

46. The Record also evidences the State's violations of my opportunity to be heard on ignored motions. The state ignored my motions to perform discovery, opportunity to prepare and present my case, opportunity to call and cross examine witnesses in the sham proceeding brought to cover up state Court misconduct and to punish me for the exercise of my First Amendment rights.

47. The State Court also criticized me for noting outside circumstances as evidence of disability in its August 10, 2022 Order, while finding those circumstances, including, but not limited to vulture attacks against me and my property, to be legitimate reasons for granting an extension of time. (DI 77 Internal-Exhibit D incorporated herein by reference)

48. Despite having good cause to contest this reciprocal proceeding. I lack time and resources to appeal the original DE disciplinary proceeding, and the civil rights case. I am unemployed, unable to seek to return to my former law firm. I am left impoverished. My parents indicated they are not able to help me as much as they would like, during this economic down turn. My parents indicated they are actually disappointed with me. They would like me to contribute more. They have indicated they intend to cut off my inheritance. I love my parents more than money, but I love God more and have to stand up for my faith in Jesus without government persecution. Then others even future generations may no longer be free from government compelled belief should I not have courage now.

49. In the interest of justice, this court must not sacrifice my meaningful opportunity to be heard in all cases, by denying a stay. This court must preserve the right for my meaningful opportunity to be heard, without waste of judicial resources or prejudice towards me, by granting a stay.

50. I plead with this court to grant a stay to grant me time to argue legal justification to overturn the original Delaware Order on appeal, albeit the procedural defects still permit me to argue the order is voidable before the District Court.

V. Factor 5, Prejudice against me is Great

51. The prejudice against me should a stay be denied is great in the form of substantial burden upon my access to the courts, additional loss of my fundamental rights and licenses. I also face the risk of other hardships, related to the loss of the opportunity to work at my former law firm, or any law firm to earn a living in my profession.

52. I have good cause to contest the decision the Delaware Supreme Court made in placing me on disabled inactive. but for the exercise of my First Amendment right to religious-political speech, religious-political belief, religious-political-exercise, and to make religious-political petitions. Yet I am impoverished. I lack time and resources to fight both the appeal and the civil

rights case and other potential reciprocal cases simultaneously. I will face irreparable injury if a stay is not granted. *Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 770 (1987).

53. The balance of the equities require a stay be granted.

VI. A stay is required because I asked for money damages, equitable relief and nominal damages like voiding Kelly v Trump not available in the state Forum

54. Additionally, a stay is required since I requested relief not afforded in the state forum, including but not limited to monetary relief and relief under 42 USC § 1985 for the Defendants' interference in Kelly v Trump, not merely relief relating to In the Matter of Meghan Kelly Case No 22-58. DI 2-4, 20-21,34-43, 50-58, I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety.

55. I sought claims for emotional distress, First Amendment violations, loss of employment opportunities, or other economic harm, and harm to my reputation. (DI 2-4).

56. I also sought claims for Defendants' selective prosecution in bringing a disciplinary action against me to demean my reputation by placing me on inactive disabled to conceal Defendants misconduct in collusion with the Delaware Supreme Court, and to punish me for exercising the right to access the courts and

First Amendment rights, based on Defendants disdain for my religious-political beliefs contained in the speech in the Religious Freedom Restoration Act petitions and other petitions. Id.

57. I later amended the Complaint to include additional facts showing the Delaware Supreme Court instigated the disciplinary proceeding against me, colluded with Defendants to prejudice my case, concealed evidence and witnesses, while denying by ignoring my motions to perform discovery. I also included additional claims procedural due process violations, denial to access to the law library and other disparate treatment by the Delaware Courts made in bad faith, which occurred during the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding as distinguished from Kelly v Trump. I sought nominal damages, damages and additional equitable relief, including but not limited to voiding the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding and Kelly v Trump due to procedural due process violations which shock the conscience. I moved to add the Delaware Supreme Court as a party. (DI 43, 58-60, 69-75, 77, 80-82, 85)

58. I later amended the Complaint to include additional facts showing the Delaware Supreme Court instigated the disciplinary proceeding against me, colluded with Defendants to prejudice my case, concealed evidence and witnesses, while denying by ignoring my motions to perform discovery. I also included additional claims procedural due process violations, denial to access to the law

library and other disparate treatment by the Delaware Courts made in bad faith, which occurred during the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding as distinguished from *Kelly v Trump*. I sought nominal damages, damages and additional equitable relief, including but not limited to voiding the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding and *Kelly v Trump* due to procedural due process violations which shock the conscience. I moved to add the Delaware Supreme Court as a party. (DI 43, 58-60, 69-75, 77, 80-82, 85).

59. In *Deakins v. Monaghan*, the Supreme Court held only that “the District Court has no discretion to dismiss rather than to stay claims for monetary relief that cannot be redressed in the state proceeding.”¹ “Federal district court must stay rather

¹ Citing, *Deakins v. Monaghan*, 484 U.S. 193, 108 S. Ct. 523, 98 L. Ed. 2d 529 (1988) “In reversing the District Court’s dismissal of the claims for damages and attorney’s fees, the Court of Appeals applied the Third Circuit rule that requires a District Court to stay rather than dismiss claims that are not cognizable in the parallel state proceeding.”); See also, *Brindley v. McCullen*, 61 F.3d 507 (6th Cir. 1995); See also *Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 517 U.S. 706, 719 (1996) (“we have applied abstention principles to actions ‘at law’ only to permit a federal court to enter a stay order that postpones adjudication of the dispute, not to dismiss the federal suit altogether.”); *Lewis v. Beddingfield*, 20 F.3d 123, 124 (5th Cir. 1994). (It was proper to stay rather than dismiss the federal suit because the damages could not be claimed in the criminal prosecution.); *Jones v. Prescott*, 702 Fed. Appx. 205, 209 (5th Cir. 2017) (Younger abstention does not apply to federal suits seeking only money damages) (citing *Alexander v. Ieyoub*, 62 F.3d 709, 713 (5th Cir. 1993)); See also, *Boyd v. Farrin*, 575 Fed. Appx. 517 (5th Cir. 2014); **Third Circuit:** *Abbott v. Mette*, No. 20-CV-131-RGA, 2021 WL 1168958, at *4 (D. Del. Mar. 26, 2021), aff’d, No. 21-1804, 2021 WL 5906146 (3d Cir. Dec. 14, 2021) (A court “has no discretion to dismiss rather than to stay claims for monetary relief that cannot be redressed in the state proceeding.”); *Abbott v. Mette*, No. CV 20-131-RGA, 2021 WL 327375, at *3 (D. Del. Jan. 31, 2021), report and recommendation adopted, No. 20-CV-131-RGA, 2021 WL 1168958 (D. Del. Mar. 26, 2021), aff’d, No. 21-1804, 2021 WL 5906146 (3d Cir. Dec. 14, 2021) (“As a general matter, assuming that a federal court has jurisdiction over a case, the federal court’s ‘obligation to hear and decide [the] case is virtually unflagging.’” *Sprint Commc’ns, Inc. v. Jacobs*, 571 U.S. 69, 77 (2013) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); *Crane v. Fauver*, 762 F.2d 325 (3d Cir. 1985) (“District court should have retained jurisdiction over correctional

than dismiss claims that are not cognizable in parallel state proceeding.” *Deakins v. Monaghan*, 484 U.S. 193, 202, 108 S. Ct. 523, 529–30, 98 L. Ed. 2d 529 (1988)

60. I made it clear to the District Court, I pled defamation, Constitutional injury and emotional distress, by pleading damages, albeit unartfully in my original

officers' civil rights action arising out of their discharge, even if it properly declined to exercise jurisdiction over federal claims, and stayed action pending outcome of related state proceeding where officers were relegated for prudential reasons to state proceeding which could only afford them dismissal of charges and back pay, with attorney fees only to extent that back pay award was reduced by interim earnings, but officers sought constitutional damages and attorney fees, and new complaint upon termination of state proceedings may have been time-barred.”); *Williams v. Hepting*, 844 F.2d 138, 145 (3d Cir. 1988) (The Third Circuit held, “Accordingly, we hold that the district court should have stayed instead of dismissed without prejudice Williams' failure-to-investigate and suggestive pretrial identification claims. Because these particular federal court claims for damages seek relief that is unavailable in Williams' ongoing state proceedings, the allegations should be stayed pending the outcome of his state court appeal on the underlying conviction.”); *Nimer v. Lichfield Twp. Bd. of Trustees*, 707 F.3d 699 (6th Cir. 2013) (*Younger* abstention applies to § 1983 damages claims, but district court must stay rather than dismiss federal suit; in other words district court has no discretion to dismiss federal suit); *Carroll v. City of Mount Clemens*, 139 F.3d 1072 (6th Cir. 1998) (when federal suit seeks damages and *Younger* is invoked, federal suit should be stayed, not dismissed; this likely will be a formality, given probable preclusive effect of state court decision); *Watkins v. Ohio Dep't of Educ.*, No. 2:21-CV-04482, 2022 WL 672565, at *8 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 7, 2022) (“Further, when a plaintiff seeks both equitable and legal relief, many courts in the Sixth Circuit stay the entire case rather than treat each form of requested relief differently.”); *Maraan v. Off. of Ohio Disciplinary Couns. for Supreme Ct. of Ohio*, No. 1:18CV645, 2021 WL 3173311, at *3 (S.D. Ohio July 27, 2021) (Court “stayed until the conclusion of the state disciplinary proceedings, rather than be dismissed.”), citing *Kalniz*, 699 F. Supp. 2d at 975 (explaining that where a plaintiff is bringing constitutional civil rights claims in a federal court case in which *Younger* abstention was proper, the stay protects against the possibility that the statute of limitations could deprive the plaintiff of the opportunity to present the merits of her damages claims); see also *Meyers v. Franklin Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 23 F. App'x 201, 206 (6th Cir. 2001) (and cases cited therein); *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Stroud*, 179 F.3d 598 (8th Cir. 1999) (when damages are sought in § 1983 action subject to *Younger* abstention, and damages are not available in pending state proceeding, federal action should be stayed, not dismissed); *Night Clubs, Inc. v. City of Fort Smith*, 163 F.3d 475 (8th Cir. 1998) (when § 1983 complaint seeking damages is subject to *Younger* abstention, federal action should be stayed rather than dismissed).

Complaint. (DI 2, 34-35). In addition, I showed my intent to seek nominal damages, damages, and equitable relief too. (D.I. 43, 58, 69-75, 77-79).

61. My claims for damages and other equitable relief were unavailable in state court.

62. A court must stay claims for monetary relief that cannot be redressed in the state proceeding, and may not dismiss the case. *Citing, Abbott v. Mette*, No. 20-CV-131-RGA, 2021 WL 1168958, at *4 (D. Del. Mar. 26, 2021), *aff'd*, No. 21-1804, 2021 WL 5906146 (3d Cir. Dec. 14, 2021); *See, Watkins v. Ohio Dep't of Educ.*, No. 2:21-CV-04482, 2022 WL 672565, at *1 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 7, 2022).

63. Staying this action is required. *See, Meyers v. Franklin Cty. Court of Common Pleas*, 23 F. App'x 201, 206 (6th Cir. 2001); *Maraan v. Off. of Ohio Disciplinary Couns. for Supreme Ct. of Ohio*, No. 1:18CV645, 2021 WL 3173311, at *3 (S.D. Ohio July 27, 2021); *Watkins v. Ohio Dep't of Educ.*, No. 2:21-CV-04482, 2022 WL 672565, at *8 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 7, 2022); (“Further, when a plaintiff seeks both equitable and legal relief, many courts in the Sixth Circuit stay the entire case rather than treat each form of requested relief differently.”).

64. Additionally, to avoid the appearance of partiality, I must be afforded to appeal the Third Circuit’s disciplinary order where Justice Alito indicated the Third Circuit is a Defendant.

65. I am tired please safeguard my opportunity to petition the courts in defense of my life, liberty, license, and eternal life. It is the opportunity to be heard pursuant to the Fifth Amendment applicable to the Federal Courts I seek to protect, not the guarantee of justice.

66. Human judges are special in that they are more powerful than Congress or the President in that they may lay down selfish desires and the desires of men or the masses to do what is right, by love. They are special in that they may reflect the image of God by love unconditionally, even for those they disagree with or whose ideas they may think are bad or repugnant like mine.

67. Are human judges perfect? No. It is the mere opportunity to petition them without foreclosure based on religious-political beliefs or poverty which must be protected in order not to violate the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component as applied to me as a party of one. I am impoverished, with unique religious-political beliefs. If I am not free to petition, than others may no longer be free in future generations.

68. Opposing Counsel did not state her position on this motion I alerted her and this Court on. 3DI 103.

Wherefore, I pray this court grants this motion.

January 4, 2023,

Respectfully submitted,

Appendix N

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

Meghan Kelly	)	Appellate Court
Plaintiff,	)	No.: 21-3198
v.	)	No. 22-2079
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.	)	
Swartz, et al.	)	District Court
	)	No.: 1:21-cv-01490-CFC
Defendants.	)	

Appellant Meghan Kelly's Motion for additional time to file a brief in reply to Defendant's Answer in the amount of 45 days

Appellant Plaintiff, Meghan Kelly, pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 26 (b), for good cause, respectfully requests additional time to file a brief in the amount of 45 days, given additional exigent factors.

1. I previously asked opposing counsel her stance a while ago. She did not respond.

2. Fed. R. App. P. 26 provides, "For good cause, the court may extend the time prescribed by these rules or by its order to perform any act, or may permit an act to be done after that time expires. "

3. I incorporate Third Circuit Docket Item ("3DI") incorporated herein by reference in their entirety 3DI-122, 3DI-123, 3DI-124.

4. Sustaining my health and life is good cause to extend the time, with little prejudice to opposing counsel and great prejudice to me in terms of loss of First Amendment rights, health and threat to life due to severe dehydration and requirement of rest, exercise and rehydration.

5. I apprised the District Court of my limitations relating to a surgery I had when I was a teenager on October 25, 2022. District Court Docket Item (“DI”) DI 4, Exhibit 43.

6. I apprised the Chancery Court, the PA Supreme Court, Delaware Board of Professional Conduct and Delaware Supreme Court by filing the same documents in their courts, though they did not appear to desire be inconvenienced to sustain my life or health. DI 2-3, DI 69-75, DI 77.

7. The Delaware Supreme Court required I attend a hearing without adequate time to prepare with fewer than 2 weeks after the Court rendered an Order permitting me to self-represent. DI 34-43, 58, DI 69-74, DI 77. Fewer than two weeks is an insufficient amount of time in light of my previous unaddressed motions to the Board and the Delaware Supreme Court. *Id.* My motions for additional time to perform discovery, to call specific named witnesses, research and prepare were ignored. The court ignored my motions submitted previously and subsequently. The Board extended the hearing 8 additional days for a reason I did not submit while ignoring my asserted reasons contained in the motions. I required time in order not to prejudice me by denying me meaningful opportunity to be heard in defense of my exercise of fundamental rights. US Amend I, XIV. I

objected to the notice as not adhering to the rules, previously and subsequently. The Court required I attend, as I was recovering from what I believe was the shingles. The Defendants cared very little about my health. I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety. Id. The District Court knew I was ill, but callously refrained from preventing possible irreparable injury to me in the form of the loss of my fundamental rights, my property interest in my license, reputation and health. DI 40.

8. I require inordinate amount of water, time, exercise, and rest to sustain my health. I lose five pounds of water weight and become dangerously dehydrated for a week and sometimes longer, each month. Id.

9. Please see DI 97-1 for an example of when I collapsed due to severe dehydration at the post office. The law suits relating to the DE order have impeded time needed to rest, and care for my health. The cumulative impact of not rehydrating has left me dangerously dehydrated for months, not a mere week a month. I do not feel well. I require time to sustain my health please.

10. I assert my right to live under the First Amendment as an exercise of religious belief. I have religious objections against healthcare and mental healthcare.

11. The US Supreme Court held that one has a right to refuse healthcare and that “right presupposes no abandonment of the desire for life.” *Cruzan ex rel. Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health*, 497 U.S. 261, 343 (1990).

12. My religious beliefs are individual and do not conform to the dictates of entities, but seek to be led by the dictates of God. I do not force my will upon others, nor do I hide my beliefs. I keep myself separate, and holy by not sinning even though the world praises evil as good, and good as evil. I am permitted to exercise religious belief differently than the world. I have religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare. I believe people go to hell for adopting the beliefs, theories and philosophies of many experts such as B F Skinner, Plato and others. Not knowing, confusion, misunderstanding, being duped or deceived by trusting in man who misleads in place of God does not remove harm or potential damnation in hell.

13. I believe the Bible teaches people go to hell for their unconcern, indifference, or the fact they were too busy caring for their own to love God or others. *See Ezekiel 9,16:49-50, Matthew 13, 2 and Corinthians 4:4.*

14. I believe people go to hell for dumbness and blindness, not knowing, for trusting in their training, doing what they are told to do instead of using their own brain, to care to know, in order to do what is right. I

believe Courts can shed light on those in the dark preventing harm and hell.
Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23.

15. I believe many people go to hell for trusting in doctors, mere businessmen, under the guise of expertise, or science or dumbed down standardized training where they are penalized for thinking outside the box of standards to care for unique patients with individual needs.

16. I believe leaders in government who teach us to trust in experts, make business greed, the mark of children of the devil and lawlessness the law if trust in business professionals remains unrestrained by the courts. I believe such government teachings make entities and businesses above the law sacrificing people and individual liberty to serve money and material gain. Human sacrifice under the guise of common good is deceit built on a lie that sacrificing other people is necessary to care for our own.

17. I believe most of our law makers are misguided to harm others on their on way to destruction in hell for teaching the lie we must compromise serving some in order to serve others when the way money is coined creates artificial scarcity to exploit as opposed to serve the people. It is possible to serve the people without sacrificing some of the people for the benefit of others. This lie human sacrifice is needed is from Satan not God. (*Hebrews 2:14*). I wish this Court would save souls of presidents and law

makers from hell by taming their lusts with the Constitutional rule of law.

See, Isaiah 10:1-3.

18. I believe people will be thrown into the fires of hell for having the evil eye by looking at people for what they can contribute, as if humans are products. *See Matthew 6:23* regarding if your eye is evil. I believe individuals in government are charged to serve and respect the people, not exploit them for material gain.

19. I believe business greed is the mark of the twice dead, those without eternal life. Those who sacrifice and oppress people to get as much as they can for as little as they can do not reflect human nature. They reflect the image of the beast, the devil, those without eternal life, without repentance.

20. Attached, please find my complaint against President Trump where I declare my religious belief that business greed reflects the mark of lawlessness misleading people to hell. DI 4, Exhibit A of F. The mark of lawlessness should not be the law by making experts and professional standards the letter of the law. Judges should judge, not businesses. Courts will not ever stop business practices that kill, steal and destroy human life and liberty for the bottom line if we they deem businesses through their bought paid professionals the letter of the law. There is evidence herbicides

and insecticides cause cancer. Yet the laws encourage or allow entities to profiteer off of their use, even by creating entities for cancer cures which rewards and profiteers off of sickness and death. I believe people go to hell for organized charity and fundraising which is not true charity per Jesus Christ. (*Matthew* 6:1-4, See DI 4, I incorporate exhibit 2, law suit against Democrats to run for office without violating my religious belief by fundraising or collecting of signature, exhibit 50, proof I sought to run for president without violating my religious beliefs, Exhibit 51 proof I sought to run for local office without violating my religious belief by encouraging volunteers, fundraising or other violations of Jesus Christ's teachings, I incorporate herein by reference in all of the exhibits entirety. *Matthew* 6:1-4.)

24. True charity is done in secret at a material loss for an eternal gain. True charity is not conditioned on societal conditional entities or conditional collective acts. True charity is based on an individual free, not collective conditional choice. It is not unconditional love if it is through a conditional entity such as a beneficial-corporation.

25. It is my religious belief that I am required to use my own brain to care for my body. My body is not a professions or the governments' property to service by doctors who exploit it for money. See, the excellent,

brilliant, thought-provoking dissent in *Meachum v. Fano*, 427 U.S. 215, 230 (1976).

26. I believe our healthcare is so bad. When I ran for office, I proposed changes to the law to improve our healthcare. Coastal Point printed my proposals in the local newspaper in Sussex County, Delaware. (See DI 4, Exhibit 43, I incorporate herein in its entirety and attach hereto.)

27. I believe that people go to hell for harming others despite doing what they were trained to do, what their employer requires should they not use their brain to care to know about possible harm in order to love those they do business with, blinded by their love of money to care for their own, should they not repent. Ignorance is guilt to God. *Hosea* 4:6. I believe courts can help people know. So, they are not damned to hell as they harm others on their way there through their unconcern, indifference or ignorance. Truth through the courts may save eternal lives.

28. I believe our healthcare harms, kills and misleads people to hell. I believe our healthcare would improve if judges judged the doctors, scientists and businessmen instead of allowing business, charities and entities to be above the law by deeming their professional standards to be the letter of the law.

29. Businesses are left unrestrained by love written on human hearts not entities or the rule of law from potentially oppressing, killing, stealing and destroying life, liberty and health should business's judgment through alleged experts replace independent critically thinking individual judges on the bench that may analyze each individual unique set of facts before it. (See *Jeremiah* 31:33 "I will put My law in their minds and inscribe it on their hearts."); *Ephesians* 6:12; "For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities [businesses, charities, not for profits, beneficial corporations...], against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms.").

30. People judges are special, not replaceable by standardized automation. Sameness, equal treatment, is not fairness. Equal treatment is not equal protection under the law, which protects people's decision to exercise beliefs differently. It is elimination and sacrifice of individual liberty to believe and exercise beliefs differently under the satanic desire for order and convenience to compel the conformed model of boxed in standards. (See 1 *John* 5:19, "We know that we are children of God, and that the whole world is under the control of the evil one.") My faith commands me to be un-conformed to the world. (See, *Romans* 12:2 "Do not

conform to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind. Then you will be able to test and approve what God's will is—his good, pleasing and perfect will.”).

31. People judges are needed to protect our liberty. Two branches give us a republic in the form of representation. The judicial branch gives us a democracy in our Democratic-republic. The Judicial branch prevents the other two branches from sacrificing individuals and individual liberty under the guise of the vote's authority to administer the mob's reign of lusts which exceed Constitutional limits. It is the Courts who give us freedom. The other two branches allege to give us representation, but merely give the majority representation.

32. I am a child of God. I associate as a Christian and Catholic, but I put my faith in God the father, son and holy spirit, not in the entity of the church or mere men.

33. I attend St. Anne's Catholic Church, located at Bethany Beach, DE. I have refrained from attending regularly because people are getting sick and dying during this plague of global infections.

34. I actually left mass early on January 1, 2023 because people were coughing without covering their mouths. I do not feel guilty. God

understands. I think is gross and dangerous when people cough without covering their mouths.

35. My health issues arose during church service at St Anne's when I was in high school. During mass at St. Anne's, I could not stand in the church's bathroom. I collapsed to the floor. I did not know that my blood was being cut off by a cyst. DI. 4, Exhibit 43.

