an IFP and submitted it simultaneously therewith. I also filed an IFP Motion in the above referenced matter I attach herewith without attaching the required affidavit and attachments theretowhich I filed with this court and is available on the docket to confirm so my access to the courts is not vitiated by any misunderstanding.

My case manager said the court retained a copy of the originals which includes the Motion IFP, and that I did not need to drive back up there to drop off all of the documents.

I am concerned because if you notice in the attached two letters by my case manager she rejected my petition for more pages filed with a motion IFP and to exempt costs for filing it along with other docs, whereas the attached sticky note reasonably leads me to believe the court's staff denied me an opportunity to be heard on the petition for more pages in error in 23A361 since I filed a motion IFP therewith.

This was heart breaking since the petition on the original DE Order was rejected solely because I filed my petition for leave for additional pages first with an IFP Motion not simultaneously with the petition for writ of cert.

I assert my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts fairly in accordance with the 5th Amendment by a full public record pursuant to the 6th Amendment right in this quasi criminal proceeding.

I was not able to electronically upload the last exhibit for the above referenced matter since there is a limit on the number of exhibits that may be uploaded. Nevertheless, I emailed them all to Robert Meek.

I thank the court for curing the error by promising to resubmit the application to Chief Justice Roberts. My intent is to prevent vitiation of my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts as it appears to have been done in the other case No. 23A361 based on confusion of whether I filed an IFP Motion. I did, and I complied with my case manager's instructions.

Please please please let Chief Justice Roberts know and provide him a copy of the IFP Motion on the docket and the original my case manager indicates the court retains so he may grant the petition for more pages. I don't want to delete the arguments I make to preserve the courts and my access to an impartial court because I must focus on other material issues relating to the above referenced case.

Thank you. I applaud the court when it corrects and cures defects.

Have a good day.

Very truly,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr
Dagsboro, DE 19939

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov <supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 at 09:32:53 PM EST
Subject: 23A596 Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Good evening,

I resubmitted the attached by placing the same in the mail. It will not be picked up until tomorrow.

Thank you and good night.

Best Regards,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr
Dagsboro, DE 19939

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

From: "no-reply@sc-us.gov" <no-reply@sc-us.gov>
To: "meghankellyesq@yahoo.com" <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2024 at 08:57:48 PM EST
Subject: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

A new docket entry, "Renewed application of Meghan Kelly submitted." has been added for [Meghan Kelly, Applicant v. United States District Court Eastern District of Pennsylvania.](#)



scan.pdf
2.1MB



FILE ME Motion to file in forma pauperis and to exempt costs.pdf
193kB

No. VSCA7 22-1770 22-1785

G

United States Supreme Court

Case number 22-1770

tiorari

ris in

iscansin

rma

eto.

ow

or

D

CLERK OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

No. USCA7 22-1770, 22-1785

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Jose Israel Leon — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

*The Respondents
will be written on a
separate piece of paper*

— RESPONDENT(S)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

The petitioner asks leave to file the attached petition for a writ of certiorari without prepayment of costs and to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Please check the appropriate boxes:

Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the following court(s):

United States court Western District of Wisconsin

Petitioner has **not** previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in any other court.


Petitioner's affidavit or declaration in support of this motion is attached hereto.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration is **not** attached because the court below appointed counsel in the current proceeding, and:

The appointment was made under the following provision of law: _____

_____, or

a copy of the order of appointment is appended.


(Signature)



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

May 16, 2023

Jose Leon
272 Misty Meadows Lane
Menasha, WI 54952

RE: Leon v. United States
USCA7 Nos. 22-1770, 22-1785

Dear Mr. Leon:

Returned are the papers for the petition for a writ of certiorari in the above-entitled case, originally postmarked on March 29, 2023 and received again on May 16, 2023, which fail to comply with the Rules of this Court.

As was stated in prior correspondence, this petition is out of time. You must submit your petition with a motion to direct the Clerk to file it out of time.

