

**CONFIDENTIAL
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Meghan Kelly

FROM: Gregory P. Williams

RE: Employment Arrangement

DATE: November 20, 2006

This memorandum outlines the arrangement, which was made concerning your employment with Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.

The following arrangements have been established for your employment commencing November 20, 2006:

1. You will be subject to the same terms and conditions of employment as all other associates (including quality of work, oversight and annual review), except as set forth below. The Firm's expectation is that you will continue to work billable hours comparable to those worked by other full-time associates in the Business Department. All non-billable work hours should be approved by your assigning director.
2. You will be paid an annual base salary of \$135,000. In the future, any adjustments will be made by the Ad Hoc Associate Salary and Bonus Committee.
3. You will not be entitled to bonuses. You may be eligible for bonuses in an amount which will be determined by the Firm.
4. You are not on track for admission to the Firm as a director and you will not be considered for election to the board of directors of the Firm.

-1-

RLFADMIN-3061182-1


5. You will have an assigning director and will generally, other than what is set forth in this memorandum, receive the same benefits as and otherwise be treated in a similar manner as any other associate.
6. These employment arrangements will be reviewed by the Firm on or ~~before June 30 of each year commencing with June 30, 2007, unless such~~ arrangements have been terminated.

7. As with all employees of the Firm, your employment is at-will.



Gregory P. Williams
President
Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.

11/20/06
Date



Meghan Kelly

11/30/06
Date

9/2021

RE: part 1 Happy Labor Day weekend/ Meg Kelly/old complaint against the democrats

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

To: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Wednesday, September 9, 2020, 01:02 PM EDT

Hey Meg,
I hope you are doing well and staying safe! Are you looking to do contract closings? You may remember we do closings at borrowers homes/offices etc. I thought that was something you were not fond of doing.

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, September 6, 2020 8:58 AM

To: Christie McDonnell <Christie.McDonnell@mcdonnelllawfirm.com>; Christie McDonnell <Christie.McDonnell@mcdonnelllawfirm.com>

Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Subject: part 1 Happy Labor Day weekend/ Meg Kelly/old complaint against the democrats

Hi Christie,

I hope you are doing well, and staying safe.

I am working on a complaint for immediate equitable relief against President Trump that will likely go to the US Supreme Court.

I do not have to pay court costs if I make below poverty pay for state or federal courts, or even the Supreme Court. I do not know if costs must be paid should I retain an attorney down the line. I will ask the court.

In the meantime,

I am willing to work as an independent contractor for very low pay, not gaining personal income for what I bring in as I work on my personal task to save the country, or in the alternative I may be able to find an attorney who will not require I pay court costs.

I will send you a draft complaint. It is important that you insulate the firm from my personal venture, in case you are interested in me.

In the meantime, I am showing you what I filed against the Democrats and withdrew.

It is like the wild, wild West in Delaware. Biden will not be our hero. We have to choose to be the heroes for one another by our love for others.

I apologize, my new phone is not working, but I thank you for your time and consideration. I am willing to risk my life for God, not money, and I would work to safeguard the firm and the client's health, even if I look like a dork in protective gear.

Thank you for your kind consideration. Side note, I have a little bit of the inside scoop since I worked in the largest corporate law firm in DE, the corporate center of the globe. I seek to prevent the man made, unnatural economic crash too.

Stay safe.

Love,
Meg

Appendix U

MEGHAN KELLY, ESQ.

34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

Third Circuit Court of Appeals
James A. Byrne United States Courthouse
601 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106

RE: /Kelly v Swartz, et al. **No. 22-3198 and 22-8037** Meg filed a Second Motion for a Stay and a Rule 60 Motion with the DE District Court requiring a stay in the Third Circuit/Procedural issue

October 14, 2022

Dear Honorable Court:

On October 7, 2022, I mailed out *Plaintiff Meghan Kelly's Motion pursuant to FRCP R. 60(b)(1)(2)(3)(4)(6) to alter and amend the orders, dated November 2, 2022, December 22, 2021, and April 26, 2022, and Motion to Stay the Proceeding until the State Proceeding is concluded, including appeals to the US Supreme Court or the time for appeal has concluded and Plaintiff Meghan M Kelly's Second Motion to stay the Proceeding until the conclusion of Respondent's originating disciplinary proceeding until a final non-appealable determination is made or the time of appeal has lapsed. Plaintiff further moves the Court, for good cause for permission to file an Amended complaint 30 days after the stay is lifted* I filed a Motion to amend the Order under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 60, incorporated herein by reference with the Delaware District Court.

The Court received the filings on October 11, 2022, but required additional time to file them. I see a filing error. Docket Item 95-4, Page 2-8 Page ID 12619 through Page ID 12625 should be removed from Docket Item 95, and placed **after** entry Docket Item 96 Page 12 Page ID 12640, and before Docket entry Docket Item 96-1, Page 1-12 12641.

The Court required extra time to look through the material accurately per my phone calls. The misfiling of the Second Motion for a Stay hopefully was not done intentionally, especially in light of the extra two or three days the staff took to allegedly carefully review the documents.

Nevertheless, I am concerned about the oversight, especially since parts of the Motion were split between two docket item numbers. It would alleviate a burden off the backs of the staff and place the responsibility upon me to accurately file should permission to e-file be restated in the Delaware District Court.

There are new and additional facts opposing counsel is aware of I could not discover without reasonable diligence. I actually am waiting to learn of more material facts, per the attached email for a complete more accurate understanding.

I pray the Delaware District Court grants a stay in order that I may file all the new facts as they arise at once at the conclusion of the Delaware Disciplinary appeal to the US Supreme Court instead of constantly potentially ping ponging between courts.

Otherwise, I will be required to file yet another motion to amend the facts and findings relating to newly discovered information I have not received as even today.

Regardless, the Third Circuit Court should be stayed upon my filing a timely appeal within 30 days of the determination of the Delaware District Court's motion, not prior to the filing of my appeal notice.

I will appeal an Amended Appeal per your procedural non legal instructions.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

October 14, 2022

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
302-493-6693
Bar No 4968 DEACTIVE

Appendix V

SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER	§	No. 2913 DD3
OF THE BAR	§	No. 118 DB 2022
	§	(Supreme Court of Delaware, No. 58,
	§	2022)
MEGHAN M. KELLY,	§	Attorney Registration No. 202268
Respondent.	§	(out of state)

Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's Motion pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 105 for permission to file unconfirming documents and to compel the acceptance of rejected documents upon the date of their submission, with allowance for opposing counsel to respond

I, Meghan M. Kelly, pro se non-attorney, retired, respondent, pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 105 move this honorable Court for permission to file unconfirming documents and to compel the Court to accept and docket rejected documents upon the date of their submission, with allowance for opposing counsel to respond, as if the date was tolled on the date of their docketing, the later date. I aver as follows:

Background

1. This disciplinary case arises because the State of Delaware does not want to be inconvenienced by upholding my Constitutional religious beliefs that do not conform to their desires. I am a Christian. I believe people sin and serve lawlessness by focus on productivity, money, convenience, costs and profit. It creates injustice and bias towards the Courts by teaching judges to have an evil unjust eye to look at people as products to exploit for material gain, instead of

people to respect, even if their religious beliefs do not conform to the belief of the majority, that money and material gain is goal.

2. Jesus teaches most people choose the way to hell. God teaches ignorance, not knowing, misunderstanding, confusion between lusts and love, if left in the dark leads to people's destruction in hell, should they not be saved by truth. Hosea 4:6. I believe that courts may save not only lives, but eternal lives too by those misguided by lawless lusts, business greed, at the exchange of harming, oppressing and destroying, essentially selling the souls of other people to repent, to turn away from such evil praised as good.

3. Jesus teaches you cannot serve God and money. Jesus teaches what profits a man to gain the world only to lose his eternal soul in hell.

4. I believe every judge and person who focuses on the government service of the judiciary in terms of costs, productivity and mere business corrupt the courts guaranteeing injustice by teaching judges to value moth and rust money and material gain at the cost of sacrificing individuals and individual liberty, making the people not free, but for sale products in contravention to the 13th Amendment. I believe the focus on convenience, costs and productivity at the cost of exchanging the souls, the life and liberty of people as if they are expendable products is lawlessness spoken of in the Bible misleading people to lose eternal life

in hell for just doing their job, doing what the rules require, what they are told to do. US Amend XIII.

5. Government is not a business, and the people are free, not for sale products to serve individuals within the state or the government backed private or foreign partners. The government has it backwards the people should not serve their country to be sacrificed, the country should serve and care for its people.

6. For years I have sent petitions to the Delaware Courts asserting my right to exercise religious beliefs, and from being compelled to violate my religious beliefs for the mere convenience of the state or government backed private and foreign partners. From my inception into the Bar in DE, the Clerk of Court compelled me to violate my religious belief by swearing in the Bar, when I specifically made a religious objection to swearing in.

7. The Exhibits to the petitions are voluminous but necessary to my defense. I also assert additional testimony and evidence is necessary to my defense. I discovered to my horror, additional Delaware Supreme Court collusion in misconduct in inciting the disciplinary case, which is necessary to my defense of reciprocal discipline by the PA Supreme Court.

8. I have also experienced hardship, in terms of a computer broke, internet issues, and a printer that required repair. I filed a letter this court refused to docket, I attach hererto and request it be docketed as not to deny me an

opportunity to be heard in violation of the 1st and 14th Amendment upon the date of its submission, I think December 13, 2022. I attach it hereto and incorporate it herein.

9. Josh, the Case manager recommended I submit an amended motion for a reconsideration this Court refused to docket. I request that be docketed on the record for the Court to accept or reject.

10. That item was not docketed. I filed it on December 13, 2022. It was rejected with delay prejudicing me on December 15, 2022.

11. Under emergency circumstances, on December 19, 2022 I submitted a Second Motion for a Stay and in the alternative a continuation the Court refused to docket. I request this be docketed. I attach that motion hereto and incorporate it herein.

12. The Court indicated it asserts its right not to receive unconfirming documents on a comments section, despite this court's prior grant of receipt of my unconfirming pro se filings in accordance to my prior motions under Pa. R.A.P. 105.

13. I believe this Court previously was amicable to my prior motion to file unconfirming documents under Pa. R.A.P. 105.

14. I request the Clerk be instructed to file such documents, especially since a stay is still required, and testimony and evidence is better gathered in the open Delaware District Court Forum.

15. I am prejudiced by the denial of an opportunity to be heard and by the denial of motions by this Court indirectly by this Court's failure to submit them for review.

16. I have submitted two motions on December 22, 2022 that were not accepted yet, that I request this Court compel the Clerk to accept. I request this Court order their submission. That way a judgment is not rendered in bad faith, indirectly, by refusing me an opportunity to be heard on the motions.

17. On December 22, 2022, I submitted 1. *Petitioner Meghan Kelly's Motion to exempt costs or expenses to Pennsylvania Disciplinary Counsel and/or to the Board if applicable due to utter poverty, and due to foreseeable costs creating a substantial burden upon Petitioner's access to the courts and forced violation of her religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness and additional relief and* 2. *Respondent Meghan Kelly's motion to separately file exhibits or additional exhibits and incorporate them herein in their entirety by reference in her motion contesting reciprocal discipline.*

18. I am prejudiced by the failure of the Court to submit these documents. I am having a hard time uploading the exhibits necessary to defend my license, and the apparent due date is today.

19. I am prejudiced by the denial of time I require and am compelled to throw together something that is not up to my personal standards due to inability to work on it. This Court did not know I was without access to my computer or tools since the Clerk refused to file documents where I apprise this Court of new hardships. This Court is without important knowledge that my health has suffered due to lack of time required to care for myself in light of limitations I previously apprised this Court of relating to a surgery that are a matter of life and death. Albeit, I told the case manager Josh on the phone that my health was suffering and the Court has notice on the record that I risk death should this Court refuse me an opportunity to have time to drink gallons of water and rest an ordinary person without a limitation does not require to sustain my health and life. Please see the attachments to my First Motion for a stay and turn towards the table of contents and pull the health document and letter from the Eastern District Court. My life should not be sacrificed and my health should not be lost for the convenience and profit of this Court because it does not want to safeguard my Constitutional First amendment rights and opportunity to be heard since the material is voluminous,

showing years of disparate treatment by DE against me with religious-political-poverty animus and indifference towards the rule of law, the Constitution.

20. I have religious objections to healthcare and mental health care. I believe people go to hell for even thinking they help people pay referring them to pay to eliminate problems. I believe people go to hell for teaching people to trust experts, making the experts God and guide and above Court correction if their professional standards are the standard the courts deer to. This allows bad businesses to be above the law, serving what I believe is the mark of the beast, damning the majority to lose eternal life on the last day. I desire judges to be the judge not businesses through paid professional experts. Business is not the law. Money is not the aim. Protecting individual and free will from forced oppression by private and public entities is. We learn from one another by diverse debate instead of dumbed down standardization which is made to serve lawless lusts convenience, expediency not justice, not fairness, not equality in terms of equal protections under the law where I protect your freedom to disagree with me and believe differently.

21. On an aside, I am not acting as an attorney. To my knowledge, I have never practiced in PA, and have been retired since 2018. I do not have access to a lot of resources attorneys actively practice do, as a pro se, non-attorney party. I admit, I thought I had to file a document within 30 days, which was rightly

rejected. I desperately sought to file a Motion for reargument on rejection of the first motion of a stay. I did not know that was not permitted and did not have access to the rules.

22. Nevertheless, the Motion to amend the motion for reargument and the Second Motion for a Stay where I asserted an ADA claim to protect my life, not only my liberty was not docketed. DE claims my religious beliefs are evidence of a “mental disability,” yet I have a physical limitation. This Court has notice of it on the record.

23. I was denied an opportunity to be heard in violation of the 1st and 14th Amendment on my Second Motion for a stay or in the alternative a continuation. Nevertheless, this Court may correct its error by submitting the documents, because a stay is required, and new evidence is best gathered in other forums in order not to prejudice me further by denying me First Amendment rights of life and liberty, due process and other foreseeable harm.

24. Attached, please also find part of my initial motion for a stay, I incorporate herein by reference and incorporate the entire motion, despite attaching part.

25. I sought to prevent the waste of resources requiring the pleading of voluminous documents to conserve resources at the inception, when this case may be stayed and resources conserved. This Court erred in denying my stay.

26. Pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 105

(a) *Liberal construction and modification of rules.*—These rules shall be liberally construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every matter to which they are applicable. In the interest of expediting decision, or for other good cause shown, an appellate court may, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (b) of this rule, disregard the requirements or provisions of any of these rules in a particular case on application of a party or on its own motion and may order proceedings in accordance with its direction.

(b) *Enlargement of time.*—An appellate court for good cause shown may upon application enlarge the time prescribed by these rules or by its order for doing any act, or may permit an act to be done after the expiration of such time, but the court may not enlarge the time for filing a notice of appeal, a petition for allowance of appeal, a petition for permission to appeal, a petition for review, or a petition for specialized review.”