36. Later in high school, I had emergency surgery the day after Halloween. They took my ovary for research.

37. I believe people sin by using body parts including my removed ovary or other people as research statistics for material gain, but my parents gave consent.

38. I became weak. I am weak. I continued and still continue to have menstruation each month, despite only having one ovary. Yet, I require rest, exercise, food and inordinate amounts of water in order not to collapse, harm my health or die.

39. I have the ability to run ten miles. Yet, despite appearance and athletic agility, I have limitations and needs that ordinary people do not require to sustain their health or life. Many people have the sin against the holy spirit by not desiring to be inconvenienced by my needs to sustain life and health. I have had to assert my right to live and sustain my precious

body. My body is God's not man's to exploit dead or alive. Citing, 1
Corinthians 6:20.¹

40. While I plea this Court grant me time to uphold my right of life and time to sustain my health on religious grounds. I assert my right to exercise religious belief by living and sustaining health. I pray this Court deems other citizens as the treasure to serve not exploit for money and material gain, "moth and rust." (Citing Jesus, *Matthew* 6:19-20.)

¹ In *Renihan v. Wright*, 125 Ind. 536, 537 (Ind. 1890), the Court found dead bodies to be property. Is property more valuable to protect than First Amendment right to religious belief or a person's body? I believe people sin for cremating other people, leading to damnation in hell for hurting other people's bodies. See *Amos* 2:1. Dead or alive they are God's for resurrection the last day for judgment. Citing, *Romans* 14:8, *Ezekiel* 37. Burial is an important exercise of my religious belief. See, eg. *Genesis* 47:29. I think non-religious people's lives and bodies should also be afforded dignity and respect with the right to live, not merely me because it is a religious exercise of my faith in Jesus. I am called to love and respect those beyond my own even my enemies too. Love does not kill or harm. Should the Court extend the right to life, bodily integrity in death, and liberty beyond religious exercise to safeguard humans as inherently deserving of respect and life unearned required, the Courts would create a fairer more just society. See, *Meachum v. Fano*, 427 U.S. 215, 230 n.1 (1976) "No State shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law" U.S. Const., Amdt. 14, § 1). There is no due process for the dead, though I believe their bones need to be resurrected on the last day for judgment of eternal life or damnation loss of eternal life. Humans, dead or alive are not property. My heart is sad. People are priceless, not price tags. They are precious and are not stakeholder slaves to be bought or sold under the global plans either. The entire world is in danger. We need the Court to be our hero, not auctioneer. Justice is not a business or a matter of barter or exchange. Justice is a matter of determining truth under the facts protecting what is right by law, not lusts.

41. I request this Court grant an accommodation by additional time.

42. Please do not sacrifice my life and health in the name of mere business or productivity. I believe sacrificing people in the name of productivity, money or material gain is satanic human sacrifice, injustice guaranteed. *Hebrews 2:14*.

43. I am concerned by the numerous historical religions or cultures that required human sacrifice for material gain, essentially selling other people's souls to gain the world to lose their own soul in hell. (*Citing, Matthew 16:26*). I am especially concerned about the law suit by Jewish women under the RFRA in Indiana where they argue killing potential life is deemed a religious exercise. This may open a can of warms for other religions to kill life. The Court should deem the right to life a liberty to protect regardless of religious beliefs. The line of rights should be limited as not to eliminate the rights of others, including the right to life. This limit makes us all freer, not for sale property of entities or governments.

44. I have good cause for an extension due to limited access to resources and due to additional reciprocating Courts foreseeably requiring inordinate amounts of time, as to deny me meaningful opportunity to prepare and draft a Reply Brief before this Court within the time frame.

45. I apprised this Court of connectivity internet issues, printer issues and my need for computer replacement or repairs. 3DI-119.

46. I also had filing issues with the Eastern District of PA. I incorporate by reference in its entirety DI-97, which required attention and time. This prejudiced my ability to research and work on this matter.

47. I also had filing issues with the Delaware District Court. It is important to have an accurate record since this Court kindly permits me to base my pleadings on the record per Third Circuit Order at 3DI 24. See one example I incorporate herein by its entirety by reference DI-98. This prejudiced my ability to research and work on this matter.

48. To date, I still do not have electronic filing privileges despite an order granting them by the DE District Court. DI 106-109. I think I may calculate the time place on electronically filed documents by looking at the docket item number to see if and when any changes may have been made should the Court have addressed my other concerns relating to denial of opportunity to be heard by making pleadings illegible including DI-7 Filed 10/25/21 Page 1 of 17 **PageID #: 2522**. If you look at the emphasized page numbers they appear to be filed chronologically by date.

49. I also apprised this Court and the Delaware District Court of time constraints due to a reciprocal law suit in the Supreme Court of

Pennsylvania. The Court and opposing counsel are giving me a particularly difficult time, despite the fact I have been retired from PA since 2018, and I argue the Court is without subject matter jurisdiction. I incorporate by reference in its entirety 3DI 122-124 and DI 100-to DI 109. I do not know if DI 108-DI 109 are quite uploaded yet.

50. I have shown good cause for an extension of time.

51. I have the threat of loss of my right to believe differently than the world and to privately exercise my beliefs without government incited economic, physical or social persecution.

52. People threw substance on my vehicle based on my perceived religious-political beliefs. (DI 3)

53. People talked about shooting me, per the attached Facebook post refreshing my recollection. (DI 100 Exhibit I). I should be permitted to exercise my First Amendment fundamental right to privately not professionally petition in defense of a substantial government burden without reprisal or government rebuke and persecution.

54. I require time to appeal two orders to the United States Supreme Court. One Order is due January 27, 2022. The other appeal is due the following week. I must be permitted to plea to believe and exercise belief and my right to access to the courts, even if the entire world thinks my

beliefs are repugnant. It is the mere opportunity of justice, not the guarantee I seek. Please protect my meaningful access to other courts.

55. 45 days, would give me a week or so to draft something before your court after I file documents with the US Supreme Court.

56. It is difficult since I disagree with the US Supreme Court on many cases. I believe there is plan to eliminate religious liberties and the US Supreme Court's members are deceived into believing the lie business is freedom by allowing the government to partner with churches to perform government business through grants or business. So, the Court is contributing to the eventual schemed demise of free exercise of religion to forced by government backing or bought and sold religious exercise.

57. I know my church the Catholic Church has misled people to hell in history for material gain, business. For instance, the crusades violated Jesus's teachings to love your enemy, and God's teachings to feed them when they are hungry, not accept material gain to kill them. I believe the deceived people will perish in hell, which makes me sad.

58. My church also misbehaved by fundraising and colonizing in the name of Christ when Jesus teaches people will go to hell for fundraising and organized charity which is not true charity. It is business giving to get. *Matthew 6:1-4.*

59. My Catholic Church also misbehaved by teaching people to give indulgences to be saved from sin when I believe the Bible clearly teaches damned to hell are those who think they may buy or barter their way into heaven. (See, *Acts* 8:20 “Peter answered: “May your money perish with you, because you thought you could buy the gift of God with money!” The man Peter scolded was damned dead to perish in hell which is sad. He will be no more, without eternal life).

60. Free exercise of religion is not for sale bought and bartered for exercise of religion, making those who have nothing to sell but their own souls, slaves not free. I believe the US Supreme Court is completely wrong in its decision in *Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colo. Civil Rights Comm'n*, 138 S. Ct. 1719 (2018) See the attached exhibit which was included at DI 4, A-5 to see how I incorporate herein by reference explaining why I believe the Court is wrong.

61. Business is not freedom. If business is deemed a freedom that makes people for sale property not free. I have to protect people's freedom to believe differently than I, even to believe wrongly because love does not control, but cares for people. Damnation is guaranteed by conditionally compelling people to care by conformed by societal pressure or otherwise

gifting or sacrifice. This is not unconditional love but the mark of the beast, the twice dead to be destroyed without eternal life.

62. I strongly support separation of church and state to prevent the government cloak or the government dollar from making us less free by government backed compelled worship.

63. I do believe there is a global planned attack against the Catholic faith in particular, my faith.

64. The churches may place their fingers at me not the courts should I be permitted to argue government business is not freedom and churches and religious entities must not partner with the government.

65. To preserve freedom of religion from government compelled worship by the establishment of government religious belief through business, we must protect individual liberty which will protect the institutions of the church and religious organizations even if they lament based on love of money and material gain, not love of God. *See, Matthew 6:24.*

66. The church need not be perfect to be deemed protected and untaxed and unbought and backed by government.

67. St. Anne's Catholic Church is also special because I met the love of my worldly life there. Attached, please find pictures of the love of my life and me I incorporate herein by reference.

68. Judge Leah Chandler, is a former law librarian in Sussex I lovingly called the lovely librarian. She is a schoolmate, one grade below me attending the same elementary, middle and high schools. I see her as a friend. Her father-in-law is the former Chancellor of the Delaware Chancery Court, William Chandler. She married his son, Bill Chandler, a friend too.

69. Years ago, I got in an automobile accident with her little brother. Instead of being mad at me for colliding into the back of his truck, he asked me on a date. I had not been on a date in almost a decade, but I was conflicted because of the conflict of interest.

70. I went to St. Anne's church to 4:00 mass to pray about it.

71. While at St. Anne's, I met the love of my life that day. I declined the date with the lovely law librarian's little brother by leaving a message on his phone, and started dating the love of my life instead. While we are no longer talking, I am grateful for the time I shared with him.

72. St. Anne's the church is important to protect as an imperfect church even if I do not agree with all the teachings like praying to Mary who is not there as opposed to God.

73. I believe the US Supreme Court is falling into a trap that will eliminate the credibility of religious institutions as businesses down the line

74. I also believe money is not there to pay government pensions, and that government employees, not merely citizens will be harmed in a schemed crash that may be unraveled and reversed.

75. Attach, please find an article by BIS, the Bank of International Settlements and another article I incorporate herein by reference.

76. Finance Digest, London Reuters, in *BIS warns of \$80 trillion of hidden FX swap*, By Marc Jones stated “The Bank for International Settlements (BIS) has warned that [United States] **pension funds** and other ‘non-bank’ financial firms now have more than \$80 trillion of hidden, off-balance sheet dollar debt in the form of FX swaps.”

<https://www.financedigest.com/bis-warns-of-80-trillion-of-hidden-fx-swap-debt.html> See, https://www.bis.org/publ/qtrpdf/r_qt2212h.pdf Also see, <https://www.reuters.com/markets/currencies/global-markets-bis-urgent-2022-12-05/>

77. The money is not there. This will affect you should your government pensions be tied with the money and will be used to eliminate the dollar and government control through a debt credit system where private central banks will be permitted to act above the law and will be

deemed to be the law even though they gain more profit the worse off we are. They gain more the more we are in debt to it.

78. Per the Great Narrative I attached to the docket below on page DI 55-12, Page 86-87:

“Network for Greening the Financial System and beyond: Imagining new policies

The Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS) is a group of **91 central banks** and supervisors committed to mobilizing mainstream finance to support the transition towards a sustainable economy. It is investigating many bold financial innovations¹⁷ that could (and most likely will) one day revolutionize the way in which climate-related risks are accounted for in central banking and banking supervision. In short, **alongside governments (which have a much broader and more effective range of tools and policies available to prevent and mitigate climate-related risks), central banks will adapt their monetary policy operational frameworks to reflect climate-related risks.** This will involve the mitigation of balance sheet risks that stem from climate change and environmental degradation, but also the active support of the transition to a non-carbon, green economy. Imagining what form this might take and devising policy tools and instruments to get there is the task of the NGFS, and largely depends on how climate risks will affect the economy and financial system through a range of different transmission channels. The menu of options available is extensive and encompasses changes in all three most important policy fields of a central bank: credit operations, collateral policies and asset purchases. It is not the purpose of this book to delve into the technicalities of what this involves but, suffice to say, **some of the options represent a radical departure from standard central bank operational policies. they are, in short, the product of central bankers’ imagination.”**

79. I believe the banks will take over government’s authority to govern, without restraint in the form of the rule of law. Governments will

have no authority to govern them. The central banks shareholding members are banks.

80. The private entity, the Federal reserve shareholders are member banks.

81. Banks gain profit and power over governments, entities and individuals the more in debt they are.

82. There is incentive to make people and the environment worse off under the guise of sustaining the world, only to sustain power, profit and positions of the few who exploit the money to serve lusts under the guise of equality, freedom and law.

83. It makes sense that more than 80 trillion does not exist to pay out pensions and debts as they fall due. Entities write off debts. Banks create money out of nothing to enslave people to gain profit interest.

84. This Court was previously apprised in my belief that people go to hell for usury and the entire stock market is a Ponzi scheme, with resold debt no one may pay leaving the boomers without retirement. *DI 2. Ezekiel 18:13*

85. The global plan violates my religious belief on a greater magnitude. It appears to be a mere incremental step to eliminate dollar to

digital currency to eliminate governments authority down the line under 2050 agendas.

86. Should you think my concerns are unwarranted, at least you have your thumb on President Biden by keeping your thumb on me.

87. I have some ideas to reverse the crash by a mistrial of Kelly v Trump. Maybe my opponents or the Court will have better ideas. I have limited means and resources, whereas my opponents and the courts have easier more thorough access to the law.

88. The reciprocal discipline case arose in part, based on the Delaware Supreme Court's disdain for two petitions relating to exemption of bar fees, one in January 2021, and one in February 2021. DI 2-4, DI 69-75. The statute of limitations may expire should I not be permitted to maintain this action by a reply. I attach these petitions hereto and incorporate them herein by reference.

89. I have stated good cause by concerns and otherwise warranting an extension.

Wherefore I pray the Court grants my motion, only if a stay is denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated January 1, 2023

/s/Meghan Kelly

Appendix O

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

Office of Disciplinary Counsel, Respondent, also known as, Delaware Office of Disciplinary
Counsel

On Appeal from the Delaware Supreme Court, Case No. 2022, 58

**Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion for permission to exceed the word limit and page limit in
her writ of certiorari**

1. I Meghan Kelly, for good cause, respectfully request, the Word limit
be excused in the above captioned Motion.
2. The amount of Words is unknown. I am having a difficult time narrowing the
many issues. I may be required to waive some issues, even if words are granted, due to time and
other constraints.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. In the August 23, 2021 letter attached hereto as Exhibit B, the 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.

6. This Court has inherent equitable powers over their process to prevent abuse, oppression, and injustice. *Gumbel v. Pitkin*, 124 U.S. 131 (1888). This Court must grant my request to prevent injustice by denial of words which essentially denies me the opportunity to be heard in defense of my religious speech reflecting my religious beliefs in my Freedom of Religion Restoration Act Complaint against former President Donald J. Trump. US Amend I, V.

7. This Court must grant my request for additional words to prevent government abuse against my person, oppression, and injustice. It is difficult for me to ask the Court persecuting me for my belief in Jesus, for help.

8. Nevertheless, the Constitutional issues must be addressed to protect not only me, but others beyond me from professional government backed persecution based on exercise of fundamental rights.

9. 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.

10. I must not be compelled to violate my religious belief by compelled religious violations of my belief in order to regain my license.

11. 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

12. “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).

13. “The doctrine that a government, state or federal, may not grant a benefit or privilege 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,

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 Services, 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 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.”).

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.")

14. "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)

15. 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."

16. 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.

17. I must argue this case must be extended to me 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.

18. 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.

19. I require more words to ask the Courts to exercise more of their power to prevent professionals from governing the nation as opposed to government elected or appointed impartial servants without a stake in the outcome against the accused, in terms of position or sustaining profit.

20. Additional words are needed not only to protect the Constitutional rights of the accused, but to improve the world, by allowed criticism, free speech, free enterprise, which helps professionals learn, and improve, not forced conformity under the threat of secret proceedings against professionals who think or believe differently.

21. The Courts guarantee injustice by making business the law. Making professionals who exercise private rights, including their religious beliefs in jeopardy of losing their ability to buy and sell merely for not adopting the government's or government backed preligious or secular belief in money and professional material gain and convenience as God and guide.

22. The Words are needed to argue, under the unique facts of this case in defense of my ability to buy and sell as a professional lawyer but for my exercise of my fundamental rights.

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants my motion.

Dated: 1/23/2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693
(1,541 Words)
United States Supreme Court No.283696

Appendix P

No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

Third Circuit Court of Appeals

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the

Third Circuit, Case Number Case Number 22-8037

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Pro Se, not represented by
Counsel
US Bar 283696
(301) 493-6693
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether the Third Circuit's rule R.A.D.E. 16 violates **Equal protections** as applied to me as a party of one, as an attorney with religious political beliefs the Delaware Supreme Court labeled are a disability, and as applied to the group labeled disabled, by affording me and the group for which I am labeled with fewer Constitutional protections than attorneys disciplined by disbarment and suspension under R.A.D.E. 6, without a necessary or compelling reason somehow more important than foreclosing me and a class of attorneys the 5th Amendment fundamental right for the opportunity to be heard on Constitutional defects on the disciplinary order reciprocating cases are based.

II. Whether the Third Circuit Rule R.A.D.E 16 violates **procedural due process or substantive due process** by denying me the opportunity to be heard, as a party of one as an attorney with unique religious-political beliefs, and the class of attorneys labeled disabled the opportunity to be heard in defense of Constitutional liberties relating to the underlying Order the Third Circuit Reciprocal disciplinary proceedings are based, to safeguard property interests in the Third Circuit license(s) to practice law, reputation and related interests. US Amend I, right to petition

A. Whether this issue is capable of repetition. Yet, evading review.

III. Whether the Federal disciplinary proceeding violates case or controversy requirements under Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, since there is no opposing counsel or underlying case. The Court acts as prosecutor and judge. Alternatively, whether my Due Process rights are violated under the facts by allowing the judge to be the prosecutor as applied.

IV. Whether it is unconstitutional for lawyers to be regulated by the Courts other than during a case, 1. a law suit in which they represent a party or 2. where the lawyer is a party.

V. Whether it is un-Constitutional for federal judges to be self-regulated or regulated by Third Parties, by congressional rule or elimination of life time tenures, in violation of my religious belief as a party of one whose unique religious political beliefs requires she safeguards the impartiality of the courts as a religious exercise of her belief in Jesus. *Matthew 23:23, Amos 5:15*

VI. Whether the Third Circuit violated my invoked right against self-incrimination by using information submitted to in Kelly v Swartz, Case Number 21-3198 to file a reciprocal proceeding, despite my invocation of the 5th Amendment, given I immediately moved to strike the information from the record. The information was removed.

A. If not, whether the rule under R.A.D.E. V violates the 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination, and is capable of repetition yet evading review.

LIST OF PARTIES

I, Meghan Kelly, Appellant, Respondent am the only real party. There is no opposing party or opposing counsel. The Third Circuit Court of Appeals is the Court, and may be named as a party in name only, as Appellee.

CASES DIRECTLY RELATING TO THIS CASE

Kelly v Swartz, et al, Delaware District Court No. 21-1490, and Third Circuit Court of Appeals Matter No 21-3198. The Original disciplinary case in Delaware Supreme Court matter No. 22-58. Reciprocal disciplinary cases Eastern District of PA matter No 22-45, Third Circuit Court of Appeals No. 22-3372, Delaware District Court No. 22-341, PA Supreme Court No 2913, DD3. DC and the US Supreme Court have refrained from discipline, DC based on jurisdiction. *Kelly v Trump* Chancery Court No. 2020-0809, Delaware Supreme Court No. 119-2021, US Supreme Court No. 22-5522, *Kelly v Democrats* Chancery Court No 2020-0157.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINIONS BELOW.....	1
JURISDICTION.....	1
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1-30
I. Background of the DE-Disciplinary Matter and DE Civil rights Case...1-8	
III. Background basis of Third Circuit Disciplinary Case violated US Amend V	9-10
IV. Federal Courts may not be regulated and controlled by self-regulation or third-party regulation.....	11-17
V. The system of reciprocity violates Case and Controversy Requirements...17-18	
VI The case and controversy requirements are not met in my case.....	18-22
VII. Self-Regulation.....	22-24
VIII Equal protections, due process and substantial due process claims as applied to me as a party of one and as applied to attorneys labeled disabled.....	24-29
IX. Urgency, threat of death or harm to health.....	29-30

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1-a Constitutional and statutory provisions involved

Appendix A Order, dated August 18, 2022 denying an extension or even the right to draft a for cause motion other lawyers disciplined as disbarred or suspended are afforded under R.A.D.E. Rule 6 (Docket Item “DI” 8)

Appendix B Order dated August 17, 2022, placing my license on reciprocal discipline disability inactive status (DI 2)

Appendix C Docket of the Third Circuit Disciplinary matter Case Number 22-8037

Appendix D letter dated 16, 2022, where I invoke the 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination

Appendix E Order in Kelly v Swartz, No 21-3198 (DI 76) indicating my submission of the original disciplinary Order against me may be used to reciprocally discipline me and was used despite my assertion of the 5th Amendment against self-incrimination

Appendix F August 23, 2022 Letter indicating my religious speech contained in my petitions in Kelly v Trump was the reason for the discipline, not health concerns at DI Exhibit 43 (DI 9 in the docket below)

Appendix G Number 7 of the Delaware Disciplinary Proceeding (DI 9)

Appendix H Reply to the ODC’s Response to my petition (DI 9)

Appendix I My Objections to the Delaware Order (DI 9)

Appendix J Table of Contents of Objections to the Board’s determination

Appendix K Internal Table of Contents of Exhibits to Exhibit K referred to in the Table Contents and contained in the Objections to the Board’s Determination, Meghan Kelly’s Answers, Defenses and Objections to ODC’s petition

Appendix L letter dated January 7, 2021, to the Delaware Supreme Court where I request an exemption for all attorneys facing economic hardship, with attachments thereto showing my negotiations with my former law firm regarding salaries, and proof of my first salary as an attorney in the amount of \$135,000.00 (DI 9, found in Exhibit C to Appendix K)

Appendix M letter dated February 5, 2021 to the Delaware Supreme court regarding attorney fees and violations of the Equal protections clause by the case-by-case solution proffered by the Court (DI 9, Found in Exhibit B to Appendix K)

Appendix N Sealed documents A-4, My Motion to the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms from unlawfully pressuring me to forgo or impede my case to protect my free exercise of religion, and exhibits thereto, including a letter to the Master in the Chancery Court concerning the staff seeking to sabotage my case, by misleading me to almost miss my deadline to appeal her final order (DI 9)

Appendix O Sealed Documents A-5, My motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the Honorable Justice Collins J. Seitz, and related exhibits thereto (DI 9)

Appendix P Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion to be excused from notary and affirming requirements in Delaware to prevent the compelled violations of her religious belief, dated June 7, 2022. (DI 9)

Appendix Q Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for good cause, 1 Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 9, to Unseal the Record, 2. to declare self-regulation of attorneys, other Professions, and judges unconstitutional, making business above the law, by making the dictates of professionals, or bureaucrats within agencies, as opposed to laws enacted by congress people, checked by the vote of the people, the law, and 3. in lieu of and in the alternative, eliminate the secret trial requirements of professionals before Boards, including the Board on Professional Responsibility, requiring the choice of an open or confidential forum left to the accused professional, instead of requiring a secret proceeding, concealing the accused's defense, to the advantage of the accuser state, in violation of equal protections, and due process 1st and 14th Protections, filed August 15, 2022

Appendix R Meghan Kelly's Motion to 1. declare the Reporting Requirements unconstitutional, requiring by written rule I violate my 5th Amendment right not to testify against myself to the government in order that the government may have evidence to prosecute me, 2. Declare the Case and Controversy requirements are not met in the system of attorney self-regulation, filed August 19, 2022, and only Exhibit F therein, not all exhibits regarding Emails of which courts were notified, and Constitutional and ethical concerns on self-reporting

Appendix S Plaintiff's Motion to amend the complaint pursuant to FRCP 15 (a)(1) and FRCP 15(a)(2) to include additional parties, eliminate a party, include additional facts and include additional requests for relief. I included the five DE Supreme Court justices, including but not limited to Justice James T. Vaughn, Jr. and Justice Tamika Montgomery-Reeves

Appendix T Releases Justice James T. Vaughn, Jr. announces he will retire on May 1, 2023 after 25 years of service on the bench, dated November 29, 2022, and Justice Tamika Montgomery-Reeves announces she will step down in February to join the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals, dated December 16, 2022

Appendix U August 13, 2022 Letter invoking the 5th and request to strike DE disciplinary Order from the docket

Appendix V Respondent Meghan Kelly's Addendum to Motion pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (e), to Strike 3DI 77 as misfiled to be rescanned in to the Correct Matter No. 22-8037, without lifting my motion for a stay, dated August 24, 2022

Appendix W Meghan Kelly's Corrected Second Motion pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (e), to Strike 3DI 77 as misfiled to be rescanned in to the Correct Matter No. 22-8037, without lifting my motion for a stay

Appendix X Meghan Kelly's Motion pursuant to Rule 40 for a panel Reargument on Order Dated August 31, 2022, and move for a Judge, not the Clerk of the Court to render an order on this Motion for Reagument, and her Corrected Second Motion pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 10 (e), to Strike 3DI 77 as misfiled to be rescanned in to the Correct Matter No. 22-8037, without lifting my motion for a stay, and Motion to strike 3DI 77, and exhibits thereto, and related document, due to the fact I brought up mistakes or potential misconduct by the clerk's office to correct, to preserve impartiality

Appendix Y Petitioner Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Motion to supplement the record with additional information, pursuant to Rule 10 (e) (2) (3) to include Meghan Kelly's legal theory for appeal of Case No 22-8037 to the US Supreme Court, and thwarted plans, in reviewing Petitioner Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Motion pursuant to Rule 40 for a panel Reargument on Order Dated August 30, 2022 (DI 87)

Appendix Z Order by Justice Vaughn granting me the right to self-representation in Matter 541. The Court denied me the right to documents in the case relating to appointment of counsel. My latest request is contained therein in the email to the Clerk of Court.