In addition, you appear to be seeking review of two different decisions from the same lower court. Therefore, you must clearly state in the basis of jurisdiction that you are seeking joint review under Rule 12.4.

If you intend to pay the \$300 docket fee, the petition must be in booklet format and on paper that measures 6 1/8 by 9 1/4 inches. Rule 33.1(a).

The appendix to the petition as required by Rule 14 must be in booklet format and on paper that measures 6 1/8 by 9 1/4 inches. Rule 33.1(a).

Rule 33.1(c) prohibits the use of spiral, plastic, metal or string bindings. Staples may be used, at least two, along the left margin covered with tape.

The petition must bear a suitable cover consisting of heavy paper, front and back. Rule 33.1(e).

The text of the petition and appendix must be typeset in a Century family (e.g., Century Expanded, New Century Schoolbook, or Century Schoolbook) 12-point type with 2-point or more leading between lines. The typeface of footnotes must be 10-point or larger with 2-point or more leading between lines. Rule 33.1(b).

All of the pages in the petition and appendix must contain margins of at least three-fourths of an inch on all sides. The text field, including footnotes, may not exceed 4 1/8 by 7 1/8 inches. Rule 33.1(c).

The text of the document must appear on both sides of the pages. Rule 33.1(b).

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

March 29, 2023

Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

RE: Application to Place Removed Exhibits Back on the Docket
22A747 & 22-6783


Dear Ms. Kelly:

Your application to place removed exhibits back on the docket, received March 28, 2023, is herewith returned for the following reason(s):

The Rules of this Court make no provision for this filing.

Sincerely,
Scott S. Harris, Clerk

By:



Lisa Nesbitt
(202) 479-3038

No. 22-6783

Search documents in this case:

Search

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	<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 Service Petition Appendix Petition Appendix Petition Appendix Proof of Appendix Appendix</p>
Feb 11 2023	<p>Application (22A747) for a stay, submitted to Justice Alito.</p> <p>Lower Court Orders/Opinions Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Main Document Proof of Service Main</p>
Feb 22 2023	<p>Application (22A747) denied by Justice Alito.</p>
Mar 03 2023	<p>Motion to expedite consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari filed by petitioner Meghan Kelly.</p> <p>Proof of Service Main Document Main Document 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 not accepted for filing. (March 13, 2023)</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 not accepted for filing. (March 13, 2023)</p>

Empty Main Doc Re.

Exhibits remain missing

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><i>These exhibits were removed March 9, 2023</i></p> <p>Other Service of Service Other Main Document Other Main Document Other Main Document Other Main Document Other 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 Main Document Document Main Document Document Main Document Document Main Document Document Main 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>

Fw: Envelopes Jan 1, 2024/23A596

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: rmeek@supremecourt.gov

Cc: david.weiss@usdoj.gov; supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov

Date: Thursday, January 18, 2024 at 02:25 PM EST

Good afternoon,

After I checked the electronic system side and despite assurance of the court that my Jan 3 pleadings would be filed, I needed to cover myself. This Court's staff recommended I file things in the past that were not accepted. Ultimately, I must assert and not waive the right to access to the courts by reliance on the staff when their past assurances were faulty.

Moreover, this court lost a massive amount of pleadings and has no explanation as to where my Nov. 6, 2023 submissions are or why they were not docketed relating to the Nov 6, 2023 PA case filings.

Further, I received someone else's pleadings for the third time. Although this is the first time before the USSC, other people's filings were incorrectly docketed in 22-45 and in 21-3198 initially with regards to someone else's financials for an IFP motion.

Accordingly, I sent 10 copies of the Jan 3, 2024 written requests relating to 23A596 this court already should have received again with tracking to cover myself today per the attached pictures.

I received the documents back from this court relating to 23A596 in error, including one that was not uploaded on the electronic filing as it exceeded the 20 document limit.

It is not fair that the court does not have the physical documents in light of the fact I hope Chief Justice grants my request. It causes a burden upon me and prejudices the court in its determination as to wrongly persuade the court to rule against me to cover up its agents' errors.