27. I am prejudiced by throwing together something without adequate time while the government compels me to harm my health when my teeth and body is suffering now due to severe dehydration that may become deadly if not addressed. I am compelled to file something subpar to take time necessary to lay down with a gallons of water because of this Court’s denial of an opportunity to be heard on safeguarding not only my liberty, license, eternal life but my life too.

28. What is quite prejudicial in the failure to submit the motions I filed yesterday is I must file something today. I had trouble figuring out how to upload exhibits, given the record before the DE Board is voluminous, and I believe included a video exhibits. I have not had the opportunity or ability to look into this given my computer broke and time constraints.

29. I need to preserve my life. One of the motions relates to exhibits. I attempted to upload exhibits separately, and may place my pleading on the bottom. I do not want to confuse the Court or create additional work. I thought it would be easier to file exhibits separately so the court may not confuse exhibits for new pleadings. The motion is still necessary and should be filed on the record to show my attempt. Yet, I will probably file a response to the order, which prejudices me because I am denied meaningful opportunity to defend my license, under these exigent circumstances, without ability to revise, research and shorten my draft.

30. The response will be at the bottom, should I file it with the voluminous exhibits I took great time to upload late into the night.

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

Dated December 23, 2022 Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693
(2863 Words) Retired No 202268

26. Pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 105

(a) *Liberal construction and modification of rules.*—These rules shall be liberally construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every matter to which they are applicable. In the interest of expediting decision, or for other good cause shown, an appellate court may, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (b) of this rule, disregard the requirements or provisions of any of these rules in a particular case on application of a party or on its own motion and may order proceedings in accordance with its direction.

(b) *Enlargement of time.*—An appellate court for good cause shown may upon application enlarge the time prescribed by these rules or by its order for doing any act, or may permit an act to be done after the expiration of such time, but the court may not enlarge the time for filing a notice of appeal, a petition for allowance of appeal, a petition for permission to appeal, a petition for review, or a petition for specialized review.”

27. I am prejudiced by throwing together something without adequate time while the government compels me to harm my health when my teeth and body is suffering now due to severe dehydration that may become deadly if not

29. I need to preserve my life. One of the motions relates to exhibits. I attempted to upload exhibits separately, and may place my pleading on the bottom. I do not want to confuse the Court or create additional work. I thought it would be easier to file exhibits separately so the court may not confuse exhibits for new pleadings. The motion is still necessary and should be filed on the record to show my attempt. Yet, I will probably file a response to the order, which prejudices me because I am denied meaningful opportunity to defend my license, under these exigent circumstances, without ability to revise, research and shorten my draft.

30. The response will be at the bottom, should I file it with the voluminous exhibits I took great time to upload late into the night.

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

Dated December 23, 2022 Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693
(2863 Words) Retired No 202268

Appendix W

SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE MATTER OF A MEMBER §	No. 2913 DD3
OF THE BAR §	No. 118 DB 2022
	§ (Supreme Court of Delaware, No. 58,
	§ 2022)
MEGHAN M. KELLY,	§ Attorney Registration No. 202268
Respondent.	§ (out of state)

Respondent Meghan M Kelly's **Second Motion for a stay** due to circumstances increasing prejudice and harm, new facts arising necessary to my defense of reciprocal order, and additional questions that require answers in order to defend myself in response to the reciprocal order **in the alternative a continuance of 6 months**

I, Respondent Meghan M. Kelly, move this Court to stay this proceeding, until conclusion of both Respondent's originating disciplinary proceeding as well as the civil rights proceeding Kelly v Swartz, et al. Case Number 21-1490, until final non-appealable determinations are made or the time of appeal has lapsed. Respondent further moves the Court, for good cause, for permission to file the "for cause" motion 30 days after the stay is lifted, and in the alternative a continuance of 6 months I aver.

1. On November 8, 2022 this Honorable Court ordered:

"AND NOW, this 8th day of November, 2022, the Application to Waive Costs is dismissed as moot. The Motion to File Unconforming Pleadings is granted. See Pa.R.A.P. 124(b). The Motion to Stay the Proceeding is denied. Respondent is afforded an additional 30 days from the date of this Order to inform this Court of any grounds against the imposition of the identical or comparable discipline in this Commonwealth." (Hereinafter "Reciprocal-Order" or "Order")

2. New and additional facts necessary to my defense of reciprocal-order was recently discovered.

3. Additional questions I require answers necessary to my defense must be ascertained in order that I may defend my retired license, and related interests.

4. This Court must afford me procedural due process to prevent additional retaliation based on the Delaware Supreme Court, Court agents and the Delaware Office of disciplinary counsel's selective application of discipline against me in retaliation for the exercise of my First Amendment right to religious belief, First Amendment right to exercise religious belief, First Amendment right of association, First Amendment right of speech, 14th Amendment right to access to the courts, with religious-political-poverty animus which is a violation of the Equal Protections Clause. US Amend I, XIV.

5. The Delaware disciplinary proceeding violates my First Amendment right to the free exercise of religion, belief, speech, association and petition, by indicating my religious beliefs contained in my religious restoration act petitions are evidence of a mental disability. (Petition at 7, August 23, 2021 letter Exhibits 1 and 2). The Delaware Supreme Court impermissibly conditioned my license to practice law on the surrender of my protected exercise of Constitutional rights.

6. States may not inactivate my duly earned license to practice law nor can they deny me my retired Pennsylvania license to practice law as a consequence of exercising my freedom of religion, speech, association, the right to petition, equal protection and other federally protected rights which supersede, preempt and limit the state's power. The state may not condition the exercise of a Constitutional liberty, upon the loss of a state earned and my entitled benefit in my Delaware active license to practice law or retired Pennsylvania license to practice law.¹

¹ U.S. Const. art. VI., § 2; *See, Minn. Ass'n, Health Care v. Minn. Dept.*, P.W, 742 F.2d 442, 446 (8th Cir. 1984); "To be sure, a state may not condition the grant of a privilege, [a license,] or benefit upon the surrender of a constitutional right." 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); *See, Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 34 (1970); "The

7. I must be afforded an opportunity to overturn the Delaware order on appeal and in the civil rights case bin order to conserve resources and to prevent this court from creating an obstacle so great as to deny me access to the courts, even its own court.

8. Conditioning the loss of my property interest in my active or retired license to practice law on my decision to exercise of Constitutionally protected conduct to petition to safeguard my private-religious-exercise of beliefs, private religious-beliefs, private religious-political-affiliation, and private religious-political-professional association is unconscionable. The precedent set by the Delaware Supreme Court will chill other people from exercising their right to access the courts to address grievances they believe to have been committed against them by the government, which essentially making government above the law, should it not be overturned.²

9. I must be afforded an opportunity to gather accurate information for my defense to show that the disciplinary proceeding in Delaware **was not fair, but fixed** with members of

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, *E.g., Cafeteria Workers v. McElroy*, 367 U.S. 886, 894; *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404; *Speiser v. Randall*, 357 U.S. 513, 519-520; *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493, 499-500; *Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding*, 344 U.S. 590, 597-598; *Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n*, 271 U.S. 583, 593-594; see *Van Alstyne, The Demise of the Right-Privilege Distinction in Constitutional Law*, 81 Harv. L. Rev. 1439, 1445-1454 (1968); *Comment, Another Look at Unconstitutional Conditions*, 117 U. Pa. L. Rev. 144 (1968). As stated in *Homer v. Richmond*, 292 F.2d 719, 722: ("One may not have a constitutional right to go to Baghdad, but the Government may not prohibit one from going there unless by means consonant with due process of law."); See, *Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 35-36 (1970), ("Neither the state in general ... is free to prohibit any kind of expression because it does not like what is being said.")

² See, *Barry v. Barchi*, 443 U.S. 55, 65 n.11 (1979); "State law has engendered a clear expectation of continued enjoyment of a license absent proof of culpable conduct by the [me. I, have] asserted a legitimate 'claim of entitlement'" Citing, *Perry v. Sindermann*, 408 U.S. 593, 601 (1972); see *Board of Regents v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564 (1972); *Bell v. Burson*, 402 U.S. 535, 539 (1971); *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254 (1970).")

the Delaware Supreme Court exhibiting bias and collusion. I recently discovered the DE Supreme Court covered up my pleadings regarding due process violations in *Kelly v Trump* to prevent the US Supreme Court's review, a mistrial and to actively participate in prejudicing the case against me in the Delaware on or about December 1, 2022. It appears a member of the Court accessed the docket the date of the preliminary hearing, as opposed to merely sealing it on that date. The members of the Delaware Supreme Court appeared to cover up evidence material to my defense which was not accessible on the record in the Delaware preliminary hearing or the Delaware Board proceeding.

10. I must be afforded an opportunity to show I was denied basic procedural due process rights at the Delaware proceeding in contravention of the 1st and 14th Amendment protections that others similarly situated are afforded.³ On or about December 1, 2022, I discovered the Delaware Supreme Court sealed documents in *Kelly v Trump*

11. Due process requirement of fair trials before impartial tribunals extends to administrative tribunals as well as courts.⁴

³ *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."); (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.").

⁴ US Const. Amend I, V. (See, *Schweiker v. McClure*, 456 U.S. 188 (1982) reversed on other grounds; *Gibson v. Berryhill*, 411 U.S. 564, 570 (1973); *Ward v Village of Monroeville*, 409 US 57 61-62 (1972) ("Petitioner is entitled to a neutral and detached judge in the first instance."); *In Re Murchinson*, 349 US 133, 136 (1955); *Tumey v State of Ohio*, 273 US 510 (1927); *Withrow v. Larkin*, 421 U.S. 35, 46 (1975); *McCool v. Gehret*, 657 A.2d 269, 277 and 280 (Del. 1995) ("excluding evidence [in my case emails] of efforts to influence a witness' testimony [to exclude evidence] constitutes reversible error."Opinion testimony by a judge creates the appearance eof partiality on behalf of a litigant, is greatly prejudicial to the adverse party..."); *Inc. v. Lopez*, CIV. No. 14-1223 (PG) (D.P.R. Oct. 27, 2015); *United Church of the Medical Center v. Medical Center Comm'n*, 689 F.2d 693, 701 (7th Cir. 1982); *Utica Packing Co. v. Block*, 781 F.2d 71, 77 (6th Cir. 1986); *Hammond v. Baldwin*, 866 F.2d 172, 177 (6th Cir. 1989); *Montgomery Tp. v.*

12. Pursuant to Pa.R.D.E., Rule 216 (c) provides:

“(c) Upon the expiration of 30 days from service of the notice issued pursuant to the provisions of subdivision (a) of this rule, the Supreme Court may impose the identical or comparable discipline or transfer to disability inactive status unless Disciplinary Counsel or the respondent-attorney demonstrates, or the Court finds that upon the face of the record upon which the discipline is predicated it clearly appears:

(1) that the procedure was so lacking in notice or opportunity to be heard as to constitute a deprivation of due process;

(2) there was such an infirmity of proof establishing the misconduct as to give rise to the clear conviction that the Court could not consistently with its duty accept as final the conclusion on that subject; or

(3) that the imposition of the same or comparable discipline would result in grave injustice, or be offensive to the public policy of this Commonwealth.” PA ST DISC Rule 216

13. The new facts and questions relate to all three of these defenses this Court requires I respond to by December 23, 2022.

14. I also require a stay as other new facts have arisen increasing the harm towards me in terms of exacerbating a substantial burden due to costs of time and resources as to deny me access to the courts, compelled religious violations against indebtedness, risk of loss of life and health, should a stay or a continuance be denied.

Com., Bureau of Social Sec. for Public Employees, 449 A.2d 841, 68 Pa.Cmwlth. 525, 1982; *Bruteyn v. State Dental Council and Examining Bd.*, 380 A.2d 497, 32 Pa.Cmwlth. 541, 1977; *Begis v. Industrial Bd. of Dept. of Labor and Industry*, 308 A.2d 643, 9 Pa.Cmwlth. 558, 1973; *Straw v. Com. Human Relations Commission*, 308 A.2d 619, 10 Pa.Cmwlth. 99, 1973; *First Nat. Bank of Pike County v. Department of Banking*, 300 A.2d 823, 7 Pa.Cmwlth. 603, 1973; *Gaudenzia, Inc. v. Zoning Bd. of Adjustment of City of Philadelphia*, 287 A.2d 698, 4 Pa.Cmwlth. 355, 1972; *W. J. Dillner Transp. Co. v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission*, 107 A.2d 159, 175 Pa.Super. 580, 1954, appeal dismissed 75 S.Ct. 580, 349 U.S. 903, 99 L.Ed. 1240; See, *Peters v. Kiff*, 407 U.S. 493, 502 (1972), *Overruled in Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 169 (1976), on other grounds.

15. Without delay, I attempted to file a series of motions requiring a stay or more time which were rejected by this Court. This Court took additional time before apprising me of rejections which caused additional prejudice to my defense.

16. I contacted the Court concerning the delay given the dire irreparable injury I face. The Court delayed further in making determinations.

17. The Clerk Nicole Traini (hereinafter "Clerk") appeared to argue on behalf of PA-ODC by making meritless arguments regarding resignation, representation of counsel, and other discussions which showed bias in favor of PA-ODC.

18. Early on the Clerk seemed to trivialize the placement of my retired license on inactive disabled as not having influence in DE or beyond.

19. My ability to seek to regain employment in my former firm would be eliminated by PA's placement of my license on inactive disabled. In addition, it would be additional government persecution against me based on my exercise of Constitutional rights. The states do not have a license to violate federal and constitutional law under the shield of governing businesses, including the practice of law. This essentially requires licensed attorneys or those who retired their licenses to exchange their First Amendment liberties and other Constitutional protections in order to be afforded the opportunity to buy and sell as a lawyer.

20. I by no means desired to waste the courts time by filing motions this court would reject. Our case manager recommended I file an amended motion for a reargument for a motion for a stay. I thought the Motion to amend my motion for reargument filed on December 13, 2022 would be accepted. This Court denied me an opportunity to be heard on this motion in violation of the 1st and 14th Amendment by failing to submit it. (Exhibit 3)

21. This Court also violated my right to be heard in defense of my Constitutional liberty, property interests, life and eternal life when it refused to docket the attached letter, I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety. (Exhibit 4) The letter outlines my circumstances. The rejection of the letter prevents me from an opportunity to plead my circumstances before the Court unless this Court accepts this pleading. US Amend. I, XIV.

22. New circumstances arose exacerbating irreparable injury to me in terms of creating obstacles so great as to deny me access to the courts to defend my liberty, exercise of Constitutional rights, my life and interests related to licenses. My computer broke. My internet has been experiencing problems, my printer needed repairs, and my health is suffering.

23. My poverty and costs associated with 5 reciprocal law suits against me and one civil rights case have also increased. Each court has unique legal issues to address with unique rules. I require time to draft documents to plead my defense so I am not denied meaningful participation in this court proceeding, and other court proceedings.

