

No. _____
Related Application No. 23A596
Related Application No. 23A144

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Meghan M. Kelly, Petitioner

v.

United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

**On Petition of Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third
Circuit, Case Number 22-3372**

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

April 19, 2024

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
Pro Se, not represented by
Counsel, Defending my private religious
belief in Jesus as God not money as God
Matthew 6:24
US Bar 283696
(302) 278-2975
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether this Court should resolve **the split in the Third Circuit and Fourth Circuit** concerning whether a claimant may appeal an order denying recusal of a judge prior to a final determination on the merits to overturn the decisions as egregiously violating Due process as partial with reward to Judge Phipp's in terms of a potential US Supreme Court seat Presidential nominee Trump by reciprocating punishment to discipline but for the fact I sued Trump, in light of the dissent brilliantly distinguishing Supreme Court case Order on this issue at *Martin v Knox*, 112 S.Ct. 620 and the irreparable injury to me in terms of the Court disbaring me by entrapment for retiring from PA in 2018 which is not legal cause to disbar me in a reciprocal disciplinary proceeding where the original court placed my license on inactive disabled but for the exercise of the right to petition to dissolve the establishment of government religion by former President Trump, continued by President Biden as creating a substantial burden upon my religious exercise of beliefs and impending continuing government persecution in light of DE's latest attack against me in March 2024.

II. Whether the court deprived me of the 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding or violated 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law by failing to recuse Judge Phipps given the original disciplinary petitions and this reciprocal petition are based on my petitions against Trump, Trump twice placed Phipp's on a list of nominees for US Supreme Court, and Trump will likely nominate Phipps' as Supreme Court justice should he be reelected and an opening occur considering the facts under objective standards, the probability of actual bias on the part of the Judge Phipps against me and in favor of Trump and my opponents is too high to be constitutionally tolerable.

III. Whether this proceeding violates Due Process and U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 3 causing manifest injustice against me in terms of capricious loss of liberties, threat to life and eternal life under the facts: there is no adverse party other than the partial presiding court, or case and controversy; no injury fairly traceable to any prospective relief other than hypothetical and speculated theorized conjectural injury in a case conducting in a partial unfair forum where Judge Diamond booby trapped me as applied knowing I risk death in that he had notice I collapsed from dehydration, had health limitations which DE and PA ignored in my assertions of ADA due to bad healthcare, with religious objections to healthcare and examinations, was concerned because people threatened me with bodily injury and death, throwing stuff at my car, talking about shooting me actually shooting two bullets in a friend's house but for exercise of Const liberties, notice of the murder of my cousin, and that I had no means to research his entrapping question as to why my 2018 retirement in PA would not retire my license in his court by the draconian order of disbaring me while exhibiting other evidence of bad faith elimination of liberties for what I believe is the mark of lawlessness written about in the Bible called the mark of the beast or sin by sacrificing human life, liberty or health for mammon, including but not limited to material gain, productivity, convenience, avoidance of costs and profit.

IV. Whether the court deprived me of the 5th Amendment right to a fair proceeding or violated 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law by failing to recuse Judge Scirica given the conflict of interest Judge Scirica chairs the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability ("Judicial rules") when I made Constitutional arguments against the

judicial rules, against regulating the US Supreme Court by a Code of Conduct, self-discipline or disciplinary rules, and made arguments against Attorney disciplinary rules and proceedings that mirror the rules Judge Scirica is charged to revise and approve in light of the fact this case may be remanded and he may participate.

V. Whether Courts must allow lawyers to correct judges and courts within the purview of the Constitutional limits 1. in cases and controversies or 2. Impeachment without retaliation in order that the courts may uphold the constitutional rule of law and guide otherwise misguided parties “as to what the law is” to improve and uphold the administration of justice.

VI. Whether the Third Circuit abused its discretion in bad faith, in clear error of law, and clear error of fact as to cause manifest injustice against me by depriving me of the 1st Am right to petition fairly in accordance with **5th Amendment due process by its 6 findings to 6 motions in Order dated June 30, 2023** in dismissing my case while simultaneously denying my motions for a stay, motion for time, motion to vacate an order limiting my motion for an extension of time to three pages given the voluminous reasons time is required and limit on filings under the threat of sanctions given my Motion for reconsideration of Order dated January 17, 2023, with regards denial of waiver of costs, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights and invocation of the 13th Amendment, motion to correct the record given the lower court misfiled 1000s of papers and placed another pro se claimants health records, and other motions, given the two orders deprived me of the Constitutional First Amendment right to petition under a motion for a rehearing under FRAP 40 on these orders and the order denying Kelly’s motion to recuse Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps as to deprive me the opportunity to petition and fair opportunity to be heard in violation of procedural due process, denying my Motion to stay this case until the civil rights proceeding is concluded with no possibility to appeal, under the extraordinary circumstances where I face irreparable injury in terms of loss of private Constitutional rights, including but not limited to First Amendment rights to petition, speech, religious belief, exercise of religious belief, association, other claims and am threatened with potentially 6 needless additional law suits where my exercise of Constitutional rights face further restraint. Whether the Order filed the same day in the civil rights case by the same Judge Phipps denying my appeal is also evidence of bad faith to increase economic burdens in light of my poverty and limited means and my assertion of accommodations in light of them, but was instead retaliated against with increased burdens.

VII. Whether the Eastern District Court refusal to grant ECF access to file before the District Court in light of the fact the District Court told me to expend resources and mail the motion per its specific instructions and stated it would grant and the decision; and the Third Circuit’s decision not to even docket the Amended notice of appeal of the Notice of Appeal, and second Notice of appeal sent per the request of Judge Diamond in the Third Circuit case below to appeal an order made the same day or close to the same day the Court said it would grant denying ECF access violated my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts and 5th Am right to petition fairly by causing an obstacle so great as to deny me access to this court and other courts in light of evidence of bad faith by requiring expenditure of funds I cannot afford in light of my genuinely hell religious belief people go to hell for debt and for requiring debts owed by those who cannot afford to pay the same. US Amend I, V.

VIII. Whether District-Court violated procedural due process, depriving me of a fair opportunity to be heard with inaccurate public record of my petitions in violation of the 1st, 5th and 6th, by placing someone else's case on my record and placing my pleadings out of order, and multiple pleadings in one Docket Item sloppily, carelessly with reckless disregard of violation of my liberties not merely my licenses, unfairly and denied me Constitutionally sufficient notice on hearing requiring acquittal and 3rd Cir violated due process for denying motions to correct the record under FRAP 10.

IX. Whether the 3rd Circuit erred in denying my FRAP 10 motion to correct the inaccurate District Court record below depriving me of 5th Am fair opportunity to be heard based on the fact my petitions were not fully or fairly docketed and could not be heard. Some one else's records were placed on my case, and two motions were connected behind one. Whether the court can consider or hear a petition that is not placed on the record fully or fairly or accurately in accordance with due process to prevent government violation of fundamental rights not merely a license to buy and sell vitiated but for religious beliefs.

X. Whether the Orders below must be vacated as depriving me of 5th Amendment Due Process and 6th Amendment right and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation. **Judge Paul S Diamond of the Eastern District of PA District Court exhibited bad faith misrepresentations to lure me by entrapment into vitiating my rights and my license to practice law**, with knowledge of my belief I was retired before the District-Court, my 6th Amendment assertion of the right to call witnesses which I was deprived of in DE, a disability order, poverty and lack of means to research to know or **have notice of the consequences of his entrapping Order**, given I documented issues relating to broken computers and lack of means to adequately research and risk of serious harm to health without accommodation in the form of time and a stay given my asserted rights in pleadings on the record, and indication of my great duress in calling two witnesses I discovered were fired by DE Supreme Court through its staff attorney Robinson to cover up testimony necessary in this reciprocal law suit. Intent of bad faith violation of fundamental rights in exchange for the type of lawlessness leading to hell and human sacrifice of lives and liberties the Constitution professes to protect, business is exhibited as the evidence shows Judge Diamond tried to get out of work, of correcting his court's error in misfiling my pleadings, not docketing two motions, placing someone else's records in my case, or addressing the misfiled or undocketed pleadings I submitted to safeguard my liberties and including but not limited to my property interest in my license.

XXI. Whether the Orders below must be vacated as depriving me of 5th Amendment Due Process and 6th Amendment right and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation when Judge Diamond would not respond to my clarifications of what the hearing was for given a number of outstanding unaddressed hearings.

XXII. Whether Third Circuit Court of Appeals abused its discretion in bad faith to prejudice me by failing to file either of the two amended notices I filed in response to the August 7, 2023 order by Judge Diamond in the District for the Eastern District of PA Court filed with the malicious intent to increase costs needlessly as to cause me to forgo access to the courts as to deny me the First Amendment right to petition by preserving the record should the case be remanded or reopened essentially vitiating my Constitutional rights and other claims I seek to protect.

XXIII. Given I filed an amended notice by mailing the same and emailing the same on August 7, 2023 to the District Court, which it did not file, but gave to the Third Circuit, wherein I never received official filed notice or a letter of rejection, when it is customary for Courts to send back rejected documents, just a verbal request from District Court staff to change the heading to Eastern District Court and they would file it despite filing my initial notice with the heading Third Circuit Court of appeals, when neither the Eastern District Court, nor the Third Circuit Court filed the first notice, and the Third Circuit indicated it docketed the notice by allowing me to file it, while setting up a booby trap by creating a new case Number where Solicitor appears to be opposing counsel to create the burden to my access to the courts my Amended Notice was meant to prevent vitiating the rights I sought to preserve should the case be remanded or reopened.

XXIV. Whether the Third Circuit's denial of my motion to exempt costs, taxes and any other fee must be overturned in order not to violate my First Amendment rights to petition, religious beliefs against debt misleading people to certain damnation in hell by making mammon God in violation of Jesus Christ's teachings in Matthew 6:24, my invocation of the 13th Amendment, and my poverty making fees and costs obstacles to my access to the Courts below, and other courts as to deprive my of the First Amendment right to petition to defend Constitutional rights thereby vitiating my Constitutional rights and claims forever, especially my protected right to religious belief in Jesus Christ as God not money or material gain as God without government persecution.

XXV Whether Kelly's Special appearance as capable of repetition yet evading review under current case law allows other lawyers to specially appear before the US Supreme Court without fear disciplined attorneys' hope of a hero will be their attacker who will attack them more quickly under Rule 8 should they exercise their First Amendment right to petition attorney discipline orders on Constitutional defects or other Constitutional grounds, thus chilling the First Amendment right and other liberties of Citizen lawyers or whether the courts should create a new rule to safeguard Constitutional rights from citizen lawyers who should not be compelled to sell freedom for a license to buy and sell.

XXVI If this court seeks to discipline Kelly in response to her request for help whether they should place her license on inactive disabled in the Eastern District of PA Court to prevent its own court from initiating a law suit against Kelly, and prevent the initiation of 6 more needless lawsuits based on the bad faith of Appellant to render an order to get out of correcting over 2,000 pages of misfiled documents showing relevant information of Delaware or other reciprocating Court's mistreatment or condoning mistreatment of Kelly based on the her religious beliefs, place of origin, or exercise of Constitutional protected rights, including another pro se claimants medical exhibits, to prevent her from not having enough stamps, paper to continue this appeal, the appeal and hopefully remand in the civil rights case, and the appeal in Kelly v PA ODC so as to deprive her of 5th Amendment fair access to the courts to exercise her First Amendment right to petition to prevent the vitiation of her constitutional rights and other claims forever.

XXVII Whether this Court should stay a decision on whether to grant the petition or grant the petition and a stay to allow Meg Kelly to appeal the civil rights case to completion.

XXVIII And should the Court grant the petition whether this court accepts her waiver should she not have the means to petition even if it is granted to allow opposing counsel and the USSC to examine the case and consider additional issues she included by reference in the rejected petitions attached hereto to save the courts and the United States from a schemed overthrow because she really believes this court and that means all of us are in trouble.

XXIV Whether the Clerk's order affirmed Order dated 5/19/23 should be overturned in light of my motions to exempt fees and costs given my poverty, religious objections to debt, invocation of the 13th Am and debt creating an obstacle so great as to deny me the 1st Amendment right to petition the courts, effectively in bad faith denying me access to the courts in violation of the 5th Amendment and 1st Amendment by actual denial of the 1st Amendment right to petition.

LIST OF PARTIES

The parties are listed on the caption. Albeit there really is not an opposing party in this Case. This Court required I serve Solicitor General and place the Court as the party below, despite the fact the court is both the judge and the party. I am deferring to the Court's instructions.

CASES DIRECTLY RELATING TO THIS CASE

This Reciprocal disciplinary case Eastern District of PA matter No 22-45, Third Circuit Court of Appeals No. 22-3372. Related Application Numbers to this court for this present case No.. 23A596 and No. 23A144.

Kelly v Swartz, et al, Delaware District Court No. 21-1490, and Third Circuit Court of Appeals Matter No 21-3198. US Supreme Court filings *Kelly v Swartz et al* 22A747, *Kelly v Swartz et al*. 22-6783, *Kelly v Swartz et al*. 23A100.

Kelly v Trump Chancery Court No. 2020-0809, Delaware Supreme Court No. 119-2021, US Supreme Court No. 22-5522

Kelly v Democrats Delaware Chancery Court No 2020-0157.

The Original disciplinary case in Delaware Supreme Court matter No. 22-58 and IMO Meghan Kelly Number 541 regarding to appointment of counsel where I was denied copies or access to the filed pleadings. US Supreme Court application 22A476 *Kelly v DE Office of Disciplinary Counsel*.

Reciprocal Disciplinary case I believe is stayed Delaware District Court No. 22-341.

Reciprocal Case in the Third Circuit Court of Appeals 22-8037. Reciprocal disciplinary case before the US Supreme Court *Kelly v Third Circuit Court of Appeals* No. 22-6584 and application No. 22A478.

PA Supreme Court No 2913 DD3, US Supreme Court filing *Kelly v Pennsylvania Office of Disciplinary Counsel* US Supreme Court Numbers 22A981, 22-7695

DC and the US Supreme Court have refrained from discipline, DC based on jurisdiction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OPINIONS BELOW.....1-2

II. JURISDICTION.....2

III. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....2

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2-10

V. REASONS TO GRANT THE PETITION.....10-40

I Meg Kelly makes a special appearance in order to assert her 1st Amendment right to petition while reserving her claims and defenses of violation of her right to notice of underlying charges in the entrapment in violation of the 6th Amendment based on 2018 retirement to disbar not reciprocate knowing I thought I was retired and was without means to research, and was under duress, and to assert 5th Amendment violation of notice, fair process and fair opportunity to be heard in contravention of Due process10-14

II. Denial of recusal of Phipps and Scirica is reversible error in violation of Due Process, Phipps gains a potential benefit for ruling against me, Scirica gains personal harm should he rule in my favor creating conflict of interests so great as to be unconstitutional. This Court should resolve the **Split in Circuits to vacate** the orders denying recusal and the underlying orders, all orders below, which Phipps participated in based on a clear error of law, clear error of act creating manifest injustice in this case as applied.....15-18

III. District Court violated procedural due process, depriving me of a fair opportunity to be heard with inaccurate public record in violation of the right to be petition and to be fairly heard on such petitions, by placing someone else’s case on my record and placing my pleadings out of order, and multiple pleadings in one Docket Item sloppily, carelessly with reckless disregard of vitiation of my liberties not merely my licenses, unfairly and denied me Constitutionally sufficient notice on hearing requiring acquittal and 3rd Circuit denied me a fair and accurate record to appeal by denying my FRAP R 10 Motion in deprivation of Due Process US Amend V, and US Amend I, right to petition or access to the courts.....18-19

IV. This Ct must overturn App H Order of the 3rd Circuit Clerk showing bad faith refusing to docket Amended Notice of Appeal to preserve and not vitiate my rights and claims related to a District Court Order dated 8/7/23, argument against vitiation of Constitutional rights including religious belief against debt, involuntary servitude under the 13th Am and access to the courts without compelled violation of relief belief, should the case not be vacated with an acquittal.....20-24

V The Ct exhibited Bad faith misrepresentations to lure me by entrapment into vitiating my rights, with knowledge of my belief I was retired before the District Court, my 6th Am assertion of the rt to call witnesses which I was deprived of in DE, a disability order, poverty and lack of means for research given I documented issues relating to broken computers and lack of means to adequately research and risk of serious harm to health without accommodation in the form of time and a stay given my asserted rt to a fair trial and circumstances.....24-30

VI. This case should be vacated. There is no Art III Case and Controversy.....30-31

VII Third Circuit abused its discretion denying a stay effectively vitiating my Const right to petition to defend Constitutional rights in accordance with due process that are vitiating by the Draconian Order done in bad faith with severest of consequences.....31-40

IX CONCLUSION.....40

TABLE OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1-a Constitutional and statutory provisions involved.....2

Appendix A Order dated July 26, 2023 denying

- 1) Motion by Appellant Meghan Kelly for Reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule R. 2, 35, 40 for a en ban rehearing of Motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023:
- 2) Motion filed by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly to Expedite DI 49-50 Motion for Reconsideration of Order Dated 6/20/23 denying the Recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for an en banc rehearing Consider Motions denied by this Court on 6/30
- 3) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly to Reopen Appeal;
- 4) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly for Reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023;
- 5) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly for Reconsideration of Order Dated June 30, 2023 denying Motion for Extension of Time to File Brief on Appeal
- 6) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly for rehearing on papers/reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 regarding 3 motions to vacate Order dated May 19, 2023 with regards denial of waiver of costs by threatening me with costs, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights and compelled violation of my invoked 13th Amendment right against involuntary servitude,
- 7) Indirectly denying Motion for a rehearing on denial of a stay and all outstanding motions not addressed.....1