It is not fair.

My case manager said they retain one original and the electronic copies, and yet I have a 6th Amendment right to a full public proceeding under the 6th as an accused in a quasi-criminal proceeding not a partial prejudicial proceeding where the members of the US Supreme Court do not have the papers to mull through important issues. Further, I have not received 10 complete versions of the filings, only partial. It is possible not all documents have been delivered yet. In addition, I am impoverished. I do not have a bank account as the new rules violate my religious beliefs against debt nor do I have income since the proceedings prevent me from working at my former law firm.

I see this court the Jan. 3, 2023 submission after I wasted money to send them out as a precaution.

I also drove to Ocean View post office twice this morning to send back the documents this court incorrectly sent me relating to another case. The post office said they would send it back for free but I should not have opened the envelop. So, I put it in a clean envelope, and they said it would be about 10 dollars. I said I thought you said it would be return to sender at no cost. They said no. I needed a box from the US Supreme Court

So, I drove home, and retrieved a box from the recycables that was hanging together by tape, and I took it to Millsboro post office along with the envelop.

The postal workers promised to return it to sender at no cost to me or the courts. I did my due diligence to protect another person's access to the courts. I am at the law library now and do not have copies of the card I placed in the box addressed to Lisa Nesbitt regarding one of her other case docs were inadvertently sent to me.

Please inform her the post office is in possession of those documents and they said they will come back to you at no cost.

I don't know where the voluminous amount of boxes I submitted with the court for the Nov. 6, 2022 are. If you are still in possession of them please tell me. I would like them back with a letter information why they were rejected with an opportunity to cure them per case law so as not to deprive me of underlying fundamental rights not merely my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts to petition.

Thank you.

On an aside, I seek to preserve my 1st, 5th, and 6th Amendment rights as applied to the federal courts, not to destroy the staff or the court for deprivations based on infringements that may be cured. The fact we may contact people staff to correct errors is why they are indispensable to uphold equal access to the courts to preserve the fundamental 1st Amendment right to petition and other fundamental liberties.

Please forgive any typos, I write under great duress and haste to assert my rights to prevent my rights from wrongful vitiation.


Thank you. Have a good weekend.

Very truly,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr
Dagsboro, DE 19939

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2024 at 01:16:07 PM EST
Subject: Envelopes

Sent from my iPhone

 IMG_3767.jpg
601.1kB

 IMG_3769.jpg
509.6kB

 IMG_3770.jpg
655.3kB

 IMG_3771.jpg
666.8kB

 IMG_3772.jpg
665.3kB

21-1490 Can the legal theories in two US Supreme court cases extend constitutional protections to attorneys resolving splits Fw: FedEx Shipment 789204864762: Your package is delayed.

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov; zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov

Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov

Date: Thursday, January 18, 2024 at 09:50 AM EST

Greene is not a criminal case and should be extended to lawyers in a professional proceeding. I am brainstorming here. Even if you are opponents will you please help me extend Constitutional protections to lawyers and judges to preserve their independence necessary to uphold the rule of law as applied to all not merely partial regulatory interests?

I do not feel so well, and am severely dehydrated and require time.

Yet, I have to act quick.

If I draft something up maybe I can work with you prior to filing it? My printer repairs are delayed per below.

You are great brilliant minds. I do not have easy access to research. It is possible your responses will change the world and preserve the rule of law.

Thank you,
Meg

Greene v. McElroy, 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959) ("this Court will not hold that a person may be deprived of the right to follow his chosen profession without full hearings where accusers may be confronted and cross-examined").