24. I intended to include motion to exempt costs by the state through opposing counsel. Costs and fees, including fees relating to the transmittal of the record violate my religious belief against debt, servitude to Satan in violation of the 13th Amendment and damnation in hell by making money my guide, as opposed to God. It is my religious belief Jesus teaches you cannot serve money and God. *Matthew* 6:24. Jesus also teaches the fact people were too concerned with earning money to pay bills and care for their own to care to love God and others is guilt. *Matthew* 13. Jesus teaches putting family first is guilt leading to hell. *Matthew* 10:34-39

25. I asked opposing counsel his stance on additional motions. The government through its arms should not compel me to violate my religious beliefs against debt in order to exercise my right to be heard, or cause me to forgo my 1st and 14th Amendment rights. I should be afforded time to draft necessary motions.

26. I am threatened with harm to health and even possible death due to severe dehydration should this court not accommodate me by granting me time I require to sustain my life and health in addition to defending my liberties before the Courts. I have religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare.

27. I believe people sin when they thoughtlessly refer people to doctors, mental health specialists or professionals to pay to fix their problems misleading others to exploitation to serve greed. Many professionals are rendered above the law. Their standards are the letter of the law Courts wrongly adhere to in determining whether workers performed the requisite duty of care. This creates poor products, bad services and evil businesses that are left uncorrected when they harm people for profit.

28. I believe that courts can save lives and eternal lives by correcting people paid to perform business who ignorantly or indifferently kill, steals, oppresses or destroys human life and health for the bottom line. *Matthew 23:23, Amos 5:15.*

29. I have strong religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare. I believe people sin by blindly doing what they are trained to do, told to do, paid to do without choosing to see clearly to care about the potential harm they cause towards those they profess to serve. I believe people sin for teaching others to trust professionals in place of God. I believe business

greed, conditionally caring is the mark of lawless lusts stemmed in no salvation from hell in people, without repentance.

30. In an exhibit, I incorporate herein as Exhibit 6, I previously provided to this Court, the US Supreme Court, the Delaware Board, Delaware Chancery, and Delaware Supreme Court I stated:

“Due to the surgery referred herein, I am (self) required to drink water, rest, exercise and eat. So, I do not faint or die due to dehydration when I have my period. I lose five pounds of water weight each month. This is still a challenge. I must assert my right to live because people serve Satan by hardness of heart. Many do not want to be inconvenienced to care, to adapt to safeguard the lives and health of others, including my own. I am a child of God. My body is not my own. I am commanded to be holy because God is holy, to care for and treasure my body, and the lives and health of others too. ‘I am not my own’ Other people are loved by God too.”

31. I had surgery more than 20 years ago, and I have to assert my right to live. I am very dehydrated, dangerously so now, and it has lasted beyond a week. I must be afforded time, an accommodation to sustain my life and health.

32. I used to drink a big gallon of water at the gym. Since the Delaware Supreme Court prevents me from returning to my former firm, I cannot afford to go to the gym. I have not been able to drink water or take time to care for my body as I should because of the time required to attend to this case and related proceedings.

33. Dehydration is serious. In undergrad at UD, I fainted during a class due to dehydration. When I awoke, no one was there but me. I was so embarrassed to discover I peed my pants, but at least I was not dead. Having enough water, and time to care for myself is required. It is not a disability to be human with individual unique limits. Nevertheless, I assert the ADA act’s requirements for access to the courts and accommodations, if applicable,

nevertheless. (42 U.S.C. §§ 12181- 12189)⁵ I should be afforded an accommodation to sustain my life and health as well as my licenses and liberty interests. The accommodation of a stay or more time does not prejudice opposing counsel or the Courts. Instead, it will likely prevent duplicity in work, requiring time I need to defend my liberty and sustain my life.

34. My First motion for additional time in the amount of 45 days to response to the PA-ODC's motion was denied.

35. This Court granted a second motion in the amount of 14 days, which is not sufficient under the circumstances. I am prejudiced.

36. After everything was rejected, I alerted the Clerk I would draft a new motion given the new facts and circumstances necessitating a stay and at least a continuation.

⁵ "Congress has abrogated states' sovereign immunity for cases that arise under Title II of the ADA if they implicate the "fundamental right of access to the courts." *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533-534 (2004)." *Reed v. Illinois*, No. 19-1164, at *4 (7th Cir. Jan. 9, 2020); *McDonough, Petitioner*, 457 Mass. 512, 519 n.16 (Mass. 2010) ("The United States Supreme Court has concluded that Title II of the ADA applies "to the class of cases implicating the fundamental right of access to the courts," and as such "constitutes a valid exercise of Congress' § 5 authority to enforce the guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment" on the States. *Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533-534 (2004) (ADA validly applies to States to extent that State court facilities are so constructed as to bar physical access to courts by individuals with disabilities)."); 42 U.S.C. § 12182 "(i) **Denial of participation**, It shall be discriminatory to subject an individual or class of individuals on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, **licensing**, or other arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the individual or class to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of an entity."

42 U.S.C. § 12182 (a) "No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation."

37. The Clerk understands my computer broke, and I noted I would draft a motion without delay for a continuation.

38. The Clerk cited the November 8, 2022 order that no further extensions would be considered, as to discourage my filing. And yet in other cases Courts state the same or similar language and still grant time to prevent manifest injustice and avoid procedural due process violations. See for example, *Mir v. Bureau of Pro. & Occupational Affs.*, No. 2557 C.D. 2015, 2016 WL 6407477, at *3 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Oct. 31, 2016).

39. Under my unique conditions denial of a stay is prejudicial and creates manifest prejudice towards my ability to plead.

40. My faith in Jesus and my ability to worship and exercise belief by the dictates of my conscience without government incited public or private persecution, but for my religious belief, is important to me to protect. Please grant a stay. I am tired. I need rest and water, but I cannot forgo the eternal rest in Jesus because of the limits of my body.

41. The Court has a strong interest in judicial efficiency. Staying this action could restructure the proceeding in this Court because collateral estoppel could prevent re-litigation of issues adjudicated on appeal in the original matter and in the civil rights proceeding. In addition, should the US Supreme Court vacate the original disciplinary proceeding, this case may be vacated as well. Thus, the interests of the Court weigh in favor of a stay, to prevent needless waste of judicial resources by a superseding US Supreme Court decision.

42. There is no prejudice towards the Plaintiff, third parties or the public by a delay, should a stay be granted. I agree not to practice law in this jurisdiction, without this court's authorization. I am retired in this jurisdiction. I require time and meaningful opportunity to not

only defend myself on appeal in the original proceeding, but also to present my case in the civil rights proceeding.

43. The public and third parties are not harmed by a stay. Yet, the public may be harmed if a stay is not granted, by setting a precedent that the state may eliminate Constitutional liberties in a government compelled exchange for the license to buy in sell in a profession. Every citizen, holding a license, may lose Constitutional rights or be in danger of being adjudicated disabled, for merely believing differently than the state, or for standing up for their religious-political beliefs in Court, should I not be granted meaningful opportunity to contest the original case on appeal to the US Supreme Court and in the civil rights case.

44. I have good cause to contest the decision of the Delaware Supreme Court to place me on disabled inactive, as punishment for my exercise of my First Amendment right to religious-political speech, religious-political belief, religious-political-exercise, and my exercise of the right to make religious-political petitions.

45. The Delaware Disciplinary proceeding is defective on its face. The record shows evidence of fraud, and collusion. (Exhibit 5). The Court was not partial, but instigated the proceeding against me and colluded with the state.

46. The Delaware Supreme Court's members concealed evidence in my favor to prejudice the fixed outcome against me in aid of the Delaware ODC. (Exhibit 5) The Court denied my requests for opportunity to perform discovery and for adequate time to prepare to hide the fact they terminated two court staff who are material to my case. The Court also secretly sealed four of my pleadings in Kelly v Trump that were material to my defense.

47. 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. I incorporate herein by reference my Reply to the DE-ODC's Response to my Objections to the Board's decision, excluding the voluminous exhibits, as Exhibit 5.

48. Despite having good cause to contest this reciprocal proceeding. Additional investigation is required. I lack time and resources to duplicate the investigation should a stay be denied. 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 actually indicated they may cut me out of their will because they have helped me this past year to a greater extent than my siblings.

Procedural Background of this case

49. This reciprocal proceeding was brought on or about August 30, 2022, in response to the Delaware Supreme Court's decision to place my license to practice law on disabled inactive on August 10, 2022.

50. I received a letter from this Court, dated August 30, 2022, concerning notice of discipline.

51. On September 21, 2022, this Court filed notice and an Order.

52. On or about October 7, 2022, I sent the Court by US mail, *Respondent Meghan M Kelly's Motion to stay the Proceeding until the conclusion of both Respondent's originating disciplinary proceeding, and civil rights proceeding until final non-appealable determinations*

are made or the time of appeal has lapsed. Respondent further moves the Court, for good cause for permission to file the "for cause" motion 30 days after the stay is lifted, with attachments I incorporate herein in its entirety. The Court received and filed this motion on October 12, 2022, almost a week later.

53. I followed up with the assigned case manager on the Court's receipt of my Motion to stay the proceeding. The case manager indicated that things would be expedited given the nature of my case. I thought in my mind this was even before the Court granted me an opportunity to be heard on the motion for a stay, to slow down the case, as if the Court has already made a finding even before reading my motion.

54. The Court's determination without granting me an opportunity to be heard on my motion for a stay does violate my right to be heard. US Amend. I and XIV.

55. Denial of the stay denies me of time I require for meaningful access to the courts in defense of my First Amendment rights and property interest in my retired license and other interests which may be affected should that interest be changed.

56. Denial of the stay denies me of time I require to protect my property interest in my retired license, which will affect other property interests and my ability to work as an attorney in Delaware should I be placed on reciprocal discipline, even if the Delaware decision is vacated.

57. This Court and the public have no interest in my retired PA license.

58. I am not admitted to this bar. I must seek readmission before I am licensed and given permission to practice law before this Pennsylvania Bar and this Honorable Court.

59. The October 8, 2022 Order denying my application of a stay violates my meaningful access to the courts in violation of the 14th Amendment and the First Amendment rights I seek to defend.

60. On October 17, 2022, Pennsylvania Disciplinary Counsel Anthony P. Sodroski, Esquire (Herein referred to as “PA ODC”) provided an answer to my motion for a stay.

61. On October 18, 2022, PA ODC supplied a supplemental answer containing the status of the matter in my federal civil rights case where I seek inter alias to overturn the original disciplinary order.

62. On October 19, 2022, I filed Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Motion for good cause to waive court costs by the Clerk and this Court including costs under Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 208, record, transcript fees, filing fees and other costs, I incorporate herein by reference.

63. On October 26, 2022, I filed a Motion to File unconfirming documents pursuant to Pa.R.A.P. 105(b), I incorporate herein by reference.

64. On October 26, 2022, PA ODC filed an Answer in response to my motion to waive costs, including costs by the ODC. The ODC’s answers evade the fact I asked this Court to waive costs by the state’s agent the ODC too. So, his response is not in opposition, but misleads the Court, unless the Court finds my motion was not specific.

65. My motion for reargument on the costs and the prohibition against 13th Amendment and compelled religious violations are more specific. It is against my religious beliefs to owe debts by forced will. I believe it leads to damnation in hell, as I previously tried to convey to PA-ODC and this Court in my pleadings.

66. My religious beliefs are private and do not conform to the religious beliefs of entities or the majority of others. My religious beliefs are genuine.

67. I will love and respect others who hold different religious-political beliefs. I will not encourage beliefs that I believe misleads people to harm and hell because I care about people. I do not want other people to lose eternal life. I can love others and believe differently. I can love others and disagree with them. Holding beliefs of my own does not make me dangerous, nor does sharing my genuine religious beliefs with others. I am not in government. It would be wrong should I use God's name for political vanity. I am a private citizen.

68. On November 3, 2022, I filed Respondent's Motion for an extension of time to respond to PA Disciplinary Counsel's Answer in opposition to my Motion for a stay, I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety.

69. On November 6, 2022, I filed Respondent's Motion to dismiss the disciplinary proceeding, without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, I incorporate herein by reference.

70. On November 7, 2022, PA ODC filed an answer in opposition of my motion to file unforming documents.

71. On November 7, 2022, PA ODC filed an answer in opposition to my motion for a stay.

72. On November 7, 2022, I filed an Application to Amend the Application to Dismiss, I incorporate herein by reference.

73. On November 8, 2022, this Court entered an Order, I incorporate herein as reference and attach as Exhibit 7, which held:

“the Application to Waive Costs is dismissed as moot. The Motion to File Unconforming Pleadings is granted. See Pa.R.A.P. 124(b). The Motion to Stay the Proceeding is denied. Respondent is afforded an additional 30 days from the date of this Order to inform this Court of any grounds against the imposition of the identical or comparable discipline in this Commonwealth.”

66. On November 8, 2022, the Court dismissed my Motion for an extension of time in the amount of 45 days to respond to PA ODC’s answer in Opposition to Motion for Stay dismissed as Moot.

67. On November 10, 2022, PA ODC filed an Answer Opposing Respondent's Motion to Dismiss.

68. On November 10, 2022, PA ODC filed a separate Answer to Respondent's Application to Amend Respondent's Motion to Dismiss.

69. On November 12, 2022 I filed corrections by submitting *Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Motion to correct errors in her Motion to Dismiss* filed on or about November 6, 2022, I incorporate herein by reference.

70. The November 8, 2022 Order did not address all my requests. I sought to waive costs by PA ODC too under Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement 208 (g), in addition to court costs, other costs and transcript fees for appeal, in order not to be compelled to violate my religious beliefs, cause a substantial burden upon my access to the courts or compelled to involuntary servitude in violate of US Amendments I, XIII, and XIV. This Court erred by ordering my motion was moot.

71. On or about November 15, 2022, I filed Respondent Meghan M Kelly's Motion for reargument on this Court's indirect denial of my motion for a stay to prevent a government compelled obstacle to my access to other courts in defense of irreparable injury to my life, First Amendment liberty interests, my license, and eternal life and a denial of my motion to exempt costs as moot, I incorporate herein in its entirety. I accidentally submitted arguments I drafted for another reciprocating disciplinary Court, the District Court for the Eastern District of PA. This Court did not indirectly deny my motion.

72. I also argue denial of the time a stay is also affecting my health, in light of my need for time to drink water and rest due to harmful healthcare against my person in my youth that I alleviate by taking needed time to sustain my health and life. (See Exhibit 8, my letter to the Clerk of the Third Circuit referring to my surgery in my youth, dated December 2, 2022. I am not misleading this Court when I state I need time and rest to prevent harm to my health. I am not ashamed of being weak. My weakness does not make me unworthy of work as an attorney who desires to return to her former firm to perform real estate settlements.) (See, Exhibit 6, containing evidence of my surgery, and a state of Delaware proposal to improve our harmful healthcare and a federal proposal to reduce costs of healthcare.)