Appendix B Order dated June 30, 2023 denying

- 1) Unopposed Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly to Vacate order dated 05/19/2023;
- 2) Unopposed Motion by Appellant to Amend Correct Motion to Vacate to Include Pursuant to Fed. R. App. Proc R 27(b) and Rule 40;
- 3) Motion by Appellant to for Leave to Exceed Word Limit for Corrected Motion to Vacate Order dated May 19, 2023;
- 4) Motion by Appellant to Correct the Record, Specifically District Court Docket Item, DI 12 under Rule 10 (e)(2)(c) and Rule 27;
- 5) . Motion by Appellant for Extension of Time to File Brief and Appendix for 120 Days to appeal the lower court's order placing license on disbarred as retired but for religious beliefs, religious political beliefs, and religious political speech contained in petitions;
- 6) Motion by Appellant Meghan M. Kelly to stay of this proceeding including briefing, with the allowance of 30 additional days, when the stay is lifted at the conclusion of case 21-3198.....1

Appendix C Clerk Order dated June 30, 2023 dismissal for failure to prosecute.....1

Appendix D Order denying recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica.....1

Appendix E Clerk Order threatening sanctions for placing misfiled docket items below and relevant other documents to refer to by reference in my attempt to reduce the appendix, and

limiting my motion for an extension of time to 3 pages in bad faith given my religious objections to debt, poverty creating an obstacle to my access to the courts and invocation of the 13th Amendment.....1

Appendix F Clerk Order dated **February 1, 2023** denying Motion for reconsideration of Order dated January 17, 2023, with regards denial of waiver of costs, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights, “to be referred to the merits panel once briefing is complete”.....1

Appendix G Clerk Order dated January 17, 2023, denying Motion by Appellant to exempt costs due to utter poverty and due to foreseeable costs creating a substantial burden upon access to the courts and forced violation of religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness.....1

Appendix H Order refusing to docket the Amended notice of appeal filed with the Eastern District Court, causing the Eastern District Court of PA not to docket the first and second notice I filed with the Eastern District of PA that were not returned.....1, 20-24

Appendix H-1 22-3372 3DI 62, transcript, Amended Notice of Appeal filed in District Court dated 8/7/23, attached Order dated 8/7/23 denying Motion for permission to use electronic filing, email to Appellee which staff previously indicated was acceptable for filing and previously filed before court changed its mind, with a mailed original copy sent per the attached envelop.....1-20-24

Appendix H-2 Amended Notice of Appeal to include Notice of Appeal to a Court of Appeals from an appealable Order of the United States District Court for the Eastern District Court for the Eastern District of PA Docket Number 33 Case No. 22-45, stamped DI 34, dated 8/11/23, filed 8/14/23., attached order denying ECF access, transcript, exhibit containing documents found in H-1, with envelop for the 8/11/23 second amended notice of appeal which unlike the first one was docketed.....1-2, 20-24

Appendix H-3 Electronic Notice **IFP Granted for Notice of Appeal**.....1-2, 20-24

Appendix H-4 Electronic Notice “**No feed paid, no IFP filed**” Appeals Clerk (fdc) Modified 8/15/2023 (lisad) by District Court.....1-2, 20-24

Appendix H-5 Order by Eastern District Court, dated 2/8/23 granting In forma pauperis status, DI 29.....1-2, 20-24

Appendix I Application for retirement in PA granted 5/16/18.....2,3, 6, 11, 24-30

Appendix J Pleadings filed in District Court showing I believed I was retired before the Eastern District Court of PA.....2, 3, 6, 11, 24- 30

Appendix K Letter to Honorable Judge and Panel Leader Paul S. Diamond, dated October 22, 2023, regarding I had no transportation. I requested PA Office of Disciplinary Counsel for a stay. I seek to preserve my life and health. I explained I had surgery as a youth which forever harmed my life and requires time to sustain my life and health as I face severe dangerous dehydration a week each month and longer if I am not afforded time to rehydrate, rest, eat and exercise. I have religious objections to healthcare and believe people will be thrown into the

fires of hell for exploiting my weakness for profit as they did when they wrongly took one of my organs, should they not repent. I indicated to Justice Diamond I collapsed due to severe dehydration as I filed documents by bike in another case. My bike's tire got flat and I live miles from the post office. I asserted my right to live, and incorporated this as evidence of why a stay is necessary in my case.

Exhibit A and B thereto emails and pictures of flat tire sent to opposing counsel in other cases

Exhibit C thereto Letter to PA Office of Disciplinary Counsel Anthony Sodroski, dated September 3, 2022, requesting his stance on a stay given I had 6 other potential law suits, and an appeal to the US Supreme Court, faced poverty creating a substantial burden to my access to the courts, people talked about shooting me, and in fact someone did shoot two bullet holes into the home of a friend due to speech they found repugnant incited by government incited unhealthy backlash for those not supporting Republicans, Trump or candidates with shared views

Exhibit D thereto, Response from PA ODC, Anthony Sodrowski indicating he does not agree to a stay

Exhibit E thereto, Exhibit 43 which includes

1. Newspaper article I drafted published in the Coastal Point, Representative candidate says health is wealth, dated July 20, 2018, Coastal Point, Guest Column, *Representative candidate says health is wealth*, By Meghan Kelly, Esq., Candidate Delaware House of Representatives, 38th District,
2. "Your Health is your Wealth You are Priceless. Not a price tag! Kelly seeks Federal Consideration of Health Care Proposal,
3. Meghan Kelly's teaching certificate, which goes to credibility. I learned psychology and behavior theories like BF Skinner's. I also am licensed to teach health so I know something about health.
4. Meghan Kelly's redacted law school transcript to show she took a course Health Care Finance and the course Law and Medicine while attending Duquesne School of Law.
5. Evidence of surgery that requires I drink water, rest and eat so I do not faint or die due to dehydration when I have my period. I lose five pounds every month. This is still a challenge. I must assert my right to live because many people serve Satan by not wanting to be inconvenienced to care to adapt to safeguard my life, or the lives and health of others. Health care record.
6. Meghan Kelly's redacted undergraduate college transcript to show she took relevant courses related to
 - a. History of Western Medicine
 - b. Economics
 - c. Medieval Philosophy
 - d. Psychology courses

7. Delaware State Police, Camden public alert, two bullets when into the home of my friend Gregory Layton former newspaper reporter at the News Journal because of his political speech incited by Former President trump's incitement of violence against dissidence to the Republican party, platform or Trump

8. Pictures of substance thrown at my car in retaliation for the religious-political speech contained on the stickers I designed on my vehicle.....2, 3, 6, 11, 24-30, 37-38

Appendix L 3rd Circuit Docket Item 56 (3DI 56) for the case below No. 22-3372 **Appellant Meghan Kelly's Motion for Reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 denying stay under Rules 2, 40, 1st, and 5th Amendment asserted rights to prevent irreparable injury,** and exhibits thereto including,

3DI 56-3 Ex A and B Order denying Stay and Order Dismissal by Third Circuit in this case (pg 18-22)

3DI 56-4 Ex C, Motion to Reopen July 10, 2023 Third Circuit Docket Items (hereinafter "3DI") 3DI 53, 3DI 54, 3DI 55 in 22-3372 incorporated in full, attached in part) (pg 23-39)

3DI 56-4 Ex D, (Initial Civil Rights Complaint in DE District Court Kelly v Swartz, et al. 21-1490, though I moved multiple times to amend to include new and additional claims, parties and to shorten it, not included herein) (pg 40-136)

3DI 56-4 Ex E Email to Delaware Supreme Court regarding swearing in violates religious belief, sadness years later when Court disregarded my request to affirm for disobeying Jesus Christ (pg 137-140)

3DI 56-5 Exhibit F Motion before DE Supreme Court in disciplinary matter to be excused from the notary, declaration and swearing in requirements so as not to violate my religious beliefs with two scriptural examples on how two dads violated this command which led to sin, death and their likely damnation in the fires of hell for compromising what is right to please people or for what is profitable at the cost of losing their souls in hell if they did not repent before they died. Repent does not mean saying sorry and making amends. It means be made clean and sin no more, and misguided are those who turn back to their sins without repentance. Forgiveness is revoked and the wrath of God losing eternal life not salvation remains. (pg 141-157)

This contains an exhibit from an England case from 1678 where a man because of his religious beliefs could not swear before the Court. Jesus teaches let your yes be yes and no be no anything else is evil. He says from the evil one, but it makes people evil to be at risk as being too disgusting to live to be destroyed in hell by compromising doing what is right to loyalty to contracting your soul to hell to gain the hope of the word here. Other people's souls are not for sale. They are free not products to exploit for material gain under the lie of the common good, public welfare, welfare of the state, public welfare or other deceit that misleads humanity to harm and loss of eternal life on judgment day. (pg 157)

3DI 56-6 Exhibit G Letter to DE Supreme Court Justice, The Honorable Henry DuPont Ridgely, dated October 1, 2012, regarding Delaware state judges exhibiting and teaching lawyers to have place of origin animus against DE attorneys associated with other states, with specific examples of discrimination based on birth in Pennsylvania or association with, and disparate favoritism based on mob marketed reputation not truth and money brought in which creates

injustice based on deception and appearance in place of truth. See Jesus’s teachings in John 7:24 “Judge correctly not based on appearance (pg 158-160)

3DI 56-7 Exhibit H, I bumper sticker I created based on correcting judicial bias and other prejudice, exploitation of outsiders based on sex, race, religion or origin (pg 161-170)

3DI 56-7 Exhibit I Three newspaper article I drafted and one where I was in based on political ideas to revise laws. (pg 171-180)

3DI 56-8 Exhibit J first petition to Delaware Judge concerning exemption from appointment in family law cases due to religious objections, request for removal on future appointments (pg 181-183)

3DI 56-9 Exhibit K Second request to please remove my name from family court appointments as violative of my religious beliefs in God’s teachings in the Bible, especially Malichi and Jesus Christ’s teachings (pg 184-186)

DI 56-9 Exhibit L Lawsuit for which the original discipline arises Kelly v Trump Chancery Court Case No. 2020-0809, DE Supreme Court Case No. 119-2021, US Supreme Court Case No. 21-5522 (pg 187-310)

DI 56-10 Ex M Kelly v Democrats and Department of Elections, Complaint, Case No. 2020-0157, Title, PLAINTIFF'S CASE FOR CHRIST, PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT AGAINST DEFENDANTS FOR THEIR VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTIONS CLAUSE, IN THIS CLASS OF ONE, UNDER THE 1ST AMENDMENT APPLICABLE TO THE DEFENDANTS VIA THE 14TH AMENDMENT, FOR DEFENDANTS UNLAWFUL APPLICATION OF 15 DEL.C. § 3103, CONDITIONING PLAINTIFF'S RIGHT TO RUN TO OFFICE, ON THE EMILINATATION OF OTHER FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS, AS APPLIED TO PLAINTIFF (pg 311-368)

DI-56-10 Exhibit N, Petition to US Supreme Court for exemption on signature and fee requirements to remove the compelled violations of my religious belief in exchange the exercise of another fundamental right, dated, Exhibit page of O (pg 369-377)

DI 56-10-11 Exhibit O Picture of Republican Rep Steve Smyk and I, He rescued me from attacks from Rep. Ron Gray along with Senator Coon’s body guards and Officer Hughes of the Georgetown police now retired (pg 378-379)

DI 56-12 A 4 wrongly sealed Motion to Reign in the courts arms and exhibits thereto filed in Kelly v Trump, *Kelly’s Motion to the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms from unlawfully pressuring me to forgo or impede my case to protect my free exercise of religion*, and exhibits thereto, , including 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, Internal Exhibit, Oct 19, 2020 letter to Patricia Griffin regarding I am acting as a party not as an attorney, DE-Lapp threatening email, Internal Exhibit, letter dated May 21, 2020 (pg.380-417)

DI 56-13 A-5 wrongly sealed motion to recuse Justice Seitz prior to learning the entire incited the state attacks against me during Kelly v Trump, *Kelly’s motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the Honorable Justice Collins J. Seitz*, and related exhibits thereto, proof of payment of bar dues, emails to Mark Vavala confirming he did not incite the investigation, Internal Exhibit Letter from the Court in response to my request for

exemption of bar dues for all attorneys facing hardship, dated February 5, 2021; attachment relating my concerns relating to recent US Supreme Court cases I disagreed with. (pg 418-451)

DI 56-14 Ex P, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Opening Brief moving the Third Circuit Court of Appeals to vacate the Delaware District Orders (DI. DI 16-17, 30-31, 59-60), and to remand the matter to the Delaware District Court for Consideration, in Kelly v Swartz, et al. Civil rights case No. 21-3198 (pg. 452-506)

DI 56-14 Ex Q Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Petition for a Panel Rehearing on denial of above referenced opening brief in Ex. P, in the civil rights case (pg 507-520)

DI 56-14 Ex R Respondent’s reply to ODC’s Corrected Response to Respondent’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Board on Professional Responsibility, in the original Delaware Disciplinary matter DE Case No. 541, 11537 B Board Matter and Supreme Court No 2022- 58 (pg. 521-552)

DI 56-15 Proof DE Supreme Court Sealed pleadings in my favor sent to appellee, Email from file and serve representative confirming dates the DE Supreme Court sealed my pleadings during Kelly v Trump to conceal evidence in my favor in Kelly v Trump to overturn the case on procedural due process defects, and necessary for the civil rights case, the disciplinary cases and reciprocal cases to prejudice me in favor of the court and the state participants who incited the insidious attacks against me in Kelly v Trump (pg 553-557)

DI 56-16 Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Motion for leave to exceed the word limit in her Motion for Reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 denying stay under Rules 2, 40, 1st, and 5th Amendment asserted rights to prevent irreparable injury (558-566)
.....2-3, 15, 30, 37-38

Appendix M Kelly v United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania On Petition of Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Case Number 22-3372, dated December 26, 2024, rejected as the petition for pages was denied.....2-3, 5

Appendix N Kelly v Swartz, et al, civil rights case, Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Opening Brief moving the US Supreme Court to vacate the Third Circuit’s Orders dismissing the case under Younger, denying recusals of Judge Scirica and Phipps and to remand the matter to the Delaware District Court for consideration, dated October 17, 2023; On Petition of Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Case Number 21-3198. Rejected as the petition for pages was denied.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix O Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s 49th Affidavit in Kelly v Swartz, filed June 26, 2023, which included emails to Appellee Court to electronically file, beliefs in the wrong manner money is coined damns people to hell, beliefs there is an attack to eliminate people lawyers and people judges, with a link to Sebastian Thrun in the 2018 World Government Summit day 2 in 2018 regarding reducing to eliminate people judges (paragraph 22, page 8), and exhibits thereto, including:

Exhibit A emails from Eastern District Court of PA staff Gail Olson indicating she would grant efilng if I expended funds and resources according to her instructions.

Exhibit B. Email to court, noting I complied with Gail’s instruction. The Court received my filing by mail.

Exhibit C concern that judges will be replaced to be eliminated should the US Supreme Court not limit correction of judges to the purview of the Constitutional limits of 1. Cases and controversies or 2. Impeachment.

Exhibit D. Email to PA ODC regarding evidence of a scheme to eliminate lawyers, Exhibit E 80 trillion dollars of government pensions were written off per BIS, Bank of International Settlements the global money changer in Dec of 2022;

Exhibit F Case concerning whether judicial speaking engagements and teaching gigs make judge’s advocates to some theories that conflict with others, tempting judges to be partial towards forums and groups who support their private ideas outside of a case and controversy creating bias against people who do not support the schools, groups or ideas that support judges acting as attorney advocates in private associated forums or schools.

Exhibit F DI 158-8 April 3, 2019 letter to the US Supreme for an exemption of requirements that violate my religious belief in exchange for the exercise of the right to run for office where I indicate some of my religious beliefs against organized charity, abortion, assisted suicide and partiality.

Exhibit G June 22, 2023 Order in civil rights case, petition for rehearing denied

Exhibit I US Supreme Court Order *Martin v Knox*, 112 S.Ct. 620, Opinion Beard et al, 811 F 2nd 818 “District judge’s refusal to disqualify himself can be reviewed by petition for writ of mandamus. (4th Cir).....2, 3, 6

**APPENDIX NOT ATTACHED BUT INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE BY
SIMULTANEOUSLY SUBMITTING THIS PETITION HEREWITH**

Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Motion for Leave to file in Forma Pauperis her Petition for Writ of Certiorari of the Orders to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Case Number 22-3372, dated April 14, 2024, and appendixes therewith (“IFP”)

Appendix 1 IFP Affidavit United States Supreme Court’s Requires and **the exhibits attached thereto and incorporated therein, including but not limited to...**2-3, 5

Appendix 2 IFP Letter confirming I am eligible for food benefits starting April 1, 2024 through September 30, 20242-3, 5

Appendix 3 IFP Appellant addendum of additional information to the affidavit, This is Proof of physical submission of my renewal application for food benefits stamped on Friday February 16, 2024, which was granted.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 4IFP Appellant addendum of additional information to the affidavit, Appellant’s Petition for an exemption from work, volunteer and training requirements which were previously granted the past 2 years, wherein I outline my religious objection to volunteering, 13th Amendment involuntary servitude to March 6:1-4 violations, debt, organized charity, pro bono, science, and healthcare and other asserted rights. It is important to note I am ant-science, and my religious beliefs are genuine, which was granted.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 5 IFP Exhibit to App G attached Complaint in Kelly v Department of elections and Democrats et al to show I pleaded religious objections to Matthew 6:1-4 violations against volunteering, gathering signatures and fundraising2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 6 IFP Email confirmation that I am exempt from the volunteer work requirements.....2-3, 5

Appendix 7 IFP Exhibit 43 thereto which includes

1. Newspaper article I drafted published in the Coastal Point, Representative candidate says health is wealth, dated July 20, 2018, Coastal Point, Guest Column, *Representative candidate says health is wealth*, By Meghan Kelly, Esq., Candidate Delaware House of Representatives, 38th District,
2. “Your Health is your Wealth You are Priceless. Not a price tag! Kelly seeks Federal Consideration of Health Care Proposal,
3. Meghan Kelly’s teaching certificate, which goes to credibility. I learned psychology and behavior theories like BF Skinner’s. I also am licensed to teach health so I know something about health.
4. Meghan Kelly’s redacted law school transcript to show she took a course Health Care Finance and the course Law and Medicine while attending Duquesne School of Law.
5. Evidence of surgery that requires I drink water, rest and eat so I do not faint or die due to dehydration when I have my period. I lose five pounds every month. This is still a

challenge. I must assert my right to live because many people serve Satan by not wanting to be inconvenienced to care to adapt to safeguard my life, or the lives and health of others. Health care record.