"Perfection may not be demanded of law, but the capacity to counteract inevitable . . . frailties is the mark of a civilized legal mechanism." *Rosenberg v. United States*, [346 U.S. 273, 310](#) (1953) (Frankfurter, J., dissenting). " *McGautha v. California*, 402 U.S. 183, 285 (1971)

"This is how the cases themselves have defined the scope of *Lovell-Freedman* doctrine. 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)

Overly broad discretion is a license to whims

Overly broad not notice

Dombrowski v. Pfister, 380 U.S. 479, 494 (1965) ("This overly broad statute also creates a "danger zone" within which protected expression may be inhibited. Cf. *Speiser v. Randall*, [357 U.S. 513, 526](#). So long as the statute remains available to the State the threat of prosecutions of protected expression is a real and substantial one. Even the prospect of ultimate failure of such prosecutions by no means dispels their chilling effect on protected expression. *A Quantity of Copies of Books v. Kansas*, [378 U.S. 205](#); *Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan*, [372 U.S. 58](#); *Marcus v. Search Warrant*, [367 U.S. 717](#); *Speiser v. Randall*, *supra*. Since § 364(4) is so intimately bound up with a definition invalid under the reasoning of

Baggett v. Bullitt, we hold that it is invalid for the same reasons.”)

“the constitutional principles there applied forbid the judiciary, as well as the legislature, of a State to interfere with the free exercise of religion. Pp. 190-191.” *Kreshik v. St. Nicholas Cathedral*, 363 U.S. 190 (1960)

“This is how the cases themselves have defined the scope of *Lovell-Freedman* doctrine. 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)

Overly broad discretion is a license to whims

splits in attorney discipline

Splits

- *Gunter v. Virginia State Bar, ex rel*, 241 Va. 186, 187 (Va. 1991) held “An attorney has no procedural due process right to discovery in a disciplinary proceeding.”
- *Rosenthal v. Justices of the S. Ct. of Calif*, 910 F.2d 561, 565 (9th Cir. 1990) (“We reject Rosenthal’s confrontation clause claim. The confrontation clause is a criminal law protection. Therefore, it does not apply to a disbarment case.”)
- The court in *Mississippi State Bar v. Attorney-Respondent in Disciplinary Proceedings*, 367 So. 2d 179, 183 (Miss. 1979) seeks to eliminate USSC holding in *Spevack* extending 5th Amendment protections against self-incrimination to lawyers in disciplinary cases.
- *Rosenthal v. Justices of the S. Ct. of Calif*, 910 F.2d 561, 564 (9th Cir. 1990) (“We reject both of Rosenthal’s attacks upon Section 6083(c). A lawyer disciplinary proceeding is not a criminal proceeding. See, e.g., *Standing Comm. on Discipline v. Ross*, [735 F.2d 1168, 1170](#) (9th Cir.), cert. denied, appeal dismissed, 469 U.S. 1081, 105 S.Ct. 583, 83 L.Ed.2d 694 (1984). As a result, normal protections afforded a criminal defendant do not apply.”)
- *Rosenthal v. Justices of the S. Ct. of Calif*, 910 F.2d 561, 564 (9th Cir. 1990) (“The principle of presumption of innocence is a creature of a criminal proceeding; and hence, does not apply in a lawyer disbarment proceeding.”) [The 9th Circuit, including California is so scary.]
- *Rosenthal v. Justices of the S. Ct. of Calif*, 910 F.2d 561, 564 (9th Cir. 1990) (“Similarly, Section 6083(c) does not violate the command of the 14th Amendment that the state prove every element of an offense beyond a reasonable doubt. That command, which arises from *Sandstrom v. Montana*, [442 U.S. 510, 99 S.Ct. 2450, 61 L.Ed.2d 39](#) (1975), applies only in criminal proceedings, not in a lawyer disbarment such as this one.”)
- *Hyman v. Bd. of Prof’l Responsibility of the Supreme Court of Tenn.*, 437 S.W.3d 435, 445 (Tenn. 2014) (“Attorney disciplinary proceedings are “quasi-criminal” in nature. *Moncier v. Bd. of Prof’l Responsibility*, [406 S.W.3d 139, 155](#) (Tenn.2013) (citing *In re Ruffalo*, [390 U.S. 544, 551, 88 S.Ct. 1222, 20 L.Ed.2d 117](#) (1968)). Accordingly, attorneys who are subject to discipline are entitled to procedural due process, which includes notice of the alleged misconduct and an opportunity to be heard. *Moncier*, [406 S.W.3d at 156](#). An attorney disciplinary proceeding does not, however, give rise to “the full panoply of [due process] rights afforded to an accused in a criminal case.” *Id.* (quoting *People v. Harfmann*, [638 P.2d 745, 747](#) (Colo.1981)). ”)
- *People v. Harfmann*, 638 P.2d 745, 747-46 (Colo. 1981) held, “We disagree with the respondent’s contention that disciplinary proceedings, which are *sui generis*, must be afforded the same constitutional safeguards which are provided to an accused in a criminal case. We conclude that the exclusionary rule should not be extended to provide a shield to a lawyer charged in a disciplinary complaint.” *People v. Harfmann*, 638 P.2d 745, 747 n.6 (Colo. 1981) (“The exclusionary rule was made applicable to the states in *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643, 81 S.Ct. 1684, 6 L.Ed.2d 1081 (1961).”)
- **This shows a split from the Nevada Court** This court grants right to confrontation under the 6th Amendment. “Both the disciplinary counsel and the respondent “shall be entitled to examine or cross-examine witnesses.” *Cerame v. Bowler*, Civ. 3:21-cv-1502 (AWT), at *4 (D. Conn. Aug. 29, 2022)