73. I am not able to get adequate rest and fluids because of the increase in workload and other stress caused by this needless litigation.⁶

⁶ Please note, the Delaware Disciplinary Counsel cared naught about my health and compelled me to attend a hearing ill, recovering from the shingles. They were concerned with my religious political beliefs. They note, my references to the Bible and my belief that courts are for correction as reasons finding me unworthy to hold an active Delaware license to practice law. See Exhibit 6.

74. This improvident law suit creates an obstacle to my access to other courts in defense of my First Amendment rights and property interests in my license to practice law.

75. On November 18, 2022, PA ODC filed an Answer Opposing my application for reconsideration on my denial to waive costs and motion for a stay.

76. On November 19, 2022, I filed Respondent Meghan M Kelly's Motion to supplement the record with new and additional information and to correct an error in belief, I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety.

77. On November 21, 2022, I filed Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's Motion for an exemption from the requirement to serve paper copies of pleadings with this Court pursuant to Pa. R.A.P. 105 and permission to serve this Court electronically, due to costs relating to printing, mailing and transporting pleadings to the Post Office, creating a substantial burden upon my access to the Court's to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, and forced violation of religious beliefs by the threat of indebtedness

78. On November 29, 2022, I filed a Motion for an extension of time to file a response to the Court's Order dated October 8, 2022.

79. On November 30, 2022, the Court granted my motion and extended the deadline to December 23, 2022.

80. This extension is not an adequate amount of time to defend my license under the facts of this unique case.

81. On December 5, 2022, I submitted Respondent Meghan Kelly's Response to Office of Disciplinary Counsel's Answer opposing dismissal of the disciplinary proceeding for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

82. On December 5, 2022, I also filed the certificate of service and a letter containing video exhibits on memory sticks I mailed to this Court and PA ODC. This was rejected, but I hope this Court accepts it on receipt because I incorporate it in an accepted pleading.

83. The Court rejected both items I filed on December 5, 2022.

84. I knew that questions relating to subject matter may be brought at any time, and there remained questions about subject matter jurisdiction. *See, Daly v. Sch. Dist. of Darby Twp.*, 434 Pa. 286, 252 A.2d 638 (1969) (“This Honorable Pennsylvania Supreme Court held “Lack of subject matter jurisdiction may be raised at any time by parties or sua sponte by Supreme Court.”); (Also see, *Martin v. Zoning Hearing Bd. of W. Vincent Twp.*, 230 A.3d 540, 545 (Pa. Cmmw. Ct. 2020), Questions of subject matter jurisdiction may be raised at any time, even on appeal, by the parties, or by the court on its own motion.” (emphasis intended, especially with regards to questions of the case law PA-ODC cites, which are distinguished from this case)); *See, Hudson v. Com*, 830 A.2d 594, 598 n.7 (Pa. Cmmw. Ct. 2003), *Citing, Dep't of Transp., Bureau of Driver Licensing v. Gelormino*, 636 A.2d 224 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1994).

85. So, I immediately drafted a Second Motion to Dismiss which included additional information relating to the facts concerning why failing to dismiss harms me and regarding legal issues. I filed the Second Motion to Dismiss on December 6, 2022, I incorporate herein by reference. This Second Motion to dismiss is different from the First Motion to Dismiss.

86. I face immediate irreparable injury and am asserting rights, without perfection in order not to waive them. I saw I referred to the video clip evidence in the incorrect paragraph and minor typos.

87. I drafted a Second corrected Motion to dismiss based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction to correct the reference to the video exhibit and to correct minor typos, I incorporate herein by reference.

88. On November 29, 2022, I filed a Motion for an extension of time to file a response to the Court's Order dated October 8, 2022.

89. On November 30, 2022, the Court granted my motion and extended the deadline to December 23, 2022.

90. This extension is not an adequate amount of time to defend my license under the facts of this unique case. I am prejudiced and denied meaningful opportunity to defend my retired license, related interests, and Constitutional interests.

91. A stay is required in order that I may acquire necessary to my defense.

92. A stay is also required to prevent needless duplicity of work when such information may be obtained in an open forum the civil rights case.

93. A stay is also required to prevent prejudice by a compelled denial of my Constitutional right to be heard in one forum in exchange with another.

94. A stay is also required to prevent prejudice by a compelled denial of my Constitutional right to religious belief against indebtedness and an economic substantial burden so great as to create a denial to access to the courts, when evidence and testimony may be gathered in one court rather than duplicating the same work in multiple courts

95. I should not be compelled to forgo the due process right to be heard in one forum in exchange with another.

96. A stay is required in order not to protect my life and health, and to prevent irreparable loss to my liberty interests, licenses and other interests.

97. The original order very likely will be overturned on appeal or in the civil rights case. Nevertheless, I asked for a continuation in the alternative. The Public, the Court and PA-ODC has no interest somehow more important to my potential loss to access to the courts, fundamental rights and loss of interests in licenses retired and others.

98. The amount of time this court extended is not enough for me under the circumstances.

II. Procedural Status on Delaware Disciplinary Order and Third Circuit Order with new and additional information with argument

99. I intend to appeal the Third Circuit reciprocal order, Eastern District of PA's reciprocal weird order, and the Delaware Supreme Court's original order.

100. I am an active member of the United States Supreme Court's Bar. I may be sued in a reciprocity law suit by the United States Supreme Court Rule. I am grateful the Supreme Court is not suing me now.

101. I do not have the time I require to effectively defend myself in this Case by an extension to December 23, 2022 either.

102. This Court must afford me adequate amount of time to plead affectively before this Court, the civil rights case and before the United States in order not to compel me to waive my right to defend myself, and lose the right to exercise my First Amendment rights of belief, exercise of belief, speech, association, the right to petition, and my property interests in my licenses to practice law. (See, US Amend I, XIV); (PA ST 2 Pa.C.S.A. § 504); (*Balfour Beatty*

Const. Inc. v. Department of Transp., 783 A.2d 901, CmwltH.2001. Adjudicatory action may not be taken validly by a judicial or administrative tribunal except upon a hearing wherein each party has an opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, to introduce evidence on his own behalf, and to make argument.); (*Pennsylvania State Athletic Commission v. Bratton*, 112 A.2d 422, 177 Pa.Super. 598).

103. I assert my right for a meaningful opportunity to defend my license, and First Amendment liberties, without compelled economic and religious substantial burdens.

104. I am impoverished. The original disciplinary order prevents me from seeking to return to my former law firm where I would perform real estate settlements.

105. An order by this Court placing me on reciprocal discipline would prevent my opportunity to seek to return to my position even if the original Delaware Disciplinary Order is vacated.

106. I asked PA ODC if I could be placed back on retired status should this court place me on reciprocal discipline. I do not want to seek to be restated or admitted. I cannot afford the filing fees. It is against my religious beliefs. I do not have money to pay this Court to reinstate my retired status should the discipline be overturned on appeal to the US Supreme Court or in the civil rights case. (Exhibit 9). I do not want to be reinstated as active as I cannot afford the costs of bar due. PA-ODC did not respond.

107. I do not have the resources I require to fight all cases simultaneously. The appeal of the original disciplinary findings will likely make this Court's Order moot. I do not know how I will be able to afford postage, paper, ink or transportation to the Court. I need to research and read too.

108. The United States Supreme Court will likely hear my case either to discipline me as a member or to grant me equality under the law worthy of First Amendment belief, exercise of belief, speech, association and access to the Courts without punishment in violation of the equal protections clause based on disparate treatment with religious-political-poverty animus or denial of substantive and procedural due process of law. US Amend I, XIV.

109. Any decision this Court provides will affect this Court's decision. This case would be dismissed as moot should the Delaware Order be vacated, which will likely occur.

110. A denial of a stay prejudices me, and risks my loss of First Amendment rights, interest in my reputation, my property interest in licenses, and my ability to work.

111. My ability to work as an attorney may be taken away because the Delaware Courts disagree with my belief in Jesus Christ. The Courts will persecute me, not protect me should I face more government incited attacks for my religious-political beliefs, religious-political speech, religious-political exercise, religious-political affiliation and religious-political petitions.

112. Instead of upholding the Constitution, the Delaware Supreme Court and its arms in collusion violate the Constitution to protect the lie of the appearance of justice by the Delaware courts in my cases while creating injustice.

III Procedural Status on the Third Circuit Case with argument

113. Opposing Counsel filed a response to my appeal. I filed a motion objecting to her exhibit. A panel has convened to render an order on the motion. I have to brief a response before the Third Circuit.

IV. Arguments: A stay is required to allow me to gather testimony or other proof concerning procedural due process violations, bad faith, harassment, malicious religious-political-poverty animus and Court collusion in the original disciplinary law suit. This information is necessary to show cause why this Court must not reciprocate.

114. I must be afforded a meaningful opportunity to uncover questions of material fact necessary to my defense in this case regarding procedural due process violations, and other issues. I must be allowed the opportunity to gather testimony and evidence in order to respond to this Court's November 8, 2022 Order.

115. This Court must allow me meaningful opportunity to defend this Court's Order, and PA ODC's law suit against me by allowing me to gather facts, testimony and evidence in defense of my property interest and fundamental rights.

116. I was denied the opportunity to prepare, perform discovery and to call witness in the original disciplinary proceeding, in part because the Delaware Supreme participated in terminating a clerk of Court and a court staff to conceal or hide their testimony material to my defense.

117. This testimony and evidence are best retrieved in the civil rights case

118. Any testimony gathered, or evidence discovered or determinations in the civil rights case, Kelly v Swartz relating to the same subject matter, in addition to other subject matter, as to the State and its agents including the Court's bad faith, harassment, collusion, bias, or fraud, will affect the findings of facts and conclusion of law before this Court.

119. This Court must grant me an opportunity to gather material facts by testimony or otherwise material to my defense in the reciprocating Order by staying the proceeding.

120. As late as December 1, 2022, I discovered **additional procedural due process** defects and evidence of the Delaware Supreme Court's **collusion to fix the outcome of Kelly v Trump**. My religious-political petitions in this law suit are the admitted reason the DE-ODC petitioned to place my law suit on disability inactive.

121. There are questions of law that must be addressed. I filed a Motion to amend the complaint on or about January 24, 2022 in the civil rights case, to include additional damages, equitable relief, nominal relief and to add the Supreme Court justices as Defendants in this case.

122. I argued the state agents are not privileged or immune given the facts of my case. I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety A-4, A-5.

123. The unsettled questions require testimony or proof. This Court must stay the case to allow the gathering of facts in the civil rights case. This Court must stay this proceeding to allow me meaningful opportunity to be heard in defense of my retired interest in my license and my First Amendment rights by denying a stay. Citing, US Amend I, XIV.

124. I await for additional information by file and serve that will likely show the Clerk of the Delaware Supreme Court, Lisa Dolph (also referred herein as "Lisa") misrepresented the fact that the complete record is unsealed as the Court Ordered in its September 7, 2022 Order.

125. On September 7, 2022, the Delaware Supreme Court granted my motion to unseal the documents I attach hereto and incorporate herein in its entirety, as Exhibit 10, *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.

126. The Delaware Supreme Court misrepresented my arguments in the September 7, 2022. I wanted the accused to have the choice of an open or closed proceeding to allow more fairness instead of secret fixed proceeding focused on serving business gain not individuals, individual liberty or the public.

127. Professional Boards do not serve or protect the public. Board members are partial to marketing professions, business, material gain and money as the goal of justice, which creates injustice.

128. There are questions of additional procedural due process violations that remain unanswered relating to how the Delaware Supreme Court acted as witness and judge in the Disciplinary proceeding in collusion with the arms or agents of the court.

129. It is notable my pleadings relating to attorney dues caused me to realize that the Supreme Court caused the interference in Kelly v Trump since DE-Lapp referred to them.

130. The Delaware Supreme Court's opinion cited a case regarding bar dues, appearing to value money over Constitutional liberties. *In re Bar of Supreme Court of Del.*, No. 58, at *9 n.14 (Del. Aug. 10, 2022) ("*In re Member of Bar*, 257 A.2d 382, 383 (Del. 1969)")

131. Any substantive or procedural defects in violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendment, collusion, bad faith or bias by the Delaware Courts or arms is relevant to whether this Court should render reciprocal discipline.

132. This court must grant me the opportunity to gather necessary evidence in defense of this reciprocal law suit by granting a stay. US Amend I, XIV.

133. I must be afforded the meaningful opportunity to prepare and present my case by allowing me to subpoena witnesses and cross examining them, and by discovery.

134. My January 15, 2022 motion before the Delaware Board to call a witness before the Board was denied by being ignored in part because the Court discharged that person from the court to protect the court, not the staff member.

135. The Court sought to hide the elimination of two witnesses to collude in fixing the proceeding against me by denying me the opportunity to perform discovery, call witnesses, and cross examine those witnesses.

136. This evidence is more fairly obtained in an open forum in the civil, where witnesses I expect to call Delaware Supreme Court judges.

137. I moved the civil rights court in January 2022, to include the judges as witnesses in an amended complaint, I sought to amend as a matter of right under Rule 15. Albeit, after his third Order, where he ignored this Motion, I moved to amend the complaint at a suspended time. I have since then, moved the court to amend the complaint again to include new and additional information and claims. DI 58 DE District Court, for example.

138. It is preferable and fairer to gather testimony in the civil rights case, rather than a closed forum needlessly increasing costs to the Court, witnesses and the party.

139. I assert my right to call witnesses and gather discovery in this Court even if this Court continues to wrongly deny a stay which prejudices me, for no necessary reason somehow more important than the loss of my fundamental rights and property interests in my license harmed but for my exercise of my rights.

140. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court must grant a stay to protect my 14th and 1st Amendment meaningful access to the courts, from a substantial burden upon me due to my poverty and religious objection to debt. A stay must be granted to allow me to gather facts to show the truth of the matter by facts and law to defend my liberty, life, eternal life and licenses.

141. The evidence shows the Delaware Supreme Court violated proper procedures and was the source of the disciplinary law suit. I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety Exhibits A-4, and A-5 which outline procedural due process violations in Kelly v Trump, and my pleadings showing belief that a Delaware Supreme Court justice incited the attacks by the state against me during Kelly v Trump to cause me to forgo my Freedom of Religion Restoration Act Law suit in violation of federal law, and the Constitution. See 42 USC Section 1985, US Amend I, XIV.

142. In February, 2022, per the email I attached to another pleading before this PA Supreme Court, it appears all of the justices instead of merely one judge instigated or participated in inciting the proceeding against me as witness, judge and jury.

143. The Supreme Court was in receipt of my petitions for exemptions from bar dues.

144. Per DE-Lapp's letter, my request for an exemption from bar dues was the admitted reason this arm of the Delaware Court attacked me in May 2021, in interference with Kelly v Trump. (A-4, A-5, please refer to the letter)

145. The only people in possession of those petitions for relief from bar dues for all attorneys facing economic hardship, not merely me, in order not to violate the Equal Protections Clause of the 14th Amendment by favorable or disparate treatment towards me was DE-ODC's Kathleen Vavala's Uncle at the Delaware Bar Association, Mark Vavala, and the members of the Delaware Supreme Court and their staff.