6. Meghan Kelly’s redacted undergraduate college transcript to show she took relevant courses related to

- a. History of Western Medicine
- b. Economics
- c. Medieval Philosophy
- d. Psychology courses.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 8 IFP Letter dated 8/23/2021 by DE ODC regarding it was concerned about my mental capacity based on my religious speech contained in my petitions in Kelly v Trump.....2-3, 5

Appendix 9 IFP DE ODC Petition at 7 where Defendants attack my citations to the Bible for my support of my private personal religious belief the exercise of which I sought to safeguard by suing President Trump/Biden to alleviate a substantial burden the establishment of government religion caused on my free exercise of religious belief in Jesus.....2-3, 5

Appendix 10 IFP Petition for Writ of Certiorari excluding the exhibits in 21-5522.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 11 IFP 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, 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, Internal Exhibit, Oct 19, 2020 letter to Patricia Griffin regarding I am acting as a party not as an attorney, DE-Lapp threatening email, Internal Exhibit, letter dated May 21, 2020.2-3, 5

Appendix 12 IFP 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, Internal Exhibit Letter from the Court in response to my request for exemption of bar dues for all attorneys facing hardship, dated **February 5, 2021**; attachment relating my concerns relating to recent US Supreme Court cases.....2-3, 5

Appendix 13 IFP **Exhibits on an Agenda to Eliminate the courts and people in the law** to eliminate the government that restrains entities from getting as much as they can for as little unrestrained from the just rule of law from oppressing, killing, stealing or destroying human life, liberty or health for the bottom line, including internal exhibits....2-3, 5

- Obituary of Richard Goll, a Delaware attorney who was exploited by an out of state real estate company practicing law without a license

- Newspaper Article I drafted in the Coastal Point on a proposition on how to resolve the fact non attorneys are practicing law without a license, I discovered lobbyists scheming to eliminate people judges too like Sebastian Thrun at 2018 World Government Summit at Day 2
- Article by the Venus project *How can laws be eliminated* regarding a new system to replace governments after 2050; found at https://www.bing.com/search?pglt=41&q=venus+eliminating+law&cvid=e7b5cce704df459e8ce2cb5cc329012b&gs_lcrp=EgZjaHJvbWUyBggAEEUYOdIBCDQ2MTdqMGoxqAIAA&FORM=ANNTA1&PC=ASTS
- Excerpts from the Book *Shaping the Fourth Industrial Revolution* By Klaus Schwabb, Founder of the World Economic Forum and Chairman with Nicolas Davis, Copyright 2018, Published in the United States by Currency, an imprint of the Crown Publishing Group, a division of Penguin Random House LLC
- Excerpts from the Fourth Industrial Revolution by Klaus Schwabb published 2016
- Article by World Government Summit Could an AI ever replace a judge in court?, dated 2017
- *Article Robot justice: China's use of Internet courts*, By Tara Vasdani This article was originally published by The Lawyer's Daily (<https://www.thelawyersdaily.ca/>), part of LexisNexis Canada Inc
- Excerpts from *The Great Narrative for a Better Future*, by Klaus Schwabb
- Letter Dated October 1, 2012 regarding DE Judges' and attorneys' prejudice and disparate favoritism towards lawyers based on place of origin, firm size and insidious prejudice against PA Attorneys with two attacks against me by judges based on my birth place, Pennsylvania, it was not funny it was scary and threatening, the second time is not in the letter by Judge Slight's. First verbal attack by Former Chief of Court of Common Pleas Judge Smalls.....2-3, 5, 12

Appendix 14 IFP Email from Delaware's e-filing provider File and serve showing PROOF the DE Supreme Court sealed two motions and two exhibits to my motion for reargument shown by graphs, at A-4 and A-5, *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*, Internal Exhibit thereto and *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. I had no notice or opportunity to be heard on the sealing of these 4 items necessary for my appeal to the US Supreme Court in 21-5522, and as a defense in the DE Disciplinary proceeding.....2-3 5

Appendix 15 IFP Email submission of *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*, Internal Exhibit thereto on **May 25, 2021** per the graph it was accepted for filing May 27, 2021 date and wrongly sealed without notice or opportunity to be heard on that date, and E-mail dated May 28, 2021 filing *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. This was sealed in this case during Kelly v Trump. I had no notice or opportunity to be heard on the sealing of the 4 items necessary for my appeal to the US Supreme Court in 21-5522, and E-mail regarding

the fact I asserted my right not to violate Jesus Christ’s teachings by servitude to Satan by swearing when I was admitted to the DE Bar. I have religious objections to swearing and affirming under penalty. The DE Supreme Court simply compelled my religious violation without due process opportunity to be heard before violation of my First Amendment right to exercise of religious belief.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 16 IFP Exhibits showing belief of danger based on partnerships between not only church and state but government backed and condoned foreign and private partners inciting private attacks based on perceived religious or political association or beliefs, including Email to Bo at the Delaware Department of elections, forwarding an email to Jesse Chadderon at the democrat’s office where I was concerned about a neighbor threatening me for my sign because he previously threatened to ram my car if I park it on my parents side lot, and he allegedly threatened to use his gun should someone at the board of the development come onto his property to inspect it without authorization, pictures of substance thrown at my car, Police report concerning 2 bullets shot into the home of Greg Layton hitting the wall above the dining room table as he and his wife sat there but for his political beliefs incited by Trump-religion, some of my signs I created which caused outrage and attacks, excluding Impeach [Trump] Serve your country not your seat, excluding Impeach [Trump] No one is above the law, No one is below the law.....2-3, 5

Appendix 17 IFP Documents relating to the US Supreme Court submission of my appeal in the civil rights case Kelly v Swartz, dated March 8, 2024 including but not limited to:

- Email to US Supreme Court via Clerk Danny Bickell and Robert Meek copying opposing counsel, dated Sunday, March 10, 2024 regarding the police at the USSC stationed for pick ups would not allow me to drop off my submission, Meg asserted her right to access to the courts and the substantial burden poverty, and religious objection to debt. I noted my concern the USSC may have insidiously deprived me of access to the courts to prevent another denial when I intend to drive up and did drive up to drop them off in the work week;
- Email dated March 9, 2024 to Clerk of Court Robert Meek, copying opposing counsel stating I am at the USSC. I was told I could drop off documents 24 hours even on Christmas. They are not accepting my documents, even though they accepted a similar amount of documents when it was closed on Dec 25-26. I drove here and it took more than 2-3 hours. Can you please help me. Thank you. I attached pictures
- Email dated March 15, 2024 to Clerk of USSC Robert Meek and attachments thereto copying US Supreme Court Clerk Danny Bickell and opposing counsel, noting on March 15, 2024 I received a letter from Robert Meek along with what appeared to be certificates of services and two appendices, that stating my submission was rejected as out of time, Email by US Supreme Court Clerk Lisa Nesbitt curing error so as not to vitiate my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts and 5th Amendment opportunity to fairly be heard on petitions before violation of fundamental rights not mere licenses, dated March 14, 2024, granting 60 days to fix the title and issues presented section, and attachments to March 15, 2024 email, picture of postal tracking sticker, picture of stack of certificates of service, and 2 copies of the appendix, 1st page of certificate of service changed to reflect I did not serve the USSC on March 9, 2024 and will not provide a memory stick to the USSC upon service to the USSC, Asserted my 1st Amendment right to access to the courts and 1st Amendment right to religious belief as debt violates it, March 13, 2024

letter by Robert Meek indicating Meg's submission was rejected as out of time, Letter by Lisa Nesbitt dated January 12, 2024 indicating the petition to exceed the page limits was denied. I had 60 days to cure the defect before March 12 or 13th 2024; March 14, 2024; Letter from Lisa Nesbitt dated March 14, 2024 indicating the title and the questions presented must change; Meg's change to IFP exhibit identification to conform to case manager's instructions, Meg's amended certificate of service where I note the Court denied me access to it to serve and noted inter alias

"I attempted to serve the original documents the above referenced documents therewith, at the following address:

Clerk's Office
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20543

However, Sgt McBeth and Officer Johnson, said they could not accept any digital date, nor could they accept any of pleadings on March 9, 2024.

They requested I come in during the week....

To confirm, I drove from my home in the early afternoon and arrived back after 6:00 PM. I was unsuccessful in service to the US Supreme Court today March 9, 2024...

Please find proof of attempts to serve and pictures I verify in good faith.

Poverty creates a substantial burden upon my access to the courts. I cannot afford to mail in documents due to Defendants 'preventing me from seeking to return to my former law firm for the job of my choice and assert US Amend XIII with regards to involuntary servitude. So, I must physically drop documents off since poverty creates a substantial burden to my access to the courts. I also have religious objections to debt. I believe go to hell seeking money, avoidance of costs and convenience for themselves to care for their own or the convenience of others at the exchange of enslaving or oppressing others or harming other people's health or life for profit, especially research and science. I believe most people go to hell per Jesus. *Matthew* 7:13-15, *Luke* 13:23-28. I believe correction in court may save lives of the victims and the eternal souls of the wrongdoers by correction to help the blind see and the dumb hear. Upholding justice is a religious command. *Amos* 5:15 and *Matthew* 23:23, and to persist like the pestering widow who petitioned an unjust judge over and over again until he granted her relief to get rid of her. *Luke* 18:1-8.

I assert my 1st Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus, 1st Amendment right to exercise my religious beliefs, my 1st Amendment right to speech in my petitions, and my 1st Amendment right to petition, 5th Amendment due process protections to be heard fully and fairly by this Court without insidious partiality to the government as opposed to the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law by the government including this US Supreme Court in accordance with the 5th Amendment's due process component. I reserve my right to be separate, holy and not conformed to the wicked vanity of other people to lose my soul in hell."

- The Old certificate of service, noting service to both opposing counsel and the USSC on March 9, 2024 which I was required to change since service was denied March 9, 2024;
- Tracking postal receipt to confirm I mailed opposing counsel the petition for writ of certiorari within the purview of the page limits on March 9, 2024; email Saturday March 9, 2024 to opposing counsel regarding service March 9, 2024; copy of envelop, Email to Robert Meek, these are attachments to the Cert of service I electronically filed; pictures

of my attempts to serve the USSC on March 9, 2024, envelop with three stamps for correcting certificate of service, Meg electronically filed her petition for writ of cert upon physical delivery to USSC on March 11, 2024 not the date to service to opposing counsel March 9, 2024, it remained submitted on March 13, 2024 around 12:57 PM per the picture; Exhibit A copy of electronic submission data, Exhibit B email conformation electronic service was complete 12:07 AM on March 11, 2024; Exhibits C and D police court stamped proof I physically delivered the Petition to appeal on March 11, 2024 which was accepted the second time; E-mail dated March 16, 2024 to Robert Meek indicating the boxes contents, and 6 fewer than previously stated because I forgot I was able to condense them in the boxes, a copy of the civil rights petition for writ of certiorari dated March 8, 2024.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 18 IFP Email to case manager while copying opposing counsel thanking her for her brilliant idea, and asserting my 1st Amendment right to religious exercise of belief, attaching health needs to sustain my health and life, and my objections to healthcare, science and mental healthcare, with attached health record.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 19 IFP 180th Affidavit, dated March 5, 2024 regarding denial of access to law library on March 5, 2024, and Richard Abbott’s appeal to the USSC, temporary denial and odd notification from PACER; and Chief Judge Colm F Connelly’s patent cases and report of discipline to the DE ODC and Attorney Generals office where the conduct harmed private people, the petitions petitioned concerning private parties whereas Richard Abbott and I petitioned to alleviate harm and address grievances by government agents or officials, with exhibits not limited to emails to DE Supreme Court Clerk Lisa Dolph since she assisted me in regaining access to the law library previously.....2-3, 5

Appendix 20 IFP FCC March 4, 2024 letter to congress concerning the Affordable Connectivity Program ending in April 2024 with potentially partial payment available in May 2024 should Congress not provide additional funding; Letter from Mediacom dated Jan 23, 2024, received April 5, 2024 concerning lack of funding, Meg did not receive this notice in January 2024.....2-3, 5

Appendix 21 IFP 189th affidavit, dated March 23, 2024, regarding my heart has been hurting, grateful it appears the USSC may grant Richard Abbott’s petition to resolve important issues as to whether judges and lawyers are below the Constitutional rule of law, exchanging Constitutional liberties for licenses, Meg’s additional thoughts on Former President Donald J. Trump’s immunity arguments, Meg avers to religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare, Defendant Kathleen Vavala’s Uncle was appointed Chair of DE-Lapp, one of the conspirators who colluded with threats and attacks to cause me to forgo Kelly v Trump, attached Oct 21, 2020 letter where DE Supreme Court instigated ODC attack during Kelly v Trump, Emails with Mark Vavala where he indicated if DE-Lapp contacted me it was because I was in trouble, they threatened me to respond within 10 days, two funeral notices, one for my friend Monica’s dad Neil Fleming, and one for my childhood friend the state of DE’s treasure esteemed Dad Bill Carroll.....2-3, 5, 6

Appendix 22 IFP Part of the Docket in 21-1490, the Civil rights case Kelly v Swartz filed prior to any disciplinary law suit with notations that I maintained objections to the

disciplinary hearings transcript as too faulty to correct at page 1, with my marked notes on 4/13/22 attached 23 IFP because I did not print out the three books attached to the exhibit. I also noted on DI 58 I notified the DE District Court two staff were fired to prevent their testimony, Constitutional challenges to Delaware rules and running motion to amend the complaint since new and additional information keeps arising, dated 4/26/2022 prior to Chief Judge Colm’s order.....2-3, 5

Appendix 23 IFP April 13, 2022 filing in civil rights case, the DE Supreme Court had exhibits at law library for a week to serve. Pro se parties are required to file DE Supreme Court filings at the law library in Sussex County, The DE Supreme Court refused to docket my petitions in full, noted bailiffs denied me access to the law library at various times, denial to access to resources at Del tech, discussion of global plans in books and the World Government Summit.....2-3, 5

Appendix 24 IFP April 21, 2022 filing in civil rights case assertion of the practice of law as a religious exercise, arguments against self-regulating making ourselves our own God essentially being our own law, partial to our convenience and interests while harming the people to sustain profit streams, power and positions by sustaining pain/injustice, entities information regarding part of the foundation which will enable the overthrow of the United States not limited to clearpass and green pass. evidence of planned crash, US Supreme Court allowed bible citations in attached document to support religious beliefs per attached document, I should not be deemed mentally disabled for seeking to safeguard my religious exercise of religious beliefs supported in the bible from the substantial Biden Trump caused by the establishment of government religion, and additional assertions of religious beliefs and concerns about the environmental carbon credit sustainability scheme, which will allow an overthrow if the courts do not save us.....2-3, 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Book, Bible

1 *Timothy* 6:10.....22
2052: A Global Forecast for the Next Forty Years by Jørgen Randers, Published by Chelsea Green Publishing, 2012, affiliated with the Club of Rome.....12
Comment, Another Look at Unconst Conditions, 117 U. Pa. L. Rev. 144 (1968).....36
Chicago Kent Law review, *Rehearing SUA Sponte in the U.S. Supreme Court: A Procedure for Judicial Policymaking*, by Rosemary Krimbel, dated October 1989.....40
J. Story, Conflict of Laws 2d ed. § 607 (1841).....13
Matthew 6:1-4.....22, 23
Matthew 6:24.....31
Matthew 6:24-34.....33
Matthew 7:13-15.....26
The Report from Iron Mountain on the Possibility & Desirability of Peace by Leonard C. Lewin, published in 1967 (during the Johnson Administration) by Dial Press..... 12
The New World Order, by H.G. Wells, published by Secker & Warburg in January 1940..13

Van Alstyne, <i>The Demise of the Rt-Privilege Distinction in Constitutional Law</i> , 81 Harv. L. Rev. 1439, 1445-1454 (1968).....	36
<i>Romans</i> 1:25.....	5, 13
<i>Romans</i> 13:8.....	22
<i>Revelation</i> 13:17.....	14