- **I think this Court also shows a split from the Nevada case.** [Utah not Nevada] "The Review Panel conducts a hearing after notice. Respondent is entitled to representation, cross-examination of witnesses, and submission of evidence. If the Review Panel recommends discipline, respondent may present exceptions which are heard by the Kansas Supreme Court." *Phelps v. Kansas Supreme Court*, 662 F.2d 649, 650 (10th Cir. 1981)

8. In *re Discipline of Harding*, 104 P.3d 1220, 1225 (Utah 2004), held, "These measures are adequate, given the nature of lawyer discipline proceedings, to ensure due process to a lawyer accused of misconduct. Direct and cross-examination of the witnesses is not required in the quasi-administrative setting of the screening panel. As a result, we find no due process deficiencies in Harding's case." There were even other lawyer disciplinary cases citing this case.

-

2. As of the time I checked today per the attached picture with date and time 1:11 PM, Jan 11, 2024 my Jan 3, 2024 has not yet been docketed. I am reasonably scared it may be lost since no one in the US Supreme Court knows where or will answer or address my question as to the physical location of the Supplemental brief in the PA case.

3. I am also horrified to learn there appears to be a split in forums where courts arguably argue incorrectly that prison disciplinary procedures permit attorney disciplinary boards and state Supreme Courts to deny lawyers the 6th Amendment right to cross examine witnesses in criminal-like proceedings.

4. In *re Discipline of Harding*, 104 P.3d 1220, 1225-26 (Utah 2004), the Court held:

"The Rules of Lawyer Discipline and Disability, under which the proceedings were conducted, do not provide to the attorney who is the subject of the hearing the right to cross-examine witnesses. In fact, all questioning is usually done by the screening panel, and includes opportunity for the lawyer, his legal counsel, and the complaining party, to suggest areas of inquiry to the panel. The accused lawyer is given prior notice of the charges, notice of the hearing, a right to be present at the hearing, and to be represented by counsel at the hearing. The lawyer is guaranteed a right to appear and present testimony, offer witnesses on his own behalf, and present an oral argument with respect to the complaint against him. The proceedings are recorded and preserved for review as necessary, and a written report of the panel's findings and conclusions is given to the lawyer. Utah R. Lawyer Discipline Disability 10."

5. Prisoner disciplinary proceedings should be a different standard than professional disciplinary standards. Even in the initial prosecution of crime the accused has the protected 6th Amendment right to cross examine witnesses.