146. To my knowledge at that time in 2021, no other person was aware of my petitions for bar due exemptions.

147. Albeit a Judge of another Delaware Court, Judge Clark alluded to my economic hardship request when he attacked me in interference of Kelly v Trump.

148. A Court of Common Pleas judge, Judge Clark attacked me first, before DE-Lapp.

149. I alleged in Kelly v Trump I esteemed Judge Clark in my complaint against President Trump. So, it appears members or agents of Chancery or Delaware Supreme Court made a request to Judge Clark. It was someone who read my complaints who incited the attacks.

150. At BJ's a bulk grocery store, sometime in April 2021, Judge Clark appeared to investigate me and threaten me because of my religious-political speech contained in my petitions. (Exhibits, A-4, A-5). If I recall correctly, he feigned concern about money or bar fees. Judge Kenneth Clark also admitted he interrogated me at DE ODC's request.

151. I asked Judge Clark if the DE ODC requested, he contact me. He responded by shaking his head up and down.

152. This Court must grant a stay so as not to violate my right to a fair proceeding to provide arguments on the defenses permitted by Pa.R.D.E., Rule 216 (c) because there are questions of Disciplinary forum partiality and material fact necessary for me to gather to answer this Honorable Court's order in my defense against this reciprocating law suit.

153. This court must allow me opportunity to meaningfully defend myself before this Court in accordance to the 1st and 14th Amendment.

154. I learned of facts material to my defense as late as December 1, 2022. I am not sitting on this. I am not delaying in bad faith. I am seeking to uncover truth.

155. Sadly, I provided inaccurate information to the Delaware District Court I corrected to provide more heinous conduct by the Delaware Supreme Court.

V. New and additional information affecting this Court's Determination arose after this Court's November 8th Order that could not have been discovered by due diligence which is material to this case and to the issue of whether a stay must be granted.

156. The Delaware Supreme Court placed my license to practice law on disability inactive to punish me for my religious beliefs, contained in my petitions and in response to my exercise of my right to access to the Courts to defend my First Amendment exercise of religious belief from a government compelled substantial burden in Kelly v Trump.

157. The Delaware Supreme Court also punished me in retaliation for my petitions to exempt bar dues for all Delaware Attorneys facing economic hardship. In one of its disciplinary orders against my license the Court specifically refers to a case regarding bar dues.

158. Money gathered by bar dues, I paid in 2021 is not more important than preempting Constitutional law, and federal law. U.S. Const. art. VI., § 2.

159. The Delaware Supreme Court erred by violating my First Amendment and other Constitutional rights, to serve the **mere money**, or the appearance of justice while committing grave injustice against me and others, by precedent by instituting a discipline suit against me based on religious-political-poverty animus, by sealing documents without notice or an opportunity to be heard in Kelly v Trump, by denying me meaningful opportunity to plead my case in the disciplinary case, and by firing two court staff to prevent their testimony in my defense.

160. I requested that all attorneys similarly situated be treated the same by affording grace to all, not merely me, so as not to violate the Equal Protections Clause. Citing A-4 and A-5.

161. I paid the Delaware bar due for 2021 in a timely fashion. Citing A-4 and A-5 which includes proof of payment.

162. The state admits that my religious speech contained in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act petitions to safeguard my religious exercise is the source of the disciplinary law suit in the Delaware Office of Disciplinary Counsel's ("DE ODC") letter dated August 23, 2022, and in its petition against me at Paragraph 7, I incorporate herein by reference as Exhibits 1 and

2.⁷ I believe that people sin when they seek money as savior in place of God which is not a popular belief when the world praises what I believe to be the the mark of the beast or lawlessness or damnation without repentance, business greed.

163. Earlier this year the United States Supreme Court granted a government employed coach freedom to exercise religious-speech and religious exercise, without government retaliation or persecution, but for the football coaches exercise of religious belief.

164. The United States Supreme Court in *Kennedy v. Bremerton Sch. Dist.*, 213 L. Ed. 2d 755, 142 S. Ct. 2407 (2022) held, "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. U.S. Const. Amend. 1.

165. I am a private not a government actor, like the football coach. I should be offered the same Constitutional protections afforded to private citizens or government citizens acting allegedly in his private capacity, as the court found.

166. I desired to exercise my private Constitutional rights, including but not limited to access to the Courts to defend my exercise of religious exercise from government substantial burden. I let go of the idea of running for office when I received threats to my person and property based on my religious-political belief when I chose to file a law suit against former President Trump. My faith in Jesus is even more important than my desire to draft just laws to

⁷ See, *Mountain Environment v. District Court*, 677 P.2d 1361, 1364-65 (Colo. 1984) "The right to petition has been characterized as one of "the most precious of the liberties safeguarded by the Bill of Rights." *United Mine Workers v. Illinois State Bar Association*, 389 U.S. 217, 222, 88 S. Ct. 353, 356, 19 L.Ed.2d 426, 430 (1967). "

care for people, while protecting their liberty to say my ideas are bad as opposed to oppress to control, or to control by enticing tempting rewards.

167. Delaware court agents mistreated me and disparately treated me based on political-religious-or poverty animus.

168. I motioned the Court for help concerning the disparate treatment, and the Court not only sealed my pleas for help, it also punished me by instituting proceedings against me in interference of Kelly v Trump, while the case in which I was a party was ongoing.

169. The Delaware Supreme Court also instigated the disciplinary law suit and upon information and belief participated in the preliminary hearing as witness, and judge, to cover up state Court misconduct. (See Exhibits A-3, A-4, A-5)

170. Until around or about December 1, 2022, I believed the Delaware Supreme Court sealed my motions and A-4 and A-5 on the date of the preliminary hearing to fix the outcome by concealing evidence material to my defense.

171. Upon information and belief, I learned the Delaware Supreme Court more heinously sealed these documents during my live case, Kelly v Trump, to prevent a mistrial, and to prevent the US Supreme Court and others from seeing my pleas, and to knowingly prejudice the Delaware disciplinary proceeding against me.

172. According to the Docket provided by Court Link attached to my First Motion for a stay, the Docket was accessed by the Delaware Supreme Court on the date of the preliminary hearing, November 3, 2022.

173. It processes the date of changes or access the next day. If you look at the top of the Court Link document it indicates it was last retrieved on November 4, 2022, meaning it was actually retrieved on November 3, 2022.

174. All of this time I thought the Delaware Supreme Court sealed my petitions relating to the contents in the attached A-4, and A-5 on the date of the preliminary hearing to conceal evidence necessary to my defense.

175. A-4 and A-5, previously incorporated herein and attached hereto, contains two pleadings that the Delaware Supreme Court secretly sealed to conceal my complaints concerning State agent and court agent attacks against me in violation of my procedural due process rights to affect the outcome of Kelly v Trump, as A-4 and A-5.

176. It appears the Delaware Supreme Court or its agent may actually have attended, aided in or participated in the preliminary hearing as witness and judge instead of merely sealing the documents.

177. To my horror, on or about December 1, 2022, I reviewed the attached graph included herein as Exhibit 11, hereto from file and serve.

178. File and serve is the docketing service the Delaware Supreme Court uses.

179. The Delaware Supreme Court sealed pleadings material to my defense to prevent a mistrial and to prevent the US Supreme Court from seeing the procedural due process complaints I made I incorporate and include herein by reference in Exhibits A-4 and A-5, attached hereto.

180. The Delaware Supreme Court also sealed to the documents to collude in fixing the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding against me. The other documents appeared public. It was only the documents necessary to my defense that were hidden.

181. According to the graph the file and serve representative provided, these documents were unsealed after my Board proceeding in response to my complaints to the Clerk of Court.

182. I did not have access to the sealed documents, through public record, nor did the ODC, the public, or the federal courts, which prejudiced me to the benefit of the State.⁸

183. Third Circuit Judge Bright's, concurring in part and dissenting in part in *U.S. v. Wecht*, 484 F.3d 194, 221, 226 (3d Cir. 2007) indicated sealing documents without notice or opportunity for a party to be heard without valid reason was enough to remove a judge from a case.

184. In my case the Delaware Supreme Court, sua sponte, sealed documents to assist the ODC's prosecution of me by concealing relevant material to my defense, evidencing the entire court's apparent bias against me and the Court's partiality to the state.

"When a court considers the imposition of a seal, it must make particularized findings on the record, giving notice on the docket of such consideration and rejecting alternatives to closure." *U.S. v. Wecht*, 484 F.3d 194, 224 (3d Cir. 2007); See *United States v. Criden*, 675 F.2d 550, 560 (3d Cir.1982).

⁸ (*N. Jersey Media Grp. Inc. v. United States*, 836 F.3d 421, 434 (3d Cir. 2016), "We have previously recognized a right of access to judicial proceedings and judicial records, and this right of access is beyond dispute." *Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg*, 23 F.3d 772, 780-81 (3d Cir. 1994) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 98 S.Ct. 1306, 55 L.Ed.2d 570 (1978) (recognizing that, in the context of criminal proceedings, the press has a historically-based, common law right of access to judicial records and documents). That right is rooted in common law and predates the Constitution. *Bank of Am. Nat'l Tr. & Sav. Ass'n v. Hotel Rittenhouse Assocs.*, 800 F.2d 339, 343 (3d Cir. 1986).

185. In my case, the Delaware Supreme Court did not make any such findings, and clearly sealed the four docket items in *Kelly v Trump*, Delaware Supreme Court No 119, 2021, DI 16, 21, 40, 41, to benefit the government to my detriment, showing clear prejudice against me, in violation of the procedural and substantive due process clause applicable to the state pursuant to the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

186. The Delaware Supreme Court sealed the 4 separate entries or group of entries I noted in Exhibit A-3, including but not limited to:

1. Exhibit A-4, Appellant's motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to Reign 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,
2. Internal Exhibit thereto, including December 1, 2020 letter to Master Patricia Griffin of the Chancery Court regarding my belief I received disparate treatment by the court's staff based on religious belief, political association or poverty; emails,
3. Internal Exhibit, Oct 19, 2020 letter to Patricia Griffin regarding I am acting as a party not as an attorney, DE-Lapp threatening email,
4. Internal Exhibit, letter dated May 21, 2020
5. Internal Exhibit A-5, Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this matter, exhibits thereto, proof of payment of bar dues, emails to Mark Vavala confirming he did not incite the investigation,
6. Internal Exhibit Letter from the Court in response to my request for exemption of bar dues for all attorneys facing hardship,
7. Internal Exhibit Feb. 5, 2021 letter request for relief from bar dues, my concerns relating to recent US Supreme Court cases;
8. Internal Exhibit, previously sealed pleading Appellant's motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to Reign 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, and exhibits thereto
9. Internal Exhibit, previously sealed pleading Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this matter, exhibits thereto.

187. The file and serve graph indicates *Appellant's motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to Reign 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* was sealed on May

27, 2021. It appears to be remaining on seal as of 2:52 PM that date. See Exhibit M Attached hereto incorporated herein.

188. Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this matter was sealed May 27, 2022, and remains sealed.

189. A-4 and A-5 appear to be sealed at this time too, per Exhibit M.

190. The Delaware Supreme Court Clerk and staff misled me before on multiple occasions. They alleged the documents were unsealed.

191. It is likely, Delaware Supreme Court judges ordered them to tell me this. I must be afforded opportunity to find out the truth concerning why the staff would be directed to misrepresent the truth to me.

192. I alerted DE-ODC of the problem per the attached emails I forwarded to PA-ODC, incorporated herein as Exhibit N.

193. The File and serve staff were not available for additional questions and is out of the office, but there appears to be concealing of documents in the disciplinary matter too.

194. The new procedural due process violations are material to my defense of this Court's reciprocation.

195. I await for additional information from file and serve which is material to my defenses before this Honorable Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

196. I seek additional evidence and answers on bad faith of the Delaware Supreme Court or its arms motive, Delaware Supreme Court partiality towards the state, procedural due

process violations, religious-political animus, collusion to fix the outcome in the original disciplinary proceeding and in Kelly v Trump, and to cover up state misconduct is material to this Court's reciprocal determination.

197. This reciprocating law suit is based on a Delaware Supreme Court Order placing my license to practice law on disability inactive.

198. Any additional information showing the reciprocating Court's Order must not be adopted by this Court is material to this case.

199. New information arose that could not have been discovered with due diligence before this Court's November 8, 2022 Order denying my request for a stay.

200. This Honorable Court must afford me 1st and 14th Procedural due process by modifying its Order pursuant to 42 Pa. Stat. and Cons. Stat. Ann. § 5505 to allow a stay, in light of the new and additional information showing procedural defects in the disciplinary proceeding, bad faith, collusion and the need for me to gather truth to defend myself before this Honorable Court should this case not be dismissed.

VI This Court erred as a matter of law, and as a matter of fact creating manifest injustice against me by denying my Motion to Stay the case, especially in light of additional facts.

201. This Court erred as a matter of law, and as a matter of fact creating manifest injustice against me by denying my Motion to Stay the case, especially in light of additional facts.

201. This Court made no finding of fact that the Court's interest or the public's interest or any other person's interests outweighs the harms towards me by denial of the stay.

202. This Court did not provide a finding on how denial of a stay in this case is somehow more important than the immediate irreparable, real not abstract loss of my Fundamental rights including but not limited to my 1st Amendment right of religious belief, First Amendment religious speech, First Amendment right of religious-political and professional affiliation, First Amendment religious exercise or my interest in my retired license.

203. This Court did not analyze how a change on the status of my retired license will cause hardship should it be placed on disability inactive needlessly or without adequate time for me to defend myself.

204. An Order of reciprocal discipline foreseeably affects my other property interests beyond rendering it more difficult for me to seek readmission to practice law from my retired status.

205. It reenforces additional punishment against me for the exercise of my First Amendment rights so as to chill me and others by precedent.

206. Denying a stay deprives me of meaningful opportunity to be heard making it more difficult to defend my liberty, and license.

207. Should this Court impose a reciprocating order, without granting a stay, it will make it more difficult for me to find work as an attorney in Delaware, even if I am able to vacate the original order.

208. An outcome may also affect my ability to fight in a fairer and open forum where I am more freely able to gather testimony by opposing parties without the costs or duplicity and additional costs for all courts involved.

209. My appeal of the original Delaware disciplinary order or the Civil rights proceeding *Kelly v Swartz*, 21-1490, will likely make this Court's reciprocal proceeding moot. I seek to move the Delaware District Court to vacate the original Delaware disciplinary order as voidable, due to procedural due process violations and other constitutional violations. (US Amend I, XIV).

210. The source of this Court's potential discipline may be nullified. Therefore, I request this Court conserve its own resources in the interest of justice until completion of the civil rights case and appeal of the original disciplinary matter before the Honorable Supreme Court, or until the time for appeal has lapsed.