Case Law

<i>Brooks v. Jones</i> , 875 F.2d 30, 31 (2d Cir. 1989).....	36
<i>Buck v. Colbath</i> , 70 U.S. 334 (1865).....	38-39
<i>Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.</i> , 129 S. Ct. 2252 (2009).....	12
<i>Cafeteria Workers v. McElroy</i> , 367 U.S. 886.....	36
<i>Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. Hialeah</i> , 508 U.S. 520 (1993).....	38
<i>Cleveland v. Krupansky</i> , 619 F.2d 576, 578 (CA6).....	18
<i>Covell v. Heyman</i> , 111 U.S. 176 (1884).....	38-39
<i>Frazier v. Heebe</i> , 482 U.S. 641, 648 n.7 (1987).....	27
<i>Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n</i> , 271 U.S. 583.....	36
<i>Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada</i> , 501 U.S. 1030(1991).....	6
<i>Garrity v. New Jersey</i> , 385 U.S. 493.....	36
<i>Harkness v. Hyde</i> , 98 U.S. 476 (1878).....	11
<i>Herring v. New York</i> , 422 U.S. 853.....	28
<i>Hilton v. Guyot</i> , 159 U.S. 113 (1895).....	13
<i>Homer v. Richmond</i> , 292 F.2d 719.....	36
<i>Gumbel v. Pitkin</i> , 124 U.S. 131 (1888).....	38-39
<i>In re Beard</i> , 811 F.2d 818, 827 (CA4 1987).....	17
<i>In re Murchison</i> , 349 U.S. 133 (1955).....	16-17
<i>In re Ruffalo</i> , 390 U.S. 544.....	27-28
<i>In re Surrick</i> , 338 F.3d 224, 231 (3d Cir. 2003).....	27
<i>Isom v. Arkansas</i> , 205 L. Ed. 2d 373, 140 S. Ct. 342, 343–44 (2019).....	16
<i>Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath</i> , 341 U.S. 123.....	29
<i>Jones v. Board of Education</i> , 397 U.S. 31 (1970).....	36
<i>Krippendorf v. Hyde</i> , 110 U.S. 276, 283 (1884).....	39
<i>Lanzetta v. State of New Jersey</i> , 306 U.S. 451 (1939).....	30
<i>Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah</i> , 508 U.S. 520, 533-534 (1993).....	38-39
<i>Kennedy v. Bremerton School Dist.</i> , No. 21-418 (June 27, 2022).....	36
<i>Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding</i> , 344 U.S. 590.....	36
<i>Martin v Knox</i> , 112 S.Ct. 620.....	9
<i>McDaniel v. Paty</i> , 435 U.S. 618 (1978).....	38
<i>Minn. Ass'n, Health Care v. Minn. Dept., P.W.</i> , 742 F.2d 442, 446 (8th Cir. 1984).....	36
<i>Murchison</i> , supra, at 136, 75 S.Ct. 623.....	17
<i>Peters v. Kiff</i> , 407 U.S. 493, 502 (1972).....	16
<i>Pittsburgh v. Simmons</i> , 729 F.2d 953, 954 (CA3 1984).....	18
<i>Rippo v. Baker</i> , 580 U.S. 285, 137 S. Ct. 905, 197 L. Ed. 2d 167 (2017).....	16
<i>Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners</i> , 353 U.S. 232 (1957).....	11
<i>Selling v. Radford</i> , 243 U.S. 46, 49 (1917).....	27
<i>Sherbert v. Verner</i> , 374 U.S.....	36

<i>Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham</i> , 394 U.S. 147 (1969).....	8
<i>Snyder v. United States</i> , No. 23-108.....	4
<i>Speiser v. Randall</i> , 357 U.S. 513.....	36
<i>Surrick v. Killion</i> , 449 F.3d 520, 530 (3d Cir. 2006).....	27
<i>Theard v. United States</i> , 354 U.S. 278 (1957).....	10, 27
<i>Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer</i> , 137 S. Ct. 2012 (2017).....	38
<i>Union Carbide Corp. v. U.S. Cutting Service, Inc.</i> , 782 F.2d 710, 713 (CA7 1986).....	18
<i>U.S. v. Levin</i> , 973 F.2d 463, 466 (6th Cir. 1992).....	30
US Am V. Gee v. Texas, No. 3:18-cv-2681-G-BN, at *6.....	17
<i>United States v. Russell</i> , 411 U.S. 423.....	30
<i>Western Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of Equalization</i> , 451 U.S. 648, 657-58, 664-65 (1981).....	36
<i>Williams v. Pennsylvania</i> , 579 U.S. 1 (2016).....	16

Delaware Disciplinary Rules

<i>Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc.</i> Rule 9 (d)(3).....	4
<i>Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc.</i> Rule 12 (h).....	4, 14

Procedural Rules

Supreme Court Rule 23.....	39
----------------------------	----

Local Rule

Local Rule 7.1 (g).....	19
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	
FRCP 52.....	19
FRCP 59.....	19

Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure

FRAP R 4.....	23
FRAP Rule 8 (b).....	18
FRAP 10.....	10, 18
FRAP 18 (b).....	18
FRAP Rule 40.....	19, 35

Statutes

29 CFR § 2200.68.....	8
18 U.S.C. § 201.....	4
18 U.S.C. § 666.....	4
28 § 144.....	16
28 § 544.....	16
28 U.S.C. § 1651.....	2

28 U.S.C. § 2101.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 1253.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 1254.....	2
28 U.S.C. § 2106.....	2
31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k).....	12
42 USC §1985 (interference with access to courts)	15, 38
42 USCS § 2000bb 1-4 Religious Freedom Restoration Act (“RFRA”)...1, 4, 11, 14-15, 37-38	
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1989, Public Law 336, U.S. Statutes at Large 104 (1990): 327-378 (“ADA”).....	5, 25

US Constitution

U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 3, § 2, cl. 1.....	30-31
Art III.....	10, 30-31
U.S. Cons. Amend. 1.....	1-40
U.S. Const. Amend. V.....	1-40
US. Const. Amend. VI.....	1-40
U.S. Const. Amend. XIII.....	1-40
U.S. Const. amend. XIV.....	1-40

US President’s Executive Orders (mentioned establishment of government religion referring to certain EOs)

Executive Orders by President Bush, Junior

Ex. Or. No. 13198, 66 Fed. Reg. 8497, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 1401, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021.....	2, 3, 6, 11, 15
Ex. Or. No. 13199, 66 FR 8497, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or No. 13831, 83 FR 20715, May 3, 2018.....	2, 3, 6, 11, 15
Ex. Or. No. 13279, 67 FR 77141, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No.13559, 75 FR 71319, November 17, 2010.....	2, 3, 6, 11, 15

Executive Orders by President Obama Ex. Or. No. 13559, 75 Fed. Reg. 71319, Nov. 17, 2010..... 2, 3, 6, 11, 15

Executive Orders by President Trump

Ex. Or. No. 13798, 82 Fed. Reg. 21675, May 4, 2017.....	2, 3, 6, 11, 15
Ex Or. No. 13831, 83 Fed. Reg. 20715, May 3, 2018.....	2, 3, 6, 11, 15

Executive Orders by President Biden

Ex. Or. 14015, 86 Fed. Reg 10007, Feb. 14, 2021.....	2, 3, 6, 11, 15
E.O. 14008 of January 27, 2021, Executive Order on Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad	5

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to vacate the Orders below and Grant relief this court (“ct”) deems just pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2106 and avers as follows:

I. OPINIONS BELOW

The orders of the Ct of Appeals to review the merits of appear at multiple dates: including a denial of a motion to reopen the case to consider my motions for rehearing under FRAP Rule 40, with denial of motions for reargument on a plethora of other motions for reargument, including but not limited to the 7/26/23 Order at Appendix (“App”) A, including denial of rearguments of stay, time, vacating order dated 5/19/23, recusal of Scirica and Phipps, and denial of reargument to vacate order dated 6/30/23; 6/30/23 Order denying 1. motion to vacate order dated 5/19.23 limiting motion for time to 3 pages, 2. Motion to correct record, 3. Motion for time, 4. Motion for stay and 5. Other two motions at App B; 6/30/23 Order dismissing the case for failure to prosecute at App C; 6/20/23 Order denying recusal of Judges Phipps and Scirica at App D; 5/19/23 Order limiting Motion for an extension of time to 3 pages and threat of sanctions for violating page limit and order at App E; 2/1/23 Clerk Order postponing consideration of my motions to exempt costs and taxes based on rel belief against debt, poverty creating a substantial burden to access to the cts in the exercise of my 1st Amendment right to petition¹ to safeguard not merely my property interests in licenses to practice law but my Const liberties, life and eternal life, invocation against the 13th and other arguments at App F; 1/17/23 Clerk Order denying motion to be exempt from costs at App G; 8/8/23 Clerk Order staying action on amended notice of appeal of Dist of Ct’s 8/7/23 order denying Motion for ECF action, which caused the Ct not to file the amended notice of appeal

¹ Amendment (“am.” or nothing) rt (“rt”); petition (“pet”); Constitutional, Constitution, constitutionally (“const”), Due Process (“DP”); liberties (“lib”); applicable (also “app” like appendix); Court (“ct”); opportunity (“oppty”)

docketed by Dist Ct for the Eastern Dist Ct of PA. (App. H, H1-H-5) There is no opinion to publish. This Ct denied additional pages on 3/1/24, granting 60 days to cure, by 4/30/24.

II. JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Ct is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1253, 28 U.S.C. § 1254, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, 28 U. S. C. § 2101 and 28 U. S. C. § 2106.

III. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Pertinent statutory provisions are reprinted in the appendix to this brief, App 1-A

IV. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This reciprocal case is brought based on DE Order placing my license to practice law on inactive/disabled but for my religious beliefs contained in my RFRA Petition against President Trump to dissolve the establishment of government religion² substantially burdening my exercise of rel beliefs, and to punish me for my rel beliefs contained in my petitions, and exercise of other Const rts. DE's order is also a cover up of DE's violations of equal protections, 1st Am rights app to DE via the 4th of rel beliefs, association, exercise of beliefs, and my right to petition coupled with due process by vitiation of fundamental rts. DE ignored and violated petitions to safeguard my unique rel belief and other liberties for about 20 years.³ I also petitioned the state ct because two judges, Slight and Small verbally attacked me based on place of origin demeaning me wrongly as a "Philadelphia lawyer" in my first case ever, and Judge Slight told me to go back to PA after I answered a question correctly after a CLE that made a Stephanie Noble look at me with dear eyes and run out of there. Albeit I see Judge Wallace has a bald head. Looking back, I wonder if it was Judge Wallace not Judge Slight. Regardless it is wrong to use the cloak of gov

² Establishment ("Est."); government ("gov"); religion or religious ("rel")

³ See, App I-L, See the IFP Motion I file simultaneously herewith and the exhibits thereto I incorporate herein by reference and note on the appendix, but not attached merely filed simultaneously herewith. ("IFP" collectively with all exhibits or (1-24) IFP identifying an appendix thereto). I incorporate herein by reference in the attached lengthy Civil rts petition the lengthy rejected petition in this case. I incorporate the records below Dist Ct ("DI") Third Circuit ("3DI") in entirety and specifically.

authority to attack me based on place of origin and mistreat me differently in violation of 14th Am Equal Protections. I complained to the police because people talked about shooting me based on perceived political beliefs incited by trump's gov forced speech, neither fair or free. No report was made. I went to the cts to protect my life, lib and property by dissolving the establishment of gov rel. The ct retaliated and sought to violate the Const by eliminating freedom for business. DE continues to attack me and has made additional movements to collude to take me out. People have threatened to shoot me. Two bullets went into the home of a friend based on exercise of rts. I have the same ideas as two murdered men to reverse and prevent the crash Lincoln and Kennedy. I do not want to die. (16IFP, App O). I petitioned DE, Democrats and Depart of Elections to run for office without violating my rel beliefs against collecting signatures and donations or paying filing fees based on my rel beliefs against debt. I ran for office because nonlawyers were lawyering hurting citizens and enriching the public⁴ by creating problems. Since money is creating out of enslaving the people by debt plus interest that cannot be paid back by design to set up the baby boomers and this country to fall should it seek mammon, money and material gain as master, savior and God to be tricked and harmed in this life by eliminating liberties for business to be destroyed in hell for lawless lusts should we not be made clean. The new way of coining money burdens Const liberties and sets a foundation for an overthrow as well as other factors. I seek to make us clean by requiring we coin correctly not out of slavery debt in contravention of the laws of my God and in violation of the 1st Am, 5th, 14th, and 13th as stated in civil rights case (App L-O, 3-6IFP). Back in 2018 lobbyists boldly alluded to their plan

⁴ public means government not the people. Any time the Courts say Public good, public welfare they violate Equal Protections by partiality to government positions, profit streams and power by sacrificing the people's lives and liberty for worship of the mark of lawlessness, called the mark of the beast leading to hell without repentance. We need the courts to restrain and tame the beast sin, not serve the people to the beast safeguarding lawlessness under the color of the law by human sacrifice of lives and liberties the Const explicitly says it protects. The pursuit of happiness is a booby trap by misguided founding fathers enslaved to lawless lusts to enslave a no longer free people to be controlled by those who tempt their desires to give into gratification not to be free.

to eliminate judges and the rule of law to allow for the overthrow of the government. I discussed ways to prevent it in *Kelly v Trump* by the US AG's possible use of 18 S 201 and 666. It appears this Ct is not amicable to saving itself after I listened to verbal arguments where Justices appeared to shut down punishments for gratuities and graft, the same misdeeds its own members are accused of possibly to create case law to serve private interests from attacks instead of impartially caring for the people. See hearing transcript *Snyder v. United States*, No. 23-108. Limiting Judicial and professional discipline within the purview of Const limits by *inter alias* preventing regulating to control to eliminate the US Supreme Court, the rule of law and professionals is another way.

This case arises based on DE's retaliation against me for the exercise of the 1st am. rts to pet, rel belief, association, exercise of belief, and speech outlining my rel beliefs app to DE via the 14th am. DE attacked me to cause me to forgo my RFRA case against President Trump to dissolve the establishment of government-rel to alleviate a substantial burden upon my rel exercise. DE states it brought a disciplinary proceeding against me but for my rel beliefs in the petitions in *Kelly v Trump*. DE denied me Const protections and protections under DE's own rules in the disciplinary proceeding, denied me the asserted rt to self-represent under the 1st and 6th am applicable to DE via the 14th on rel grounds in a quasi-criminal proceeding, denied me notice, the opportunity⁵ to be heard, access to petitions in my own case No. 541, the asserted reasonable and fair oppty to prepare, to call witnesses, a completely inaccurate and flawed transcript too incurable to correct where I made a special appearance in the hearing while recovering from the shingles asserting DP violations of notice since notice was sent to no one on my behalf the date allegedly sent which prejudiced me and a fair opportunity to defend myself,

⁵ Opportunity ("oppty"); DE denied notice in conformity of Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 9 (d)(3) which prejudiced me and other rules not limited to Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 12 (h)

denial of placing my pleadings in full on the record, and other deprivations.⁶ Since the original case ended DE attacks against me continue.⁷ I incorporate the entire record below, and every exhibit in the appendix and the unattached exhibits incorporated by reference including the IFP Motion and attachments submitted herewith, incorporated to be considered herein. DE placed my license on inactive disabled which has prevented me from working as an attorney, whiling causing reciprocal law suits making car insurance and access to research unaffordable and inaccessible during a time below. I had surgery as a youth which harmed me for life where I require time to sustain my life and not die. I asserted my right to live as a rel exercise before this ct and all cts including this one without compelled rel objections to healthcare and mental health care or examinations.⁸ I also asserted my rel objections to healthcare, mental healthcare, examinations and science to all cts including this ct. See *Romans* 1:25.⁹

I asserted health limitations under the ADA to PA and DE disciplinary cases and apprised DE of health limitations in *Kelly v Trump* and in *Kelly v Democrats* which were ignored and violated causing me to get the shingles and to collapse and risk death by dehydration but for the

⁶ App M, N

⁷ See the IFP Motion I file simultaneously herewith and the exhibits thereto I incorporate herein by reference and note on the appendix, but not attached merely filed simultaneously herewith. (“IFP” collectively with all exhibits or (1-24)IFP identifying an appendix thereto)

⁸ (7, 3-5, 10, 15 17-18, 21 IFP), and (App K,-N, App.17-18)

⁹ See, (17-18IFP) I believe people commit idolatry by making men and their works idols unrestrained by the law or love when they defer to experts, professionals or their product, science, idea or service. I believe people go to hell for their deference to experts and for oppressing others to exploit them for material gain of experts or their partners and their products, services, science or ideas, should they not repent. I believe every government official who serves business or raising money enslaves the people in violation of the Const and is marked as without eternal life should they not repent. The government must govern and guide and not collude thereby making their partners above the law when they oppress and harm people to sustain the pain to sustain positions, power and profit streams, especially under the new carbon credit plan. Sustaining environmental harm secures the UN and its contracted partner who seeks diplomatic immunity and control of 30 percent of the US and the globe under the 30 30 agenda. **Biden’s EO 14008** of January 27, 2021 grants them use of science by making what is natural unnatural to profit and prioritize destroying nature under the guise of saving it to take control of resources, to control the government to eliminate the government to overthrow the US after 2050 if the courts do not stop it. See, *A Notice by the Patent and Trademark Office* on 03/15/2024, See, *Request for Comments: Unlocking the Full Potential of Intellectual Property by Translating More Innovation to the Marketplace* See section II *Green technology. A Notice by the International Trade Administration and the Trade and Development Agency* on 05/02/2023.

kindness of someone getting water for me, which Judge Diamonds and 3rd Cir were apprised of during this case.¹⁰ This case must be heard to prevent the capricious loss of my life, liberty and property interests for the lawless vanity of those in the cts and gov who use the cloak of gov to serve their personal positions, appearance, profit streams and professional interests by eliminating professionals fundamental rights, including my personal interest as a party of one, especially my 1st Am rt to rel belief in Jesus, & the exercise of the 1st Am rt to petition coupled with oppty to be fairly heard pursuant to the 5th or 14th in exchange for a mere license to buy and sell. This Ct held *Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada*, 501 U.S. 1030, 1057-58 (1991)

“At the very least, our cases recognize that disciplinary rules governing the legal profession cannot punish activity protected by the First Amendment, and that First Amendment protection survives even when the attorney violates a disciplinary rule he swore to obey when admitted to the practice of law. See, e. g., *In re Primus*, [436 U.S. 412](#) (1978); *Bates v. State Bar of Arizona*, *supra*. We have not in recent years accepted our colleagues' apparent theory that the practice of law brings with it comprehensive restrictions, or that we will defer to professional bodies **when those restrictions impinge upon First Amendment freedoms.**”

The District Ct below (“Dist Ct”) booby trapped me knowing I thought I was retired before it because I indicated retired on my pleadings by requiring I state why I should not be retired since I was retired from PA since 2018 by disbaring me as retired in bad faith to get out of the voluminous amount of work of correcting the 1000s of pages of misfiled pleadings, including someone else’s health record in my case, hearing witnesses I reserved to call, considering outstanding and unaddressed motions and without providing notice or a fair opportunity to be heard or “informed of the nature and cause of the accusation.” US Am I, VI, VI. Case law shows my retirement in PA back in 2018 does not require retirement before federal courts in clear error of the law, of fact creating manifest injustice against me by vitiating Const liberties not merely licenses. US Am I, V, VI. The Ct knew I did not have access to research but

¹⁰ (3-5, 7, 10, 15 17-18, 21 IFP), and (App I,-N)

it did. Judge Diamond acted with malice to deprive me of my 1st Am rt to pet coupled with 5th Am due process to vitiate my underlying rts and claims not limited to 1st am rts.