6. In *Carroll v. Ill. Dep't of Corr.*, 2018 Ill. App. 4th 170465, 9 (Ill. App. Ct. 2018), Court stated, "The right to call witnesses in a [prison] disciplinary proceeding is limited. *Baxter v. Palmigiano*, [425 U.S. 308, 321](#) (1976)." The Court further stated

"Prison officials maintain necessary discretion to keep disciplinary hearings within reasonable limits and to refuse to permit the testimony of witnesses who may create a risk of reprisal, undermine authority, or provide irrelevant or cumulative and repetitive testimony. *Wolff*, [418 U.S. at 566](#)." *Carroll v. Ill. Dep't of Corr.*, 2018 Ill. App. 4th 170465, 9 (Ill. App. Ct. 2018)

In *Baxter v. Palmigiano*, 425 U.S. 308, 320-21 (1976), the USSC held:

"In *Wolff v. McDonnell*, we held that "the inmate facing disciplinary proceedings should be allowed to call witnesses and present documentary evidence in his defense when permitting him to do so will not be unduly

hazardous to institutional safety or correctional goals." [418 U.S., at 566](#). We noted that "[o]rdinarily, the right to present evidence is basic to a fair hearing; but the unrestricted right to call witnesses from the prison population carries obvious potential for disruption and for interference with the swift punishment that in individual cases may be essential to carrying out the correctional program of the institution."

7. I am horrified that lawyers are deemed without Constitutional rights namely the right to a fair proceeding by a state disciplinary forum where they may cross examine witnesses in Utah.

8. *In re Discipline of Harding*, 104 P.3d 1220, 1225 (Utah 2004), held, "These measures are adequate, given the nature of lawyer discipline proceedings, to ensure due process to a lawyer accused of misconduct. **Direct and cross-examination of the witnesses is not required in the quasi-administrative setting of the screening panel.** As a result, we find no due process deficiencies in Harding's case." There were even other lawyer disciplinary cases citing this case.

9. This week in horror I learned Richard Abbott and I both were denied the asserted right to call witnesses and cross examine our accusers because the Court fired them in my case and hid that fact, and I had no idea Abbott had 17 or so subpoenas quashed.

10. We have a 6th Amendment right to cross examine witnesses and a 1st Amendment right to petition to do so and a 14th Amendment state right to a fair proceeding.

11. I did not know there was a split in jurisdictions where some courts say hey lawyers you do not have a 6th Amendment right to cross examine witnesses until I saw the similarity in Abbott's case which caused me to look.

12. I think it imperative for the US Supreme Court to resolve the split so professionals including lawyers are not deprived of Constitutional freedoms for business of boards who sacrifice them to market their positions to maintain profit streams at the cost of human sacrifice of lives and liberties for the bottom line, the mark of the beast untamed by love or the just rule of law. When the courts deem business preempts freedom, or business is freedom, there is no freedom. Everything is for sale. Lives and feigned liberties are bought, and the Constitution is a lie not enforceable by the government when government officials wrongly hold they are immune to the law and above the law like Former President Donald Trump appears to do. It is folly to say the courts have no competence to judge whether the other branch violated the Constitution for security reasons. That makes Presidents rulers, not servant leaders safeguarding liberties. Courts eliminate liberties when they hold the other branches are above the Constitutional laws that safeguard the people from the government enslaving or sacrificing them for moth and rust. See in Isaiah 14 how the devil sought to be his own God and judge above the law.

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

From: TrackingUpdates@fedex.com <trackingupdates@fedex.com>
To: "meghankellyesq@yahoo.com" <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2024 at 08:16:06 AM EST
Subject: FedEx Shipment 789204864762: Your package is delayed.



Hi. Your package is delayed.
It is scheduled to arrive on
Fri, 01/19/2024.