Appendix AA Healthcare record, healthcare and mental healthcare concerns about care that harms patients, proposals to improve healthcare on the state and federal level, and college transcripts with courses related to healthcare and psychology.

Appendix BB Facebook present sense impression when people talked about shooting me for religious-political speech or perceived affiliation or beliefs

Appendix CC Email requesting the record on my case, in a separate matter which prejudices my case and denies me the opportunity to be heard on appeal to the US Supreme Court and below, since not all pleadings are on 22-58, despite previous denial by the DE Supreme Court.

Appendix DD Newspaper article I drafted regarding title companies practicing law without a license, messing up on the chain of title, costing DE many by untaxed professional work

Appendix EE Complaint Kelly v Democrats

Appendix FF Petition to the US Supreme Court concerning filing fees and signatures, Letter to the Democrat's Delaware Chair for an exemption from signature and filing fees in order not to violate my religious beliefs which was denied

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Book, Bible

<i>Amos</i> , 5:15.....	14
<i>Matthew</i> , 23:23.....	14

Case Law

<i>Bridges v. Wixon</i> , 326 U.S. 135, 152, (1945).....	6
<i>Constr. Drilling, Inc. V. Chusid</i> , No. 03-3786, 2005 WL 1111760, at *3 (3d Cir. May 11, 2005).....	2
<i>Government of Canal Zone v. Brooks</i> , 427 F.2d 346, 347 (5th Cir.1970).....	6
<i>In re Gi Yeong Nam</i> , 245 B.R. 216 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 2000).....	9
<i>Kennedy v. Bremerton Sch. Dist.</i> , 142 S. Ct. 2407 (2022).....	7
<i>May v. Anderson</i> , 345 U.S. 528, 537 (1953).....	2
<i>Pease v. Rathbun-Jones Eng. Co.</i> , 243 U.S. 273, 276 (1917).....	2
<i>Pearson v. Callahan</i> , 555 U.S. 223, 227 (2009).....	3
<i>Rendell v. Rumsfeld</i> , 484 F.3d 236 (3d Cir. 2007).....	17
<i>Saucier v. Katz</i> , 533 U.S. 194, 201, (2001).....	3
<i>Schwartz v. Board of Bar Examiners</i> , 353 U.S. 232 (1957).....	28
<i>Spevack v. Klein</i> , 385 U.S. 511, (1967).....	10
<i>Uniontown Newspapers, Inc. v. Roberts</i> , 576 Pa. 231, 253 (Pa. 2003).....	3
<i>Werkheiser v. Pocono Twp.</i> , 780 F.3d 172, 176 (3d Cir. 2015).....	3
<i>Wisconsin Dept. of Industry v. Gould Inc.</i> , 475 U.S. 282, 286 n.3 (1986)....	10, 28

Procedural Rules

3rd Circuit Court of Appeals Rules of Attorney Disciplinary Enforcement Rule(s) (also referred to as “R.A.D.E. R” or RADE R)

R.A.D.E. R. 5.....	9, 10
R.A.D.E. R. 6.....	24-25, 27

R.A.D.E. R 8.....	24-25
R.A.D.E. 13(3).....	27
R.A.D.E. R 16.....	24-28

Delaware

DLRDP Rule 9(d)(3).....	5
-------------------------	---

Publications

David H. Armistead, <i>Substantive Due Process Limits on Public Officials' Power to Terminate State-Created Property Interests</i>	6
--	---

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1254	1
28 U.S.C. § 1253.....	1
42 USC §1983.....	4
42 USC §1985.....	4
42 USC §1988.....	4
42 USCS § 2000bb 1-4 Religious Freedom Restoration Act (“RFRA”).....	2, 4

US Constitution

U.S. Cons. Amend. 1.....	1, 3-6, 12-14-19, 21 24-30
U.S. Const. Amend. V.....	1, 3-6, 12-19, 21 24, 25-30
U.S. Const. Amend. XIII.....	11, 12-14, 21, 23, 24
U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1.....	1, 3-6, 19, 21, 24, 25
U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 3, § 2, cl. 1.....	17-19

US President’s Executive Orders

Executive Orders by President Bush, Junior

Ex. Or. No. 13198, 66 Fed. Reg. 8497, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 1401, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021.....	2, 7
Ex. Or. No. 13199, 66 FR 8497, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, 83 FR 20715, May 3, 2018.....	2, 7
Ex. Or. No. 13279, 67 FR 77141, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No.13559, 75 FR 71319, November 17, 2010.....	2, 7

Executive Orders by President Obama

Ex. Or. No. 13559, 75 Fed. Reg. 71319, Nov. 17, 2010.....	2, 7
---	------

Executive Orders by President Trump

Ex. Or. No. 13798, 82 Fed. Reg. 21675, May 4, 2017.....	2, 7
Ex Or. No. 13831, 83 Fed. Reg. 20715, May 3, 2018.....	2, 7

Executive Orders by President Biden

Ex. Or. 14015, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021.....	2, 7
--	------

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

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals to review the merits appears at Appendix (“App.”) A, dated August 30, 2022. There is a previous Order by the Third Circuit, dated August 17, 2022 App.-B. There is no opinion to publish. There is no lower Court opinion.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254 or in the alternative under 28 U.S.C. § 1253.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Pertinent statutory provisions are reprinted in the appendix to this brief, App 1a.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I. Background of the DE-Disciplinary Matter and DE Civil rights Case

A Delaware Lawyer Disciplinary Order placed my license to practice law on inactive/disabled, but for my religious-political beliefs and poverty and exercise of the fundamental right to petition the Courts to alleviate a substantial burden upon my religious exercise, First Amendment rights to private-religious-political speech, private-religious beliefs, private-religious association and private exercise of religious belief, and to petition the Court relating to bar dues, and procedural Due Process violations, without disparate treatment unlike attorneys similarly situation in violation of the Equal Protections Clause. App F-S. US Amend I, XIV.

I filed a Religious Freedom Restoration Act lawsuit (“RFRA”) law suit against former President Donald Trump to alleviate a substantial burden upon my religious exercise, but for the establishment of government religious belief by a course of conduct, including the passage of executive orders granting churches government money as agents of the state to perform government work, and granting churches the legal authority to use other people’s money, the parishioner’s, to back candidates and parties. App H-K This government money and government backing and buying of churches incited violence against my person. Id.

During *Kelly v Trump*, Chancery Court staff prevented service of the complaint to local counsel Attorney General David Weiss. App. N-O. A Delaware arm, DE-Lapp sent a threatening letter based on petitions regarding bar dues, Judge Kenneth Clark of the Court of Common Pleas attempted to bully me into forfeiting my right to access to the Courts and the Delaware Office of Disciplinary counsel sent threatening letters in an attempt to cause me to forgo my law suit against former Donald J. Trump. Id.

My writ of certiorari to this Court under No 21-5522 I incorporate herein by reference was denied on or about November 1, 2021. Looking back, I should have argued the case was voidable based on procedural and substantive due process defects. (See, *May v. Anderson*, 345 U.S. 528, 537 (1953) “It is void ... if it denies due process of law.”); (*Pease v. Rathbun-Jones Eng. Co.*, 243 U.S. 273, 276 (1917) Judgments “ are void for lack of due process of law, or should be set aside for error.”); (See, *Constr. Drilling, Inc. V. Chusid*, No. 03-3786, 2005 WL 1111760, at *3 (3d Cir. May 11, 2005) (The Third Circuit held, “A judgment may also be void if a court "acted in a manner inconsistent with due process of law).

I drafted motions in *Kelly v Trump* alerting the Court concerning actions by state government agents to apparently impede and obstruct my access to the courts in that proceeding,

I attach here and incorporate herein by reference. App N-O. I objected to such interference. *Id.*

The First Amendment prohibits state officials, employees and agents from retaliating against claimants, such as myself, for exercising the right of access to the Courts in defense of the exercise of my First Amendment religious belief, religious-speech contained in the petitions, religious association, and religious exercise. *Id.*

"[T]he Supreme Court . . . consistently recognized 'that retaliation' by public officials against the exercise of First Amendment rights is itself a violation of the First Amendment." *Uniontown Newspapers, Inc. v. Roberts*, 576 Pa. 231, 253 (Pa. 2003) (Internal citations omitted)

I argued the state and its agents were not entitled to immunity under the US Supreme Court's 2-part test under *Saucier v. Katz*, 533 U.S. 194, 201, (2001). *Citing, Werkheiser v. Pocono Twp.*, 780 F.3d 172, 176 (3d Cir. 2015); *but see, Pearson v. Callahan*, 555 U.S. 223, 227 (2009) ("We now hold that the Saucier procedure should not be regarded as an inflexible requirement and that petitioners are entitled to qualified immunity on the ground that it was not clearly established at the time of the search that their conduct was unconstitutional.")(This case is distinguished from the present case since 1st Amendment free exercise of religious beliefs, speech, association, exercise of religious beliefs, and the right to petition are clearly established Constitutional rights that should be known by the Court and its agents at the time of their misconduct in violations of those rights and federal laws.).

I brought a law suit in the Delaware District Court prior to the institution of the Delaware Disciplinary Proceeding and prior to the conclusion of *Kelly v Trump* to *inter alias* seek relief for procedural due process violations, ongoing interference in *Kelly v Trump* and retaliation for the exercise of my fundamental rights, by the Delaware Disciplinary Counsel ("DE-ODC").

The Delaware Courts have a long history of denying and ignoring my religious exercise by compelled violations. See for example App P. Affirming and swearing is against my religious beliefs in Jesus. I was required to swear into the Delaware Bar despite my previous request to affirm. At the time, I did not understand affirming was sin too. My request for an exemption under new rules implemented by a Delaware Court were denied without a necessary reason somehow more important than my fundamental right to religious exercise and belief by compelled violation in exchange to access to the courts. App P. See also App. I, and exhibits thereto too voluminous to attach in the appendix. US Amend I, XIV, V.

I brought *Kelly v Swartz*, et al, on or about October 25, 2021, for equitable relief, and damages caused by the Delaware disciplinary counsels', court members' and the State's interference in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act lawsuit ("RFRA") against former President Donald J. Trump (referred to as "Kelly v Trump"), in violation of 42 USC §§§ 1983, 1985, 1988. I sought claims for emotional distress, First Amendment violations, loss of employment opportunities, or other economic harm, and harm to my reputation. (Docket Item in the Third Circuit (hereinafter referred to as "DI") 9, App. H-P).

I also sought claims for Delaware's selective prosecution in bringing a disciplinary action against me to demean my reputation by placing my license on inactive disabled 1. to conceal Defendants misconduct in collusion with the Delaware Supreme Court, and 2. to punish me for exercising the right to access the courts and First Amendment rights, based on Defendants disdain for my religious-political beliefs contained in the speech in the Religious Freedom Restoration Act petitions and other petitions. *Id.*

I later amended the Complaint to include additional facts showing the Delaware Supreme Court instigated the disciplinary proceeding against me, colluded with the Board and DE-ODC to

prejudice my case, concealed evidence and witnesses, while denying by ignoring my motions to perform discovery. I also included additional claims procedural due process violations, denial to access to the law library and other disparate treatment by the Delaware Courts made in bad faith, which occurred during the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding as distinguished from *Kelly v Trump*. I sought nominal damages, damages and additional equitable relief, including but not limited to voiding the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding and *Kelly v Trump* due to procedural due process violations which shock the conscience. I moved to add the Delaware Supreme Court as a party, and each of its members in their individual and professional capacity.

I include and restate and incorporate by reference Respondent's reply to ODC's Corrected Response to Respondent's Objections my to the Report and Recommendation of the Board on Professional Responsibility, dated June 7, 2022, and all documents referred therein and incorporated thereto, although they appear only on the record below, and not contained in the appendix as too voluminous. (App. H-R, DI 9)

The Delaware Disciplinary proceeding was brought around or about November 3, 2021, after I filed the law suit in the DE District Court, and after my writ of cert was rejected by this court. As the DE Disciplinary case proceeded the state of Delaware through the DE-ODC, Board and Court violated my 1st and 14th Amendment rights at the inception by sending out notice to no one on the date the Board averred to send out notice of a hearing. Three days after issuing the notice to no one, the DE Supreme Court appointed counsel despite my previously stated objections on First Amendment religious beliefs and 6th Amendment religious beliefs, providing notice which did not conform to its own rules. The Board gave me 18 days, when the DLRDP Rule 9(d)(3) required, they provide me with notice "at least 20 days in advance of the hearing date," which prejudiced me. "It is well established that it is a denial of due process for

any government agency to fail to follow its own regulations providing for procedural safeguards [in my case 20 days prior notice] to persons involved in adjudicative processes before it.”

Government of Canal Zone v. Brooks, 427 F.2d 346, 347 (5th Cir.1970). *See, Bridges v. Wixon*, 326 U.S. 135, 152, (1945) (“The rules are designed to protect the interests of the alien and to afford him due process of law.”); *see, David H. Armistead, Substantive Due Process Limits on Public Officials' Power to Terminate State-Created Property Interests.*

The Court and the Board ignored and never addressed my motions I filed immediately rejecting appointment of counsel and firing the attorney, objecting to defective notice, and requesting time to perform discovery in order not to deny me meaningful opportunity to be heard in defense of my exercise of fundamental rights in violation of US Amend I and XIV.

When I received notice I could self-represent, I had fewer than 14 days until the hearing and fell ill with the shingles, at the time the Court issued. (App Z) I received the notice before a three-day holiday. I filed motions swiftly, objecting to notice, requiring additional time to prepare, call witnesses, perform discovery and research. I required for meaningful access to the courts. My petitions were denied. I was granted an 8-day extension, due to a reason I did not allege in my motions, the shingles. This was not enough time to be heard on my ignored motions or to prepare. The DE Supreme Court rendered an order without granting me the opportunity to be heard with an appealable order. The Board gave a non-appealable email order. I was denied access to discovery, meaningful opportunity to prepare in the fixed proceeding against me. I filed additional motions you may see on the table of contents that were not addressed. App. J-K (DI 9)

On January 24, 2021, I moved the Delaware District Court to amend my complaint as a matter of right to include Delaware Supreme Court Justice Reeves and Vaughn, wherein I discussed the procedural defects and Equal Protections violations they participated in in *Kelly v*

Trump and the Disciplinary matter. The Clerk confirmed the entire court not merely Chief Justice reviewed the bar dues requests which was the admitted reason DE-Lapp attacked me. The Motion was not addressed by Chief Justice Colm F. Connelly.

It was not until January 2023, I discovered Justice Vaughn and Justice Reeves both resigned from the Delaware Supreme Court to evade the law. App. T. President Biden appointed Justice Reeves to the Third Circuit, knowing I desired to substitute him in *Kelly v Trump*, after he signed an order giving foreign churches government money under the guise of performing government business. President Biden worsened the establishment of government religion the past 4 presidents created through government agents and partnerships with foreign and private religious partners.

After the Board hearing, I discovered the DE Supreme Court prevented discovery to conceal the termination of two Court staff with material information necessary to my case to prejudice the fixed outcome against me. The DE Supreme Court's agent, Attorney Robinson signed off on their departure forms.

After the hearing, I also discovered the Court sealed my petitions regarding Due process violations and the Court's member's participation in inciting these violations, which prejudiced my defense in the disciplinary matter. App N-O. I thought they were sealed during the preliminary hearing, but they were sealed during *Kelly v Trump* to also prevent this Court from reviewing an accurate record, to fix the planned disciplinary proceeding against me, to prejudice me in the federal civil rights case or reciprocal cases, and to demean my credibility and reputation based on the Court's disdain of my private-religious-political beliefs contained in the speech in my petitions. *See, Kennedy v. Bremerton Sch. Dist.*, 142 S. Ct. 2407 (2022) ("The Free Exercise and Free Speech Clauses of the First Amendment work in tandem: where the Free

Exercise Clause protects religious exercises, whether communicative or not, the Free Speech Clause provides overlapping protection for expressive religious activities.”)

The Disciplinary hearing was flawed. The reporter did not transcribe my testimony accurately and colluded to fix the shame proceeding against me. I objected even after I filed objections to the inaccuracy of the transcript. The Reporter placed weird statements in my mouth I did not say. Reliance on the inaccurate sham transcript of the hearing and the accusations against me based on my poverty and lack to access to resources shocks the conscience in denial of my procedural and substantive Due Process rights. I was required to attend, without necessary time to prepare while ill in order to prevent a contempt Order.

None of this was normal, firing material witnesses to conceal their testimony, denying me the right to self-represent, to call witnesses, to prepare, to perform discovery, removing my pleadings without notice or an opportunity to be heard and resigning from the court to evade the law are not normal. Nor is it normal to require I violate my religious beliefs in exchange to access to the courts. The Delaware Supreme Court, Board and DE-ODC violated my procedural due process rights and I have colorful Constitutional claims to contest the proceeding.

The DE Supreme Court denied my requests relating to my request for a copy of the documents in the In the matter of Meghan Kelly No 541, appointing counsel and granting me the ability to self-represent despite my written request for the papers against my person, and any transcript relating thereto. App Z, App. CC.

Despite having sound reasons to contest the Reciprocal Order by the Third Circuit, my attempts to preserve the right to file a for cause motion were denied by the Third Circuit. App. A-B.

III. Background basis of Third Circuit Disciplinary Case violated US Amend V

On August 16, 2022, I drafted a letter to the Third Circuit for the reciprocating matter invoking the 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination as required by its R.A.D.E. R. 5. App U.

I filed the DE Supreme Court Order of Discipline in the separate Third Circuit civil rights case *Kelly v Swartz*, to maintain electronic filing under the mistaken belief the state reported the Order. App U.

I moved to strike self-incrimination information from the record. App U-Y.

On August 17, 2022, the Case manager on the Disciplinary Case entered an Order that the DE Order may be used in a reciprocal case in violation of my US Amend. V. App. C

The self-incriminating reporting Order was given to a federal judge or a panel of federal judges who prosecuted me, the attorney by reciprocal deactivation of license that same day. App.A-C.

In *In re Gi Yeong Nam*, 245 B.R. 216 (Bankr. E.D. Pa. 2000), the Court held:

“Once a witness voluntarily reveals an incriminating fact, Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination cannot be invoked to avoid disclosing the details of that fact unless the witness' answer to the particular question posed would subject him or her to a “real danger” of further incrimination.” U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 5.

In my case, volunteering information by reporting orders against my license subjects me to automatic government prosecution. The fact I appeal orders on public record before appellate

courts, does not remove the “real danger of further [government prosecution] in proceedings likened to be both criminal and civil in nature.” Id.

This Court in *Spevack v. Klein*, 385 U.S. 511, (1967) held:

“Within rule that Fourteenth Amendment secures against state invasion the same privilege that Fifth Amendment guarantees against federal infringement, that is, right of person to remain silent unless he chooses to speak in unfettered exercise of his own will, without suffering penalty for such silence, “penalty” is not restricted to fine or imprisonment but means imposition of any sanction which makes assertion of Fifth Amendment privilege costly.”

This Court further held, “Self-incrimination clause of Fifth Amendment as absorbed in Fourteenth Amendment extends its protection to lawyers and should not be watered down by imposing dishonor of disbarment and deprivation of livelihood as price for asserting it” Id.

The Court acted as the prosecutor, the judge and witness too, without a case or controversy requirement. The Third Circuit compelled me and other attorneys to provide testimony against my person at the threat of certain prosecution and increased penalties for failing to report in violation of my right not to self-incriminate.

Self-reciprocal Disciplinary reporting requirements by disciplinary command under R.A.D.E. R. 5. run afoul of the Constitution by compelling professionals to waive Constitutional rights under the threat of additional punishments. The self-reporting requirements relating to lawyer disciplinary proceedings should be deemed unconstitutional as applied and per se.

Even if this Court may find I waived my 5th, this issue is capable of repetition, yet evading review. *Wisconsin Dept. of Industry v. Gould Inc.*, 475 U.S. 282, 286 n.3 (1986). This issue must be considered to preserve the Constitutional limits on government which makes us freer.