The original order was brought in violation of my 1st am rts appl to DE via the 14th am. I was deprived of DP in the original proceeding for which this case arises. The State has attacked me further and will attack me again should I not keep the civil rts case alive. I moved the cts below for a stay pending the civil rts case where I petition the only forum which may grant me relief in terms of preventing the vitiation of Const protections of my fundamental rts and other claims, not merely my license to practice law. The Cts below denied my motions for a stay, time, and a slew of other motions simultaneously in the same order in bad faith. I required a stay as necessary to prevent deprivation of Const lib of access to the courts. A stay was denied creating an obstacle so great as to deny access to the courts and DP right to be heard on pet which vitiated my rts and sought to obstruct rts to access to other cts. The same day the Ct denied the stay, the 3rd Cir. and the same Judge Phipps denied an appeal in the civil rights case. The same judge Phipps signed orders against me. The denial of my motion for a stay in light of my circumstances contained on the record and stated herein vitiated my 1st Am access to the cts, 5th Am. Rt to a fair oppty to be heard, a fair proceeding and vitiated my freedom to believe in Jesus not merely buy and sell as an attorney but for the government finding my religious beliefs in Jesus repugnant. The Ct dismissed the case for failure to prosecute. Third Circuit abused its discretion denying a stay effectively vitiating my Const rt to pet to defend Const rts in accordance with due process that are vitiated by the Draconian Order done in bad faith with severest of consequences. A stay is required to allow me to pet to safeguard my 1st am liberties from vitiation and to prevent a schemed overthrow of the gov. I moved the cts below for a stay pending the civil rts case where I petition the only forum which may grant me relief in terms of

preventing the vitiation of Const protections of my fundamental rts and other claims, not merely my license to practice law, and offer a forum to prevent the overthrow.

The Ct below abused its discretion by denying my motions for a stay, time, and a slew of other motions simultaneously in the same order in bad faith. I seek to gain a stay in this appeal or relief this ct deems just, by overturning the order as violating 1st, 5th, and 6th Am as clearly reversible under the facts. The same day the Ct denied the stay, the 3rd Cir. and the same Judge Phipps denied an appeal in the civil rights case. The same judge Phipps signed orders against me. The denial of my motion for a stay in light of my circumstances contained on the record and stated herein vitiated my 1st Am access to the cts, 5th Am. Rt to a fair oppty to be heard, a fair proceeding and vitiated my freedom to believe in Jesus not merely buy and sell as an attorney but for the government finding my rel beliefs in Jesus repugnant. It must be overturned as clear abuse of discretion as an error of law, of fact creating manifest injustice.¹¹

3rd Cir Orders also violate 5th am DP or violated 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law by failing to recuse Scirica and Phipps' recusal and Phipp's participation in light of the facts of this case which materially prejudiced me and deprived me of a fair proceeding. This reciprocal case against me is based on my petitions against Trump, Trump twice placed Phipp's on a list of nominees for US Supreme Ct, and Trump will likely nominate Phipps' as Supreme Ct justice should he be reelected and an opening occur considering the facts under objective standards, the probability of actual bias on the part of the Judge Phipps against me and in favor of Trump and my opponents is too high to be const tolerable.

There is a split in the Circuits whether the USSC may hear petitions for recusal prior to a final determination on the merits. Since this ct dismissed for failure to prosecute this Ct should

¹¹ See *Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham*, 394 U.S. 147 (1969).

use this case as ripe to resolve the split in the 3rd and 4th Circuit concerning whether a claimant may appeal an order denying recusal of a judge prior to a final determination on the merits, in light of brilliant distinguishing Supreme Ct case Order on this issue at *Martin v Knox*, 112 S.Ct. 620, attached as an Exhibit in App. O, page 18 49th Aff by safeguarding my DP herein.

The Orders denying motion to exempt costs, denying a stay, denying recusal, denying time, denying pages beyond three, denying notice, denying FRAP 10 correction of the docket by 3rd cir and by Diamond, denying request for notice in accord with 5th and 6th Am, and pleading on entrapment and other motions must be reversed as a matter of law as requiring I violate my 1st Am rel beliefs against debt, 1st am rt coupled with 5th Am fair oppty to be heard on pet to eliminate me not to uphold the Const as rule of law that limits even the cts. The original notice violate 5th and 6th Am rt to due process of notice or any fair oppty to contest a hearing where I asked the contents of the same since I filed a pleading to correct the record where 2000 documents were misfiled, three motions filed together, left unaddressed and it appeared Judge Diamond misbehaved by giving into temptations of lawless lusts and partial whims for convenience and avoidance of costs by sacrificing Constitutional liberties and my life the law protects from him and other government's from sacrifice for the mark of lawlessness leading to hell. Human sacrifice of life and liberty for business is not only unconstitutional but I believe damnable without repentance. Not knowing is not innocence. Ct correction saves eternal lives.

Judge Diamond requested I draft a motion for ECF access he would grant. I am impoverished with health limitations. I drafted it, and mailed it in. He denied it. I appealed upon receipt of the denial. Then the 3rd Cir would not docket the appeal. It is not fair but I am including as much as I can below with abbreviations, even though there are more issues to address especially with regards to the Constitutionality of attorney and judicial disciplinary

proceedings. This proceeding violates Art III and DP since opposing counsel is the judge and ct. There is no case and controversy and attorney and judicial correction or discipline should be limited in an actual case and controversy. Judge Diamond is partial to himself and booby trapped me.

I Meg Kelly makes a special appearance in order to assert her 1st Amendment right to petition while reserving her claims and defenses of violation of her right to notice of underlying charges in the entrapment in violation of the 6th Amendment based on 2018 retirement to disbar not reciprocate knowing I thought I was retired and was without means to research, and was under duress, and to assert 5th Amendment violation of notice, fair process and fair opportunity to be heard in contravention of Due process

I file this by making a special appearance so this Supreme Ct may not reciprocate in an order passed without **notice** under the circumstances, given the Appellee (“Dist-Ct”) had notice of multiple jurisdictions placing my license to practice law on disabled. While I contest any allegation of mental disability, the Third Circuit who has declared me disabled separately by order may not deem me disabled while ignoring the Constitutional law’s protections this Ct has created to safeguard lawyers from disbarment for an adjudication of disability under *Theard v. United States*, 354 U.S. 278 (1957). Despite the fact Dist-Ct indicated disbarment was not punishment, the Dist-Ct knew I thought I was retired. Due to poverty, and other limitations, I did not have access to the law or even access to a vehicle to drive to the law library for a time the Ct entrapped me into disbarment through the Dist-Ct’s Order dated 11/17/22 requiring a memorandum why the 2018 retirement of my PA state license would not cause me to be retired or lose my bar before the Dist-Ct. The Dist Ct knew or should have known I did not understand and had no notice the Dist-Ct would enter an Order disbaring me in response for its request as to why my retirement from PA in 2018 would cause me to no longer be an active member before its own Bar. App. I, J, K

The Ct knew I was under great duress because I cared about the two Chancery Ct staff the DE Supreme fired by forced retirement to conceal their testimony in any proceeding in defense of my Constitutional rts, licenses and other claims. Former ct staff member Katrina Kruger was a fitness instructor at my former gym. I used to see her every day and the DE Supreme Ct participated in firing her under forced retirement to conceal her testimony in contravention of US Am VI applicable to the state via US Am XIV. I care about former DE Ct staff member Arline Simmons too.

When I petitioned the ct it was to safeguard my rts not destroy those who violated them. I did not want her to lose her job to cover up lawless conduct of the ct that snowballed into worse constitutional and legal deprivations of my rts under state and federal law. I reserve my rt to plead lack of notice in violation of the 5th and 6th Am rt to know charges or consequences against me by specially appearing and denial of a fair proceeding. US Am I, V. Gov “cannot exclude a person from the practice of law or from any other occupation in a manner or for reasons that contravene the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Am” or the 5th Am applicable to the federal government.” *Citing, Schware v. Board of Bar Examiners*, 353 U.S. 232 (1957). My Due process rts were violated in this case and in the original DE Disciplinary case. I provided copies of orders adjudicating me disabled to the Dist-Ct. The DE order and reciprocating orders of disability were rendered but for my rel beliefs contained in my speech in my Rel Freedom Restoration Act and establishment of government rel complaint in *Kelly v Trump* where my rel beliefs and the government substantial burden upon my exercise of rel beliefs but for the establishment of government rel by the president’s course of conduct outlined in US Supreme Ct Appeal No 22-5522 are in issue. This Ct held *Harkness v. Hyde*, 98 U.S. 476, 479 (1878), “Illegality in a proceeding by which jurisdiction is to be obtained, (in my case notice of

discipline, order, or the subject of the cancelled hearing and fairness) is in no case waived by the appearance of the defendant for the purpose of calling the attention of the ct to such irregularity; nor is the objection waived when being urged it is overruled, and the defendant is thereby compelled to answer.” Judge Diamond tried to get out of correcting the voluminous thousands of pages his staff misfiled when the case manager was out, including another pro se party’s health records, attaching two of my motions on the bottom of a separate pleading, and filing things out of order with missing documents evidencing almost 20 years of disparate treatment by the State of DE and DE Cts in retaliation for my exercise of the 1st Am rts to petition, rel belief, exercise of belief, speech, and association in contravention of the Equal Protections component by political-rel or poverty animus against me and partiality to the selfish interest of those within the government for their individual convenience, productivity, avoidance of costs, profit, position, marketing business or caseload speed at the cost of liberty, life, and health which lawless people claim is for the common good, public good or welfare. (App. 3DI 56) Eliminating the Constitutional law’s restraint upon government, including judges and government backed private and foreign partners, government agents, by permitting human sacrifice of life or liberty under the deception of the public welfare will be used after 2050 when a schemed overthrow is planned to eliminate the rule of law should the cts not stop it.¹² Justice Story explained, “It is easy to

¹² See, 13IFP. **Exhibits on Agenda to Eliminate people in the law to eliminate the government that restrains entities from getting as much as they can for as little unrestrained from the just rule of law from oppressing, killing, stealing or destroying human life, liberty or health for the bottom line, and App. Exhibits showing belief of danger based on partnerships between not only church and state but government backed and condoned foreign and private partners inciting private attacks based on perceived rel or political association or beliefs)** See, *Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.*, 129 S. Ct. 2252, 2259 (2009) regarding the requirement of impartiality by the courts as opposed to partiality to selfish convenience or gain eliminating asserted Const law’s limits upon government and government private and foreign agents through partnerships to render oneself above the law. Also see, 19th and 93rd Affidavits, not attached regarding economics and debt to be used to eliminate the courts by the lie of self-regulation by eliminating the courts and the rule of law that creates the governments to be controlled by those who control the resources or the channels to access them in a digital slave system that teaches a lie of freedom by eliminating laws after 2050. Look at Exhibit to the 93rd aff with focus on 14th amendment arguments to void debts designed to overthrow the government, and temporary relief under 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) and additional arguments. I do not want the courts to draft the law. I want the courts to say what the law is in the form of

understand that the defendant may be at liberty to impeach the original justice of the judgment by showing . . . that it was procured by fraud [or judicial partial whims and temptations for avoidance of work and convenience at the cost of human sacrifice, sacrificing my liberty, health or life.)” J. Story, *Conflict of Laws 2d ed.* § 607 (1841) (quoted with approval in *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113, 190 (1895)). Wherefore, I pray this Ct does not punish me for asking for help in this special appearance. I am scared. People have talked about shooting me but for my rel-political beliefs or presumed beliefs. I also have health limitations where I require time in order not to harm my health or die I have asserted in all of my cases. I assert my rt to live as a rel exercise, and my rel belief that people go to hell for trusting in or telling others to trust in or participate in healthcare examinations, treatments or professionals. It makes men and their professional work above the law when they harm, kill, steal or destroy human life or health like a doctor did to me in my youth. I have sincere rel objections to deferment to science, experts or professionals and believe people sin against God by making man and man’s creation God in place of God. *Romans* 1:25 (“They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen.”). I assert my 1st Am rt to exercise my rel belief against human sacrifice to live for God not the vanity of man even medical knowledge. I have rel objections to evaluations and healthcare and mental healthcare, which is scary to share since Justice Jackson’s husband is a doctor. So, this Ct obviously may and most likely does disagree with my private rel beliefs. The question is will you safeguard my individual liberty to believe differently from this Ct and to exercise my rel

limiting the other two branches to prevent slavery and require they coin lawfully not in violation of US Amend XIII or my rel belief as applied as a party of one. US Amend I. See, *2052: A Global Forecast for the Next Forty Years* by Jørgen Randers, Published by Chelsea Green Publishing, 2012. *The Report from Iron Mountain on the Possibility & Desirability of Peace* by Leonard C. Lewin, published in 1967 (during the Johnson Administration) by Dial Press, *The New World Order*, by H.G. Wells, published by Secker & Warburg in January 1940. Also see App 107th Affidavit, not attached

beliefs according to the dictates of my conscience, even if every judge on this ct finds my rel belief in Jesus as God, not money, man or man's technology, product, studies aka science or professional service God repugnant. Should anything happen to me and I should die it is not by free choice. During *Kelly v Trump* the DE Supreme Ct sealed pleadings in my favor where I asserted the DE Chancery, Supreme Ct and its arms or agents committed procedural due process violations. The Ct sent agents and its arms to threaten me to compel me to forgo my appeal to the US Supreme Ct. Later the DE Sup Ct through Staff-Attorney Robinson signed off on terminating two material witnesses and colluded to prevent me from subpoenaing them in the DE Disciplinary proceeding despite my motion of my intent to do so, while preventing me 10 days required in order to subpoena the hidden witness by rescheduling the hearing to 8 days to evade discovery. US Amend VI, Del. Disc Rule 12 (h). If the DE Cts will sacrifice their own people for their vanity, the mere appearance of justice while committing great injustice, I fear for my safety in the exercise of my rel belief in DE and in the world. My freedom to believe Jesus without government incited persecution may forever be eliminated in DE if the cts do not save me and others from the elimination of free exercise of rel in exchange with the ability to buy and sell. *See, Revelation 13:17* ("And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name."). I incorporate herein by reference any Dist-Ct Item ("DI") or Third Circuit Ct Docket Item ("3DI") or any other document I refer to even if not attached hereto in its entirety, the entire records below especially since the papers were mis-docketed and all Exhibits contained in the Appendix, attached exhibits contained in the individual appendix items and any other document referred to herein or attached hereto.

II. Denial of recusal of Phipps and Scirica is reversible error in violation of Due Process, Phipps gains a potential benefit for ruling against me, Scirica gains personal harm should he rule in my favor creating conflict of interests so great as to be unconstitutional. This Court should resolve the Split in Circuits to vacate the orders denying recusal and the

underlying orders, all orders below, which Phipps participated in based on a clear error of law, clear error of act creating manifest injustice in this case as applied

The failure to recuse Phipps and Scirica deprives me of a fair opportunity to be heard in violation of my 5th Am procedural due process rts requiring Phipps's orders to be overturned, including the denial of a stay which would vitiate the dismissal for failure to prosecute.

I am being disciplined for suing Trump to dissolve the establishment of government rel. Phipps was included as a potential nominee twice by Trump to be placed on the list of candidates to become US Sup Ct Justice. Trump will likely be the next President and nominate Phipps again should a justice retire as one may be pressured to do so by abnormal attacks by lobbyists pressuring Congress to impeach or regulate the cts. Phipps presides in the civil rts case. He and Scirica ruled against me based on the state's false and misleading allegations in civil rts case. The false claims and misleading allegations of the State unbacked by the record allow witnesses to testify in Phipps's head without affording me an opportunity to cross examine in the Eastern Dist case in violation of the 1st, 6th and 5th. Phipps's has a conflict of interest that would tempt the common man to partiality to rule against me and effectively for Trump to gain a seat at the most powerful place the US Supreme Ct. Judge Phipps is on the panel of all orders denying me relief rendering me an unfair biased proceeding which caused actual prejudice and deprivations of 1st, 5th, 6th Amendment liberties and other rights.