DELAYED

SCHEDULED DELIVERY

Fri, 01/19/2024

Initially expected: Thursday 01/18/2024



DELAY
nan

TRACKING NUMBER [789204864762](#)

FROM Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr
Dagsboro, DE, US, 19939

TO Epson America Inc - Indianapolis
Return for Exchange (GREEN)
2350 Stafford Rd Ste 167

Plainfield, IN, US, 46168

PURCHASE ORDER NUMBER 240112-001070

REFERENCE X8GN148296

RMA 0051052815

SHIP DATE Mon 1/15/2024 12:00 AM

DELIVERY LOCATION ZIONSVILLE, IN

PACKAGING TYPE Package

ORIGIN Dagsboro, DE, US, 19939

DESTINATION Plainfield, IN, US, 46168

SPECIAL HANDLING E-mail Return Label
Package Returns Program

STANDARD TRANSIT Thu, 01/18/2024

NUMBER OF PIECES 1

FOLLOW FEDEX



✉ Please do not respond to this message. This email was sent from an unattended mailbox. This report was generated at approximately 7:16 AM CST 01/18/2024.

All weights are estimated.

To track the latest status of your shipment, click on the tracking number above.

Standard transit is the date and time the package is scheduled to be delivered by, based on the selected service, destination and ship date. Limitations and exceptions may apply. Please see the FedEx Service Guide for terms and conditions of service, including the FedEx Money-Back Guarantee, or contact your FedEx Customer Support representative.

© 2024 Federal Express Corporation. The content of this message is protected by copyright and trademark laws under U.S. and international law. Review our [privacy_policy](#). All rights reserved.

Thank you for your business.

No. _____, Application No. 22A747

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

Pennsylvania Disciplinary Counsel et al

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Application to the Honorable Justice Alito to place exhibits back on the Docket to prevent the deprivation of her 5th Amendment Equal Protections and procedural due process right to a full and fair opportunity to be heard without selective, arbitrary, disparate, unfavorable treatment towards her as applied, and to preserve her 6th Amendment right

Pursuant to the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component, the 5th Amendment Due Process Clause, the 1st Amendment right to petition, 6th Amendment right to a public proceeding, 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 physically filed and electronically filed exhibits relating to my March 6, 2023 Application for an extension of time to file a writ of certiorari in the above referenced file to be placed on the public electronic docket available on its web page.

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, the 1st Amendment right to petition, and my 6th Amendment right to a public proceeding as the accused.

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. I filed the application for an extension of time electronically in two separate electronic entries as a continuation of the application for an extension of time as an addendum by entering in application for an extension of time on the system. Per the attached Exhibit filed with the Third Circuit Docket Number 3198 at DI-192, I incorporate herein in its entirety (herein referred to as “DI-192”), I include emails to the US Supreme Court’s efilings clerks noting the problems of electronic filing, the solution of uploading the pleading in two entries, and my invocation of my 1st, 5th and 6th Amendment rights to be adhered to by the US Supreme court without waiver.

5. In DI-192, I also include affidavits regarding mailing concerns, with pictures, discussions with my case manager regarding delays in receipt of the orders, and a copy of the letter I file simultaneously herewith to Justice Jackson for reconsideration of Justice Alito’s denial of my motion for more time despite the loss of my First Amendment right to petition and fundamental rights, property interests, harm to health with records and pictures of a recent emergency injury, family reunion and my poverty creating a substantial burden upon my access to the courts.

6. The attached two exhibits I incorporate herein as Exhibits 11 and 12 were not uploaded on the public record despite my invocation of my rights under 1st, 5th and 5th Amendments. Exhibits 11 and 12 were electronically and physically filed on May 6, 2023. The exhibits contain information material to my application and claims. They also are important because I note where I disagree with the Courts. When claimants or lawyers believe courts violate the Constitution, claimants and lawyers should uphold the Constitution by showing the

courts where they erred to prevent manifest injustice towards them or the public. I believe the Courts may only be corrected within the purview of the Constitution by 1 cases and controversies or 2 impeachment. Should courts waive that requirement by agreeing to regulations or statutes beyond the Constitutional limits injustice would result by tempting judges towards partiality towards upholding the regulations as opposed to the impartial rule of law. If I am not allowed to plead in a case or controversy to correct judges than a Constitutional check is eliminated, judges may be left uncorrected within the purview of the Constitution, essentially making judges above the law. This would allow for more criticism to wrongly encourage regulations of the courts. I do not want that. The Courts do not want that. Use my case(s) to limit not eliminate judicial checks please. Otherwise, injustice will arise to all.