IV. Federal Courts may not be regulated and controlled by self-regulation or third party regulation

I am a Christian. The Delaware Supreme Court finds my religious beliefs a disability. I believe differently. I believe a lot of things people think are no big deal are a matter of eternal life and damnation in hell, the second death. Every moment, every little thing, every second of my life matters, and it is not for sale for money or material gain. I gave it to God.

Protecting freedom under the Constitution means not selling your people under the lie slavery to money to pay government compelled private or foreign debt is freedom. People should be able to choose to work by free not government forced choice. Otherwise, there is no freedom, just bondage in a forced not free economy in violation of US Amend XIII.

Government collusion with private and foreign partners to fix a forced not free economy creates subpar products and services by stifling innovation by freedom of thought through standardization, based on bought or bartered for partnerships, not freedom. I desire the Courts exercise more authority by judging the experts, professionals and standards to prevent businesses from being above the law, above correction, above government and government's guidance to prevent oppression, killing, stealing and destroying life and liberty for material gain. I wish defamation laws would be ruled unconstitutional as they chill free speech would improve products and services by Godly criticism. Instead these unjust laws stifle improvement by threat of losing money by entities who buy guaranteed injustice by burying the common man in legal fees for a fighting chance to do what is right, exposing evil to transform it to good.

Eliminating the right to work in the field of my choice based on my religious beliefs allows exploiters to oppress people, including me, by substandard wages because of the

government created desperate conditions. This is government backed slavery in violation of my 13th Amendment right against involuntary servitude and religious beliefs against indebtedness.

The Delaware Supreme Court participated in inciting the disciplinary proceeding, terminated witnesses, prevented their discovery, and denied me meaningful opportunity to be heard by conduct which shocks the conscience. App. H-P.

This has caused additional courts to place my license on inactive disabled, causing multiple reciprocating law suits in jurisdictions where I am licensed or retired to practice law in, including the Third Circuit Court of appeals. App A-C

The Third Circuit placed my license on inactive/disability without affording me Constitutional protections afforded to similarly situated attorneys placed on suspension or disbarred, arguably in violation of the Equal Protections Clause applicable to me as an attorney with unique religious-political beliefs, and to the class of lawyers adjudicated disabled. Id.

The most recent order relates to documents I filed including but not limited to Motions filed with the Delaware Supreme Court containing Constitutional arguments against lawyer self-regulation and third-party regulation. App B, Q, R, DI 9.

I seek this Court's consideration of my Constitutional arguments to be extended to the Federal judiciary. Id. I argue standing as an attorney seeking to uphold the impartiality of the Courts as a religious exercise. I move this Court to rule that federal judges may not be regulated through self-regulation or third-party regulation beyond the procedures of the Court, even if this Court denies my other arguments.

Such regulations of the federal judiciary create injustice, making us less free, by tempting federal judges to render orders based on their collective interests or based on the interest of third parties who regulate their seats as opposed to the impartial rule of law.

I believe judges may only be disciplined under Constitutional Law by impeachment or by law suit, not by third party or self-regulation. Congress's proposals to the contrary, and their use of societal peer pressure as well as the pens, law making authority is repugnant. Albeit, they may outline internal rules regarding impeachment. Congress is acting above the above the law, and above the Constitution in an attempt to make judges puppets to the partial interests that serve their seats.

I also oppose eliminating life time tenures as that will tempt federal judges to be partial towards the interests of those who maintain their seats as opposed to maintaining impartiality necessary to safeguard the rule of law.

I strongly oppose, as an attorney, in inactive status, term limits or Congressional control over the US Supreme Court. I also oppose self-regulation. Impeachment and law suits are the two means to correct judges. No judge should be controlled by business professionals, including professional boards, or by Congress, outside of written rules they may draft relating to impeachment. The judges will be tempted down the line by automation's ease, to potentially have their position as judges eliminated through automation.

Automation has no power to render justice with mercy like judges. Judges have the ability to critically think beyond the standards, to see clearly the unique case before it, to render true justice based on truth, not conformity or sameness. Judges have a duty to protect people's freedom who think differently than they do, even if they believe those beliefs harm business's

bottom line. What is more important money or freedoms under our constitution? I argue the Constitutional laws protecting individual liberty and individuals supersedes professions and entities who desire to sacrifice individual liberties or individuals for the entities or associations
bottom line

As a Christian I believe “justice in the courts” is a command by God. *Citing Amos, 5:15*, Jesus Christ teaches justice, mercy and faithfulness are more important laws than laws relating to money and material gain. *Matthew 23:23*.

I believe the other two branches are not free, but are controlled by partisan collective interests to be enslaved by entities who entice their interest, not free to do what is right.

The other two branches give us a Republic, by granting us alleged majority representation. The judicial branch gives us freedom and a Democracy in our Democratic-Republic by preventing the mob reign of lusts by majority by restraining the desires of the many with the impartial rule of law.

The judicial branch protects individuals and Constitutional individual liberties from being sacrificed for entities and the majorities dictates through the vote or government partnerships. Individual Judges are more powerful than entities or groups or the other two branches because they may down their individual and collective desires to care to think in order to unconditionally uphold Constitutional rights for individuals who do not conform to the majorities’ religious or political beliefs. Entities, parties and the other two branches act conditionally, and are not free to unconditionally due what is right by collective control by those who entice their conformed interests through temptations.

People on the bench are special in that I believe they may reflect the image of God by unconditional love and respect, even for those whose religious beliefs they find insulting and repugnant, like me. The other branches may do not good by unconditional love, since they act upon conditional collaborative collective interests.

Individuals are more powerful than collective groups since they may lay down the collective groups' desires, to think, to care to know truth, in order to do what is right, not what is self-serving for the alleged many by sacrificing the few under the guise of the common good.

There is an attack of people judges. I gave opposing counsel in the civil rights case excerpts from a book, the Fourth Industrial Revolution, and video clips showing the World Government Summit and World Economic Forum are talking about eliminating people judges and people lawyers.

I also filed an article in the civil rights case concerning judgeless courts in China. The temptations to entice judges to create the appearance of partiality is meant for the court's destruction down the line to eliminate individual liberties that exceed the standardized algorithms of automation.

This Court may stifle the plans to eliminate the courts by preventing standardization by self-regulation or third-party regulation which prevents courts from protecting the exercise of Constitutional rights by those who do not conform to the standards of the many, like me.

This Court does not waive its right to eliminate partiality to self-interests or third-party interests at the cost of making those interests more important than the Constitutional preempting law. The Contract Clause may not bind the courts where there is no meeting of the minds, nor has any waiver occurred.

I believe a holding that the Court may not be compelled by partiality towards third party interests who regulate them or self-interests is a step towards eliminating people judges.

Without people judges, none are free, but are for sale by barter or exchange to serve the collective interests of entities.

I am aware of the societal peer pressured attacks against judges on the news, by congress and on social media. Please be strong, remain impartial, due not give into temptation by societal peer pressures to create the appearance of partiality. You must use the rule of law to overcome lawless selfish lusts to place position first in order to protect your position.

I ran for Delaware local office in 2018, because my esteemed colleague, Dick Goll, Esq. was taken advantage of by out of state foreign title companies practicing Delaware law without a Delaware license. App D I discovered this misbehavior was rampant throughout Delaware by talking with other real estate attorneys who saw the chain of title on deeds were messed up with no attorney to call to remedy mistakes. I drafted the attached article in hopes to alleviate the situation. I called the Office of Disciplinary Counsel to remedy the situation. It is not until now that I realized no Office of Disciplinary Counsel has legal authority to prevent the practice of law by non-attorneys through entities using automation.

Upon information and belief, there really is a plan to not only dismantle and create a new economic model, that will be changed to a far worse model down the line, but there is also a plan to eliminate the institutions of our government that make us freer. There is a planned attack against the courts. Please use this case to prevent the elimination of people judges by standardization through regulating federal judges. This is a step to prevent automating the rule of law which

prevents justice and constitutional protections from being eliminated to those who do not fall into the standards in algorithms.

V. The system of reciprocity violates Case and Controversy Requirements

Federal reciprocity of the Delaware Order requires the Third Circuit Court to be the prosecutor, the judge and witness too, not an outside adverse party, violating the case or controversy requirements of U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 3, § 2, cl. 1.

In federal reciprocity cases, and in this case, I do not serve an opposing counsel as reciprocal discipline is conducted against me. I am defending myself against required Court prosecution where I, the accused, am required to bear the burden of clear and convincing evidence as to why the Court must not prosecute me, in potential violation of my Fifth Amendment rights, or as in this case, I am deemed worthy of fewer rights to contest proceedings in violation of the Equal Protections Clause, procedural and due process clause as applied to me as a party of one, and to the class of attorneys labeled disabled. US Amend I, V. (App. Q-R)

The Third Circuit held,

“The existence of a case or controversy requires: (1) a legal controversy that is real and not hypothetical; (2) a legal controversy that affects an individual in a concrete manner so as to provide the factual predicate for reasoned adjudication; and (3) a legal controversy with sufficiently adverse parties so as to sharpen the issues for judicial resolution. *Rendell v. Rumsfeld*, 484 F.3d 236 (3d Cir. 2007)

The Third element is not met in all cases before federal disciplinary hearings. There is no adversarial party when the entity prosecuting is judge and jury, including mine. This system of automatic as opposed to discretionary discipline must be overturned to preserve the Constitutional liberties of the accused. This issue is capable of repetition, yet evading review,

and should be, in the interest of justice be considered by an impartial judicial forum. A federal court will not admit it violates the Constitution by blindly adhering to its internal procedures. Id.

This Court must, in the interest of justice, consider these important issues.

VI The case and controversy requirements are not met in my case.

There arguably is no controversy in my case, just a cover up of court misconduct, elimination of witnesses, the wrongful removal of four public documents material to my defense from public records, and government persecution towards me, but for my First Amendment exercise of or assertion of my protected Constitutional rights. Id. The record shows, I do not intend to practice law before the courts should the restriction on my license be lifted. I intend to seek to rejoin my former law firm where I would perform real estate settlements. Id.

There is no harm to the state of Delaware or the Third Circuit Court of Appeals showing a case or controversy. In the DE case, there are mere complaints about my lack of resources due to poverty, run on sentences, typos, and citations to the sham fixed transcript. “I maintain my objection to, where the reporter misrepresented what I said to intentionally collude to fix the outcome or because she could not hear me.” Id.

The record also shows the State reciprocal court laments I discuss the bible as a source of my religious belief relating to petitions where I assert and defend my religious exercise. Id. App F-N. My religious beliefs and compelled violation of those beliefs and exercise of my religious beliefs are in issue as the protected liberty interest I sought to protect in *Kelly v Trump*, and one of the liberties I seek to defend in this present case, and the original reciprocating appeal I must draft and file. It is unconstitutional for the Court to persecute me, because I invoke my First Amendment right of belief, religious-political-belief, religious-political exercise, religious-

political-association, religious-political-speech, and my right to petition the Court to uphold these religious-political fundamental rights, despite the State's disagreement with my beliefs, typos, or inconvenience that my poverty, or religious-political genuine beliefs creates to the court.

My association as a Christian who believes business greed is the mark of lawless lusts misleading many to lose eternal life by making money and professional pride above the law does not warrant discipline based on the state's disagreement of my religious beliefs.

This Honorable US Supreme Court held, in *Schwartz v. Board of Bar Examiners*, 353 U.S. 232, 233 (1957) "The use of aliases, the arrests, and former membership in the Communist Party do not in combination warrant exclusion of petitioner from the practice of law"

Since the association as a communist does not warrant disbarment, my association as a Christian should not similarly not eliminate my interest in my license to practice law based on my exercise of fundamental rights, including the right of association and belief and exercise of religious belief in Jesus, God the father and the holy spirit as Word of God.

The State Court is aware of my circumstance. Due to lack of resources, working computers, printers, paper and other luxuries, I had typos and run on sentences in some of my pleadings. I did not have the luxury of time or resources to proof read or correct documents. I typed desperately wherever I could use computers or print documents, including at libraries, with limited time at the computer. I was required to file timely or waive my rights. I do not regret imperfectly standing up for my religious belief from government persecution.

I would regret doing nothing. If I am unable to exercise the most basic First Amendment rights, speech, belief, association, exercise of belief and petition, then I may logically assume

others are not free. Standing up for myself, now, no matter how imperfectly, may create precedent to stand up for the rights of others, well past my fleeting, soon to be forgotten life here.

In App. R I, No. 35-36 stated,

“The State Court grasps at straws by holding there is evidence of either a physical or mental disability. The state appears to be claiming my belief in Jesus is a disability, or there is a physical disability alluding to a possible physical disability as a harm to the state, with unclean hands, as the State has notice of my limitations. The state rushed the proceeding in violation of my right for an opportunity to be heard, notice, an opportunity to prepare and defend perform discovery, call witnesses, having motions ignored, left unaddressed, in the forum below, or above, and intentionally caused foreseeable emotional distress, **in hopes to make me physically ill to use it against me, like heartless monsters.**

I dispute the allegation of physical disabilities as an “or” source for the State Court’s holding. The record excludes sufficient evidence to make such a finding. Even if on appeal, the Court finds physical limitations, such as the shingles temporarily caused in my case or otherwise, such limitations would not limit my ability to practice law. **And if such limitations are found, I invoke the protections of ADA protecting me from state discrimination, either by denial of meaningful access to the courts based on alleged disability, or denial of First amendment rights based on such disability, or my license to practice law based on any such alleged disability, without accommodation by the state.** I reserve this for appeal.”

I in fact due have a physical limitation that requires I rest, drink water and exercise in order not to jeopardize my life and health, the Delaware Supreme Court and all lower courts were apprised of. App AA.

Despite this my health has been jeopardized. I do not feel now, and fear worsening to my health and even death if I am not afforded **time** to rest, drink obscene amounts of water and exercise which I have been denied by multiple courts. It is most urgent to file this appeal more immediately, even as I have work in other matters. None are free if the Courts are eliminated by automation. Please excuse errors as I write in haste and fear.

Whether Constitutional protections are violated by the reciprocity system is a more important issue than mere appearance, and productivity, in terms of material gain for professions or businesses, at the cost of sacrificing freedoms.

The Courts, as government servants, work for justice, not money. If government judges, law makers and presidents care more about money and draft, enforce, and uphold rules that violate the more important Constitutional laws, than none of us are free. If money is the law, then the people are slaves to the government by artificially indebtedness, under the guise of freedom.

I have a duty to uphold the Constitutional laws that protect something more precious than all the money in the world, individual liberty from government incited private or public economic, physical or social burdens upon, but for the exercise of such Constitutional rights.

This Court's duty to uphold the same is even more stringent. The Constitution protects me from the Government, including the Courts from persecuting me for the exercise of my fundamental rights. Sameness is not fairness. Respecting people's individual liberty to believe, think, associate, live, exercise belief, and rights by the dictates of their conscience, no matter if it does not conform to the majority is a Constitutional duty of this court by its oath.

Even though, I oppose oaths on religious grounds, because of 13th Amend compelled slavery and other reasons, I assert current law under religious objections. App. P

In order to safeguard freedom, the government must let go of control. Allowing lawful disorder by the exercise of liberties and freedom creates in a world where not everyone is the same or chooses to believe the same or live the same is required. Otherwise, none are free. All are slaves to the conformed will of those with authority in private or public.

The government's duty is to care for people, while protecting the people's freedom, not control and exploit the people for material gain and productivity, under the guise of order and improving the man-made-unnatural economy.

The issues relating to government compelled self-incrimination by the reporting requirements and the case and controversy issues are capable of repetition, yet, evading review. This Court must in the interest of justice consider these Constitutional issues. Otherwise, no other Court may and violations of freedom for the convenience of the government backed private business partners will continue into infinity, sacrificing humans for business greed, not good.

VII. Self-Regulation

Self-regulation takes government out of the hands of the government and makes business above the law, by making business, and professionals desire for money, the law.

This biased self-regulation enslaves professionals to business greed, not good, not based on freedom in a fixed bad business economy.

Allowing Professionals to self-regulate, corrupts justice by tempting professionals to look after their own, at the cost of exploiting others, untamed by the just rule of law to prevent killing, stealing or destroying human life for what I argue is the mark of the beast, business greed. Professionals have a tendency to conceal their own misconduct to prevent harming their mere appearance, and reputation of their colleagues.

Self-regulation by deferring to professional standards causes injustice, by preventing courts from correcting professional standards that harm people.

As a child of God, I believe people sin by teaching man to blindly trust science, professionals, experts, research or innovation. I believe people are misled to harm by blindly trusting in man, the creature, the created and his creation, his scientific work, research, products and services as god and guide. Science is the mere study of things. When scientific speculation aka hypothesis are wrong and harm and kill people, such as bad medicine, the courts must have

the power to correct experts. Should the courts defer to experts, they wrongly make non-government businesses or entities through their experts the real ruling power. Entities may act unrestrained by the law to govern and guide it for the protection of citizens and individual liberties. This allows human sacrifice and slavery which is repugnant to my religious beliefs. US Const. Amend. XIII.

Perfection is not the standard, even for judges. Where there is humility, there is grace, improving the world here and in eternity. Where Government and government backed partners teach loyalty to profession, pride in profession, or position above loyalty to the Constitution, or where business is the law, there is lawlessness, by sacrificing people, and individual liberty for material gain.

This lawlessness, and corruption within government creates a threat of economic, physical or social persecution against my person and the public.

Partial forums, including this Courts, as applied against me as a party of one, and against the class of lawyers labeled disabled, and the professional Boards, focus on professions, guarantee lawless injustice by focus on money instead of caring for people and their individual liberty above money, productivity, costs and convenience.

The practice of law is not a mere business. The practice of law protects freedoms that are not for sale, by barter or exchange. Money is not the law. Selling a free people as subjects and slaves to gain money, material gain or to sacrifice to alleged Mother Earth for the lie of the common good, is not upholding the Constitutional laws that prevent slavery by upholding free exercise of liberties.

The practice of law requires independent, impartial, critically thinking judges who uphold people's Constitutionally protected freedoms to think, live, believe, exercise belief, associate by the dictates of their independent, individual conscience, not the dictates of money or professionals.

Injustice is guaranteed when a judicial determination is for sale, a matter of barter or exchange as opposed to truth under the law. This affords those without anything to exchange, except their souls to slavery in violation of the 13th Amendment, at a disadvantage, in violation of the Equal Protections Clause's protection of the poor, and common person's fundamental right to access to the courts. US Amend I, V, XIV The Courts must be more concerned with actual justice than the mere appearance of justice to serve their positions.

Self-regulation of attorneys, other Professions and judges is unconstitutional, making business above the law, by making the dictates of professionals, or bureaucrats within agencies, as opposed to laws enacted by congress people, checked by the vote of the people, the law

VIII Equal protections, due process and substantial due process claims as applied to me as a party of one and as applied to attorneys labeled disabled.

Per App H-P, I have good cause to contest the Third Circuit's reciprocating order. Nevertheless, the Third Circuit's rules deny me and other attorneys labeled disabled the Constitutional protections afforded to other disciplined attorneys to argue such cause. See R.A.D.E. Rules 6, 8 and 16.

On or about August 17, 2022, the Third Circuit filed an Order automatically transferring me to disabled inactive, without an opportunity to be heard on procedural defects. App B

The Third Circuit Court in Matter No. 22-8037 held “When she believes she should be reinstated, or if she desires to contest this transfer, formal reinstatement proceedings can be instituted. See R.A.D.E. Rules 16.3, 16.5.”

Under R.A.D.E. Rules 6 and 8, suspended and disbarred attorneys, in reciprocal and *ab initio* or other disciplinary proceedings are afforded more Constitutional protections than those adjudicated disabled/inactive.

I, individually, as a class of one, an attorney with unique religious-political beliefs, and as an attorney in the class of attorneys labeled disabled/inactive, receive fewer Constitutional protections in violation of the 5th Amendment’s Equal Protections component applicable to the Federal Courts, in the defense of my exercise of Fundamental First Amendment rights. US Amend I, V.

All other attorneys are afforded 30 days from the date of the Order to plead why the reciprocal discipline should not be adopted by its court, including procedural defects. R.A.D.E. Rules 6 and 8.

In my case, I have many arguments relating to substantive and procedural due process violations, lack of subject matter, and other arguments. (DI 9, App F-P)

I desired to argue the following, among other arguments:

“The imposition of discipline is unwarranted in this case. The record shows the procedure was so lacking in notice and opportunity to be heard as to constitute a deprivation of due process. There was such an infirmity of proof establishing the alleged misconduct as to give rise to the clear conviction that this Court could not, consistent with its duty, accept as final the conclusion on that subject. The imposition discipline by this Court would result in grave injustice.”

“The hearings and actions taken against my professional license in retaliation for my exercise of Constitutional rights, violate my 1st and 14th Amendment free exercise of religious beliefs, religious-political-speech, petition and association , the Procedural and Substantive Due Process Clause and Equal Protection Clauses Protections under the 1st of the 14th Amendments. They must be rejected as by “rule of law” rather than personal

vendetta for my personal religious-political speech contained in the petitions. (US Amend I, XIV)”

“The State denied me of substantive and procedural due process rights in the Delaware disciplinary proceeding, denying me meaningful access to the courts, preventing discovery, eliminating witnesses, sealing my petitions to the advantage of the state, and denying me the right to perform discovery to conceal Court misconduct in hiding material evidence in my favor.”

“The record shows clear and convincing evidence that the proceedings were brought, with religious-political animus, and poverty animus, in retaliation against me for filing *Kelly v Trump* and for petitioning the court regarding bar dues to safeguard my liberties.”

“The state courts are also without subject matter jurisdiction due to their conduct and interference with *Kelly v Trump*, to fix the outcome of that case and the Delaware Supreme Court’s participation in fixing the sham trial against me in the disciplinary action by violating my procedural and substantive due process rights rendering both the action voidable.”

“I have a right to petition the courts when I believe a transgression has been committed against me by the establishment of government religion. The secret proceeding against me reveals great injustice and shows the government seeks to be above the law, untamed by the just rule of law in my case.” Citing, App. Y, Numbers 8-13.

I am not able to make any of those arguments in a Motion in the Third Circuit. I, and the class of attorneys labeled disabled are denied the fundamental right to the opportunity to be heard on Constitutional defects of originating disciplinary orders in violation of the First and Fifth Amendment Due process and substantive due process components.

The Third Circuit Court prevented me from discussing procedural defects under R.A.D.E. Rule 16. I believe my claims warrant review, but the Court affords none in my case, nor any to the class of attorneys labeled disabled. R.A.D.E. Rule 16 violates the Equal Protections Clause by denying fundamental rights of the opportunity to be heard on Constitutional defects of the originating disciplinary order to a class of lawyers labeled disabled and to me as a class of one.

The Third Circuit Court cut off my electronic filing access for the reciprocal automatic matter 22-8037.

Additionally, the Third Circuit Court, in a separate order, indicated it would not consider any document I mailed in, unrelating to the Petitions it cited under R.A.D.E 16. App B

I admit R.A.D.E 16 (3) permits me to contest the Order, but requires it be contested concerning the material rulings without affording me Constitutional protections.