Both Scirica and Phipps must be recused from the matter should this be remanded given the partiality both men have to serving their own personal interest which is in opposition to mine. Phipp's has a personal stake in punishing me for suing Trump. If elected Trump will likely appoint him as a justice of the USSC. I seek to preserve the rt to pet against Trump by voiding *Kelly v Trump* based on procedural PD violations, and seek additional claims for DE's interference in the case and retaliation against me for suing Trump to dissolve the establishment

of gov-rel which substantially burdens my rel exercise. Phipp's increases the material benefits he may gain by ruling against me and in favor of the state and the ct below based on DE's attacks against me for suing Trump. Judges may not be biased proponents of one party before them while discriminating against the other party me in violation of the 5th Am Equal Protections component, regardless as to whether the judge is consciously aware of the temptation created by the conflicts of interests. Under objective standards in my case, "the probability of actual bias [by Phipps] is too high to be const tolerable."¹³ An ordinary person in Phipps' place would be biased against me based on the benefit my loss in the case would potentially allow them to gain, a potential nomination to be a USSC justice. Similarly, Scirica is the chair of the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. He works on drafting the rules in judicial disciplinary proceedings I seek to vitiate. An average judge in Scirica's position is not likely to be neutral. I seek to destroy and harm his personal work product, which may vitiate a pecuniary gain in terms of honor and power to draft rules that bind the courts. So, he has much to lose should I win. The failure to recuse them violates PD and 28 §§ 144, 544. The conflicts of interest are so great as to deprive me of a fair oppty to be heard. US Am I, V. The failure to recuse them violates PD and 28 §§ 144, 544. These two judges ruled against me in all orders in the civil rts case, and Phipps ruled against me in this case causing actual prejudice. They also created obstacles to my access to the courts by denying a stay and rapidly ordering a hearing date prior to briefing so as to prevent this US Sup Ct from hearing my Pet for writ of Cert before Judgment to stay the case

¹³ *Rippo v. Baker*, 137 S. Ct. 905, 907 (2017); See, *Isom v. Arkansas*, 205 L. Ed. 2d 373 (2019) (At the same time, the Court has acknowledged that "[a]llowing a decisionmaker to review and evaluate his own prior decisions raises problems," *Withrow*, 421 U.S. at 58, n. 25, 95 S.Ct. 1456, perhaps because of the risk that a judge might " "be so psychologically wedded to his or her previous position" " that he or she will " 'consciously or unconsciously avoid the appearance of having erred or changed position.'" *Williams*, 136 S.Ct., at 1906 (quoting *Withrow*, 421 U.S. at 57, 95 S.Ct. 1456). And it has warned that a judge's "personal knowledge and impression" of a case may sometimes outweigh the parties' arguments. In *re Murchison*, 349 U.S. 133, 138, (1955).) *Williams v. PA*, 195 L.Ed.2d 132 (2016.); *Peters v. Kiff*, 407 U.S. 493, 502 (1972)

to prevent me the oppty and means to appeal the DE Disciplinary (“Disc”) matter to this USSC before it was too late to grant relief making it impracticable and impossible. I was prejudiced by the deprivation of underlying rts and a fair oppty to be heard by a biased partial forum. Neither judge recused themselves per my request. “The Tumey Court concluded that the DP Clause incorporated the common-law rule that a judge must recuse himself when he has “a direct, personal, substantial, pecuniary interest” in a case.” In this matter, Judge Phipps’ and Scirica’s direct, personal, substantial, pecuniary conflict of interests in opposition to my claims is too prejudicial to my case to afford me a fair proceeding. US Am I, V. “A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of DP.” Murchison, supra, at 136, 75 S.Ct. 623 Id. Judge Phipps’ and Scirica’s participation violated DP. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure treat orders that are entered without DP as void. US Am V. Gee v. Texas, No. 3:18-cv-2681-G-BN, at *6. I was deprived of a fair oppty to be heard. Accordingly, the orders below should be voided. It was clear error of law, clear error of fact, causing manifest injustice against me for Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps to fail to disqualify themselves in this proceeding. It is unfair that judges must discern whether they may recuse themselves. There is an inclination of blindness in judging oneself as an unfair judge in a matter. It is fairer for the court or a panel to make a determination as a whole as opposed to the judge asked to be recused in accordance to and to uphold the 5th Am rt to an impartial fair proceeding despite Congressional rules that conflict with or violate the Constitutional’s 5th Am rt to a fair proceeding as applied or per se.¹⁴

¹⁴ Congress’s recusal statutes violate judges’ 5th am rt against self-incrimination by requiring the judge with a possible petition to recuse himself to recuse or not, to look at oneself for incrimination, only to possibly be insulted on appeal. It creates partial injustice for Congress and bureaucratic professional boards even of peers as judges and lawyers to commandeer the Ct. and lawyers to restrain their ability to advocate or petition to defend Const or rights from the professionals who have a conflict of interest in that they sacrifice liberty for business even marketing within the boards by compelled waivers. I have a lot of Constl arguments against professional and judicial regulation that eliminates parties rts, professional rts and the cts and the people’s. If my case is alive, maybe the USAG can participate to prevent the overthrow.

This Ct should resolve the split by voiding the orders done in violation of DP by adopting the 4th Cir, and overturning the split by allowing consideration of this issue before final judgement, and make decisions it deems just.¹⁵

III. Dist-Ct violated procedural due process, depriving me of a fair opportunity to be heard with inaccurate public record in violation of the right to be petition and to be fairly heard on such petitions, by placing someone else's case on my record and placing my pleadings out of order, and multiple pleadings in one Docket Item sloppily, carelessly with reckless disregard of violation of my liberties not merely my licenses, unfairly and denied me Constitutionally sufficient notice on hearing requiring acquittal and 3rd Cir denied me a fair and accurate record to appeal by denying my FRAP R 10 Motion in deprivation of Due Process US Amend V, and US Amend I, right to petition or access to the courts

I filed a Motion for a rehearing on denial of the stay DI 12. The Dist-Ct misfiled the exhibits to the Motion for reargument on denial of a stay and other motions including over 2,000 misfiled pages. The items were out of order and some appeared missing. The Ct placed another's person's medical exhibits on my docket. So, I filed a letter at DI 13 for corrections. I think the Dist-Ct made some corrections, but other documents appear to be out of order which prejudices me and the appellate cts. This denied me procedural due process of a fair, complete, accurate opportunity to be heard by prejudicing me and this appellate ct because the ct cannot easily find the documents I referred to in my Motion for a rehearing on the Ct's Order denying a stay in the voluminous misfiled exhibits. US Am V. Gail requested a list to aid in correcting the filings. So, I spent hours over a weekend resending each and every exhibit in order, with a document list outlining the order with the title of each email. I do not have ECF access, but upon information and belief the docket remains a mess. I filed a Motion before the Third Circuit Ct to

¹⁵ *Martin v Knox*, 112 S.Ct. 620, ““The petition is not frivolous because it raises a question on which the Courts of Appeals are in conflict. Compare *In re Beard*, 811 F.2d 818, 827 (CA4 1987) (district judge's failure to disqualify himself can be reviewed by a petition for writ of mandamus); *Union Carbide Corp. v. U.S. Cutting Service, Inc.*, 782 F.2d 710, 713 (CA7 1986) (same), with *Pittsburgh v. Simmons*, 729 F.2d 953, 954 (CA3 1984) (judge's failure to recuse himself is reviewable only after final judgment); *Cleveland v. Krupansky*, 619 F.2d 576, 578 (CA6) (same), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 834, 101 S.Ct. 106, 66 L.Ed.2d 40 (1980). Accordingly, it would be inappropriate to invoke Rule 39.8 and deny Martin's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. I nevertheless agree that it is proper to deny the certiorari petition because it appears that the underlying recusal motion has no merit.”

correct the docket below regarding my Motion for a rehearing on a motion for a stay, since a motion for a stay is required in my case. 3DI-29-34, 3DI-36-41. I am required to show my efforts below in requesting a motion for a reargument on the Ct's order denying a stay. I have shown a motion for a stay having been made, the Dist-Ct denied the motion or failed to afford the relief requested by not addressing my Motion for reargument on the Ct's Order denying a motion for a stay. See, FRAP Rule 8 (b) and 18 (b), See, DI 6-7, DI 12-24. The Ct below seemed to give up on correcting the docket relating to my motion for a rehearing on the denial of stay and scheduled a hearing. (DI-14). I had a number of outstanding motions. I requested the subject matter of the hearing. I asked the Ct what the hearing was about and indicated my intent to call witnesses should it be on the reciprocal discipline as opposed to a hearing on whether a stay or my other motions was required. The Ct evaded responding on the telephone or by email. So, I filed a letter asking for notice. I pled on other issues below including the fact ECF access was not ripe because I had not asked for it at any time prior to the Order dated October 6, 2022 denying ECF rts. So, there are a variety of issues the hearing may have related to. I requested notice of the topic of the hearing in conformity with procedural due process requirements applicable to the Appellee pursuant to the 5th at DI 15. I sent an email to follow up on exhibits and expressing the need to correct them as I assumed the Ct would make a determination on outstanding motions at DI 16. The Ct appeared to ignore that too. On November 3, 2023, I filed Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for an Order on her Motion for good cause, to waive record, transcript fees, filing fees and other ct costs by the Clerk and this Ct in order not to compel me to violate my rel beliefs against debt in exchange for access to the cts in defense of her 1st Am rts. DI-17. On November 3, 2023, I filed Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion for an Order on her Motion pursuant to Local Rule 7.1 (g), FRCP 52, and in addition to or in the alternative of FRCP

59(e), for a rehearing on the Ct Order Denying Request for ECF access, and my corrected Motion to Stay the Proceeding until the conclusion of both Respondent's originating disciplinary proceeding, and civil rts proceeding until final non-appealable determinations are made or the time of appeal has lapsed. DI-18

IV. This Ct must overturn App H Order of the 3rd Circuit Clerk showing bad faith refusing to docket Amended Notice of Appeal to preserve and not vitiate my rts and claims related to a Dist Ct Order dated 8/7/23, argument against vitiation of Constitutional rts including rel belief against debt, involuntary servitude under the 13th Am and access to the cts without compelled violation of rel belief, should the case not be vacated with an acquittal

Dist-Ct ordered me to draft a motion for cause to explain why reciprocal discipline would not be warranted before its Ct. (Dist-Ct Docket Item ("DI") DI-2). I drafted a motion for a stay and a corrected motion for a stay. (DI 4, 6) Dist-Ct denied my motion for a stay and corrected motion for a stay. (DI 3-7), Third Circuit Docket Item ("3DI") 3DI-27, incorporated herein by reference. Every DI and 3DI cited is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety). In the same Order, the ct denied ECF access not ripe for a decision since I did not request ECF at that time. (DI-7). The Ct requested I file a motion for ECF access. Id. I was concerned the Dist Ct may be booby trapping me. 3DI-27. The Ct did booby trap me to waste resources to vitiate my access to the cts. I filed a motion for ECF access Dist Ct Case Manager Gail Olson ("Gail") indicated the ct would allow per the emails on the record on 6/21/23, but the ct denied it on 8/7/23 as moot. (DI 31-34). On 8/7/23, I emailed and mailed an amended notice of appeal to Dist Ct to include the 8/8/23 Order. (App. H). Neither the Dist or Third-Circuit filed it as a notice, despite both cts confirming receipt. Third-Circuit refused to docket the Amended Notice I filed with the Dist-Ct it received from the Dist-Ct on this case's record. I placed the amended notice of appeal on the record at 3DI-62 beneath the transcript because I suspected foul play by the Cts, after all the DE Supreme Ct sealed my petitions and fired witnesses to conceal testimony

in my favor to fix the outcome in the sham original disciplinary case against me. (App. H-1) I seek to hold judges are not above the law and that ct correction by appeals or law suits must be permitted to preserve the Constitutional rule of law. The Ct in bad faith seeks to prevent judges from being accountable to the purview of the Constitutional laws' limits. The Dist-Ct did not file the 8/7/23 Amended Notice of appeal. I required it to be docketed to preserve my rts should the case be remanded back to the Dist Ct to prevent vitiation of my fundamental rt to rel beliefs against debt by compelled waste of resources. The clerk confirmed it gave it to the Third Circuit. Third Circuit confirmed receipt, but did not file it. I drafted **another** Amended Notice of Appeal I mailed out and sent electronically on 8/11/23 to preserve the issues and not waive my claims and rts should this Ct remand the case back to Third Circuit. Dist-Ct filed it per the attached App H-2, but changed electronic notice from "IFP granted" to "No fee paid, no IFP filed" on the electronic notice. Dist Ct granted IFP on 2/8/23 per the attached Order. (App. H-3, H-4, H-5). Dist-Ct filed the second amended Notice appealing denial of ECF access on 8/14/23.

On 8/24/23, the Eastern Dist Ct and the Third Circuit laid another booby trap by creating a new case number, knowing I filed an amended notice I desired the Ct to file in this case to preserve my arguments should the case be remanded or reopened. I am shaking I am so upset. The Third Circuit and Justice Diamond are well aware of my genuinely held rel beliefs and how upset the tomfoolery of deceiving me into waste resources against my rel beliefs has been for me. The Ct indicates in forma pauperis is not granted and this is a different proceeding.

The additional paper, ink and postage required to file the same documents are a cost so great in term of costs as to vitiate my access to the cts. The reason why I filed the motion was to avoid the costs the ct in bad faith compels me to pay despite the fact it required I filed the motion it denied in bad faith. The DE Order and the orders below prevent me from returning to my

former law firm, and may prevent me from getting a job as a lawyer to render any fees impossible to pay back. In addition, asking for donations is against my religious beliefs as I believe people are misled to hell by *Matthew* 6:1-4 violations of organized charity, fundraising and pro bono. Going into debt, of even a few dollars, is against my religious belief, and the additional costs of even a few dollars to pay for postage, stamps, ink and paper is a substantial burden upon my access to the courts due to my utter poverty, and my inability to pay back any fees should my appeal fail. In addition, asking for donations is against my religious beliefs as I believe people are misled to hell by *Matthew* 6:1-4 violations of organized charity, fundraising and pro bono. I am a Christian, a child of God. I attend a Catholic church, but place my faith in God, not man, or money. I do not want to sin against God by incurring debt. I believe people sin against God by incurring debt. God teaches in *Romans* 13:8, "Owe no one anything, except to love each other, for the one who loves another has fulfilled the law." Since it compromises our loyalty to God towards the pursuit of money to free us from bondage of sin, as savior instead of God. Jesus teaches you cannot serve both God and money as savior. *Matthew* 6:24. I choose God. Earning money is not sin. When our desire to earn money takes the place of our desire to do God's will, by hardening our heads, hardening our hearts and hardening our hands preventing us loving God foremost and subordinately loving others as ourselves, I believe we sin. I believe "the love of money is the root of all evil. 1 *Timothy* 6:10

I believe it is a great sin to go into debt, and an even greater sin to require a person to go into debt to exercise fundamental freedoms, that are no longer free, but for sale to those who can afford to buy the ability to exercise Constitutional 1st Am liberties, the wealthy, rendering the poor less equal, no longer free, but for sale bought people, as wage slaves, in violation of the 13th Am, and Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Am applicable to the states, and the Equal

Protections component of the 5th Am applicable to the Federal government, with government support. The DE Disciplinary Order and Dist Cts reciprocal orders prevent me from returning to my former law firm, and may prevent me from getting a job as a lawyer to render any fees impossible to pay back. In addition, asking for donations is against my rel beliefs as I believe people are misled to hell by *Matthew* 6:1-4 violations of organized charity, fundraising and pro bono. I appeal the Order of both the Eastern Dist Ct and the Third Circuit refusing to grant ECF access to file before the Dist Ct and the decision not to even docket the order the Amended notice of appeal the Dist-Ct indicated it transmitted to it on its electronic filing receipt below, and seek to prevent the ct from causing an obstacle so great as to deny me access to this ct and other cts. US Amend I, V.I am required to exercise my rt to petition and appeal within the purview of FRAP R 4, 30 days within the Order to preserve my claims in order not to vitiate my rt to rel belief against debt, 1st Am rt to petition and invocation of the 13th Am to prevent needless costs by refileing paper copies by US Postage of my denied Motion for ECF should the case be remanded back to the Appellate Ct and ultimately back to the Dist Ct.¹⁶

If a Dist-Ct may enter an Order, than I the claimant must be permitted to appeal the Order on the record to preserve my claims to prevent the Ct from bad faith causing needless costs in

¹⁶ On August 24, 2023, the Third Circuit Court and Dist-Court sought to booby trap me based on the amended order by requiring I expend resources I do not have in the same Dist Court case 22-45 for a separate appeal case number opened 8/24/23 No. 23-8425 that by filing an amended notice of appeal for case No 22-3372 I sought to avoid from being created as an obstacle so great as to deny me access to this court by preserving my appeal on the record below. Such an appeal in a separate case matter where I would be required to file in forma pauperis motions and other documents would be fruitless, and I am not falling for the trap meant to harm me into running out of resources, time, stamps, paper as to cause me not to appeal by appealing separately. I should not be denied my fundamental rts I seek to preserve on the record by such entrapment by the court, but assert and do not waive my claims with the intent to preserve my rts not extinguish them by losing the rts and resources I sought to preserve by requiring I appeal separately effectively vitiating the rts I appealed to protect. To make the matter worse. It looks like counsel would be appointed by the Eastern Dist of PA, PA ODC on an appeal that is not ripe to determine whether it is frivolous as this Court has not decided to hear or potentially remand the case. The Court threatened PA ODC with sanctions for an appeal that if filed would be frivolous as vitiating the rts I seek to preserve by filing an appeal. I refuse to willfully be booby trapped as I was unwilfully booby trapped previously.

order to create a burden based on my poverty and asserted rts as to deny me access to the cts in my exercise of my 1st Am rt to petition to preserve my claim should the case be reopened or this Ct remand it back. US Amend I, V, VI. The original order prevents me from working in the profession of my choice and requires time to fight reciprocal cases. It is against my rel beliefs to go in to debt per the petition to file in forma pauperis I incorporate herein. I assert the 1st and 13th Am against involuntary servitude to sin and death in hell. I also invoke my rt to access to the cts under the 1st Am without disparate treatment in violation of the 5th Am based on lack of accommodation due to poverty, rel accommodation, and asserted not waived rel beliefs and assertions against involuntary servitude. US Amend I, V, XIII.