211. Proceeding with this disciplinary proceeding without a stay would also cause a substantial burden upon my access to other courts, due to my limited resources in terms of time, money and material.

212. I am unemployed, and I am impoverished.

213. Continuing with this reciprocal proceeding, without a stay before the litigation on appeal of the original disciplinary proceeding and the civil rights case is complete including appeals to the United States Supreme Court or until the time of appeal has lapsed would create an economic burden so great as to deny me access to this court and other courts to defend my First Amendment rights. (US Amend I, V).

214. I also have religious objections to indebtedness. Continuing this proceeding without a stay would force me into likely needless debt requiring I violate my religious beliefs in order to defend my liberty to exercise religious beliefs without government retaliation or forgo my access to the Courts, my First Amendment rights and my property interests in my licenses, and relief from other harm.

215. There is no compelling reason to deny my request for a stay. The public and parties are not prejudiced by my request. I am not practicing law in any jurisdiction. Nor is any justification narrowly tailored to meet any compelling reason. This Court may stay a reciprocal case, with no prejudice, while potentially avoiding needless work for this court, the appellate courts and the parties in related cases.

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

217. The public may also be harmed if a stay is not granted, by setting a precedent that the state may eliminate Constitutional liberties in a government compelled exchange for the license to buy and sell in a profession. Every citizen holding a license may lose Constitutional rights or be in danger of being adjudicated disabled for merely believing differently than the state, or for standing up for their religious-political beliefs in Court, should I not be granted meaningful opportunity to contest the original case on appeal to the US Supreme Court and in the civil rights case, which may also be appeal to the Honorable United States Supreme Court.

218. I have good cause to contest the decision of the Delaware Supreme Court to place me on disabled inactive as punishment for my exercise of my First Amendment right to religious-political speech, religious-political belief, religious-political-exercise, and my exercise of the right to make religious-political petitions.

219. The Delaware Disciplinary proceeding is defective on its face. The record shows evidence of fraud, and collusion. The Delaware Supreme Court's members concealed evidence in my favor to prejudice the fixed outcome against me in aid of the Delaware ODC. The Court denied my requests for opportunity to perform discovery and for adequate time to prepare to hide the fact they terminated two court staff who are material to my case. The Court also secretly sealed four of my pleadings in Kelly v Trump that were material to my defense. My request to call one of the terminated employees was ignored and indirectly denied.

220. Despite having good cause to contest a reciprocal proceeding by this Honorable Pennsylvania Supreme Court, I lack time and resources to appeal the original DE disciplinary proceeding, the civil rights case, while fending off reciprocal cases, which may also be appealed. I am unemployed. I am 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.

221. I do not have the time, ability or resources to fight all cases all at once. In the interest of justice, and for good cause, I request this Honorable court preserve the right for my meaningful opportunity to be heard, without waste of judicial resources or prejudice towards me, by granting a stay.

Wherefore I pray this Court grants this Motion.

Dated: Dec 19, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

(302) 493-6693

Retired Bar No. 202268, INACTIVE, not practicing
law

Appendix X

Re: 21-3198/219 Meghan's denied amn opportunity to be heard by the refusal of the court to docket pleadings based on my religious beliefs and voluminous amount of evidence necessary to defend my life and liberty

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: supreme.grievanceofficer@pacourts.us; anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; supreme.grievanceofficer@pacourts.us; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Friday, December 23, 2022 at 09:58 AM EST

Good morning,

I am quite prejudiced by the denial of an opportunity to be heard, not for procedural grounds but based on bad faith denial due to the voluminous amount of documents I require to submit to show years of disparate treatment by the state of Delaware towards me based on my assertion of religious petitions.

It appears the Court in bad faith is not docketing additional motions based on disdain towards my religious beliefs contained therein, and due to the volume.

I attempted to prevent the duplicity of work by filing a motion for a stay, which was wrongly denied. I alerted the court to the voluminous amount of documents necessary to my defense. I submitted a Second Motion for a stay with matters unrelated to the first motion.

John Vascov said I could resubmit the motions, but I am prejudiced in that I do not have time as I am drafting a document due today. He in bad faith indicated he rejected the documents without thoroughly reviewing them assuming they were already granted, when I asked for additional relief including including a motion to prevent costs or expenses to PA ODC and a motion to accept non-conforming documents and documents the courts refused to docket necessary to my defense of life and liberty and my retired license.

I am denied an opportunity to be heard when my pleadings are not docketed. I am asking for the opportunity at justice, not the guarantee. That opportunity is denied when my pleadings are not docketed, without proper reason under the rules, in light of my different requests to file nonconforming pleadings, the denial of pleadings despite that apparent grant. I asked for a different request under 105 today. It remains docketed.

I filed items today that were rejected without valid reason. I write you in case this issue is not resolved by the end of the day, when everything is due.

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

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693

retired 202268

Appendix Y

Denied help Re: 21-3198/219 dd3 Fw: Americans with Disabilities Act Accommodation (ADA) Title II Request for Reasonable Accommodation Case No 2913 dd3

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: supreme.grievanceofficer@pacourts.us; wdada.coordinator@pacourts.us; anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; supreme.grievanceofficer@pacourts.us; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Thursday, December 22, 2022 at 11:03 AM EST

Dear Sirs and Madams,

The Court denied an extension in the amount of 45 days. I am not sure what you are looking at for a second grant of an extension. 14 days is inadequate under the circumstances.

I am prejudiced. This Court has notice I could not stand at the post office due to severe dehydration related to a surgery. I assert my right to live by seeking an accommodations. It appears I attempted to file it with the court correctly, but it remains undocketed.

This Court has notice of my medical records, but it is more concerned with costs and convenience than justice. Justice is not a matter of business and barter or exchange, but a matter of truth under the law.

Claimants without means or with limited ability should be afforded access to the courts without denial of an opportunity to be heard by the court's failure to docket the items.

I thank you for your consideration and getting back to me. Have a good day.

Regards,
Meg

On Thursday, December 22, 2022 at 10:54:03 AM EST, Supreme Grievance Officer <supreme.grievanceofficer@pacourts.us> wrote:

Dear Ms. Kelly.

A review of your communication regarding an alleged ADA request has taken place. Please be advised that the Grievance email is to be used only when a party has filed a proper request for an accommodation with a Supreme Court Coordinator and has been denied said request. Records reveal that the rejected filing you take issue with, is in regards to an active Disciplinary matter concerning yourself.

As you should be aware, the courts cannot administratively grant, as an ADA accommodation requests that impact court procedures within a specific case. Thus any extension of time requests are not properly made to the ADA Coordinator or Grievance Officer, but on the matter docketed at 2913 DD3. There the Court may consider an individual's disability, along with other relevant factors, in granting or denying the motion. However; it is noted that the Court already granted two extensions as evidenced in its 11/8/2022 and 11/30/2022 orders and in its last order specifically stated that no further extension request will be entertained. Thus, a Response to the Notice and Order dated August 10, 2022 is due to be filed at 2913 DD3 on or before December 23, 2022 and the Western District appropriately rejected any filings that were not said.

Regards,

Regards,

Irene M. Bizzoso

Supreme Court Grievance Officer

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2022 3:44 PM
To: Supreme Grievance Officer <Supreme.GrievanceOfficer@pacourts.us>; WDADA Coordinator <WDADA.Coordinator@pacourts.us>; Anthony Sodroski <Anthony.Sodroski@pacourts.us>; Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>; david.weiss@usdoj.gov
Subject: 21-3198/219 dd3 Fw: Americans with Disabilities Act Accommodation (ADA) Title II Request for Reasonable Accommodation Case No 2913 dd3

CAUTION: This is an external email. Please think before you click on an attachment or link!

Good afternoon,

I left a voice message with

Angharad Stock	Allegheny County Courthouse 300 Frick Building 437 Grant Street Pittsburgh, PA 15219	phone: 412-350-3877 email: courtaccess@alleghenycourts.us
----------------	---	--

The ADA Coordinator for grievances in Allegheny County is not going to be available until January 4, 2022, per her message. This is too late to prevent irreparable injury.

Very truly,

Meg

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dr.

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

(302) 493-6693

Not acting as an attorney

Retired License 202268

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: courtaccess@alleghenycourts.us <courtaccess@alleghenycourts.us>

Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>; Anthony Sodroski <anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us>;
WDADACoordinator@pacourts.us <wdadacoordinator@pacourts.us>; david.weiss@usdoj.gov
<david.weiss@usdoj.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2022 at 03:13:16 PM EST

Subject: Americans with Disabilities Act Accommodation (ADA) Title II Request for Reasonable Accommodation Case No 2913 dd3

Dear Sirs and Madams,

A reciprocal law suit was filed against me, based on an original law suit alleging my religious-political beliefs in God not money as God and guide is evidence of a disability. I seek to contest that. I believe differently, and I have religious beliefs against healthcare and mental healthcare.

I require an accommodation in the form of a stay to protect my life and health due to a limitation.

I studied healthcare law and finance at Duquesne School of Law. I believe people not only are harmed but also lose eternal life in hell because of our bad healthcare. I especially oppose drugs that allegedly help people feel better by feeling nothing. Drugs often inhibit people's faculties. It is my religious belief people must use their brain to go to heaven. I believe that people go to hell for not using their brains, not knowing, for their belief in a lie, their misunderstanding, for doing what they are trained to do, told to do should they harden their hearts towards loving others for their love of money as God to care for their own, without repentance.

I believe healthcare would improve if judges judged the experts instead of making them like God, allowing their opinions and practices to be above the law, by submitting their testimony as the standard. The bad standards are never corrected by the courts when judges allow business professionals collective uniform standard to be the standard of the law.

I have many religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare. Nevertheless, I assert my right to live.

Attached, please find documents the PA Supreme Court refused to submit including an ADA claim.

Thank you,

Meg

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dr.

Dagsboro, DE 19939

302) 493-6693

acting as a party not as an attorney

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: SupremeGrievanceOfficer@pacourts.us <supremegrievanceofficer@pacourts.us>;
WDADACoordinator@pacourts.us <wdadacoordinator@pacourts.us>

Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>; Anthony Sodroski <anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us>

Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2022 at 01:52:43 PM EST

Subject: 2913 dd3 /Fw: "Answer to Application for Emergency Relief" filing WSUPWD01363707 rejected for case "In the Matter of: Meghan Marie Kelly" (2913 DD3)

Dear Sirs or Madams,

I attempted to file the document rejected associated with the docket entry items referred to below. I sought an accommodation under the ADA. I was denied the opportunity to be heard. It was not even submitted before the Court. The documents were rejected.

According to your web site, I must file 3 days in advance, and am alerting you now, three days wherein I seek an accommodation in the form of time by granting a stay of the proceeding to protect not only my liberty, but life too.

Thank you,

Meg

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dr.

Dagsboro, DE 19939

(302) 493-6693

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

From: "administrator@pacourts.us" <administrator@pacourts.us>

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

Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2022 at 11:28:53 AM EST

Subject: "Answer to Application for Emergency Relief" filing WSUPWD01363707 rejected for case "In the Matter of: Meghan Marie Kelly" (2913 DD3)

"Answer to Application for Emergency Relief" filing WSUPWD01363707 rejected for case "In the Matter of: Meghan Marie Kelly" (2913 DD3)

A filing has been rejected on a case in which you, or the attorney(s) you are proxying for, are participating.

Click the following link to login to PACFile and view this notification: <https://ujportal.pacourts.us/Secure/eFiling/ViewNotification.aspx?notificationID=122080620>.

This notification was sent on 12/21/2022 11:18 AM.

Appendix Z

25

26

APPENDIX 1-c

Showing missing
Document

for filer 21-5522
Kelly v. Trump

[Click to Print](#)

Printed on: 7/21/2021 13:29:40 GMT-0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)

Case History Search

Search Created:

7/21/2021 13:29:40 GMT-0400 (Eastern Daylight Time)

Court: DE Supreme Court **Judge:** Delaware, Supreme Court **File & ServeXpress Live Date:** 4/21/2021
Division: N/A **Case Number:** 119,2021 **Document(s) Filed:** 53
Case Type: Civil-Other **Case Name:** Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump **Date Range:** All
Linked Case(s): 2020-0809-PWG [View Case History]

1-21 of 21 transactions <<Prev Page 1 of 1 Next>>

Transaction	Date/Time	Option	Case Number Case Name	Authorizer Organization	#	Document Type	Document Title	Size
66786294	7/21/2021 1:02 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court		Letter	Letter dated 7-21-21 from Appellant to Court, regarding elimination of the dollar-intentionally crashing the economy to get out of the biggest bill failing due, caring for the baby boomers. (dja)	0.1MB
						Exhibit	Exhibit to letter	2.1MB
						Exhibit	Exhibit-Covid-19: The Great Reset	1.9MB
						Exhibit	Exhibit part 1	4.1MB
						Exhibit	Exhibit Part 2	9.9MB
						Exhibit	Exhibit Part 3	7.3MB
						Exhibit	Exhibit part 4	8.5MB
						Exhibit	Exhibit part 5.	10.9MB
66776781	7/19/2021 11:33 AM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	45	Mandate to Clerk of Court Below	Mandate to Clerk of Court below. Case closed. (raw)	0.3MB
66776197	7/19/2021 9:40 AM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Gary F Traynor, DE Supreme Court	44	Order	Order dated 7-19-21 by Traynor, J. IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reargument is DENIED. (JTV, GFT, TMR) (raw)	0.1MB
66764398	7/14/2021 8:59 AM EDT	File And Serve	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	43	Motion for Reargument	Appellant's Unopposed Motion for a Reargument Before the Delaware Supreme Court. (filed 7-12- 21) (ead)	0.3MB
66744583	7/7/2021 9:11 AM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Gary F Traynor, DE Supreme Court	42	Order - Final	Order dated 7-7-21 by Traynor, J. IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Court of Chancery is AFFIRMED. The other pending motions are moot. (JTV, GFT, TMR)(ead)	0.1MB

66667019	6/8/2021 4:00 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	32 Opening Brief	Appellant's opening brief. (dja)	0.5MB
					33 Other	Declaration filed by appellant.	0.1MB

① Missing

2 missing

34 Proposed Order	Proposed order.	0.1MB
35 Certificate of Compliance with Typeface	Certificate of Compliance with Typeface.	0.1MB

36 Exhibit	Court of Chancery docket. (dja)	0.2MB
------------	------------------------------------	-------

37 Appendix	Appendix A-1	0.1MB
-------------	--------------	-------

38 Appendix	Appendix A-2	0.1MB
-------------	--------------	-------

39 Appendix	Appendix A-3. (dja)	0.2MB
-------------	---------------------	-------

40 Appendix	Appendix A-4. (dja)	1.2MB
-------------	---------------------	-------

41 Appendix	Appendix A-5. (dja)	1.3MB
-------------	---------------------	-------

66659299	6/4/2021 4:08 PM EDT	File And Serve	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Gary F Traynor, DE Supreme Court	31 Order	Order dated 6-4-21 by Traynor, J. Supreme Court Rule 14(d)(i) provides that an opening brief shall not exceed 10,000 words. [sic] The motion states that the appellant's word count is 9,300 words. Using 14-point font in the footnotes, as required by Rule 13(a)(i), will not increase the word count. Thus, it appears that no relief is required. Moreover, the motion does not state the number of additional words requested. (raw) • Linked to (1)	0.2MB
----------	----------------------------	-------------------	---	---	----------	---	-------