I, unlike suspended and disbarred lawyers, am not allowed to argue Constitutional and procedural defects. Id.

R.A.D.E. 13(3) further states “by bringing such a proceeding, the [disabled] attorney waives the doctor-patient privilege (and other similar privileges) regarding the disability.” This requires additional potentially embarrassing requirements, to the class of people adjudicated disabled.

I have religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare. So, this increases a burden upon me uniquely, by potentially requiring I violate my First Amendment right to religious belief to regain my active license, to buy and sell as an attorney, in reciprocal punishment for the exercise of my First Amendment rights of speech, belief, exercise of belief, association and petition. US Amend I.

Under R.A.D.E. 16.5, the Court permits me to argue “that the disability has been removed and the attorney is fit to resume the practice of law.”

However, I am not disabled, and was wrongly labeled disabled as punishment for the exercise of fundamental rights and to cover up the Delaware Supreme Court and its agents’ misconduct. There never was a disability to remove.

The protections under R.A.D.E. R. 6 must be extended to attorneys adjudicated disabled inactive. The discriminatory elimination of Constitutional rights to a class of people labeled disabled, potentially a more vulnerable class is unfair.

The elimination of the Constitutional right to petition to contest reciprocating orders based on constitutional defects under R.A.D.E. R. 16 is unconstitutional as applied to me, and as applied to lawyers labeled disabled. Since, they unlike other lawyers are selectively denied procedural due process regarding Constitutional and procedural defects.

“Even in applying permissible standards, officers of the State cannot exclude an applicant when there is no basis for their finding that he fails to meet these standards, or when their action is invidiously discriminatory, ”by denial of fundamental rights, including the opportunity to be heard. *Schwabe v. Board of Bar Examiners*, 353 U.S. 232 (1957)

This Court held, “A State cannot exclude a person from the practice of law or from any other occupation in a manner or for reasons that contravene the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. ” *Schwabe v. Board of Bar Examiners*, 353 U.S. 232 (1957)

The Federal Court cannot similarly exclude me or the class of attorneys labeled a disabled for reasons that contravene the First and Fifth Amendment component of procedural and substantive due process.

I argue R.A.D.E. R. 16 contravenes the First and Fifth Amendment component of procedural and substantive due process as applied to the Third Circuit, as applied and per se.

The Order below must be overturned, and Rule 16 must be deemed unconstitutional by denying a class of attorneys Constitutional rights afforded to other attorneys, based on the invidious label of disability.

This issue is capable of repetition, yet evading review. *Wisconsin Dept. of Industry v. Gould Inc.*, 475 U.S. 282, 286 n.3 (1986).

The form of loss of First Amendment rights and my property interest in my license without an opportunity to contest a sham proceeding is unconstitutional.

A lawyer's right, my right to pursue the profession of my choice constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, and of which I cannot be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the state's disagreement with my religious-political beliefs. I and the class of attorneys labeled as disabled should not be denied the right to petition and the opportunity to be heard afforded to other attorneys disbarred and suspended without a compelling interest necessary and more important than elimination of the First and Fifth Amendment fundamental right to petition.

It is the opportunity to be heard I seek to protect, not the guarantee. If only certain people are protected by the courts there is partiality towards those deemed worthy of justice while the least of these are guaranteed injustice.

IX. Urgency, threat of death or harm to health

My life is in danger. Courts failure to grant accommodations in the form of time to sustain my health due to my unique physical needs have needlessly created a government compelled threat to my physical health. App AA. In two forums I filed pleadings relating to the fact I collapsed and could not stand at the post office because I am not afforded an accommodation in the form of time to care for my health. I certainly do not want to die because judges heartlessly do not desire to be inconvenienced with my defense of Jesus Christ. I plead the right to live on religious grounds as a religious exercise.

My life is in danger. People threw things on my car. App BB. People talked about shooting me as I noted in the attached Facebook post, admissible under present sense impression should anything worse happen to me. Id. DI 9

Both democrats and republican lobbyists who control the other two branches are not pleased with me. App EE. I proposed five articles of impeachment to use for President Trump. Additionally, I filed a lawsuit against the democrats to run for office without violating my religious beliefs by collecting signatures and money to pay the election office's fee. Id. I do not want to be controlled by those who give signatures and money, no longer free to do what is right by unconditionally loving and serving all, not merely those who seek to enslave me. Id. App FF.

Your branch is the only free, impartial not bought branch. by donations, signatures or otherwise. Without preserving your freedom from bias towards regulators, none are free. Even if I am eliminated, please use this case to prevent the elimination of the Courts. Please save these United States, even if you do not choose to save me. I file this in haste, imperfectly to preserve my rights, and to preserve the courts.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants this petition, vacates the order below under and grants any relief this court deems just.

Dated: 1/12/2023

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

Appendix Q

Thomas J. Farrell
Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Raymond S. Wierciszewski
Deputy Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Anthony P. Sodroski
Disciplinary Counsel-In-Charge,
Special Projects

District I Office
1601 Market Street
Suite 3320
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2337

(215) 560-6296
FAX (215) 560-4528

THE DISCIPLINARY BOARD
OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA



OFFICE OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL
www.padisciplinaryboard.org

Disciplinary Counsel-In-Charge
Ramona M. Mariani

Disciplinary Counsel
Richard Hernandez
Gloria Randall Ammons
Harriet R. Brumberg
Michael D. Gottsch
Jeffrey M. Krulik
Mark F. Gilson

September 12, 2022

Meghan Marie Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

Re: In the Matter of Meghan Marie Kelly
No. 2913 DD3 - Supreme Court

Dear Ms. Kelly:

Your correspondence dated September 3, 2022, has been received and reviewed by Office of Disciplinary Counsel (ODC). ODC will not agree to a stay of the above-captioned proceeding.

If the Order of the Supreme Court of Delaware dated August 10, 2022, is vacated or stayed, please notify me and provide a copy of the order vacating or staying the August 10 Order.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Anthony P. Sodroski

Anthony P. Sodroski
Disciplinary Counsel-in-Charge,
Special Projects

APS/rbc

cc: Thomas J. Farrell, Chief Disciplinary Counsel
Raymond S. Wierciszewski, Deputy Chief Disciplinary Counsel

Appendix R

A-4

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Meghan Kelly,	)	
	)	No. 119, 2021
Plaintiff Below,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Donald Trump, a.k.a. Donald J.	)	
Trump, a.k.a. President Trump	)	
a.k.a. President Donald Trump,	)	
in his official capacity as President of	)	
the United States	)	
	)	
Defendant Below,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	

APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT TO
REIN IN ITS ARMS THROUGH ITS AGENTS FROM UNLAWFULLY
PRESSURING APPELLANT TO FORGO OR IMPEDE HER CASE TO
PROTECT HER FREE EXERCISE OF RELIGION.
BY RELIEF IT DEEMS JUST

1. I, Meghan Kelly, pro se appellant, having been granted in forma pauperis relief, move this honorable Delaware Supreme Court, unopposed, to reign in its arms through its agents unlawfully pressuring appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion, by relief it deems just. I suggest private guidance.

2. My faith in God may appear crazy to others. Nevertheless, I have the freedom to believe by the dictates of my conscience, no matter what the

government through its agents believes. *Cantwell v. State of Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 60 S. Ct. 900, 84 L. Ed. 1213 (1940). I am allowed to think differently instead of being conditioned to worship as the state's forced will of materialism, pursuit of money, and unholy charity that damns people to hell per Jesus, such as fundraising or organized charity. Jesus teaches people "have their reward," meaning they have no reward, no eternal life from God. Matthew 6:1. Organized charity, fundraising, pro bono, and volunteering is no small sin. It is not true charity, but damns people to hell by teaching business greed is love. *See Matthew* 6:1-5. Also see, *State ex rel. Tate v. Cabbage*, 210 A.2d 555, 557, 1965 Del. Super. LEXIS 67, *1, 58 Del. 430, 433, ("It is no business of courts to say that what is a religious practice or activity for one group is not religion under the protection of the First Amendment. Nor is it in the competence of courts under our constitutional scheme to approve, disapprove, classify, regulate, or in any manner control sermons delivered at religious meetings."); *See, Africa v. Pennsylvania*, 662 F.2d 1025, 1025, 1981 U.S. App. LEXIS 16448, *1, (3d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 456 U.S. 908, 72 L. Ed. 2d 165, 102 S. Ct. 1756 ("It is inappropriate for a reviewing court to attempt to assess the truth or falsity of an announced article of faith. Judges are not oracles of theological verity, and the founders did not intend for them to be declarants of religious orthodoxy. However, while the truth of a belief is not open to question, there remains the significant question whether it is

truly held. Without some sort of required showing of sincerity on the part of the individual or organization seeking judicial protection of its beliefs, the U.S. Const. amend. I would become a limitless excuse for avoiding all unwanted legal obligations.”); *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 682, 134 S. Ct. 2751, 2759, 189 L. Ed. 2d 675, 680, 2014 U.S. LEXIS 4505, *1. (“Courts have no business addressing whether sincerely held religious beliefs asserted in a RFRA case are reasonable.”); *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872, 887, 110 S. Ct. 1595, 108 L. Ed. 2d 876 (1990). (“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.”); *Presbyterian Church in U. S. v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church*, 393 U. S. 440, 450, 89 S. Ct. 601, 21 L. Ed. 2d 658 (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, 194 L. Ed. 2d 231, 235-236, 2016 U.S. LEXIS 991, *10-12. See, *Holt v. Hobbs*, 574 U.S. 352, 352, 135 S. Ct. 853, 856, 190 L. Ed. 2d 747, 747, 2015 U.S. LEXIS 626, *1, 83 U.S.L.W. 4065, 93 A.L.R. Fed. 2d 777, 25.

3. I write to alert this Honorable Court concerning actions by state government agents taken to apparently impede and obstruct my access to the

Courts in this proceeding. I object to such interference, and reserve these issues for appeal, mentioned in part in Exhibit 55, attached hereto, and mentioned below, incorporated herein as if part of this letter, and in my brief, below. Dckt 60 at 63-64.

4. The First Amendment prohibits state officials, employees and agents from retaliating against claimants, such as myself, for exercising their right of access to the courts.

5. "Retaliation by public officials against exercise of First Amendment rights is itself violation of the First Amendment." *U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 1. Zilich v. Longo*, 34 F.3d 359 (6th Cir. 1994).

6. A representative of the Chancery Court staff misled me into almost missing my deadline to file a notice of Exception. See, Docket 54, December 1, 2020 letter, regarding Due Process concerns, also contained in Docket 90, combined with Docket 36, attached to the notice as Exhibit F- Exhibit 55.

7. The representatives at the Chancery Court demeaned me apparently based on poverty, association or religious beliefs. See, *Id.*

8. I asked the Master for her help. She kindly helped me. Dckt 55, 58.

9. In addition, the ODC impermissibly interfered with this case by contacting Judge Clark, per Judge Clark's admission.

10. In mid-April, Judge Clark appeared to threaten me at BJ's, a store, located in Millsboro, Delaware, as if I was on trial for standing up for my faith in Jesus, solely based on my exercise of seeking relief in court based upon alleviating the government sponsored burden government-religion has caused on my free exercise of religion in the action below.

11. The ODC and Judge Clark clearly violated or encouraged the violation of the judicial Code of Conduct, by seeking to use their government power to obstruct my case, showing partiality to the Defendant, the President of the United States.

12. "Supreme Court's two-step *Saucier* analysis governs whether a government official is entitled to qualified immunity, considering: (1) whether the facts alleged by the plaintiff show the violation of a constitutional right, and (2) whether the right at issue was clearly established at the time of the alleged misconduct." *Werkheiser v. Pocono Twp.*, 780 F.3d 172 (3d Cir. 2015).

13. Judge Clark knew or should have known that seeking to use his cloak of government authority, as a respected, fair judge, to chill or condemn or interfere with my ability to bring this case without government retaliation or pressure violates the Delaware judicial Code of conduct. See, *The Delaware Judges Code of Judicial Conduct*, Canon 1, "A judge should uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary," Canon 2, "A judge should avoid impropriety and

the appearance of impropriety in all activities,” Canon 3. “A judge should perform the duties of the office impartially and diligently,” Canon 7, “A judge should refrain from political activity inappropriate to the judge's judicial office.”

14. My right to a fair, unobstructed trial to alleviate a substantial burden upon my free exercise of religion is a constitutional right.

15. “Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary all have a duty to support and defend the Constitution.” *Salazar v. Buono*, 559 U.S. 700, 130 S. Ct. 1803, 176 L. Ed. 2d 634 (2010)

16. “There is no ‘de minimis’ defense to a First Amendment violation.” *Doe v. Indian River Sch. Dist.*, 653 F.3d 256, 259, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 16121.

17. “The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.” *Mullin v. Sussex County*, 861 F. Supp. 2d 411, 415, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67571, *1

18. I will likely continue to suffer government threats by the state if the Court does not help me by upholding the Constitutional limits from state overreach.

19. I am standing up for my personal freedom to worship Jesus according to the dictates of my conscience, even if no one else shares the same beliefs, without government persecution.

20. I am permitted to believe differently than the government through its agents, even if what Jesus teaches seems foolish to the world. 1 *Corinthians* 1:18, 2:14-16.

21. “Government official's conduct violates “clearly established” law, so that the official is not entitled to qualified immunity, when, at the time of the challenged conduct, the contours of a right are sufficiently clear that every reasonable official would have understood that what he is doing violates that right.” *Id.*

22. I do not wish to have any disciplinary action against any of the government representatives for misconduct. I desire fair access to the courts, without government persecution based on my exercise of redressing a grievance to alleviate the burden upon my free exercise of religion from Government sponsored religious persecution directly caused by government establishment of government-religion and government-religious views.

23. I object to disparate treatment based on religious affiliation on due process, first amendment and equal protection grounds. I object under RFRA too. See, *Tanzin v. Tanvir*, 141 S. Ct. 486, 208 L. Ed. 2d 295 (2020). The Supreme Court in dicta explained RFRA applied to state and local employees and agents, not merely federal officials.

24. I received additional pressure by the arms of this Honorable Delaware Supreme Court on May 24, 2021. I received an E-mail offering alleged help from an arm of the Court, the Delaware Lawyers Assistance Program ("DE-LAP"), from Carol P. Waldhauser, Executive Director, copying a mental health professional, relating to a past request for a waiver of attorney filing fees. Attached hereto as an Exhibit.

25. It was not help to pay the fee. I paid the fee long ago, though I did not receive a response from this Honorable Supreme Court, per my request back in January 2021 or secondary request in February 2021. I certainly hope this Honorable Court did not instigate the abuse by its arms. If so, please desist.

26. DE-LAP was looking after its own interests, which conflicts from mine.

27. I am a Christian. I believe people go to hell for trusting in what psychologists, mental health professionals, psychiatrists and behavioral theorists teach, which often is focused on being happy or productive materially instead of being holy. The organization premises its existence on mental health theories which I believe harm people. I believe such theories teach patients to seek to fulfill their own material desires instead of doing what is right, thereby teaching people to reflect a little piece of hell on earth, the image of Satan by living for self, conditionally caring based on relationship, reward and avoidance of harm with no

sacrificial unconditional love or God in them, teaching a lie that damns. See Isaiah 14 to understand how Satan wanted to be his own God, as high as God, to place self-first. I believe their thinking misleads patients to hell, especially BJ Skinner's theories, which most teachers, including myself learned.

28. These mental health professionals focus on misleading people to feel good, not be good, which is not good. I believe it is evil, misleading those they exploit for a paycheck to harm and hell.

29. Carol P. Waldhauser created the appearance of a threat by inaction by requiring a response within ten days.

30. While I believe artificial entities without hearts such as the ODC and DE-LAP, per se behave based on the mark of beast, absence of love, survival, for reward and avoidance of harm, serving greed by exploiting need, not doing good by their love of humanity, but seeking to control, eliminating free will by forcing the entities' will, its interest by threat of punishment, this Court has the power to reign in beasts, aka artificial entities without hearts, organizations, LLCs, corporations and such, with restraint in the form of the rule of law, which teaches love of humanity, not exploitation to serve the beasts' interests, the love for profit and praise at the cost of inhibiting freedom in the form of free will, freedom of

conscience by forced will under the threat of government sponsored persecution by funding such entities or otherwise.¹

31. I have the freedom to chase after God instead of chasing after money at this time in my life.

32. I have the freedom to pursue my religion by justice in the courts, to protect my freedom to worship by the dictates of my free will, not the forced will, not the dictates of the state through its agents to worship money, which I believe leads to damnation.

33. I believe business greed is the mark of the beast. Jesus teaches you cannot serve God and money. Matthew 6:24. 1 Timothy 6:10, I stand by God.

¹ I did not know how bad the world was until I ran office. I think artificial entities without hearts, charities, organizations, not for profits and businesses through alternative entities ("beasts") tempt world leaders through donations, signatures or support in elections, essentially controlling the leaders to mislead by serving the leaders' self-interest by serving the beasts at the expense of the people. The entities who appear to control the world through world leaders arguably likely have contacts in Delaware. I have been writing US Attorney General Garland concerning ideas how he may persuade this Court to save the world in other cases, including one to alleviate an economic crash using laws like 18 USC section 666, considering bailouts, grants and tax breaks as bribes, especially concerning the big payouts in 2020. The courts can tame beasts without hearts with the rule of law, since Judges are not beasts or mere puppets of power or mere robots. Judges are powerful because they may choose to reflect the image of God by love for humanity, sacrificing potential profit for people, making many people richer in love and materially, instead of the few. Entities without hearts who seek to get as much as they can for as little as they can will devour humanity, if humanity does not tame it. The heartless entities will seek to control people, if the courts do not take control of them, forcing people to reflect the image of Satan by behaving like heartless beasts too. I hope the Delaware courts will be our world's hero should an economic crash occur too, saving lives and eternal lives.

34. I am in danger, a different type the bodily harm I will discuss in my brief, albeit I have been visibly shaken up clenching my teeth, and have cried concerning the state attacks related to this motion too.

35. Justice in the courts is a command by God. Amos 5:15. "Justice, mercy and faithfulness are greater commands" superseding concerns relating to costs and convenience. Citing Matthew 23:23.

36. Courts should sacrifice potential profit to serve people, not sacrifice people for the love of profit through entities' unjust gains.

37. Please instruct your arms to stop bothering me or other relief this Honorable Court deems just, and to allow me to pursue my case without government threats.

38. I respectfully request the Court guide its arms through relief it deems just. I suggest correction through loving instruction, guidance to prevent additional government interference in this action. Please help.

39. On an aside, I am crying as I type this since I am reliving the wounds of the past where an arm of the Supreme Court economically persecuted me to protect those with shared interests.

40. While I took the Delaware Bar my ceiling at the dorm caved in with a leak and destroyed my bar materials, I paid thousands of dollars for. I complained to the supreme court. As a result, an arm of the court, the Board of Bar Examiners

punished me and threatened me and made a complaint against me because I asked for help.

41. Where you see smoke, you think fire. I joined RLF on a contract for about \$135,000 a year. I did not get my contract renewed as the law firm participated in my bar admission.

42. Prior to that in law school, I had rats in my apartment the last semester and during bar exams. I complained.

43. Duquesne, a Christian Law School responded by blaming me and hiking up my rent.

44. The press helped me by putting me on TV and the newspaper, but no actual relief resulted, only harm. I was freaked out and emotionally exhausted. There was a bunch of baby rats trying to climb up my bed as I tried to get sleep. I was horrified. I did not pass the bar the first time. I got super high scores the second time and allegedly high scores in Delaware passing on the first try. I should not be ashamed. I am disappointed in the cold heartedness by the officials of a Christian law school.

45. While I was in law school, my brother was also in an accident. I sought permission to travel and take off time to delay my first bar exam, to see my brother, to make sure he would live.

46. Duquesne said yes. But a day or two before the exam I found a note in my box. They changed their mind. They tried to call me. I did not have a phone. I do not buy things I cannot afford. I go without as incurring debt is against my religious beliefs.

47. I took the exam in Civil Procedure, and received my worst grade, and hated civil procedure ever since as a reminder of the cold heartedness of the Christian university.

48. The fact I have a heart to fight heartless beasts, including charities, not for profits, businesses and churches, does not make me weak. It makes me human with the power to reflect the image of God by love, stronger than heartless beasts who seek cold hard cash for survival.

49. My cousin, Peter Conaboy ("PJ"), also was murdered while I was in law school. So, this is all very painful to relive, and to be reminded of by the May 24, 2021 letter.

50. His mother, my Aunt Jackie Conaboy is in the hospital now. She is doing poorly. She may not make it in this life or the next. At PJ's funeral the priest said "hurry it up. I have a luncheon" as people shared stories about PJ. I scolded the priest as I left. "What would Jesus say." My aunt Jackie remembered that. Ever since then, she has not gone to church, and she turned to wine not God for comfort. I do not think she will go to heaven, if she does not turn towards God

for comfort. I pray, but recognize prayers are not enough at times since people have free choice. She may die soon. God's plan is the same for all. I discern whether people are lost or saved, whether they do man's plan or God's. She is not okay.

51. I learned early to turn to God for comfort, not to turn to any imperfect person or thing in this world for my comfort. I am not like the world. I am sad for the world, as I seek to heal it with love, through justice in the courts, shedding light on evil, not celebrating evil as good.

52. While scars remain well beyond our fleeting lives, harming future generations, and relived by new attacks such as the May 24, 2021 attack, this Court can prevent future harm to me by government actors misbehaving by seeking their own power and profit in this case, right here, right now, before it is too late, and additional harm is incurred, lasting beyond the fleeting lives of the perpetrators who act on self-interest, not love.

May 25, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
pro se, as a party, not an
attorney advocate
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

EXHIBITS THERE TO

EXHIBIT

55

December 1, 2020

Court of Chancery Courthouse
34 The Circle
Georgetown, DE 19947

RE: Meghan Kelly v. the President Donald Trump, et. Al.
Case No. 2020-0809- Master PWG

Due Process concerns

Dear Honorable Master Patricia W. Griffin:

I believe I may have received disparate treatment based on my wealth, political affiliation and or religious orientation, and will continue to receive such treatment without your assistance.

The staff in your court appear to be subverting my case, by serving as advocates for President Trump.

I sensed this early on when I was having trouble gaining a copy of everything, pursuant to your kind order granting me one copy. I felt like my case was not treated as a serious matter.

I sensed this when I when I felt mistreated by your staff around October 12, and October 13, and went home crying for days. See Exhibit A, emails, admissible under the present sense exception.

I filed the letter dated October 19, 2020, regarding the fact I am not an officer in this court to address and qualify my position as the party, not a mere attorney in hopes to prevent future abuse.

I am without the insulation or protection of counsel. I am the party. The staff may more freely scold and criticize attorneys without display of improper partiality towards a party.

I sensed this when Arline Simmons misled me concerning your November 2, 2020 as something trivial on November 4, not November 2 as indicated in my letter dated to this Honorable Court dated November 6, 2020, apparently, in hopes I would not seek exception to your rulings.