This ct must overturn the Dist Ct's denial of access to electronic filing and the Third Cir.'s denial of exemption from costs in order not to deprive me of access to the cts due to poverty creating a burden so great as to vitiate my 1st Am rt to petition should this order be remanded and not simply vacated.

V The Ct exhibited Bad faith misrepresentations to lure me by entrapment into vitiating my rts, with knowledge of my belief I was retired before the Dist-Ct, my 6th Am assertion of the rt to call witnesses which I was deprived of in DE, a disability order, poverty and lack of means for research given I documented issues relating to broken computers and lack of means to adequately research and risk of serious harm to health without accommodation in the form of time and a stay given my asserted rt to a fair trial and circumstances

The Dist-Ct evaded addressing the outstanding motions and instead set me up in a booby trap by issuing an order requiring I draft a memorandum on why my retirement in PA would not affect my standing in its ct. DI-21. I retired from the bar of the state of PA in 2018. (App. I, certificate of retirement). Throughout the proceeding I believed I was retired in the Dist Ct. I averred I was retired before the Dist Ct in my motion and corrected motion for a stay. In pleadings and in emails I noted retired status. I thought I was retired, and became confused.

The Dist-Ct knew I was not retired. The Ct knew I was retired in PA since 2018. It pulled that data from the PA web site. The Ct knew I believed I was retired before the Dist Ct since I was retired in PA since 2018. I indicated I was retired at the signature line of my pleadings (App J). The Dist Ct also knew I did not have easy access to transportation to travel to the law library to research. DI-9. I was so poor I rode my bike and did not have access to a vehicle around that time. Even worse my bike got a flat tire. DI-9 (App K). The Dist Ct knew I was impoverished and could not afford or pay for Lexis or Westlaw too in order to research either. The Dist Ct knew I was under great duress. I am fighting for my licenses, liberties, life, health and eternal life from the fires of hell. The Dist Ct knew I was having life threatening health issues as I noted I collapsed due to severe dehydration related to a bad surgery I had as a youth. DI-9. (App K). I require time to care for my health in order not to diminish it or die for the vanity of others. DI-9. I attempted to assert my right to live. I alerted the Ct to the fact I require time to sustain my health by including my health records and assertions in order not to harm my health or die at App K too. PA ODC did not care that I collapsed at the post office but for his and the Ct's denial of a physical accommodation in the form of time in violation of the ADA regarding to physical not mental accommodations. The Ct also knew I desired to subpoena witnesses should the hearing be on discipline. I was not afforded that asserted right to subpoena witnesses in the DE proceeding. The Ct knew I was not retired, but attempted to set me up to fall, which may cause 6 new law suits relating to a new order. At the time I drafted the letter at DI 22, I was fighting for my life and eternal life, not merely my licenses in other cases simultaneously with this case. I believe differently than others. I believe many things lead to certain loss of eternal life in the fires of hell. I do not believe many people go to heaven. Jesus teaches few people have eternal life at the resurrection of the bodies from their graves the last

day. *Matthew 7:13-15*. I believe compromising my belief in Jesus for the vanity of men misleads others to hell and may damn me to hell. It is no small matter. I do not want to mislead others or miss out on sharing a fuller type of love with God on judgement day for eternity. I was utterly confused because Gail indicated I was not retired and I thought I was. Then, I just did not know. The Dist Ct knew I thought I was retired. I stated the same in pleadings. The Dist Ct knew I have been retired from PA since 2018. That was confirmable public knowledge at the time of the Order. Moreover, the Dist Ct cited the public state web site. DI 21. The Dist Ct also knew due to lack of time, poverty and limited means of transportation, broken electronics and lack of resources I could not easily research. Despite that the Ct ordered me to draft a memorandum of law as to why my retirement in PA would not retire my license in its Ct. DI-21. The Ct booby trapped me based on an error of fact, an error of law creating manifest injustice against me by using retirement as a reason to disbar me. In response to the Order for a memorandum, while acting under great duress, I fell into the misleading trap of the Ct. I filed a letter asking to be placed on retirement, as not admitted in the Eastern Dist Ct of PA Dist Ct to practice because I was confused as to whether I was retired or not. I thought my assumption of retirement might be wrong, but then the Ct asked why I should not be retired. DI-22. To my horror, the Ct disbarred me instead of placing me on retirement. DI-23. I was surprised because I thought I would be retired. I immediately called Gail noting my confusion. I asked if this was punishment. I exclaimed my confusion as I thought I would be placed on retirement. She responded no, it was merely placing my license as disbarred due to retirement, not punishment. Gail Olsen said the Ct was not disciplining me, per the letter confirming our conversation at DI-24. Having multiple law suits where Cts sought to discipline me for my faith in Jesus, I drafted a letter confirming our conversation, but remained confused. DI- 24. At the time, just like now, I was under water in

other cases as I fought for my eternal soul from the pits of hell by defending my faith in Jesus Christ from government persecution but for the exercise of rel beliefs. I did not have easy access to research. During the case I could not even afford car insurance and gas and was compelled to hand in my tags since the DE Order and law suits arising from it preventing me from working in the occupation of my choice and I assert my 13th Am rts.

After researching I discovered I was not automatically retired since disbarred PA attorneys are not automatically disbarred and may have an office to practice before the Federal cts.¹⁷ Judge Diamond of Dist-Ct booby trapped me by creating the assumption I was retired by asking me to draft a memorandum on why I should not be retired in its ct too. Judge Diamond sought to entrap me into requesting retirement in order to disbar me for conduct I would not have otherwise committed but for the trap he laid out to get out of work. I have limited time, resources and ability to research. The Ct should not have placed me as disbarred instead of as retired. Moreover it is clear error of law, of fact creating manifest injustice against me to place me on retirement too, even if the order should be changed. I did not have notice of disbarment, and the Dist-Ct had reason to believe I did not understand the consequences of retirement. The Dist-Ct knew I was confused and exploited that confusion to get out of analyzing the voluminous amount of Constitutional issues in the underlying original disciplinary case the reciprocal case is based on. The Orders below violate my 5th Am rt to notice, and a fair proceeding.

The Ct held in, *In re Ruffalo*, 390 U.S. 544, 551 (1968), “The charge must be known before the proceedings commence. They become a trap when, after they are underway, the

¹⁷ See, *Theard v. United States*, 354 U.S. 278, 282 (1957); *Selling v. Radford*, 243 U.S. 46, 49 (1917), *Frazier v. Heebe*, 482 U.S. 641, 648 n.7 (1987); also see, *In re Surrick*, 338 F.3d 224, 231 (3d Cir. 2003), (disbarment by the [s]tate does not result in automatic disbarment by the federal ct." *In re Ruffalo*, 390 U.S. 544, 547, 88 S.Ct. 1222, 20 L.Ed.2d 117 (1968)). *Surrick v. Killion*, 449 F.3d 520, 530 (3d Cir. 2006), (“The question in this case is whether a state may prohibit an attorney admitted to the bar of a federal Dist ct, but suspended from the state bar, from maintaining a legal office for the sole purpose of supporting a practice before the federal ct.”).

charges are amended on the basis of testimony of the accused. He can then be given no opportunity to expunge the earlier statements and start afresh.” I was not given advance notice on the matter of the hearing or notice of disbarment based on retirement. I was without access to legal resources and under great duress. The ct took advantage of my hardship to vitiate my license to practice law in bad faith. The Ct indicates in *Herring v. New York*, 422 U.S. 853, 866-867, “Due has long been recognized as assuring “fundamental fairness” the elements of fairness vary with the circumstances of particular proceedings... What is fair in one set of circumstances may be an act of tyranny in others.” As applied the ct acted unjustly creating irreparable injury to me in terms of punishing me even more harshly for the 1st Am rts to petition, rel belief, exercise of belief, association and speech and asserted other Constitutional rts including the 6th Am rt to cross examine my accusers which I alerted the ct I reserved my rt to do since I was deprived of the rt in the original DE Disciplinary proceeding. I asserted my 6th Am rt to call witnesses. The order violated 6th and 5th Am notice of charges. I did not know the Eastern Dist Ct would disbar me when I did not draft a memorandum as to why retirement in PA would not retire my license in its Ct. I asked the Ct be placed on retirement so as not to be barred as active, but I thought I might have been wrong on my assumption of retirement. I was confused without ability to research the issue due to lack of time and resources. My conduct was not done knowingly or voluntarily but under great duress. It was a boobytrap based on a misunderstanding similar to the entrapped lawyer relating to the disciplinary proceeding in *In re Ruffalo*, where I was denied fair notice and a fair and fair opportunity to be heard given my unique situation of facing 6 law suits, limited access to the cts given lack of time, health limitations and poverty creating a substantial burden to my access to the cts and rel belief against debt. The Order should be overturned, and my license should be placed on retirement either. While, I do not have

easy access to resources, the Dist Ct should have known retirement in state does not automatically retire my federal license unless specifically drafted in its rules. The rules do not require reciprocal retirement in my case. So, the Dist Ct appears to have set me up to fall which is not fair or just. I gave the ct notice I lacked time and resources to investigate. DI-9. I was under duress having noticed the Dist Ct of my collapse upon the floor of the post office due to lack of time to care for my health to sustain it. I noticed the Dist Ct of my lack of resources to pay for car insurance, and my limited resources too. I did not have the means to research until later. I discovered and realized I must appeal the Eastern Dist of PA Order or potentially face 6 new law suits. That is important to prevent in order not to certainly vitiate my Constitutional rts. Costs of needless additional law suits are so great given my poverty and rel beliefs against debt as to effectively to deprive me of my ability to petition to defend the loss of Constitutional rts and claims including but not limited to my private 1st Am rts 1. to rel belief in Jesus as God not money as God, 2. Exercise of rel belief, petition, speech, association and other claims. US Am I, V, XIV, XIII. “The standard of due process is that no one may be deprived of liberty or property without such reasonable notice and hearing as fairness requires.” *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 124. I was deprived of procedural due process by the unfair trap the ct laid to entice me to eliminate work caused by its staff’s messing up on docketing when the case manager Gail was out and lack of notice and an opportunity to be heard fully and fairly as written on the docket. US Am. I was deprived of 6th Am rt to be “informed of the nature and cause of the accusation.” US Am I, VI, VI. The vitiation of my rts not to be deprived of my license but for the entrapment of the ct was not knowingly or voluntary given. “Due process must be respected in periods of calm and in times of trouble,” even during a global pandemic, war in Ukraine and Israel and global economic crisis. Id I was not predisposed to

violating rules against retirement. “The entrapment defense prohibits the government from instigating a criminal like violation of the disciplinary rules by persons otherwise innocent in order to lure them to its commission and to punish them. I was not predisposed to place my license I thought was on retired by automatic rule of law with the 2018 retirement in PA onto retirement. Justice Diamond set me up with an evil selfish biased motive of person trying to get out of upholding Constitutional rts to get of work which is required to uphold justice for all, even me as a party of one with unique rel beliefs that no one is above the law nor below, even Presidents, judges and law makers. *United States v. Russell*, 411 U.S. 423, 424. I face irreparable injury before the partial forum to itself and its case law instead of the impartial application to the rule of law in violation of my rt to an impartial forum. I request acquittal and vacation of the order disbaring me due to retirement. App. I, J, K The Government through the Ct, “may not issue commands to its citizens, under criminal [or disciplinary] sanctions, in language so vague and undefined as to afford no fair warning of what conduct might transgress them.” *U.S. v. Levin*, 973 F.2d 463, 466 (6th Cir. 1992) *Citing Lanzetta v. State of New Jersey*, 306 U.S. 451 (1939). The government, the ct, lured me in bad faith by trickery to disbar me to get out of work its staff created by misfiling my pleadings. I did not knowingly nor voluntarily relinquish my license to practice law. The ct knew or should have known I was confused, and entrapped me in bad faith. Accordingly, the order below must be vacated.

VI. This case should be vacated. There is no Art III Case and Controversy

Federal reciprocity requires the Ct to be the prosecutor, the judge and witness too, not an outside adverse party, violating the case or controversy requirements of U.S.C.A. Const. Art. 3, § 2, cl. 1. In federal reciprocity cases, the Dist-Ct who is both the prosecutor and the judge is the named party in this case. I am defending myself against required Ct prosecution where I, the accused bear the burden by clear and convincing evidence as to why the Ct must not prosecute

me, in potential violation of my Fifth Am rts by reporting requirements and fair notions of due process and procedural due process applicable to federal cts. The Third Circuit held,

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

The Third element is not met in all cases before federal disciplinary hearings. There is no adversarial party when the entity prosecuting is judge and jury, including mine. There is a conjectural not a real but a hypothetical controversy. This system of reporting in violation of the 5th and automatic reciprocity without a case or controversy must be overturned to preserve the Const lib of the accused. This issue is capable of repetition, yet evading review, and should, in the interest of justice be considered by an impartial judicial forum who has not reciprocated discipline Ct. A Ct will not admit it violates the Const by blindly adhering to its internal procedures. Art III This Ct must consider these important issues to prevent manifest injustice.

VII Third Circuit abused its discretion denying a stay effectively vitiating my Const right to petition to defend Constitutional rights in accordance with due process that are vitiated by the Draconian Order done in bad faith with severest of consequences

Citing Matthew 6:24. Extraordinary circumstances warrant a stay. Ct abused its discretion by denying my Motion for a stay until a final non-appealable decision is made in the civil rts case effectively vitiating my Constitutional right to petition to defend Constitutional rights in accord with due process in this case and civil rts case that are vitiated by the Draconian Order of disbarment done in bad faith with severest of consequences in terms of vitiating my Constitutional rts by obstructing my access to the cts below to defend punishment for exercising rts. US Am I, V, VI. The denial vitiated my 1st Am rt to access to the courts below and 5th Am rt to petition fairly and effectively done in bad faith with knowledge of my poverty and the loss of

fundamental rights and licensed without due process below. Since I am punished but for the exercise of fundamental rights, and was punished in violation of DP in DE.

Moreover, the disbarment and vitiation of my underlying fundamental rights is done in bad faith, knowingly to chill my right to petition by obstructing my access to other courts in light of knowing of my poverty and health limitations but not upholding the Constitution as applied to me based disparately. Professionals are not below the Constitution in exchange for a license. I need a stay, not merely a remand until the civil rights proceeding is concluded in order to research and do a good job on this appeal to prevent 6 new lawsuits in order that this Court too does not obstruct my access to the courts in another case with malice in terms of the intent of depriving me of fundamental rights including the 1st Amendment right to petition and the 5th Amendment right to fairly be heard on such petitions before government deprivations of rights, liberties and other interests. It is in the interest of the courts and the public to allow a stay. The public also faces a great loss making those within the government above the law, and those who hold licenses below the Constitutional law's protections under the threat of similar retaliation which would restrain their licenses to buy and sell but for the exercise of fundamental private rights should a stay be denied. The public is not harmed by a stay. I am not licensed before the District Court at this time, and am not practicing law on behalf of another.

However, the public may be harmed should a stay be denied by punishing professionals for upholding the constitutional limits against state and government agents, chilling correction needed to safeguard fundamental rights for all. The courts are not harmed by a stay and have no legitimate reason for denying a stay other than to deprive me of access to the courts and the underlying rights I seek to defend in bad faith. The Courts are not harmed by a stay, but may be harmed by a denial which may cause up to 6 additional needless law suits and additional work. The balance of the equities shows a stay is required to prevent manifest injustice and loss of my private 1st Amendment right to

pet to defend the exercise of fundamental rts in the civil rts case. The balance of the equities and case law regarding parallel proceedings show the Third Circuit Ct committed clear error of law, clear error of fact, creating manifest injustice against me. I am not practicing law. I am acting as a private person standing up for my rt to live, exercise 1st Am private speech, 1st Am private rel belief, 1st Am private exercise of rel belief, 1st Am rt to association, 1st Am private exercise of the rt to petition without government persecution, but for the exercise of my 1st Am rts, no matter if the State finds my belief in Jesus Christ illogical. It is not for the state to dictate who or what I worship. (*Citing, Bible, Matthew 6:24-34*).

I face the irreparable injury in terms of loss of health, life, constitutional liberties and eternal life. This ct is apprised of my poverty and health limitations. It is not fair that I must pick and choose which cases to defend since poverty creates a substantial burden upon my access to other cts. My religious beliefs against debt also creates an obstacle to my access to the cts. I believe debt damns people to hell by tempting them to make the pursuit of money instead of pursuit of God and God's will savior. I also invoked and continue to invoke the 13th Am against involuntary servitude to work for money to pay off government compelled debt to defend Constitutional liberties.