③ Recusal
Missing

66658984	6/4/2021 3:20 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	28 Motion under Rule 14(d)	Motion under Rule 14(d) by appellant. (dja)	0.2MB
					29 Other	Appellant's declaration.	0.1MB

66649842	6/2/2021 11:29 AM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	21 Motion - Other	Document entitled "Motion for recusal" filed by appellant. (283)(dja)	0.2MB
----------	-----------------------------	-----------	---	--	-------------------	---	-------

22 Exhibit	Exhibit 1	0.1MB
------------	-----------	-------

23 Exhibit	Exhibit 2	0.2MB
------------	-----------	-------

24 Exhibit	Exhibit 3	0.1MB
------------	-----------	-------

25 Exhibit	Exhibit 4	0.3MB
------------	-----------	-------

26 Other	Declaration by appellant.	0.1MB
----------	---------------------------	-------

27 Proposed Order	Proposed order to motion.	0.1MB
-------------------	---------------------------	-------

66639035	5/27/2021 2:52 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	16 Motion - Other	Document entitled "appellant's motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms through its agents from unlawfully	0.2MB
----------	-----------------------------	-----------	---	--	-------------------	---	-------

Missing

H

(4) Missi

pressuring appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion by relief it seems just" (documents received by email 5-25-21) (556) (dja)

					17	Other	Signed Declaration filed by appellant. (dja)	0.1MB
					18	Exhibit	Exhibit 55 (dja)	0.6MB
					19	Exhibit	Exhibit DELAP document. (dja)	0.1MB
					20	Proposed Order	Proposed order.	0.1MB
66629407	5/25/2021 12:12 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	15	Letter from Supreme Court Clerk	Letter dated 5-25-21 from Clerk to appellant, striking the letter as a nonconforming filing. (ead)	0.1MB
66629090	5/25/2021 11:08 AM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	13	Letter	Letter dated 4-20-21, received 5-24-21, from appellant to justices, regarding her appeal. (ead)	0.1MB
					14	Exhibit	Exhibits to letter. (ead)	0.6MB
66625495	5/24/2021 12:35 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Paul A Fioravanti Jr, DE Court of Chancery Civil Action	12	Record as Ordered	Transfer of Court of Chancery docket to Supreme Court on appeal constituting the record as ordered. (dja) • Linked to (1)	0.2MB
66612254	5/18/2021 5:42 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	11	Letter - Record Due from Supreme Court Clerk	Letter dated 5-18-21 from Senior Court Clerk to the Chief Register in Chancery, advising the record is due 6-10-21. (raw) • Linked from (1)	0.1MB
66603779	5/14/2021 3:41 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	10	Brief Schedule	Brief schedule issued. (Opening Brief is due 6-28-21)(raw)	0.1MB
66601300	5/14/2021 8:56 AM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Gary F Traynor, DE Supreme Court	9	Order	Order dated 5-14-21 by Traynor, J., appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED, limited only to waiver of docketing fee. (ead)	0.1MB
66572383	5/5/2021 8:08 AM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	8	Certificate of Service	Certificate of service to statement in lieu. (served by mail and email on 5-4-21) (dja)	0.1MB
66570847	5/4/2021 3:07 PM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	7	Statement in lieu of ordering Transcript	Statement pursuant to Rule 9(e) in lieu of ordering of proceedings below by appellant. (dja)	0.1MB
66566457	5/3/2021	File Only	119,2021	Supreme	6	Other	Unsworn declaration filed	0.1MB

	1:32 PM EDT		Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court		by appellant. (dja)		
66540809	4/23/2021 10:26 AM EDT	File And Serve	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	5	Letter from Supreme Court Clerk	Letter dated 4-21-21 from Clerk to appellant, directing that the IFP must be notarized or an unsworn declaration be filed by 5-5- 21. Advising that the many documents filed with the notice of appeal will not be docketed. (ead)	0.1MB
66533768	4/21/2021 11:53 AM EDT	File Only	119,2021 Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump	Supreme Court Delaware, DE Supreme Court	1	Notice of Appeal Pro Se	Notice of appeal from the Order dated 3-26-21 in the Court of Chancery, by Vice Chancellor Fioravanti, in C.A. No. 2020-0809, with designation of no transcript. (no service shown) (dja) (filed on 4-20- 21)	0.2MB
					2	Exhibit	Exhibit-NOA order dated 3- 26-21	0.3MB
					3	Exhibit	Exhibit-NOA Master's Final Report dated 11-2-20. (dja)	0.1MB
					4	Motion to Proceed in Forma Pauperis	Motion to proceed in forma pauperis by appellant. (not notarized)(dja) (filed on 4- 20-21)	0.5MB

Appendix AA

RE: Meghan Kelly/Delaware Supreme Court/ Question dates sealing and unsealing matters/o 119-2021 and matter No 58-2022

From: Jason Gonzales (jgonzales@fileandserve.com)

To: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Thursday, October 13, 2022 at 06:00 PM EDT

My pleasure, Ms. Kelly.

Let me do some research on our side to see what information we can glean.

Thank you.

Jason

Jason Gonzales

Manager, Account Management, [File & ServeXpress](#)

972-893-6632 jgonzales@fileandserve.com



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 5:41 PM

To: Jason Gonzales <jgonzales@fileandserve.com>

Cc: Support <support@fileandserve.com>; Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Meghan Kelly/Delaware Supreme Court/ Question dates sealing and unsealing matters/o 119-2021 and matter No 58-2022

Hi Jason,

Thank you so much. The court misbehaved by sealing and leaving documents unsealed to protect the court.

Are you able to provide dates documents were unsealed and sealed in both matters?

I have contacted the court. The court provided inaccurate information on the unsealing and sealing of documents in the two matter.

Thank you for the email indicating it is not file serve's fault or under your control.

Thank you,

Meg
Please forgive typos.

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 12, 2022, at 4:52 PM, Jason Gonzales <jgonzales@fileandserve.com> wrote:

Good afternoon Ms. Kelly.

Our Support team forwarded your email to me. I can confirm that our platform is integrated with the Delaware Courts. Our system automatically updates when the court takes action on or changes the status of a case/filing/documents. File & ServeXpress does not assume the authority to seal and unseal documents.

I encourage you to contact the court should you have any questions about the security status of a case and/or a document(s).

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jason

Jason Gonzales

Manager, Account Management, [File & ServeXpress](#)

<image011.png>

972-893-6632

<image012.png>

jgonzales@fileandserve.com

[<image018.png>](#)

[<image013.png>](#) [<image014.png>](#) [<image015.png>](#) [<image016.png>](#) [<image017.png>](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Support <support@fileandserve.com>
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2022 1:19 PM
To: 'Meg Kelly' <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Cc: Support <support@fileandserve.com>
Subject: RE: Meghan Kelly/Delaware Supreme Court/ Question dates sealing and unsealing matters/o 119-2021 and matter No 58-2022

Hello Ms. Kelly!

I have reached out to our team to provide some clarify for your inquires below, and will follow up with you before the end of the day with additional information.

<image001.gif>

Client Support JR, [File & ServeXpress](#)

<image002.png>

[888-529-7587](tel:888-529-7587)

<image003.png>

<image009.png>

support@fileandserve.com

<image004.png> <image005.png> <image006.png> <image007.png> <image008.png>

<image010.jpg>

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2022 12:01 PM
To: Support <support@fileandserve.com>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: Meghan Kelly/Delaware Supreme Court/ Question dates sealing and unsealing matters/o 119-2021 and matter No 58-2022

Good morning,

Per the September 7, 2022 order in the first docket attached hereto, relating to Delaware Supreme Court matter IMO Meghan Kelly a member of the bar, the court ordered the case unsealed. Did the Court process the request on September 29, 2022, and did it go through on September 30, 2022?

In the second docket attached hereto, case number 119, 2021, Case name Meghan Kelly v Donald Trump, could you please provide the dates the following four documents were sealed and unsealed?

Transaction ID 66649842, docket item 21.

Transaction ID 66639035, docket item 16

Transaction item number 66667019, Docket Item 40, appendix A-4, Docket item 41 Appendix A-5.

Could you please confirm that Delaware Courts are an integrated courts. By integrated Courts I mean the courts are in charge of what is sealed and unsealed. File and serve does not assume the authority to seal and unseal documents by request. It is physically entered by the attorneys and courts.

I am a party in both cases.

Thank you,

Meg

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dr.

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Appendix BB

[1192021, Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump, et al](#)

DE Supreme - New Castle

New Castle

This case was retrieved on **11/04/2021**

Header

Case Number: 1192021

Date Filed: 04/21/2021

Date Full Case Retrieved: 11/04/2021

Status: Open

Misc: (0) Civil-Other; Civil

Summary

Judge: Delaware, Supreme Court

Status: Active

Participants

Litigants

Meghan Kelly

Appellant

Donald J. Trump President

Appellee

Donald Trump

Appellee

Meghan Kelley

Appellee

New Castle County, Sheriff

Appellee

President Donald Trump

Appellee

President of the United States

Appellee

DE Supreme Court

Other

Attorneys

Pro Se Pro Se

Appellant

Sheriff New Castle County

Appellee

Fax : 302-395-8460

302-395-8457

Proceedings

Date	#	Proceeding Text	Details
04/21/2021	1	Notice of appeal from the Order dated 3-26-21 in the Court of Chancery, by Vice Chancellor Fioravanti, in C.A. No. 2020-0809, with designation of no transcript. (no service shown) (dja) (filed on 4-20-21)	Number of Pages: 8 Filer Name: Meghan Kelly
04/21/2021	2	Exhibit-NOA order dated 3-26-21	Number of Pages: 6 Filer Name:

1192021, Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump, et al

Date	#	Proceeding Text	Details
			Meghan Kelly
04/21/2021	3	Exhibit-NOA Master's Final Report dated 11-2-20. (dja)	Number of Pages: 8 Filer Name: Meghan Kelly
04/21/2021	4	Motion to proceed in forma pauperis by appellant. (not notarized)(dja) (filed on 4-20-21)	Number of Pages: 13 Filer Name: Meghan Kelly
04/23/2021	5	Letter dated 4-21-21 from Clerk to appellant, directing that the IFP must be notarized or an unsworn declaration be filed by 5-5-21. Advising that the many documents filed with the notice of appeal will not be docketed. (ead)	Number of Pages: 3
05/03/2021	6	Unsworn declaration filed by appellant. (dja)	Number of Pages: 1
05/04/2021	7	Statement pursuant to Rule 9(e) in lieu of ordering of proceedings below. (dja)	Number of Pages: 2
05/05/2021	8	Certificate of service to statement in lieu. (served by mail and email on 5-4-21) (dja)	Number of Pages: 1
05/14/2021	9	Order dated 5-14-21 by Traynor, J., appellant's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED, limited only to waiver of docketing fee. (ead)	Number of Pages: 1
05/14/2021	10	Brief schedule issued. (Opening Brief is due 6-28-21)(raw)	Number of Pages: 1
05/18/2021	11	Letter dated 5-18-21 from Senior Court Clerk to the Chief Register in Chancery, advising the record is due 6-10-21. (raw)	Number of Pages: 1
05/24/2021	12	Transfer of Court of Chancery docket to Supreme Court on appeal constituting the record as ordered. (dja)	Number of Pages: 7 Filer Name: Kruger, Katrina
05/25/2021	13	Letter dated 5-25-21 from Clerk to appellant, striking the letter as a nonconforming filing. (ead)	Number of Pages: 1
06/04/2021	14	Motion under Rule 14(d) by appellant. (dja)	Number of Pages: 8
06/04/2021	15	Appellant's declaration.	Number of Pages: 1
06/04/2021	16	Proposed Order of motion.	Number of Pages: 1
06/04/2021	17	Order dated 6-4-21 by Traynor, J. Supreme Court Rule 14(d)(i) provides that an opening brief shall not exceed 10,000 words. [sic] The motion states that the appellant's word count is 9,300 words. Using 14-point font in the footnotes, as required by Rule 13(a)(i), will not increase the word count. Thus, it appears that no relief is required. Moreover, the motion does not state the number of additional words requested. (raw)	Number of Pages: 2

1192021, Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump, et al

Date	#	Proceeding Text	Details
06/08/2021	18	Appellant's opening brief. (dja)	Number of Pages: 53
06/08/2021	19	Declaration filed by appellant.	Number of Pages: 1
06/08/2021	20	Proposed order.	Number of Pages: 2
06/08/2021	21	Certificate of Compliance with Typeface.	Number of Pages: 1
06/08/2021	22	Court of Chancery docket. (dja)	Number of Pages: 11
06/08/2021	23	Appendix A-1	Number of Pages: 2
06/08/2021	24	Appendix A-2	Number of Pages: 2
06/08/2021	25	Appendix A-3. (dja)	Number of Pages: 8
06/08/2021	26	Appendix A-4. (dja)	Number of Pages: 38
06/08/2021	27	Appendix A-5. (dja)	Number of Pages: 34
07/07/2021	28	Order dated 7-7-21 by Traynor, J. IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Court of Chancery is AFFIRMED. The other pending motions are moot. (JTV, GFT, TMR). (EAF)	Number of Pages: 7
07/14/2021	29	Appellant's Unopposed Motion for a Reargument Before the Delaware Supreme Court. (filed 7-12-21) (ead)	Number of Pages: 16
07/19/2021	30	Order dated 7-19-21 by Traynor, J. IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reargument is DENIED. (JTV, GFT, TMR) (raw)	Number of Pages: 1
07/19/2021	31	Mandate to Clerk of Court below. Case closed. (raw)	Number of Pages: 11
07/21/2021	32	Letter dated 7-21-21 from Appellant to Court, regarding elimination of the dollar-intentionally crashing the economy to get out of the biggest bill falling due, caring for the baby boomers. (dja)	Number of Pages: 2
07/21/2021	33	Exhibit to letter	Number of Pages: 8
07/21/2021	34	Exhibit-Covid-19: The Great Reset.	Number of Pages: 213
07/21/2021	35	Exhibit part 1	Number of Pages: 58
07/21/2021	36	Exhibit Part 2	Number of Pages: 34
07/21/2021	37	Exhibit Part 3	Number of Pages: 35
07/21/2021	38	Exhibit part 4	Number of Pages: 34
07/21/2021	39	Exhibit part 5.	Number of Pages: 33
07/22/2021	40	Letter dated 7-22-21 from Chief Deputy Clerk to appellant, advising her case is closed and the Court will take no further action with her	Number of Pages: 1

1192021, Kelly, Meghan v. Donald Trump, et al

Date	#	Proceeding Text	Details
		letter. In addition, the Court will not docket or act on any future documents submitted in this matter. (dja)	
09/01/2021	41	Letter dated 8-30-21 from U.S. Supreme Court Clerk to Clerk, advising that the writ of certiorari was filed on 8-23-21 and placed on the docket 8-30-21 as No. 21-5522. (eaf)	Number of Pages: 1
11/03/2021	42	Letter dated 11-1-21 from Supreme Court of the United States to Clerk of Supreme Court of Delaware, advising that the petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.	Number of Pages: 1

Copyright © LexisNexis CourtLink, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

*** THIS DATA IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY ***

End of Document

Appendix CC

CASE 1:19-2021

Transaction ID 66648942, docket item 21.