Then, I realized the court's staff may be scared of messing up with regards to paper filing, and the unique Covid19 amendments the requirements. I believe the Supreme Court is merciful concerning trite matters such as the fact none of us appeared to be aware of the waiver of notary requirements. I applaud the Supreme Court's leadership in safeguarding people's lives more than safeguarding business as usual.

Yet, my suspicions of partiality towards me proved correct. On December 1, 2020, your staff appeared to be attempting to bleed me dry of resources to continue this proceeding by denying me the benefits of the Chancery Court Rule 171 (c)'s authorization which provides in part. "... I

copy of all briefs shall be mailed to or filed with the Register who shall immediately docket them and mail or deliver the original to the Judge to whom the matter has been assigned..." (emphasis intended).

The court's staff appears to be playing the advocate to win the case for President Trump by directing me to mail everything to the Court in Wilmington or pay for gas to drive two hours away despite the fact she is aware of my limited resources. See Exhibit B.

I should not be additionally taxed by unnecessary costs because the court's staff opposes my position.

This case will likely remain alive, with possible interpleading by churches who care more about money than humanity. Under the guise of freedom of religion some churches will foreseeably display whoredom, selling my God for a price too high, costing lives and health to serve their bottom line. An order requiring, I mail everything to upper Delaware is unjust, based on bad faith of the court's staff, intentionally causing me to withdraw my case due by running out my limited funds in mailing costs.

The Court's agents cannot act as the Defendant's advocate by indicating I am not worthy of a fair and impartial case because of poverty that inconveniences the Court, political orientation or political beliefs.

I understand, most people support President Trump down here, and that most people do not think or believe as I do. Yet, I still have the freedom to pursue my unpopular belief, and my desire "not to be conformed to the world," without government persecution or threat of persecution. Romans 12:2.

I have chosen to confront the most powerful man in the world with endless resources paid by the federal government. That fact does not make my case trivial.

I believe "God chose the foolish things of the world (like me) to shame the wise; God chose the weak things (like me) of the world to shame the strong." 1 Corinthians 1:27.

Part of what makes this country already great is the impartiality required by the courts, creating an equalizer in fairness, regardless of wealth or poverty, power, position, race, religion, affiliation or place of origin.

Justice is not guaranteed. Yet the opportunity for justice, even by a peon like me against the most powerful man in the world, is. Should I fail, that is on me, not the court. This Honorable Court must allow me to try.

I believe the staff's behavior is not a reflection on the Court, nor a reflection on you, Honorable Master Patricia W. Griffin. They add a buffer between me and you to prevent ex parte communications.

Yet, the buffer has broken to the point that the floods of injustice may arise without the protection of the court's guidance on its own staff to uphold the integrity of the law.

"To be actionable, claim of denial of access to courts need not allege total or complete denial of access; rather, plaintiffs need only claim that interference with and potential prejudice to right of access to redress in state court rises to level of constitutional deprivation." *In re Cincinnati Radiation Litig.*, 874 F. Supp. 796 (S.D. Ohio 1995).

"Opportunity to be heard is essential requisite of due process of law in judicial proceedings." *Richards v. Jefferson Cty., Ala.*, 517 U.S. 793, 116 S. Ct. 1761, 135 L. Ed. 2d 76 (1996).

Please assure me the protection of due process, without rendering an order displaying partiality to the opposing side, to prevent infringement upon my right of due process in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,


Meghan Kelly, Esquire

Pro Se

34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(Word Count 993)

Exhibit A

10/15/2020

Re: Thursday afternoon/Meg/3 Original summons/ - Yahoo Mail

Re: Thursday afternoon/Meg/3 Original summons/

meghankellyesq@_inbox

Oct 14 at 9:20 AM



Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: Kruger, Katrina (Courts) <katrina.kruger@delaware.gov>,
Simmons, Arline (Courts) <arline.simmons@delaware.gov>

Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Hi Arline,

Thank you for responding so quickly. Will do. If anything comes up I will let you know.

Arline, Thank you for holding off on the summons from Friday October 9, 2020 for the civil processor. I did not want you to do it twice with the incorrect amount of days the Defendant has to respond. I explained to the Honorable Court, the Defendants are allowed 60 days instead of 20 in the documents I filed. I alerted the Honorable Master to this in the filings.

Accordingly, I am missing three summonses for the Second Amended Complaint, and one summons and copy of the praecipe for all three Defendants. They have 60 days to respond. I do not believe the Honorable Master Patricia W. Griffin can not make a determination on anything until all three Defendants are served.

I will draft more detailed certificates of service. So Katrina knows what links up with what.

Thank you for letting me know, you need more specificity Katrina.

I did not sleep at all last night (and I always sleep well) and cried this morning after yesterday and Monday too. I would not have filed this case if I thought things would be ok, I do not. I am seeking to expedite this case because I believe people are deceived by the Defendant to be harmed and damned to hell. I am still crying. I thank you for your hard work on this case. It is worth the effort, even if you do not believe I am worth it. I am Katrina. I love and respect you in real life but was so saddened by the way you demeaned me as an inconvenience. I am entitled to a fair impartial opportunity to be heard under the law, despite the required work for the Honorable Court to listen to my words. Justice is not to be earned, bought or bartered for by those with money. It must be granted to the rich and poor alike without bias towards those with money. Otherwise it is injustice guaranteed.

I am still crying. I might need a day to collect myself and refocus my attention on the case at hand. I intend to come in tomorrow morning. I will let you know if I can not make it.

I will draft a more detailed certificate of service for the 3 summonses I will file. So, you know what goes with what.

Thank you.

Love,
Meg

On Wednesday, October 14, 2020, 08:11:11 AM EDT, Simmons, Arline (Courts) <arline.simmons@delaware.gov> wrote:

Hello Meg,

Please come on THURSDAY before 11:00 a.m.

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 13, 2020 6:48 PM

To: Kruger, Katrina (Courts) <Katrina.Kruger@delaware.gov>; Kruger, Katrina (Courts) <Katrina.Kruger@delaware.gov>

Cc: Simmons, Arline (Courts) <Arline.Simmons@delaware.gov>

Subject: Thursday afternoon/Meg

Hi Katrina and Arline,

I have a CLE scheduled on Friday. May I please come in Thursday afternoon.

Thank you,
Meg

10/15/2020

RE: Monday Meg Kelly - Yahoo Mail

RE: Monday Meg Kelly

meghankellyesq@.inbox



Simmons, Arline (Courts) <arline.simmons@delaware.gov>

To: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>, Kruger, Katrina (Courts) <katrina.kruger@delaware.gov>

Oct 14 at 3:52 PM

Monday is fine-Can you come before 11:00 a.m.?

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2020 3:41 PM

To: Simmons, Arline (Courts) <Arline.Simmons@delaware.gov>; Kruger, Katrina (Courts) <Katrina.Kruger@delaware.gov>; Kruger, Katrina (Courts) <Katrina.Kruger@delaware.gov>

Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Subject: Monday Meg Kelly

Hello,

May I please come in Monday instead? I am still shaken up. Remember I am behaving as the injured party, not bringing this complaint as an advocate with the insulation of representation.

I think a couple days, may help Attorney General William Barr, Esq. and President Trump too recover from Covid19 too. The Honorable Master can not rule on anything until all 3 Defendants are served to affid notice, or at least attempted notice to all parties. Attorney General William Barr and the US Attorney General agent, the civil process clerk, are deemed the United States, a necessary party according to the rules of Federal procedure Rule 12 3(A).

Arline is wiser than I. She kindly indicated "do you need the United States as a party. I did not know until I looked it up." I am sorry that required I had to amend the complaint. I tend to look things up to confirm, but now I no longer have the ability to easily look things up. Arline thank you for your kindness and mercy.

Thank you.

Meg

10/19/2020

Meg/Sorry Katrina/Meg is not an attorney advocate in this case - Yahoo Mail

Meg/Sorry Katrina/Meg is not an attorney advocate in this case

meghenkellyesq@.../Sent



Meg Kelly <meghenkellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: katrina.kruger@delaware.gov, katrina.kruger@delaware.gov

Cc: Simmons Arline (Courts) <arline.simmons@delaware.gov>

Meg Kelly <meghenkellyesq@yahoo.com>

Oct 15 at 12:20 PM

Hello,

I do not know I do this, but I have been told I raise my voice when I am upset and passionate. I do not notice it. I apologize Katrina.

When Katrina said I was not allowed to file anything, though I must or it will be kicked out, she behaved like Defendant's advocate, not as an impartial government agent.

When Katrina said I needed a phone when the rules afford lawyer for those without a working phone, it made me feel as if you represented Defendant's interest and the Court's convenience over truth and justice.

You made me feel less than, when you said I should let someone ahead of me on Monday, when I am trying to expedite this case for immediate relief.

The Court's agents cannot act as the Defendant's advocate by indicating I am not worthy of a fair and impartial case because of poverty that inconveniences the Court, political orientation, or religious beliefs.

I understand, most people support President Trump down here, and that most people do not think or believe as I do. Yet I still have the freedom to pursue my belief, and my desire "not to be conformed to the world," without government persecution or threat of government persecution.

I am sorry I need to clean my dirty heart of the sin of fear. It appears I am raising my voice with other people when I talk about pursuing an action to safeguard freedom to worship or not according to the dictates of our conscience, not the dictates of the government, under the threat of government sponsored public or private persecution.

I am not an attorney advocate in this case. I am without the insulation and protection of counsel. I am a pro se litigant. I am the party and not the party's counsel. If I was a mere attorney, an officer of the Court, as opposed as the party, it would be different.

Thank you for understanding. I will work on cleaning my dirty heart of sin. I am sorry Katrina. I am having a real hard time with my winpy high voice. I need to become brave, and have faith in pursuit of justice in the courts. I have never been so scared in my entire life. I am scared of letting God down, and this Honorable Court down. It is humbling. I have chosen to confront the most powerful man in the world with endless resources paid by the federal government. Yet "...God has chosen the weak things of the world to shatter the things which are strong." 1 Corinthians 1:27

I apologize in advance for not having easy access to the law too.

Thank you. Have a good weekend.

Kind regards,

Meg

Meg

Exhibit B

12/1/2020

(1,996 unread) - megkellyesq@yahoo.com - Yahoo Mail

Fw: Meg v Trump Case 2020-0809 -PWG/letter Requesting permission to exceed the Rule 171(f) word limit

From: Meg Kelly (megkellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: katrina.kruger@delaware.gov; arline.simmons@delaware.gov; megkellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Monday, November 30, 2020, 01:29 PM EST

Hi Katrina,

May I please drop them off to your court as the rules allow? The cost of continuously mailing verses dropping off are prohibitive. It is stressing me out, and I am already at risk of a heart attack. My blood pressure is higher than expected. I didn't know my heart was hurting because my blood pressure is high, 138 over 87, most recently. That is why my heart hurts when people say I am not a Christian. It upsets me to the point it may eventually kill me.

Thank you,
Meg

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

From: Meg Kelly <megkellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: Kruger, Katrina (Courts) <katrina.kruger@delaware.gov>; Simmons, Arline (Courts) <arline.simmons@delaware.gov>; McKinnon, Brenda (Courts) <brenda.mckinnon@delaware.gov>; Boyer, Sheila (Courts) <sheila.boyer@delaware.gov>

Cc: Bauer, Cecelia (Courts) <cecilia.bauer@delaware.gov>; Meg Kelly <megkellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020, 01:14:02 PM EST

Subject: Re: Meg v Trump Case 2020-0809 -PWG/letter Requesting permission to exceed the Rule 171(f) word limit

Hi Katrina and Sheila,

Since I have very little money to mail, it is more plausible for me to adhere to the rules by dropping it off to Sussex County. Thereby, I seek the benefits of the rules, without waiving them.

Thank you for your suggestion, and understanding.

Have a good day.

Very truly,
Meg

On Monday, November 30, 2020, 12:57:56 PM EST, Boyer, Sheila (Courts) <sheila.boyer@delaware.gov> wrote:

Thank you, Katrina --

You have detailed everything perfectly. Since Vice Chancellor Fioravanti is assigned to this case to hear the Exceptions to Master's Report part of this case, anything having to do with those documents, or correspondence to Vice Chancellor Fioravanti, need only be sent to his Case Manager, Brenda McKinnon -- and/or to the Register in Chancery in Wilmington -- mailing address is shown below with my signature block.

12/1/2020

(1,505 unread) - megharikalyasa@yahoo.com - Yahoo Mail

Strohma

Shella L. Boyer

Judicial Case Management Supervisor

Register in Chancery Wilmington

500 N. King Street, Suite 11600

Wilmington, DE 19801

302-255-0552

From: Kruger, Katrina (Courts) <Katrina.Kruger@delaware.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 12:48 PM
To: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>; Simmons, Arline (Courts) <Arline.Simmons@delaware.gov>; McKinnon, Brenda (Courts) <Brenda.McKinnon@delaware.gov>; Boyer, Sheila (Courts) <Sheila.Boyer@delaware.gov>
Cc: Bauer, Cecelia (Courts) <Cecelia.Bauer@delaware.gov>
Subject: RE: Meg v Trump Case 2020-0809 -PWG/letter Requesting permission to exceed the Rule 171(f) word limit

Hi Meg,

Just to make sure I got this correct. I received the Letter to Vice Chancellor Fioravanti asking to exceed the word count and also the certificate of service in today's mail. According to your email below, you also sent BOTH documents to the Register's Office in New Castle County. Is that correct? I am including in this email Brenda McKinnon, the case manager to the Vice Chancellor, and also Sheila Boyer, office manager, in the event that Brenda is out of the office. There is no need for both counties to docket the same thing. It currently is not on the docket. I will go ahead and efile both documents. ALSO, you need to wait and see how the judge rules before mailing the brief for anyone to efile.

From this point forward, it is best to send the filings to just *one* office. Since this is now assigned to a judge in New Castle County, mail the documents upstate and bypass the Sussex County office altogether. Otherwise it gets too confusing. If Brenda or Sheila feel differently, they will advise in this email chain.

Thanks,

Katrina

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 12:15 PM
To: Simmons, Arline (Courts) <Arline.Simmons@delaware.gov>; Kruger, Katrina (Courts)

12/1/2020

(1,956 unread) - meganicallysco@yahoo.com - Yahoo Mail

<Katrina.Kruger@delaware.gov>

Subject: Meg v Trump Case 2020-0809 -PWG/letter Requesting permission to exceed the Rule 171(f) word limit

Good morning,

I hope you are safe and well.

I wanted to give you a head's up. On Friday, I mailed the attached letter requesting permission to exceed the Chancery Court Rule 171(f) Rule word limit for briefs and the related certificate of service to Defendant Barr.

Could you please confirm receipt, once it is docketed?

I see in under Rule 171(c) that I merely have to drop off the brief to the Court, and the Court will mail it to the upper DE Vice Chancellor. This is weird for me. I am learning it is unusual for you too. I really appreciate your time and assistance even more. Thank you.

I actually mailed the letter and the certificate of receipt to the upper Delaware Court and your court too. So, you may not have to mail what I sent if he confirms receipt or docketed it first. Sorry for mailing it to both courts.

Thank you. Have a great day.

Very truly,

Meg

October 19, 2020

Court of Chancery Courthouse
34 The Circle
Georgetown, DE 19947

**RE: Meghan Kelly v. United States, President of the United States,
Defendant, Donald Trump, a.k.a. Donald J. Trump, a.k.a. President
Trump, a.k.a. President Donald Trump, his official capacity as
President of the United States, No. 2020-0809- Master PWG
Plaintiff Not officer of the Court/Economic Crash/Forum**

Dear Honorable Master Griffin:

Thank you for taking the case.

I am not an attorney advocate in this case. I am without the insulation and protection of counsel. I am a pro se litigant. I am the party, not the party's counsel. If I was a mere attorney, an officer of the Court, as opposed to the party, it would be different. Lawyers are permitted to talk to judges, but not on matters relating to matters, ex parte. I am not allowed to talk to you ex parte period.

The court's staff adds a buffer, and are not the Judge on the case.

It is strange for the staff, and for me. For instance, I could not share the rules that required 60 day notice instead of 20 days notice to the staff ex parte to give to you, even though I had them in my hand, and the staff kindly said she could take them.

Instead, I must communicate with the defense counsel simultaneously, electronically, or by mail while speaking directly to this honorable Court.

I do not know whether this case will remain in this Court or be removed to federal Court. This area heavily supports President Trump. One of Defendant's biggest campaign contributors allegedly lives in Sussex, and Delaware's liason for President Trump, Rob Arlett, lives in Sussex.

Although I am cognizant of the pro Trump atmosphere in this county, I have faith in the fair impartial rule of law by this Honorable Court.

The federal courts are more of a concern for me. The President's sister presided as a judge in the Third Circuit until recently. In addition, the President placed two Third Circuit judges on his list of potential nominees for Supreme Court, creating a concern that the federal judges may be biased toward their colleagues' potential nominations at the death of the next Supreme Court justice, Justice Hardiman and Justice Phipps.

I believe this Honorable Court, from the smallest state, has more power to save the country than the Supreme Court.

This is the corporate capital of the globe.

The biggest government expense globally is healthcare. (See the web site cited in Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"), Count 234). The US spends more money on social security and healthcare than any other sector.

That fact is often hidden by discretionary charts, instead of mandatory spending charts. The US now must pay out more.

The country and the globe have the biggest bill in the history of the world that has fallen due, healthcare and retirement for the baby boomers. Those who value money more than humanity are seeking to get out of paying this earned and owed debt, by bad business. Bad business, made to fail, made to bail out or bankrupt as directors continue to collect hefty salaries and potential bonuses, should not be rewarded by the government for the profit of the few at the expense of the many. (See, SAC, Counts 229-286)

Directors have the power to artificially inflate stocks through stock buy backs. Entities may resell worthless debt in bankruptcy remote entities into infinity while creating the illusion the economy is above water. I used to draft these bankruptcy remote entities at RLF, Delaware's largest home-grown corporate law firm.

With regard to business bailouts and business incentives, creating artificial debt and charging interest to give to businesses to enslave the people to desperate conditions to require the people pay debt back is the sin of inequity and oppression, arguably violating the 13th Amendment by creating wage slaves, or forced volunteering.

Creating jobs is not helping the people. (Sec, Romans 4:4. "Now to the one who works, wages are not credited as a gift but as an obligation.")

Creating jobs is not a gift.

It is exploiting the people to serve those who already profited at their expense with bail outs and incentives, under the deception of doing people a favor by employment.

Soon we will see entities exploit people in a different way only to gain praise by those they oppress, by the elimination of welfare such as social security and medicare, and replacing it with charity violating Matthew 6 misleading people to hell.

This Honorable Court is the only Court in the world that can prevent a global economic crash, while saving government pensions, retirement, social security, lives' savings and Medicare by cutting through the corporate veil of entities to hold those people, directors or otherwise, responsible for made to fail, made to profit from, bad business.

Misleaders and deceivers exacerbate desperate conditions to exploit those they are charged to serve for self-gain. Leaders look after those they serve by alleviating desperate conditions.

This Court is the king of corporate law. Now we need this Court to be a servant leader by slicing the ill gained fat of a few to save the many.

Years ago, I negotiated for a really cool lawyer tool either from Westlaw or Lexis that gave me people and entity's information, including people's social security numbers, except the last two, which is scary because you could go upstairs in the Superior Court and get the last two numbers for Defendants.

The source provided relationships with other people and entities, including entity information in other countries relating to entities here.

Lawyers now have the means to cut through entity shells. The Court is powerless to save the world if lawyers do not have the courage to ask.

I am grateful for the opportunity to be heard.

Please find additional hearing exhibits, to include with the exhibits to the complaint, and a filing list.

Thank you,


Meghan Kelly

Pro Se

34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(Words 1000)

SOLACE and LAC

From: Carol Waldhauser (cwaldhauser@de-lap.org)

To: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Cc: emkiesel@aol.com

Date: Monday, May 24, 2021, 11:58 AM EDT

Meghan:

Please find attached a self-explanatory letter.

Please contact us within the next 10 days regarding it.

Thank you.

Carol

Carol P. Waldhauser, Executive Director

The Delaware Lawyers Assistance Program

(DE-LAP)

405 N. King Street, Suite 100B

Wilmington, DE 19801

(302) 777-0124

Cell: (410) 409-8874

cwaldhauser@de-lap.org

www.de-lap.org

DE-LAP is a Confidential, Free, Non-Judgmental Service Just for Delaware Lawyers and Judges

CHECK IT OUT ON YOUR PHONE, TABLET OR COMPUTER, DE-LAP'S NEW WEBSITE AT SAME ADDRESS: WWW.DE-LAP.ORG

FREE, CONFIDENTIAL AND NON-JUDGMENTAL, DE-LAP has assisted the Delaware Bar with quality of life and quality of professionalism issues. We Do Together What Need Not Be Done Alone!

-Carol P. Waldhauser, Executive Director

This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately and return the original message to us at the address above. Thank you.



2021_05_24_11_52_37.pdf
296.6kB



2021_05_24_11_53_47.pdf
678.2kB

Lawyers Assistance Program

Carol P. Waldhauser, Executive Director
The Renaissance Centre
405 N. King Street, Suite 100 B
Wilmington, Delaware 19801
www.de-lap.org

Private: (302) 777-0124
Toll Free: 877-243-3527
Fax: (302) 658-5212
cwaldhauser@de-lap.org

MAY 24, 2021

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE. 19939

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Meghan:

We understand that you may be experiencing some financial difficulties with regard to license fees, etc. As a member of the Delaware Bar we care about you. For that reason, we are reaching out, confidentially, to see if we might be able to offer assistance to you.

The Delaware Lawyers Assistance Program, The SOLACE Committee, The Delaware Lawyers Assistance Fund and the Professional Guidance Committee all provide support to attorneys who may need resources for basic needs, as well as referral options as needed or required. Again, these services are free and confidential.

To better understand, how we can assist, we want to meet with you - either virtually - or in person. Do you have WIFI available where we might meet virtually? Or in the alternative, are you able to come in Georgetown to meet? Once again, this is confidential, and we would like to be able to explore our resources and determine if our services can help you.

So please, reach out to us either by e-mail or phone. Our information is: Carol.cwaldhauser@de-lap.org and/or Eleanor can be reached at ernkiesel@aol.com, or call Carol at DE-LAP 302-777-0124. We hope that you can connect with us and see if our resources and/or referrals can assist you. Remember, DE-LAP is a Confidential, Free, Non-Judgmental Service Just for Delaware Lawyers and Judges. Equally important, we do together what need not be done alone!

Very truly yours,


Eleanor M. Kiesel, Esquire, PhD, Lawyers Assistance Committee


Carol Waldhauser, Executive Director, Lawyers Assistance Program (DE-LAP)

Electronically forwarded with encls: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Appendix S

A-5

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Meghan Kelly,	)	
	)	No. 119, 2021
Plaintiff Below,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Donald Trump, a.k.a. Donald J.	)	
Trump, a.k.a. President Trump	)	
a.k.a. President Donald Trump,	)	
in his official capacity as President of	)	
the United States	)	
	)	
Defendant Below,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	

APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR THE DELAWARE SUPREME COURT TO
REQUIRE THE RECUSAL OF THE HONORABLE CHIEF JUSTICE COLLINS
J. SEITZ, JUNIOR IN THIS MATTER

1. I, Meghan Kelly, pro se appellant, unopposed, having been granted in forma pauperis relief, move this honorable Delaware Supreme Court, unopposed, move to recuse the Honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior ("Chief Justice Seitz") from participating in review of my case, requiring delegation to the other honorable Justices.