7. Having a complete electronic record eases other reviewing justices' and other courts' ability to review the public record, protects my right to a public record and safeguards the public by noticing them of where I believe the government or Courts erred by eliminating freedoms in exchange for business. In addition, I also note my belief of harm towards our nation by a schemed economic crash to overthrow our government in the undocketed exhibits that I pray this court unravels. (Exhibit 12). These are important interests the public and the press has a 1st and 6th amendment right to know of by public record too. Finally, the documents material to my application were contained therein including but not limited to the attached certification.

8. The sixth amendment provides the accused with the right to a public proceeding. See, e.g., *Waller*, 467 U.S. at 43, 104 S.Ct. at 2214, 81 L.Ed.2d at 36. The public trial guarantee ensures that the accused is tried fairly as opposed to prejudicially mistreated in a secret proceeding. *Waller*, 467 U.S. at 46, 104 S.Ct. at 2215, 81 L.Ed.2d at 38. This explicit sixth amendment right to a public proceeding invokes the same considerations raised implicitly in the

first amendment right of the press and public to attend an accused's trial. Id. at 46, 104 S.Ct. at 2215, 81 L.Ed.2d at 38. Because of this similarity, the Supreme Court found that under the sixth amendment any closure of a public trial over the objections of the defendant must meet the tests set out under the first amendment analysis in *Press-Enterprise Co. v. Superior Court of California*, 464 U.S. 501, 104 S.Ct. 819, 78 L.Ed.2d 629 (1984). See *Waller*, 467 U.S. at 47, 104 S.Ct. at 2216, 81 L.Ed.2d at 39.

9. In my case no party seeks to close the proceeding. I assert my 6th Amendment right to a public proceeding with a public record of the proceeding to defend my life, liberties, especially my religious exercise of belief in Jesus Christ, health, life, eternal life, and other protected interests, the public's 6th and 1st amendment interests and in the interests of justice for all Exhibits 11 and 12 must be docketed. The courts, even the US Supreme Court must not violate Constitutional asserted rights to serve their own partial lusts for convenience, avoidance of costs, productivity at the cost of eliminating Constitutional rights towards me, a party, and the public.

10. Freedoms are not for sale by barter or exchange. When courts entertain cost benefits analyses as to whether a party is worthy of being heard, and worthy of other Constitutional rights, the courts violate the 5th Amendment Equal Protections Clause by deeming some people worthy of rights and others not, based on the partial interests of the courts as opposed to the impartial rule of law. As applied the denial of the application and uploading the exhibits in full appears to be based on the Court deeming me or my private-political-religious beliefs contained in the exhibits unworthy or repugnant in violation of the 5th Amendment's Equal Protection's component since there is no rational basis for the Court to deny my application under the circumstances given I need time to prevent irreparable injury in terms of

loss of Constitutional liberties, licenses, harm to my life and health, to attend a funeral, and time with family.

11. The 6th Amendment right to a public proceeding must extend to the accused me as applied in this case. It is a distinguishing question as to whether it should apply to the states too, since to the best of my knowledge every federal attorney disciplinary proceeding appears to have an open public attorney disciplinary proceeding in the Circuit and District Courts below, unless the accused exercises his rights to move to close them.

12. The disciplinary proceedings are brought to punish me for my private exercise of the right to petition to safeguard my belief in Jesus Christ from compelled government violations of my religious beliefs. The states prevent me from buying and selling but for my religious beliefs.

13. This Court may direct the filings on May 6 to be incorporated into the March 6 2023 application by reference to this entry or by requiring the clerk electronically file my submitted electronic entry containing the two documents. My rights in a public proceeding are not moot, but is necessary to defend my faith in Jesus and exercise the 1st amendment right to petition to defend my rights from continual government persecution.

Wherefore I pray this Court grants me relief by docketing Exhibits 11 and 12.

Dated: May 11, 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
(Word Count 1,474)