On 6/30/23 3rd Cir Ct entered 7 judgments against me near closing time on the 4th of July holiday weekend in this matter and the civil rts case, Kelly v Swartz. The denial of a stay, and a denial of more time caused the Clerk to file an Order dismissing the case immediately for failure to prosecute in the other case. On 6/2/23, I filed a Motion for more time under prejudice in the other-case given the Clerk of Ct Ordered that I may not exceed three pages despite good cause and requirement for more time under my unique situations. The Order effectively chilled my ability to effectively refer to all the facts and case law necessary to defend my 5th Am rt to a fair

proceeding by the threat of the irreparable loss of my private rt to rel belief, substantial burden to access to cts and involuntary servitude against my asserted invocation of the 13th Am in the Motion for reargument on this cts Denial of costs, fees or taxes with leave to reassert the Motion. I reassert the Motion to vacate 5/19/23 Order, motion to exempt costs and reargument on denial of motion to exempt costs now in full, and incorporate it herein, especially concerning the page-limit threatening Order compelling me to comply or risk violating my rel beliefs, Motion to correct Motion to vacate, and related documents in their entirety. I was compelled not to include legal arguments and facts under the threat of the Ct forcing me to violate my rel beliefs against Jesus Christ by costs, and the rt to petition to prevent irreparable injury in terms of loss of other Consti asserted rts given the threat of malicious bad faith fines and my rel beliefs against debt.

At 3DI-55 I also note on the record evidence Circuit Ct appeared to punish me in retaliation of exercising my rt to petition in the civil rts case in bad faith to chill my speech and petitions. US Am I. The clerk's order 5/19/23 should be overturned in light of my motions to exempt fees and costs given my poverty, rel objections to debt, invocation of the 13th Am and debt creating an obstacle so great as to deny me the 1st Am rt to petition the cts, effectively in bad faith denying me access to the cts in violation of the 5th Am and 1st Am. I called Gail more than a week before the due date 6/13/23. She, and 3rd Pamela Batts, assured me I would be granted more time in the other-case. I called her again on 6/13/23 because I was panicking. I had no reason to believe 3rd Circuit Ct would deny my reasonable, necessary request for a stay or time to preserve my fundamental rts and the eliminating my licenses but for my exercise of fundamental rts of 1st Am rt to petition, speech, associate believe, 6th Am rt to self-representation, rt to Equal Protection and a fair and meaningful opportunity to be heard under the 5th and 14th Ams and DE claims. I also filed Motion for a stay as I require time in order to

effectively argue the Order below in the Other-case must be overturned under the threat of **6 new additional law suits against me should I fall short, including one by the US Supreme Ct.**

The Ct denied a stay on 6/30/23 abusing its discretion creating manifest injustice against me by the severest of penalties dismissing the case, while denying me the rt for a rehearing on outstanding motions and the 6 or more additional motions denied by an order filed simultaneously therewith therein or by failure to address. I filed motions for reargument after 6/30/23 to assert my 1st and 5th Am rt to petition and be heard pursuant to FRAP 40 on motions for rehearing or reargument on the denied motions for a stay, time, vacating order, failure to recuse and dismissal for failure to prosecute, I incorporate herein. Circuit Ct unreasonably and in bad faith denied my motion to reopen the case and all my motions filed after 6/30/23 effectively depriving me of the rt to appeal and an opportunity to be heard to defend my exercise of Constitutional liberties and my interests in my licenses under US Am I, V, and FRAP 40.

I do not think anyone wants up to 6 new needless law suits, should the orders at Third Circuit not be vacated by this ct. The new law suits would effectively vitiate my ability to protect my 1st Am Rts, 6th Am rts and other claims in this civil rts case. I do not have the resources to fight potentially 14 defendants in this case, the other-case or potentially 6 additional lawsuits simultaneously dur to poverty, lack of time and resources. I must be afforded time to petition in other cases. Denial of stay vitiates my rts by creating obstacles to petition in some cases in exchange with my fundamental 1st am rt to petition in other cases by denying my request for a stay and time, without a fair opportunity to reargue by the severest of penalties dismissing the case. A lawyer's rt, my rt to pursue my profession constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the 5th and 14th Am, and of which I cannot be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the gov's disagreement with my Const protected rel-

political beliefs. The State placed my license to practice law on disabled to chill my 1st Am rts to rel belief, exercise, speech, association and petition but for their rel-political-poverty animus. I must be afforded fair access to the cts to defend my licenses to practice law from being placed on inactive disabled or lost but for my faith in Jesus Christ, and exercise of fundamental rts. US Am I, V, XIV. Conditioning my ability to petition under the threat of government compelled rel violations and loss of other Constitutional rts such as access to other cts is unConst. I must not be compelled to violate my rel belief against debt in order to regain my licenses, safeguard my Const lib or preserve my other claims. Nor should I be deprived of the Const rt to pet in one courts from gov forced relinquishment of the rt to pet in another court by court incited obstruction of access to the cts. Nor should I be punished for my exercise of the rt to access to the cts to defend my rel beliefs because the Defendants and the original disciplinary Ct finds my citations to the Bible and rel beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions illogical. The Fed Ct “may not condition the grant of a privilege, [a license, or a Const right] or benefit upon the surrender of a constitutional rt.”¹⁸ “The doctrine that a government, state or federal, may not grant a benefit or privilege on conditions requiring the recipient to relinquish his constitutional rts is now well established.”¹⁹

¹⁸ *Minn. Ass'n, Health Care v. Minn. Dept.*, P.W, 742 F.2d 442, 446 (8th Cir. 1984); Citing, *Western Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of Equalization*, 451 U.S. 648, 657-58, 664-65 (1981); *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404-05, (1963).

¹⁹ Citing, *Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 34 (1970); E.g., *Cafeteria Workers v. McElroy*, 367 U.S. 886, 894; *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404; *Speiser v. Randall*, 357 U.S. 513, 519-520; *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493, 499-500; *Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding*, 344 U.S. 590, 597-598; *Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n*, 271 U.S. 583, 593-594; see *Van Alstyne, The Demise of the Rt-Privilege Distinction in Constitutional Law*, 81 Harv. L. Rev. 1439, 1445-1454 (1968); *Comment, Another Look at Unconst 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 rt to go to Baghdad, but the Government may not prohibit one from going there unless by means consonant with due process of law.”) “Neither the state in general, nor the state university in particular, is free to prohibit any kind of expression because it does not like what is being said.” *Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 35-36 (1970) The United States Supreme Ct in *Kennedy v. Bremerton School Dist.*, No. 21-418, at *15 (June 27, 2022) held, “Where the Free Exercise Clause protects rel exercises, whether communicative or not, the Free Speech Clause provides overlapping protection for expressive rel activities.”

I must be afforded fair access to the courts to defend my license to practice law from restrictions but for my faith in Jesus Christ, and exercise of fundamental rights, without compelled denial by requiring I fight multiple law suits without the material means or time to pay for gas, paper and postage simultaneously. US Am I, V. I will lose my liberties, livelihood, claims and be tempted to lose my eternal life if a stay is not granted. This law suit also has new and additional claims based on disciplinary proceeding brought by the state of DE (“State”), with retaliatory-political-poverty animus to punish me for my exercise of the private 1st Amendment right to petition, religious belief, exercise of religious belief, associate, speech, and to cover up the State’s retaliation against me for petitioning the Court to safeguard my rights, predominately of the 1st Amendment right to exercise my religious belief over the course of about 20-years.²⁰ I incorporate in its entirety the initial-civil-rights complaint I filed, and exhibits thereto.

²⁰ See pp L-M The State retaliated against me for exercising my 1st Amendment right to petition for relief even prior to bar admission by punishing me for petitioning its partner grant me relief when my DE bar materials were destroyed by a leaky ceiling at the dorm room I resided. I passed the DE Bar on the 1st try, but lost expected income in the amount of about 2 million dollars over the years based on retaliatory action by the state. The DE-Supreme Court compelled me to violate my religious belief against swearing in despite my request to affirm upon my admissions to the DE bar (3DI 56 at Exhibit E). After I learned affirming violates Jesus Christ’s teachings, I petitioned the DE Supreme Court to be excused from affirming too. (3DI 56 at Exhibit F). The court denied my request violating my 1st Amendment right to exercise religious belief. Throughout the years DE Supreme Court members or agents have violated my Constitutional rights by disparate selective treatment. During my 1st appearance as a lawyer in Court, Judge Smalls called me a Philadelphia lawyer as if PA was a bad word. Former DE Supreme Court Justice told me to go back to PA after a CLE when I stole his thunder by answering a question on recent USSC proceedings not because I am smart, but because I care and listened to public radio. My friend Stephanie Noble had dear eyes. I drafted a contained in the record below petition with the DE Supreme Court and created the bumper-sticker related to this when I ran for office in 2018, attached hereto, along with newspaper articles, one of which shows government agents chilled my speech. (3DI-56 at Exhibit G-H-I) The State disregarding my request against family-law appointments per my second request to be removed from the roster as against my religious belief, per two Court petitions in 3DI 56 at Exhibits J K. I petitioned the court in *Kelly v Trump* to alleviate a substantial burden upon my religious belief, and instead of alleviating it, they worsened it and demeaned me for my Bible references per Petition at 7. (3DI 56 at-Ex L). I placed the Constitutional challenges to disciplinary proceedings on the record before Third Circuit below and I extended the arguments to prevent regulating the US Supreme Court and federal judges. 3DI-57-58. Pursuant to US Am V, I seek a reasonable fair opportunity in the form of additional time to defend the exercise my 1st Amendment right to petition to assert my claims in the civil rights case in order to prevent the permanent loss of the exercise of fundamental rights including my private 1st Amendment right to petition, speech, religious belief, exercise of religious belief, 6th Amendment right to self-represent in state Court, 13th Amendment right against involuntary servitude, harm to health, loss of property interests, 6 new law suit needless law suits with a certain one before the US Supreme Court, loss of licenses, Constitutional arguments against disciplinary proceedings and rules including but not limited to Rules 7, 13, 14, other Constitutional liberties and claims, not by free choice, but government compelled choice, should this court not accommodate me by allowing a stay so as not to forever deprive me of my religious exercise of belief in Jesus without threat of punishment in DE, and other injuries caused by denial of a time. A denial of time vitiates my ability to

I have been selectively targeted based on subject matter of speech contained in my petitions, without a compelling state interest more important than the protection of my Constitutional rights, which if left unprotected makes other professionals no longer free under the threat of government retaliation. The object of the application of the state's discipline is to "infringe upon or restrict [my] practices because of their religious motivation, the law is not neutral," as violating the Equal Protections clause as applied to me a party of one. *Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of*

effectively exercise my 1st Amendment right to petition in this civil rights and in the other-case on appeal effectively vitiating my 1st Amendment right to religious belief, exercise of belief, speech, association, and other claims. Denial by this Court would compel me against my will to lose my 1st Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus, exercise of belief, 1st Amendment right to petition to safeguard Constitutional liberties and other claims forever in DE as the DE Courts and its arms will continue to attack me as below the protection of the Constitutional law as they have deemed me unworthy for almost 20 years. (3DI-56) A stay is required to prevent irreparable injury to me in terms of the loss of my freedom to exercise private 1st Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus Christ in DE, petition, speech, association, 6th Amendment right to self-defense, and licenses under the threat of not being able to buy and sell but for my religious beliefs the state finds repugnant. I also require a stay to sustain my life and health. I asserted my right to live in all circumstances and have attached on the record health records and averred that I must assert my right to live under less strenuous circumstances because people have the sin against the holy spirit by the desire not to want to inconvenience their own for the few to sustain life and health. App. K I have religious objections to healthcare and mental healthcare. Id. A stay would prevent duplicity of potentially conflicting decisions in parallel disciplinary cases and 6 new law suits. All I ask is for a fighting a chance an opportunity to be heard fairly, not a guarantee of justice in the civil rights case and this case. US Am I, V. Denial of a stay obstructs my access to the courts by needless unaffordable costs relating to duplicated litigation on the same issues from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, creating an obstacle so great as to deny me access to the courts to defend my license and exercise of fundamental rights, given my poverty and religious objection to debt. I need a stay in order to adequately and fairly make an appeal on orders below. Courts committed clear error of fact, of law, creating manifest injustice. A stay is required to allow me a fair and adequate focused amount of time to appeal the District Court order below disbaring me. Yet, I do not have the means, given poverty and lack of material resources or time to petition effectively petition in all cases. A stay is also required to give me a fighting chance in the civil rights case relating to this matter *Kelly v Swartz*. On or about October 25, 2023, I filed a Civil rights case in the Delaware District Court, *Kelly v Swartz* for 1st Amendment violations, procedural due process violations, emotional distress, retaliation, witness tampering, defamation, and other claims relating to the State of Delaware's attacks in interference of *Kelly v Trump*, and retaliation for the exercise of my Constitutional rights, based on religious-political-poverty animus to punish cover up the state's violations of procedural due process and other laws ("civil rights"). I amended the civil rights complaint to include Delaware Supreme Court, and its members since it fired staff to conceal their testimony, sealed and concealed evidence in my favor and incited the attack to cover up its unconstitutional acts by inciting the attacks against me during *Kelly v Trump* to cause me to forgo my lawsuit based on the information of the attackers the State-Arms DE-Lapp and an agent of the ODC Judge of Court of Common Pleas, Kenneth S. Clark. The Civil rights case is now ripe to appeal before the US Supreme Court, *Kelly v Swartz*. The State labels my religious belief contained in my speech in my petitions to be a disability. The United States Supreme Court held in *Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer*, 137 S. Ct. 2012, 2019 (2017); "The Free Exercise Clause "protect[s] religious observers against unequal treatment" and subjects to the strictest scrutiny laws that target the religious for 'special disabilities' based on their "religious status." Citing *Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 533, (1993); ("In *McDaniel v. Paty*, 435 U.S. 618 (1978), "for example, we invalidated a state law that disqualified members of the clergy from holding certain public offices, because it "impose[d] special disabilities on the basis of . . . religious status." The State Court applies discipline in an unconstitutional manner while treating other attorneys who exercised the same rights for which I am punished more favorably without state discipline so long as they align with the government's belief in money and material gain.

Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 533-534 (1993), US Amend I, XIV.²¹ This Ct has inherent equitable powers over its process to prevent abuse, oppression, and injustice. *Gumbel v. Pitkin*, 124 U.S. 131 (1888); *Covell v. Heyman*, 111 U.S. 176 (1884); *Buck v. Colbath*, 70 U.S. 334 (1865); *Krippendorf v. Hyde*, 110 U.S. 276, 283 (1884) to grant me an interim Stay herein.

This Ct must exercise its power here and under Supreme Ct Rule 23 to prevent abuse and injustice by granting a stay to allow me to fight the civil rts case to prevent vitiation of my fundamental rts and to prevent the cts bad faith from vitiating rts based on partial whims of the court with partiality towards itself in violation of Equal Protections. Ct denied a stay on June 30, 2023, and denied my motion for a rehearing on a stay on July 26, 2023 erring as a matter of law, as a matter of fact creating manifest injustice against me as to cause me to lose my 1st Am rt to pet fairly pursuant to the 5th Am to defend my exercise of my 1st Am rt to rel belief, speech, association and petition without loss of my license to practice law but for the state's rel-political poverty animus. In the interest of justice for good cause to prevent irreparable this ct must overturn the Order below and grant me a stay so as not to deny me a fighting chance to assert my rts in the only forum where relief may be had the civil rts case, to prevent 6 needless law suits and to prevent irreparable loss not only in terms of loss of licenses, claims, harm to health but loss of my 1st Am rt to rel belief in Jesus without government persecution, but for my belief in Jesus as God and savior not money as well as vitiation of other Const lib. Time is required to prevent the schemed overthrow of these United States. The Civil rts case is the only forum

²¹ The United States Supreme Ct held in *Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 543, 546, 561 (1993), "The principle that government, in pursuit of legitimate interests, cannot in a [selective manner impose burdens only on conduct motivated by religious belief] is essential to the protection of the rts guaranteed by the Free Exercise Clause. ...A law [as applied to me as a party of one] burdening religious practice that is not neutral or not of general application must undergo the most rigorous of scrutiny. To satisfy the commands of the 1st Am, a law restrictive of religious practice must advance "interests of the highest order," and must be narrowly tailored in pursuit of those interests....A law that is religion neutral on its face or in its purpose may lack neutrality in its effect by forbidding something that religion requires or requiring something that religion forbids." *Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 561 (1993)

where I may seek relief to protect my fundamental rights and other claims from vitiating. Should I fall short, US AG's may help in this case to preserve the US from dissolution if it is stayed here on appeal before your court. I give consent to Ct and opposing counsel to be heard without me should I be unable to pet. The US is founded based on the Const as rule of law, and is maintained and sustained by the rule of law.

The power of the gov and the power of the people including the 1st Am rt to pet coupled with 5th and 14th Am rts to fair oppty to be heard is based on the rule of law, the Const, which sustains and maintains these United States. Petitioning is the only individual lib that safeguards every other Const protected individual lib and claim without compromise or vitiating for the collective representative interest by the vote. The cts degrade the Const as rule of law that sustains these United States and threaten dissolution by the removal of the legal power of the people to restrain the government from violating law by obstruction of the rt to pet and DP oppty to fairly and meaningfully be heard **as applied to me in this case and other cases**, statutory decrees of immunity or case law granting immunity to government agents such as Presidents, including Trump. Whereby the cts threaten our national security by eliminating the people's legal check through the 1st Am rt to petition coupled with the 5th and 14th Am fair and meaningful opportunity to be heard before capricious infringements of life, liberty or property without DP by obstructing access to cts based on partial judicial whims. Your honors violate the law by case law conflicting with the Const and the people's legal check upon it, upon the gov and upon the private sector and parties. Removing Const or law as applied to gov partiality violates Equal protections. How can I petition to protect and correct you when you say you are above the law and professionals are below the law and have no rt to access to ct.

VIII CONCLUSION Wherefore, I pray this Ct grants this petition.

Dated

April 19, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,

Meghan Kelly

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

302-493-6693

US Supreme Ct Number 283696

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

Dated:

April 19, 2024

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan Kelly (signed)