2. On about May 25, 2021, I sent the honorable Court *Appellant's (unopposed) Motion to guide or reign in the arms of the Delaware Supreme Court,*

or for other relief this Court deems just, (the “motion”), incorporated herein as if included in the first instance. I suggested private guidance. Motion at 1, 37, 38.

3. One of the allegations in the motion was concerning De-Lapp’s response to a request for a suspension of bar fees to serve De-Lapp’s purpose not to help to pay any fee since I paid such fees. Motion at 24 -30. Attached please find my receipt of payment of the Bar registration fee, incorporated as an exhibit, as if expressly stated herein.

4. I attached the May 24, 2021 attack letter as an exhibit to the motion, and incorporate it herein as if included as part of the motion.

5. In the May 24, 2021 attack letter, Carol Waldauser and Eleanor Kiesel state, “We understand that you may be experiencing some financial difficulties with regard to license fees.”

6. The only person who knew I made a request for suspension of Attorney Registration of license fees is Chief Justice Seitz, since I made the request to him, and Mark Vavala.

7. I reached out to Mark Vavala (“Mark”) per the emails, attached herein and included and incorporated herewith as if alleged as part of this motion (“Emails”), admitted under the state of mind exceptions, belief and admissions. See Exhibit, the Emails.

8. I turned to Mark for guidance, as he has always treated me as a judge should, with respect regardless of poverty, religious belief or association, as to requesting relief for attorney registration fees.

9. In the past I turned to Mark when he was a commissioner when Cathy Marshall, the former Supreme Court Clerk treated me with great cruelty and disregard for humanity for cost and convenience, reflecting the image of Satan with regard to unbending rules and penalties regarding the rather unsafe requirement of registration online and by required use of emails during a heightened time of increased threats to electronic hacks.¹

¹ I am trying to persuade US Attorney General Garland to close the back doors on electronic devices President Bush Junior opened up under the guise of safety from terrorism. Bush opened the door to economic, speech and privacy attacks, making the entire globe less safe, especially with regards to health data, health insurance hacks and systems in recent years. Our information is more easily manipulated making us believe we are safe when the pandemic may not be waning as much as suspected. Please note, worldometer has not been reporting all states in its data but has excluded about ten states every day for the past two weeks. I suspect it is being manipulated, hacked, to market the vaccine as working better than it is. I have checked worldometer every day for over a year. They included most states every other day. This is strikingly concerning to me. See, Dckt 71, Exhibit E, Exhibit 26, copy of the web site worldometer, to show healthcare is the biggest global money maker and expense.

Bush sold our freedoms for money by opening the door to those who will kill, steal and destroy or diminish freedoms and lives to gain more material gain. Freedom is not for sale. People are not for sale, to those who require they pay for freedom. People are priceless not price tags, worthy of protection by this Court. Throwing money at a problem or grants is never the solution. Neither is money given to government agencies without strings attached. The spend it as you see fit or lose it provisions reward waste. Strings attached to laws must be tied with all government money offering guidance for good not evil greed, the mark of the

damned. The desire for more government money for government partnered entities under the guise of charity or otherwise, including churches, is the problem. Business greed, to use for the study of things, science to manipulate to gain grants or business profit for something different or for a different fix instead of removing the problem should end. Entities are rewarded with more money by not resolving the problem. Government must fund itself, not pay bribes to entities which per se try to get as much as they can for as little as they can. Then, such entities may supplement with fundraising and charity which I believe damns people to hell. Schools, sports and the post offices would be fully funded if the government paid bills instead of bribes. Children learn to go the way to hell by learning early to rely on associations and organizations, artificial entities without hearts, that run on the mark of the beast to represent their interests, instead of choosing to use their own brains to think, to care, to know, to love, individually and specially, as the treasure they are. We lose treasures to hell. Children are forced to fundraise for sports and schools which will damn them to hell should they not unhardened their heads and learn such evil is bad, all to pay bribes of government agents to serve their interest. Property taxes should not be increased to fund government bribes, thereby creating disparate treatment by zip code, based on home values in violation of the Equal Protections Clause applicable to the states via the Fourteenth Amendment, with no rationally related purpose. The government would decrease waste, create a more fair, equal and just union if government employees, including Presidents and law makers, did their jobs instead of exploiting tasks to serve government agents personal interest including but not limited to getting out of work or liability, while arguably creating artificial debt in violation of the 13th amendment to serve greed not need, by paying entities to profit off of its government duties at a greater bill to its people in terms of not merely monetary loss but loss of constitutional freedoms. It is an abomination. The government itself is a heartless beast should the agents not use their power to individually use their free will, their brains, to think, to care, to know, to love people, instead of acting as heartless robots going through mechanical motions of a system. Then brainlessly blaming the system, instead of themselves, for problems they cared naught to address.

I digress, government funding for science is bad and a black hole, that should be closed from sucking the life blood and souls out of humanity by indentured servitude to feed unsatiable greed by entities without hearts. Just laws, just policies and justice in the courts is the solution to close the black hole. The government rewards businesses for made to break, made to repair and replace products, polluting in the production and polluting with replaced parts and products in the landfills. The US through its unjust decrees, including but not limited to the UCC, tax code wrote offs and insurance laws is the reason why the

world is so polluted. China would not make made to break, service and replace products if our courts and laws did not reward such, instead of made to last goods, decreasing polluting in production and in parts. Money is never the solution, since it rewards misbehavior, to create the endless lust for greed to make something different, or use of a product for a different function, not made to last, not made to work. Science is the study of things. When the pupils, doctors and scientists declare themselves to be the masters of the universe on a subject, the experts, or knowing the answers, they are per se stupid, and defeat science. Science, after all, is the mere study of things, not the master of things as defined by the scientific method with built in recognized uncertainties called variables, unknown and known. Meaning possible error, not knowing everything, is declared as part of the scientific method. Learning is good, but manipulating data while using good science, retrieved from tests for self-gain, not knowledge, is deceptive and wicked. Our government appears to be partnered with private industries, not for profits, businesses, and churches, by bought or bartered for bribes, in exchange for loyalty or backing of elections, paid with money taken from being used for the people's need, government infrastructure, not Biden's bad plan either, to be used to pay entities to perform the government's job because the government employees evade responsibility of working and blame for expenditures and plans not working, grants and bailouts to exploit the problem to waste money and cause harm to the world for self-gain, by creating industries to profit off of the problems instead of correcting the problem by making the world more safe by closing the back doors in electronics, including but not limited to making lawyers money by adding an unnecessary additional field, insurance companies, fields for miners who sell our data, anti-virus software companies. I am still brainstorming constitutional and criminal theories to persuade the US AG Garland to save us regarding foreseeable looming threats not by people but by entities without hearts, businesses, LLCs and such, by protecting our freedom of speech without government sponsored or encouraged threats against privacy or speech, and a potential 13th amendment argument regarding artificial debt which is a sin against God in the old testament especially, called inequity and will damn the perpetrators to hell despite their stupidity and ignorance. See, Matthew 13, Hosea 4:6. It is no small matter. It is a matter of heaven and hell. The Bible teaches people go to hell for misunderstanding evil for good and good for evil. Not knowing can kill you eternally. You have to care to think, care to know, care to love to escape the fire of the second death at the resurrection of the dead the last day. You must use you free will, your brain, not your belly, meaning your desires. *Philippians 3:19*, "Their end is destruction, their god is their belly (meaning their appetites, their desires), and they glory in their shame, with minds set on earthly things." I argued

that Trump does not use his brain, but is reigned by his desires, the mark of the beast, the whore, the damned, the mark sadly most of humanity has should they not erase that mark before it is too late and they are dead. See Dckt 60 at 21,94,123, 124, 413. Trump is reigned by desires, emotions, instead of laying down his desires, to care to think to love others, by sacrificing to self. I am pointing this out to confirm believe not using your brain to think, to care, to love, is sin.

As a licensed teacher, previously substituting in the schools, I tried to teach kids they were loved and respected no matter whether they failed or succeeded, and to love and respect one another regardless as to whether others succeed or fail. I taught them to think for themselves, instead of writing what they thought I wanted to hear. I taught them their diverse unique view made us all smarter, by shedding light on a different perspective. I tried to teach kids the way to heaven young by Jesus's new command in John, to love one another, without violating the separation of church and state, without using God's name or bible verses in vain. I am pointing this out as I try to live my faith, live my religious beliefs by doing the will of God, through understanding Jesus's words. I believe Jesus is not kidding. I also have ideas on how Attorney General Merrick Garland can safeguard the right to vote, and eliminate the temptations for law makers to create unjust decrees and policies by removing three temptations to do so, eliminating money in politics, ending entity and private backing with money, by allowing the people to more equally and freely, not by purchase of support or opposing a candidate by the only equal, fair, free form, the vote.

Our laws fund grants for science that serve greed, the bottom line, not learning or truth to improve societal conditions. Our tax laws, grant policies and other laws increase temptations to make made to break, made to replace, polluting in the production, and polluting by throwing away replaced parts and products in landfills into infinity, to gain more money by selling replacement parts or products. More grants are given out for some different research. Greed for money is rewarded, driving out love for humanity leading to exploitation of the people and the environment, and I believe damnation in hell.

Additionally, our health care harms health to make people feel better, by feeling nothing, or by masking the ailment, often inhibiting people's faculties, their ability to use their free will, their brain, their mind, I believe guaranteeing their damnation in hell. I believe eternity is determined at the last day of your life. (See, Docket 77, Exhibit F, Exhibit 43, Article I drafted and factors relating to my passion to improve healthcare, to care for the sick and elderly's health, not destroy health by comfort care, eliminating the pain by causing patients to feel nothing, like vegetables, often inhibiting their free will which I believe they need to use to go to heaven, likely misleading the sick and elderly to hell, which breaks my heart, 1.

10. Mark is not hard headed, hard hearted or hard handed. He understands the rules are there to serve humanity, not exploit humanity for the cost

Coastal Point, Guest Column, *Representative candidate says health is wealth*, By Meghan Kelly, Esq., Candidate Delaware House of Representatives, 38th District, 2. Document, *"Your Health is your Wealth You are Priceless. Not a price tag!* Kelly seeks Federal Consideration of Health Care Proposal, 3. Meghan Kelly's teaching certificate, which goes to credibility. I learned psychology and behavior theories like BF Skinner's. I also am licensed to teach health so I know something about health. 4. Meghan Kelly's redacted law school transcript to show she took a course Health Care Finance and the course Law and Medicine while attending Duquesne School of Law. 5. Meghan Kelly's redacted undergraduate college transcript to show she took relevant courses related to

- a. History of Western Medicine
 - b. Economics
 - c. Medieval Philosophy
 - d. Psychology courses
6. Evidence of surgery that requires I drink water, rest and eat so I do not faint or die due to dehydration when I have my period. I lose five pounds every month. This is still a challenge. I must assert my right to live because many people serve Satan by not wanting to be inconvenienced to care to adapt to safeguard my life, or the lives and health of others.)

Drugging the elderly and sick people up so they cannot use their free will to choose to think, to care, to know, to love removes their freedom of conscience to choose the way to eternal life.

It is healthcare, not comfort care, deceiving people to believe you are healing them only to be killing them in this life and the next by concealing pain. At this time, I may not have standing with these unrelated issues, but the Attorney General may have standing down the line. It is notable, about 33 billion has been misused for years via NIH for bad healthcare that cares less about patients' health and more about entities' wealth.

Without protecting freedom of conscience, none are free, none have liberty, all are controlled by the forced will of heartless beasts, organizations and entities, even government, to serve what I argue is the mark of the beast, business greed. We must allow our judges to use their brain, their free will too, to think, to care, to love, instead of robotically adhering as troops in a war, where they no longer lead but are misled by heartless beasts that rule over them.

and convenience by those who wield government power. See *Matthew 23:11*, regarding Jesus's claim leaders are servants. I believe servants of self are misleaders and deceivers, who exploit those they are charged to serve to serve those who serve them thereby serving themselves, reflecting the image of Satan, aka children of the devil not choosing to be saved from the fire the last day by laying down their desires to care to love those outside their own, specifically those who inconvenience them, and their greed by need. See, *John 8:47*, *1 John 3:10-11*, *Acts 13:10*, *Matthew 13:38*, regarding children of devil.

11. I thought I sinned against God by forgetting to look after Mark's daughter, an attorney within the arms of the ODC. I thought Mark's kid may have lost her job at the ODC, with the news of a new hiring at the ODC, because her father helped me in the form of guidance with regard to requesting a suspension or waiver of attorney fees from the Honorable Supreme Court by official request to Chief Justice Seitz. See Emails.

12. I realized the only two people on the planet aware of my request for the waiver are Chief Justice Seitz and Mark Vavala per that revelation in the E-mail. See Emails

13. In my horror and great sadness, I confronted Mark to determine whether he "threw me under the bus." Citing Emails. I quickly confronted him to determine the worst possible scenario to eliminate any doubt that may tarnish a

professional relationship based on mutual respect for the dignity of all, even one another.

14. I tested him. Mark did not instigate the ODC and DE-Lapp attacks. See Emails.

15. Besides passing the test, I trust Mark Vavala as a former judge, a commissioner, without partiality based on self-interest. I sought Mark's help for years to gain his wisdom and kind guidance. He is smart and wise, and unafraid of tough questions, because he answers honestly with integrity, even with the honest response, I don't know.

16. The conclusion Mark Vavala was not the perpetrator of potential abuse me, led me to determine that Chief Justice Seitz may have instigated the abuse by De-Lapp and the ODC.

17. The interest for fees for an arm may have tarnished Chief Justice's vision as I noted in my motion, the Supreme Court itself may have instigated the abuse. Motion at 25.

18. Far worse, the Chief Justice may have instigated attacks by the ODC and De-Lapp discussed in my motion because my second request relating to waiving attorney registration fees is based on and intertwined with religious arguments in violation of my free exercise and the RFRA which applies to state agents too, including judges and judges' agents, its arms, ODC, De-Lapp, and their

agents, foreseeably impeding and obstructing my access to the Courts in this proceeding.

19. I must correct my allegation at Motion at 25. I was blinded by my desire to persuade this court to save the world by saving me in my case, and possibly other matters, even if the court does not want to. Jesus says if we believe we can move mountains, we will move them. Citing Jesus, Mark 11:23. I believe I have an opportunity, not a guarantee, that I may move a mountain by moving this Court's justices' hearts to be our heroes. Mountains after all means impediments on our hearts, temptations to sin by comfort, costs and convenience instead of doing what is right. *Id.*, (See, *Luke* 8:10. Jesus speaks in parables so only those who seek his will instead of their own or the mere will of man understand what Jesus says by mountains and in general. Others do not choose to use their brains, their free will, to understand God's will, God's plan which is love. They, instead, willfully are blinded by worldly temptations and do not use their brains to think, to care to know, to care to love in truth, not lust, not covetousness based on lies.)

20. I forgot, this court did answer my first request for a suspension of fees relating to attorney registration based on unemployment or financial impediment. I am including the response attached to and incorporated therewith as an exhibit. See, the Court's response attached hereto.

21. In a letter dated February 2, 2021 the Court responded, "The Court acknowledges receipt of (my) letter dated January 7, 2021, wherein (I) request that the attorney registration fees for lawyers out of work due to the pandemic be waived.

22. I responded per the attached February 5, 2021 letter, attached hereto and incorporated herewith in toto, as an Exhibit. I provide in part:

"Thank you for the February 2, 2021 letter in which the Court indicated it would consider requests for waivers of attorney fees on a case by case basis, by formal request.

My concern, is accepting applications for waivers on a case by case basis violates the Equal Protections Clause applicable to the State's agencies, even the courts via the 14th Amendment, by disparate treatment within a class. I am likely not the only one out of work due to the pandemic. Others are struggling too. A case by case determination would likely be per se unconstitutional.

I will likely never have standing to stand up for those similarly situated with myself. Yet, if I made such a request, I would be asking the Court to treat me with preference instead of impartiality as required by law.

My conscience may not allow me to make such a request, tempting this Honorable Court to misbehave to serve my own gain.

I can, however, request that all fees for attorney registrations be the same regardless of years barred. So, I am making such a request for future consideration for 2022 and beyond. Please treat all lawyers the same by requiring the same lawyer registration fee for every lawyer, without persecution towards attorneys with more years of experience by an increased fee. There is no rational basis for an increase in lawyer's fees based on number of years, except the desire for more money.

It is wrong to assume the longer you have been barred, the more money you have or must pay.

I am saddened when I see unjust decrees and policies based on the love of money, desire for money, at the cost of driving out the love for humanity, the people the state serves.

On an aside, the reason why I became a lawyer is my faith in Jesus Christ. Justice in the Courts is a command by God. See Amos 5:15. Jesus Christ

taught that “justice, mercy, and faithfulness” are more important commands. Matthew 23:23.

23. In my second request relating to attorney fees, dated February 5, 2021, I go on to discuss more religious concerns therein.

24. I note, Mark Vavala in the Email exhibits noted 5 other attorneys reached out to him regarding attorney fee cost issues.

25. Imagine how many other lawyers may be struggling due to the pandemic, possibly catching the sickness or caring for a loved one or merely life’s struggles unforeseeably hampering lawyer’s capability to pay the Registration fee.

26. Such case by case application creates disparate treatment by the hidden reign of lusts or likes as it suits the judges interests, not the impartial rule of law, without selective application.

27. The Court should create a form that permits lawyers without the ability to pay to waive such fees, to automatically apply for waiver based on debt or financial burden, and such waivers should be freely given, instead of enslaving already financially desperate people with additional pressure.

28. No one is above the law. No one is below the law, not even judges who administer the laws. Judges must maintain their independence from self interest, and their appearance of independence.

27. “The Founders rejected the medieval myth that sovereign (rulers, even judges and Presidents) are anointed by God to rule over them. The Founders laid a

new foundation for our country, based not on the lie of divine right, (but by free choice, the free will of the people based on the universal belief that) all people are created equal and all just powers are derived from the consent of the governed.

They changed the very source and nature of Law. Law does not emerge from the mouth of a king but rather the votes of the freely chosen representations of the people,” with limited, not absolute power, limited by the Constitution by the Courts. Citing, Duquesne Lawyer, *The Rule of Law, the Constitution and Democracy*, by Wilson Huhn, Professor of Law, Spring 2021 Edition.

28. Partiality and the appearance of impartiality must be maintained in my case to protect the integrity of the courts.

29. I seek to protect the judiciary.

30. To maintain the integrity of the three branches of government.

31. In this United States, the Founders created checks and balances to prevent and fix branch overreach. The fact a check is made, means the system is focused on maintaining a more equal, fair, just union. Humans with hearts are in control and in charge of choosing to maintain, and service the checks on the executive, judicial and legislative branches, like a car in need of oil to run better. People must choose to use their brain to care to think, to care to know, to care to love humanity, instead of comfort, convenience and cost by avoiding tune ups in our system of government.

32. The fact I seek correction will not prevent me from seeking protection of the same system I am seeking to tune up through law suits, to prevent the engine of our nation from failing us, the impartial rule of law.

33. The Courts can uphold the integrity, encourage faith in the system by having the humility to understand it is run by imperfect people in need of guidance through checks and balances, the executive branch, the legislative branch and even the judiciary.

34. In addition, my little cousin, Ikey Adams, a family member, is a partner in Sidley Austin, in DC, where Chief Justice Seitz's daughter appears to work too.

34. These two issues, as to who instigating the government threats via the ODC and De-Lapp, and the familial relations, create the appearance of partiality, or bias that may blemish a rather historical case, should this Court allow me to go forward with arguments.

35. The President(s) need the court's heavy hand of loving guidance to reign in the Presidents' abuse and misuse of power and government funding by dissolving the establishment of government-religion. President Bush Junior, President Obama, President Trump, and President Biden all misbehaved, and misbehavior will continue well past their fleeting lives, should this court fail to declare the Presidents are not above the Constitution. Sovereign immunity seems

to be waived for RFRA claims per the Supreme Court against officials, including the President. *Tanzin v. Tanvir*, 141 S. Ct. 486, 208 L. Ed. 2d 295 (2020)

36. I respectfully request that the Honorable Chief Justice be recused from deciding this case.

May 28, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

pro se, as a party, not an

attorney advocate

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

EXHIBITS THERE TO

Transaction Receipt from Delaware Supreme Court Attorney Registration for \$353.00 (USD)

From: Auto-Receipt (noreply@mail.authorize.net)

To: Meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Saturday, February 6, 2021, 01:38 PM EST

Order Information

Description: Annual Registration [e7f2e41f-a8bd-4e7b-bfab-9d5f3858b75f]

Billing Information

Meghan Kelly

19939

Meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Shipping Information

Total: \$353.00 (USD)

Payment Information

Date/Time: 6-Feb-2021 10:38:16 PST

Transaction ID: 62839723216

Payment Method: Visa xxx9775

Transaction Type: Purchase

Auth Code: 748294

Merchant Contact Information

Delaware Supreme Court Attorney Registration

Wilmington, DE 19801

US

terros@doellegal.com

Re: Nick of time response/Glad your kid is okRe: Your kid/meg worried

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: mvavala@dsba.org

Date: Thursday, May 27, 2021, 02:19 PM EDT

Thank you Mark.

Please remain uninvolved, as I might have to seek further action, and state agents may get in trouble. Please remain uninvolved, even with your child.

I am grateful, she has her job.

This is a serious matter.

Very truly,
Meg

On Thursday, May 27, 2021, 01:24:20 PM EDT, Mark Vavala <mvavala@dsba.org> wrote:

Meg, I won't be involved in whatever transpires. As for my knowing your situation, there have been at least five other members who have approached me since COVID who needed assistance in some form and were in financial difficulties. I didn't refer anyone who contacted me to either ODC or DE-LAP, so I really don't know anything more.

Again, you will remain in my prayers.

Mark

Mark S. Vavala, Esq.,

Executive Director,

Delaware State Bar Association

405 N. King Street, Suite 100

Wilmington, DE 19801

(302) 658-5279 (office)

(302) 658-5212 (fax)



www.dsba.org

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 1:12 PM
To: Mark Vavala <MVavala@dsba.org>
Subject: Re: Nick of time response/Glad your kid is okRe: Your kid/meg worried

Mark

You are the only one in the world, other than the Supreme Court who knew of my waiver. I am disappointed. I sought relief from the Delaware Supreme Court to make both the ODC and DE-Lapp desist. Please refrain from participating further. It is in the Supreme Court's hands now, whether my order will be granted or denied.