Submit Date	Review Status	Reviewer	Reason	Comment	Document Type	Document Title	Access Type	Statutory Fee
May 17 2022 8:21AM EDT	Accepted (6/7/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Motion - Other	Document entitled "Motion for recusal" filed by appellant. (283)(djs)	Public	\$0.00
Jun 3 2021 8:36AM EDT	Accepted (6/7/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Motion - Other	Document entitled "Motion for recusal" filed by appellant. (283)(djs)	Sealed, electronic	\$0.00
Jun 2 2021 11:55AM EDT	Accepted (6/7/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Motion - Other	Document entitled "Motion for recusal" filed by appellant. (djs)	Sealed, electronic	\$0.00
Jun 2 2021 11:29AM EDT	Pending			Document created	Motion - Other	Document entitled "Motion for recusal" filed by appellant. (djs)	Sealed, electronic	

Transaction ID 66678825, docket item 16

Submit Date	Review Status	Reviewer	Reason	Comment	Document Type	Document Title	Access Type	Statutory Fee
May 17 2022 8:20AM EDT	Accepted (5/27/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Motion - Other	Document entitled "appellant's motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms through its appointment in unlawfully pressuring appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion by relief it seems just" (documents received by email 5-15-21) (556) (djs)	Public	\$0.00
May 27 2021 3:08PM EDT	Accepted (5/27/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Motion - Other	Document entitled "appellant's motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms through its appointment in unlawfully pressuring appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion by relief it seems just" (documents received by email 5-15-21) (556) (djs)	Sealed, electronic	\$0.00
May 27 2021 2:52PM EDT	Pending			Document created	Motion - Other	Document entitled "appellant's motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms through its appointment in unlawfully pressuring appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion by relief it seems just" (documents received by email 5-15-21) (556) (UNDER SEAL) (djs)	Sealed, electronic	

Transaction item number 666670215, docket item 40, appendix A-4, docket item 41, Appendix A-5.

Submit Date	Review Status	Reviewer	Reason	Comment	Document Type	Document Title	Access Type	Statutory Fee
May 17 2022 8:22AM EDT	Accepted (6/8/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Appendix	Appendix A-4 (djs)	Public	\$0.00
Jun 8 2021 4:10PM EDT	Accepted (6/8/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Appendix	Appendix A-4 (djs)	Sealed, electronic	\$0.00
Jun 8 2021 4:00PM EDT	Pending			Document created	Appendix	Appendix A-4 (djs)	Sealed, electronic	
Submit Date	Review Status	Reviewer	Reason	Comment	Document Type	Document Title	Access Type	Statutory Fee
May 17 2022 8:22AM EDT	Accepted (6/8/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Appendix	Appendix A-5 (djs)	Public	\$0.00
Jun 8 2021 4:10PM EDT	Accepted (6/8/2021)	28, Supreme Court			Appendix	Appendix A-5 (djs)	Sealed, electronic	\$0.00
Jun 8 2021 4:00PM EDT	Pending			Document created	Appendix	Appendix A-5 (djs)	Sealed, electronic	\$0.00

Appendix DD

MEGHAN MARIE KELLY, ESQUIRE

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

Clerk of Court

Pennsylvania Supreme Court

Pennsylvania Judicial Center

601 Commonwealth Ave.

Suite 4500

P.O. Box 62575

Harrisburg, PA 17106

RE: Retired PA Bar No. 202268/Computer broke

December 12, 2022

Dear Honorable Clerk of Court :

On December 12, 2022, the cord to my computer broke. I am unable to resolve this problem immediately.

I may be without a computer. This affects my ability to timely receive notifications and draft and file documents. It also prevents me from working on my response to this Court's November 8, 2022 Order.


I emailed opposing counsel concerning my ^{broken} computer, ^{mic} printer and concerning ^{Internet connectivity issues} and concerning ^{mb} the fact I do not feel well due to lack of time required to care for my health due to this litigation. I require time due to a surgery I had as a youth I previously noted to this Court on the record.

The 14 day extension is not enough time in light of my situation.

Thank you.

12/12/22

Respectfully Submitted,



/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
302-493-6693
Retired Bar 202268

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

Dated: December 12, 2022

Meghan Kelly (printed)

 (signed)

Allstate Protection Plans: Response to your inquiry

From: Warranty Support (warrantysupport@squaretrade.com)

To: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 at 02:36 PM EST



Serviced by
SquareTrade, an
Allstate company

Dear Meghan,

Kindly send us the picture of your cord.

Thank you,
The Allstate Protection Plans Team

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to visit our [help center](#).

ref:_00D306mMq._5005Y2JOAWw:ref

2913 dd3 Fw: Cord

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us

Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 at 02:53 PM EST

Anthony,

I got home from the law library and my computer's charger is broke. You are aware that my printer is getting repaired.

I require a stay or a continuation. Denial will prejudice my ability to effectively defend my case.

I am not having the best of luck.

Please state whether your position remains the same.

You are also aware that I require time to rest and drink water per my previous filing with the court. I assert my right to live, as well as my liberty.

I have religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare.

Regards,
Meg

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>


Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 at 02:31:38 PM EST

Subject: Cord

Sent from my iPhone

 IMG_1717.jpg
834.2kB

 IMG_1716.jpg
702.4kB



REALTEK

Model / 型號: BR1160CK Notebook PC / 筆記型電腦

Input / 輸入: 115V ~ 237V, 45W / +15V ~ 3A, 45W (Only for Type C DC in)

CE FCC

EMI



UL LISTED



Realtek Computer Inc. All rights reserved. CAN ICES-003 (3) / NMB-003 (6) Made in China / 中國製造 R-1

Contents

1. Realtek BR1160CK

2. Realtek BR1160CK

3. Realtek BR1160CK

4. Realtek BR1160CK

5. Realtek BR1160CK

6. Realtek BR1160CK



電圧値により5.2/5.3GHz
帯は国内使用に限りま
(5.2GHz)帯系出力が一
部ノイズの発生局又は
地上波の中継局と通信す
る場合を除く。

BR1160CKA-X504

SN: M5NXL P00X314207

CN: N9DY

MFD: 2021-05

12M

2913 dd 3 Fw: ASUS Service No=N2209023925-0005; Rma No=

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us

Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 at 03:13 PM EST

Anthony,

I am on the phone. They rejected my request for a new cord relating to physical damage. It is faulty, and i am seeking to talk to a manager relating to this design defect.

I require time. I am prejudiced and do not have adequate time to file a response in light of my circumstances.

Please reconsider your position.

Thank you,
Meg

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

From: ServiceCenter_AM <servicecenter_am@asus.com>

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

Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 at 03:09:38 PM EST

Subject: ASUS Service No=N2209023925-0005; Rma No=

Hello Meghan Kelly,

Thank you for contacting ASUS Product Support.

My name is Daniel Mo. and it's my pleasure to help you with your problem.

CASE NO= N2209023925-0005

You are more than welcome to visit our Asus support website: <https://www.asus.com/us/support>
If you continue to experience issues in the future, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Best regards,

Daniel Mo.

ASUS Product Support

Chat with Us if you need further support.

Help make us better! Let us know what we can do to improve by clicking [here](#).



=====

This email and any attachments to it contain confidential information and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient or receive it accidentally, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail and delete the message and any attachments from your computer system, and destroy all hard copies. If any, please be advised that any unauthorized disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted in reliance on this, is illegal and prohibited. Furthermore, any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not represent those of ASUSTeK. Thank you for your cooperation.

=====

Internet problems/Computer and printer problems too

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)
To: anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us
Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
Date: Monday, December 12, 2022 at 03:22 PM EST

Anthony,

I also have been having problems with the internet for more than a week. I went into mediacom to seek to resolve the problem today.

They printed out the note on the file noting they see problems. Attached, please find the print out.

I am still on the phone hoping to get my computer fixed despite the initial denial.

I need to conserve the battery as i try to figure out how to best use the remaining life I have.

My apologies should I not respond to emails. Please afford me meaningful opportunity to respond. On a side note, the representative relating to Asus, the computer people just hung up on as I am on hold. I must call again.

Thank you,
Meg

 scan.pdf
6.5kB

204017976160221209 mediacomcorp\gbaldelli signal issues showing on modem may need a tech - will possible swap modem at LO - informed that may not work but will see. If issue persists will work out a tech visit - please give printout of this note for record of issue.

2913 dd 3 printer Fw: Return Instructions for your Epson product - 221207-004892

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us

Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Thursday, December 8, 2022 at 09:02 AM EST

Good morning,

Yesterday, my printer broke and I shipped it off, and a back up one is not working.

I am giving you notice in case I need to file past today's deadline.

I am not misleading you. Inconveniences sometimes happen. The rich may buy help. The poor are without help and without the ability to buy solutions only the rich may afford, preventing justice in many cases beyond my own. Throwing money at it is not the answer. Accommodations are. not exploiting need to serve greed under the guise of charity in violation of Jesus's teachings in Matthew 6:1-4.

Have grace.

Thank you,
Meg

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

From: Epson America Inc. <autonotification@ea.epson.com>

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

Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 at 06:18:03 PM EST

Subject: Return Instructions for your Epson product - 221207-004892

Dear Customer,

Please follow the instructions below to package and return your original unit.

For your reference:

Serial Number: X8GN117798

Model: ECOTANK ET-4800 WHITE AIO PRINTER WIFI

Reference Number: 221207-004892

RMA Number: 0050993142

Package your product

Click this link for packaging instructions: [Packaging Instructions](#)

Print your return shipping label

Epson provides a return shipping label for your convenience. After you package the product, print your label using one of these options:

Note: After you print your return shipping label, it is available to reprint for 5 days at fedex.com

- Print the label yourself

Click this link to view the label: [Print Label](#)

- Print the label at a FedEx location

The barcode attachment should only be scanned from your mobile device, do not print it out. Bring your mobile device to a FedEx location [FedEx location](#) and show them this email and they can print the label by scanning the attached barcode file from your mobile device. Check with the FedEx location to be sure the "Get a Shipping Label" service is available.

Return your product

Take your package(s) to the nearest [FedEx location](#) for return shipping.

Best Regards,

Epson Support Team

This email was sent from a notification-only address that cannot accept incoming email. Please do not reply to this message.



FedEx.PDF
4.5kB

2913 dd3 Second Motion for a stay stance

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Friday, December 9, 2022 at 07:59 AM EST

Good morning,

I have slept all night, and am not feeling too well.

What is your stance if i draft a Second Motion for a stay. It appears that is the appropriate thing to do. I need to remove any allegations of court error and include the new and additional facts.

Reargument appears to be the wrong relief. I have new facts and conditions which are not included in the 4 items below.

"Rule 2543. Considerations Governing Allowance of Reargument

Currentness

Reargument before an appellate court is not a matter of right, but of sound judicial discretion, and reargument will be allowed only when there are compelling reasons therefor. An application for reargument is not permitted from a final order of an intermediate appellate court under: (1) the Pennsylvania Election Code; or (2) the Local Government Unit Debt Act or any similar statute relating to the authorization of public debt.

Note: The following, while neither controlling nor fully measuring the discretion of the court, indicate the character of the reasons which will be considered:

- (1) Where the decision is by a panel of the court and it appears that the decision may be inconsistent with a decision of a different panel of the same court on the same subject.
- (2) Where the court has overlooked or misapprehended a fact of record material to the outcome of the case.
- (3) Where the court has overlooked or misapprehended (as by misquotation of text or misstatement of result) a controlling or directly relevant authority.
- (4) Where a controlling or directly relevant authority relied upon by the court has been expressly reversed, modified, overruled or otherwise materially affected during the pendency of the matter sub judice, and no notice thereof was given to the court pursuant to Rule 2501 (b) (change in status of authorities).

The 1997 amendment clarifies that applications for reargument are not to be filed in matters arising under the Pennsylvania Election Code, the Act of June 3, 1937, P.L. 1333, 25 P.S. §§ 2600-3591, or the Local Government Unit Debt Act, 53 Pa.C.S. §§ 8001-8271. Matters involving elections and authorization of public debt require expeditious treatment. See, e.g., Rule 1113(c)."

Reconsideration does not appear to be the correct relief to ask regarding new facts in the appellate Court as opposed to a trial court.

The Rules related to reconsideration above do not include new and additional facts.

Plus, I discovered the information more than 7 days after the order.

"Pa.R.A.P. Rule 3814. | Reconsideration. A petition for reconsideration of the Supreme Court's Order may be filed within seven days of the date of the Court's Order."

The other rules appear to apply with the denial of an appeal. See, Rule 1123. | Denial of Appeal; Reconsideration. (a) Denial

I do not see any other way to introduce the need to answer new questions and time to include additional evidence found without fault. I was not sitting on this.

Thank you.

Meg

Not acting as an attorney

I am scrolling from a PDF of the rules the law librarian sent me. Please excuse the lack of citations.

2913 dd3 What is your stance on a continuance

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us

Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Friday, December 9, 2022 at 02:40 PM EST

Hi Anthony,

Could you please let me know your stance on a continuance. I do not have time to do all things, and should not be compelled to waive my rights out of necessity.

I am trying to figure out how not to prevent additional punishment for my religious beliefs in God as guide not money. I believe people are misled to loss of eternal life by seeking money in business or organised charity as savoir, as God, should they not repent. See Matthew 6:1-4 and John 2:16

My beliefs are not fake. I do not want to be compelled to violate my beliefs. I do not want to sell my soul to hell in exchange. :(My faith in Jesus and my ability to practice law are important to me. Just because I believe differently than the majority of Christians is not evidence of a disability.

Thank you,
Meg

It looks in another board nonattorney hearing continuances are allowed.

After discussing further with the prosecuting attorney the effect any pending federal litigation should have on the proceedings, the Hearing Examiner indicated that she would grant Mir another continuance of six to eight weeks and would advise Mir that this would be the last continuance in the case. (R.R. 628.)

Mir v. Bureau of Pro. & Occupational Affs., No. 2557 C.D. 2015, 2016 WL 6407477, at *3 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Oct. 31, 2016)

Appendix EE