Thank you,

Meg

On Thursday, May 27, 2021, 12:10:15 PM EDT, Mark Vavala <mvavala@dsba.org> wrote:

Hi Meg. I don't know what you are referring to. I didn't submit your name to any ODC/DE-LAP matter at all. My correspondences with you have always been cordial. I saw the letter you sent as a copy in your last email and that was the first time I saw DE-LAP had contacted you. Carol and I have a good working relationship and I respect all she does to help out attorneys, but she keeps her matters confidential from me. If it is something else I did, please let me know as I take seriously any accusation that I threw someone under the bus. I know how hard you work and how passionate you are about your issues.

That being said, if DE-LAP reaches out, then someone did suggest you needed help and I encourage everyone to go that route rather than having ODC get your case. Carol is confidential and has helped a lot of attorneys...not just those who need help, but those who have been referred unnecessarily and having her in your corner is great. She works tirelessly to make sure that people don't run into trouble.

Again, though, I see that as your personal right to make that choice.

Please take care,

Mark

Mark S. Vavala, Esq.,

Executive Director,

Delaware State Bar Association

405 N. King Street, Suite 100

Wilmington, DE 19801

(302) 658-5279 (office)

(302) 658-5212 (fax)



www.dsba.org

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021 8:34 AM
To: Mark Vavala <MVavala@dsba.org>; Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fw: Nick of time response/Glad your kid is okRe: Your kid/meg worried

Mark,

Maybe you threw me under the bus for self interest because I asked for help in the past? I am disappointed.

Please do better by refraining from participating in burdening my first amendment freedoms in my suit, my free exercise of religious beliefs, freedom of conscience from substantial burden by persecution by the forced will of the state through its arms to serve money and material gain, not good by love and respect for humanity, instead exploitation to serve self interest by the mere fact I choose to live God's will

Thank you.

Meg

— Forwarded Message —

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: Mark Vavala <mvavala@dsba.org>

Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2021, 07:55:17 AM EDT

Subject: Nick of time response/Glad your kid is okRe: Your kid/meg worried

Hi Mark,

Thank you for writing back as I was going to draft something to look after your kid.

I sent a motion for the supreme court to rein in its arms. I actually retained the new ODC guy in a case as an arbitrator. He should know better than to unlawfully interfere.

I am reviewing a slew of executive orders where I see Bush Junior, Obama, Trump, and Biden all misbehaved. In particular Bush Junior talked about deregulating obstacles meaning the free exercise clause in 3 or more of his orders to pay churches to perform government work in a whored, bought or bartered, bribed union of church and state to essentially whore churches to the state, the blasphemous backing by buying the appearance of backing of God. This is an abomination.

I digress, Biden misbehaved in his Feb 14 executive order by talking about preserving the free exercise clause while destroying the same by continuing to purchase churches bought, bartered for, bribed, backing not free but bought, for services to perform government work, causing inefficiencies guaranteed. The churches create the illusion of charity but they serve business greed and supplement with fundraising which as you know I believe damns people to hell as not true charity by teaching deception as truth. Business greed is not true charity per Jesus Matthew 6:1-5, but is the mark of children of the devil, the beast, should they not wash away such inequity and be made clean.

The root of the religious dissention we have seen in our country in recent years is the love of money not the love of any God. Trump merely watered it, allowing it to pierce through the surface with unholy weeds. (biblical reference weeds). I see federal servants speaking of global war, using my God as Mickey mouse mascot for war profit, exploiting the pandemic. That is not okay. The courts are my hope for a hero to correct and prevent harm. They can make Biden behave too. They will be in charge of guiding him to do good, by love of humanity, not evil, by love of funding and money at the cost of sacrificing troops lives. God desires mercy not sacrifice. Christians go after the 1 and leave the 99 behind. I should fear God should I sacrifice the weak, the sick, the elderly, the vulnerable, the misguided to the wolves to serve the pack. Troops are manipulated like the government's bitches, like dogs by praise and profit to be exploited like call girls for war money, not freedom. I must seek to protect them. You may see my words and deeds as an insult offense, but God teaches it is love to reign in folks from the slaughter. Love is not feeling good. It is actually feeling bad, having a conscience at harm to one's brother, our brother is all of humanity, to lose one to eternal sin, is to lose an irreplaceable treasure forever. Courts can guide the misled back to the narrow way and save souls, if I guide the misled courts to do so. The Supreme Court is hard headed and confused. I must seek to correct them. I am pretty sure my case will go to the Supreme Court eventually if not on this appeal, unless Biden surprises me by agreeing to a stipulation.

I asked the court to stand down its arms.

So, glad you spoke up since I already drafted something and held off on sending it since it was late. Please tell your arms to stand down and stop interfering to prevent escalation. Attached, please find a motion the court received where I respectfully requested your arms stop interfering in my case through threats or otherwise, especially Judge Clark. I was so disappointed in him.

Thank you. Have a good day.

With love and gratitude your kid is okay,

Meg

On Wednesday, May 26, 2021, 07:17:58 PM EDT, Mark Vavala <mvavala@dsba.org> wrote:

Hi Meg. No worries! My daughter moved to New York after working with ODC only for a short while. She wanted to live in Manhattan. My niece Kathy still works at ODC.

Thank you for your kind words. I really hope that you are well and aren't too stressed over all the things you wrote me about last time. I think the last President did some horrible things and I'm hopeful we all get a break from that behavior. It would be nice if everyone just treated each other with compassion and kindness. We never know what someone is going through.

Please take care of yourself. And stay safe.

Mark

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 11:54 AM
To: Mark Vavala <MVavala@dsba.org>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: Your kid/meg worried

Hi Mark,

You were kind to me, and respected me as a human, even if you did not agree with me over all these years.

Others have not been so kind. Thank you.

I am concerned that your daughter may have lost her job at the ODC, because you were kind, and treated people like me fairly, without disparate treatment based on poverty, religion or political association.

I am sad I did not write anything to the court to address that.

I am sorry people get into trouble in this world for doing the right thing.

I hope your kid is working at another safe place.

Thank you for being a hero by your love for humanity, not sacrificing people for profit or praise. That makes you different.

Love,

Meg

SUPREME COURT OF DELAWARE

LISA A. DOLPH
Clerk

DORIS J. ADKINS
Chief Deputy Clerk
DEBRA J. ZATLOKOVICZ
Senior Court Clerk
RENÉ A. WORRELL
Senior Court Clerk
ELIZABETH A. FELICIANO
Senior Court Clerk

SUPREME COURT BUILDING
55 THE GREEN
DOVER DE 19901

(302) 739-4155
(302) 739-4156

February 2, 2021

Meghan Marie Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

Dear Ms. Kelly;

The Court acknowledges receipt of your letter dated January 7, 2021, wherein you request that the attorney registration fees for lawyers out of work due to the pandemic be waived. Attorneys wishing to have the assessment fee waived must file a formal request. The Court will take each request under consideration as received and act appropriately.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Lisa A. Dolph

MEGHAN MARIE KELLY, ESQUIRE

**34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939**

February 5, 2021

**Delaware Supreme Court
55 The Green
Dover, DE 19901**

**RE: Suspension of lawyer fees/Equal Protections concern/New
Request 2022, flat fee for all licensure fees not based on years
which is not rationally related to a legitimate purpose, instead
arguably may be age discrimination to weed out older lawyers**

Dear Honorable Supreme Court Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Jr.:

**I hope you are healthy and well. Thank you for the February 2, 2021
letter in which the Court indicated it would consider requests for waivers of
attorney fees on a case by case basis, by formal request.**

**My concern, is accepting applications for waivers on a case by case
basis violates the Equal Protections Clause applicable to the State's agencies,
even the courts via the 14th Amendment, by disparate treatment within a
class. I am likely not the only one out of work due to the pandemic. Others
are struggling too. A case by case determination would likely be per se
unconstitutional.**

**I will likely never have standing to stand up for those similarly
situated with myself. Yet, if I made such a request, I would be asking the
Court to treat me with preference instead of impartiality as required by law.**

My conscience may not allow me to make such a request, tempting this Honorable Court to misbehave to serve my own gain.

I can, however, request that all fees for attorney registrations be the same regardless of years barred. So, I am making such a request for future consideration for 2022 and beyond. Please treat all lawyers the same by requiring the same lawyer registration fee for every lawyer, without persecution towards attorneys with more years of experience by an increased fee. There is no rational basis for an increase in lawyer's fees based on number of years, except the desire for more money.

It is wrong to assume the longer you have been barred, the more money you have or must pay.

I am saddened when I see unjust decrees and policies based on the love of money, desire for money, at the cost of driving out the love for humanity, the people the state serves.

On an aside, the reason why I became a lawyer is my faith in Jesus Christ. Justice in the Courts is a command by God. See Amos 5:15. Jesus Christ taught that "justice, mercy, and faithfulness" are more important commands. Matthew 23:23.

Just like not all secular laws are afforded the same weight, but are superseded by greater laws for example federal laws preempt and supersede conflicting state laws, not all of God's laws are afforded the same weight but are superseded by the law of love. (See, John 19:11, Jesus told Pilate ...“ the one who handed me over to you has the greater sin.”); (See, 1 John 5:17, “All wrongdoing is sin, and there is sin that does not lead to death.”); (See, Luke 6:3-4 “Jesus replied, ‘Have you not read what David did when he and his companions were hungry? He entered the house of God, took the consecrated bread and gave it to his companions, and ate what is lawful only for the priests to eat.’” King David violated the Levitical laws to live for God. Yet, he was not guilty of wrong doing.); (See Hosea 6:6, Matthew 9:13, Matthew 12:7, Proverbs 21:3, Isaiah 1:11, God desires mercy not sacrifice.); (See, Isaiah 1:13-15 “Bring your worthless offerings no more; your incense is detestable to Me—your New Moons, Sabbaths, and convocations. I cannot endure iniquity in a solemn assembly. 14I hate your New Moons and your appointed feasts. They have become a burden to Me; I am weary of bearing them. When you spread out your hands in prayer, I will hide My eyes from you; even though you multiply your prayers, I will not listen. Your hands are covered with blood.”); (See, Matthew 12:1-8, Mark 2:23:28, and Luke 6:1-5, Jesus picks grain on the Sabbath, allegedly violating

the law of the Sabbath, but not breaking the law.); (See, Matthew 12:9-14, Mark 3:1-6, and Luke 6:6-11, Jesus healed a man with a withered man on the Sabbath); (Luke 13:10-17, Jesus healed a woman with a hurt back on the Sabbath.); (Luke 14:1-6, Jesus healed a man with dropsy on the Sabbath); (John 5:1-9, John 7:21-24, Jesus healed a cripple man, who could not go into a pool of water without help.); (John 9:1-41, Jesus cures a blind man on the Sabbath.).

I believe the courts have the power to save lives and eternal lives. Our nation is in need of a hero. I know that the Courts have no power unless lawyers humble themselves and ask for their help. Now is a time I need my license to practice law the most.

I live in Sussex County where Bible boys gone wild teach anarchy, lawlessness, is freedom. Lawlessness is not freedom, but tyranny by those with money, power and connections without restraint, called laws to stop them from harming others to serve their own.

Some churches are misbehaving by inciting insurrection and disobedience to laws to attend services, which they call Sabbath, to serve their coffers.

Many preach breaking the Sabbath violates Jesus Christ's teachings. Jesus teaches us we break a greater law of love by not safeguarding the

health and valuing the dignity of lives of others, by failing to break the so-called Sabbath to preserve the health and lives of others. Id.

They preach for their own vanity, their own purpose, not to glorify God by his love and mercy. They are confused, and really do not know. They are tempted to break small laws meant for their benefit, to break greater laws by profiting off of the unholy cries for “Gods, guns and freedom.” My God is a God of life and love not death for dollars.

Our nation and the world is in trouble. I believe the Courts have the power to be our hero to save us, if we only have the courage to ask.

Things are not ok down here in Sussex. People see evil as good and good as evil.

The government through its agents misbehaves by citing the same passages in the Bible the KKK cites to serve their own gain under the guise of Godliness by violating Jesus’s teachings too.

Jesus says there is “no greater sacrifice than to lay down your life for one’s friend.” John 15:13 Jesus next says “You are my friend if you do what I command you.” John 15:14 Jesus commands us to love our enemies, not kill them. Matthew 5:38-48, Luke 6:27-36, Romans 12:14-21, Proverbs 25:21, Exodus 23:4-5. Yet, the military misleads our troops to harm enemies, under the guise of Godliness, but in truth to serve the vanity of

men. The troops are misled to potentially be damned to hell by serving reign by might not right, reign by violence and threat of death like barbarians instead of logic and reason in the courts. See, Hebrews 2:14, the devil has power over death. Jesus came to give life and eternal life. See, John 6:51.

With the acceptance of the cloak of government authority, government servants have fewer freedoms to share their belief and may not condemn nor support a religious belief under the inherent threat of persecution against people for believing differently than those with government authority.


This Court does not have to believe as I do, to safeguard everyone's freedom to worship or not according to the dictates of their own conscience, without government sponsored persecution.

The Supreme Court misbehaves too. Please see the attached. I fear Justice Alito, Justice Kavanaugh and Justice Thomas are confused into believing in sacrificing human life to keep the so-called Sabbath and to serve business greed is keeping the law. They are wrong. They love money not humanity, and will sacrifice those the Constitution protects to serve the almighty dollar under the guise of an almighty God or good. See, Matthew 6:24. I think those justices will go to hell if they are not corrected by our courts or otherwise. Confusion kills. See 2 Corinthians 4:4.

This Court has the power to save lives and eternal lives, even the lives of US Supreme Court justices, via correction with mercy, to prevent condemnation by transforming wrong doers into right doers, by love for one another, not exploitation of one another to serve the love of money.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Respectfully submitted,


Meghan Kelly, Esquire

Bar # 4968

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

(Word Count 1431)

CC: LD, via Email

**Freedoms are not for sale
Business is not religion
Business Greed is not God**

The Supreme Court has before it a case to determine whether a government entity violates the free exercise of religion of a religious business organization by refusing to pay a Catholic agency to foster kids.

I argue it is not. I must confess, the Cake decision in *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*, where a similar issue arose, was as smooth as butter, so easy to swallow. But I realize now, the Honorable Supreme Court's decision is poison in that case too. It just took months to get through my hard head because I was so captivated by the brilliant, persuasive writing of the Supreme Court Justices.

Thank you for allowing me to share some hard to swallow words, that are nourishment to maintaining our freedom from government sponsored private oppression.

The distinguishing element in the Cake case and the one before the Honorable Supreme Court now is performing business by barter or exchange is not freedom, but costs a form of exchange. The critical element is looking at the permission to accept money in the form of business verses lawlessly turning people away, from serving a good or service based on personal religious beliefs or beliefs of conscience. The license to accept money verses the fundamental right to give money for a service or good without being turned away, based on religion, like race, or place of origin, is the critical.

Think of the horrors of our own history that we have overcome, the signs "No Catholics served here," "No Irish," or "No blacks."

Think of Delaware's ugly scar in *William Burton v Wilmington Parking Authority*, 365 U.S. 715 (1961), a government agency wrongfully permitted a business it leased a restaurant building to, to maintain a policy of saying no blacks served here. The Supreme Court kindly, like a loving parent, corrected our own misbehavior Delaware. It is wrong to tell people they may not be served here, even under the guise of God or good.

We have the freedom to worship or not according to the dictates of our own conscience, without government sponsored public or private persecution.

I thought hard about the 13th Amendment, involuntary servitude, and truth clunked in my hard head. Business is not a right. Freedoms are not for sale. Business is not a religion. Business greed is not God.

Businesses should not be in business if they get to turn away certain segments of society. If your religion requires discrimination in the business, you may choose a different business.

Freedom is not for sale. The government misbehaves by endorsing the premise those who do not conform to the beliefs of businessmen, women or entities may be turned away. Will business greed under the guise of Godliness become the religion of many more? Jesus Christ says, "You cannot serve both God and money." Citing, Matthew 6:24. I choose to guide folks to love one another, not exploit others to serve their own for their love and trust in money, as God.

Should the Supreme Court declare the mark of the beast, business greed is God, Congress through the interstate commerce clause has the power to balance, correct the Supreme Court's misbehavior, by passing laws to prevent businesses from turning people away based on religion, or other factors under the guise of religion, such as race, or place of origin.

Thank you for allowing me to share my concerns.

Appendix T

MEGHAN MARIE KELLY, ESQUIRE

34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

January 7, 2021

Delaware Supreme Court
55 The Green
Dover, DE 19901

**RE: Covid 19 order/Please suspend attorney fees for lawyers
unemployed due to the pandemic**

Dear Honorable Supreme Court Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Jr.:

Thank you for allowing lawyers to file pleadings with the court via email so we do not die of Covid 19.

I am writing to respectfully request this Honorable Court waive attorney registration fees for lawyers, out of work, due to the pandemic.

I worked in 2018, but in 2019-2020, I worked without pay, actually sacrificing from what I little I had by contacting federal law makers in an attempt to:

1. Prevent the elimination of social security and Medicare, replaced with Matthew 6 violations (forced volunteering or business, not for profit and charitable donations and fundraising which I believe violate Jesus's teachings leading to harm and hell by teaching giving to get is love, driving out God, love, from the hearts of men replaced with business greed,

which I believe is the mark of the damned should they not unhardened their hearts).

2. Prevent oil and gas drilling up and down our coast.

On an aside, I am disappointed in my relative by affinity, Mark Braden, Esq., former counsel to the Republican party in DC. His kid has a job related to off shore drilling. So did one of Mr. George Cole's kids. Mr. George Cole retired from office, as the longest serving local politician in one seat in Delaware's history. (Mike Castle does not count since he hopped seats.). It is wrong to compromise the environment and people's lives to serve your own family, especially by political people charged to serve the public.

3. Improve healthcare. Our healthcare is terrible because our laws and policies reward misbehavior and bad or different, not better care, at the expense of human life and health. Changing the laws would improve care. Throwing money at fundraisers and healthcare is incentive for more bad care, greed for more and more money.

Just decrees teach people to care about other people. Unjust decrees teach people to love money, rewarding misbehavior, encouraging folks to harm one another by ignorance or otherwise to serve money.

4. Prevent the kill old people laws suggested to save money.

People are priceless, not price tags. The elderly, ill and vulnerable are easily manipulated into believing hurting themselves helps others through the death with dignity acts.

There is too much temptation for people to encourage the elderly to harm themselves, die, and sadly I believe go to hell. Judas and Saul went to hell in the Bible for killing themselves.

Leaders misbehave when they draft laws and policies which encourage those they serve to die and potentially go to hell. I want people to live and have eternal life. Per the bible, just decrees and justice in the courts has the power to save lives and eternal lives.

You really have the power to be life savers and eternal life savers as judges, via correction to prevent condemnation in hell for the love of money driving out love for humanity.

5. I proposed 5 articles of impeachment and contacted all 541 federal law makers.

Since, I did not work during 2019-2020, I am not eligible for the \$600 bail out, and will not likely be eligible for future bail outs.

My old law firm was interested in me in 2020. I was negotiating for a position, per the attached emails. I stopped the negotiations to sue the

Democrats because seeking to do the right thing is more important than money. Then, the pandemic hit. I withdrew my law suit since I did not want people to die, and reached out to my law firm. Negotiations are on a stand still. Covid19 hampered prospects.

I am concerned about dying for dollars, during this pandemic. I actually was born with breathing problems, and have severe allergies that make my throat close up. So, catching covid19 would likely be a death sentence for me.

Thank you for considering my life potentially more valuable than a few hundred dollars.

The Supreme Court could possibly include a suspension of lawyer fees, solely for the unemployed, in their covid19 measures. I tried to contact the Governor too. The Governor could also include a suspension for licensure fees for those unemployed, limited to those not using their license during the pandemic, too.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Respectfully submitted,



Meghan Kelly, Esquire

Pro Se, Bar # 4968

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

(Word Count 76P6)

Re: McDonnell/Meg Kelly/ void November 19 Contract

From: Christie McDonnell (christie.mcdonnell@mcdonnelllawfirm.com)

To: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Cc: Virginia.Gaitens@McDonnelllawfirm.com

Date: Friday, November 22, 2019, 08:38 AM EST

I tried to negotiate for more money

Good morning, Meg,

Per your request we will tear up the offer you signed thus making it null and void. We do not accept your counteroffer.

We wish you the very best.

****All Funds greater than \$5,000 must be WIRED to our trust account. Please CALL your Closer if you need our wiring instructions. Due to the rise in wire fraud, our wiring instructions will not be resent via email. Please note that McDonnell and Associates does not change our wiring instructions. Please call your closer immediately if you receive revised wiring instructions.****

Regards,

Christie McDonnell
Chief Strategy Officer
(843) 375-8930 (office)
Christie.McDonnell@McDonnellLawFirm.com | McDonnellLawFirm.com

This message and any attachments are solely for the intended recipient and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, use, or distribution of the information included in this message and any attachments is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by reply e-mail and immediately and permanently delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.

On Nov 22, 2019, at 7:28 AM, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good morning,

Please tear up the contract for \$55,000.

Attached, please find my first salary as a licensed attorney, \$135,000.00.

With this additional potential liability and responsibility should anyone mess up on IOLTA accounts, state and federal taxes, or attorney work product, I require a higher salary.

I do not need this job, but you need a managing attorney in Delaware, in addition to an office to perform any business in this state period.

You can always open additional offices to house employees, but few attorneys would manage because of the great risk.

I require a firm credit card for business expenses, and a detailed explanation on how taxes will be handled in Delaware.

I assume McDonnell's South Carolina head quarters would handle payroll and adhere to Delaware's local, state and federal income taxes. If this is not the case, I am not interested.

I must be able to oversee others through trustworthy team members or by other means.

I require details concerning the professional liability insurance that will cover me and any potential employees.

Down the line, I require anti-discrimination training based on gender, race, religion or place of origin to be signed by all employees.

Delaware is number 2 in foreclosures in the entire country. Your firm is merely opening up. I know this small start is going to grow dramatically into a large beast sooner than you realize. I need to tame this beast now. So I keep it under control and in adherence to Delaware law. So it does not transform into a monster.

I was disappointed to see Jennifer Cooper, Esq. is an attorney too, not an accountant.

I need to be able to have access to each and every item I must review on IOLTA accounts. I must be comfortable and may need a few days to practice in house in South Carolina. Please help me on this. This is mandatory. I must be comfortable adhering to the IOLTA. I must know how to adhere to them before I leave South Carolina.

Would you consider \$135,000, my first year's salary as an attorney?

I am not going to be exploited, nor will I exploit others. I gave my life to God, not to man's greedy, self serving desires. I desire to serve, to teach respect for the dignity of every person in my life, regardless of race, religion or place of origin, not respect for the mere bottom line.

The purpose of my life is bigger than bucks. So is yours. Your life is worth more than money and can not be bought or enslaved by mere peanuts. I will not be exploited and enslaved for mere peanuts.

Thank you for your time. I am copying my most trusted friend.

Think about it.

Have a good weekend.

Best regards,
Meg Kelly, Esq.

Would you consider

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: matthewkosiorek@comcast.net
Date: May 18, 2013 at 9:16:00 AM EDT
To: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: Richards