

APPEAL

MEGHAN M. KELLY,
Respondent.

§ APPEAL COURT
§ CASE NUMBER: 22:37372
§ DISTRICT COURT
§ Misc. No. 22-45
§ DISTRICT COURT
§ Judge Paul S. Diamond
§

v.
United States District Court,
Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Petitioner Meghan Kelly Affidavit in Support of Recusal of Judge Phipps, and Judge Scirica

Comes now Plaintiff Meghan Kelly, I declare and affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

1. I certify this affidavit is made in good faith to prevent manifest injustice against me by vitiating my Constitutional rights by bias and prejudice so great by Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps in favor of an adverse party or adverse ruling that I respectfully request their recusal in this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144

2. 28 U.S.C. § 144 provides, “ The affidavit shall state the facts and the reasons for the belief that bias or prejudice exists, and shall be filed not less than ten days before the beginning of the term at which the proceeding is to be heard, or good cause shall be shown for failure to file it within such time.”

3. Good cause is shown by excusable neglect in that I did not know I was required to file an affidavit. Due to poverty, and health issues I have limited ability to research.

4. Moreover, I was taken aback that Judge Phipps had the boldness to serve as a member of the panel adjudicating my matter in this case given the grave prejudice I alerted the Court to in the Civil Rights case and this case prior to the June 30, 2023 Order wherein I learned he is the member of the panel who ruled against me.

5. I was taken by surprise, given the notice of my legitimate concern that Judge Phipps’ acting as a member of the panel actually granting an adverse decision based on actual

prejudice relating to a conflict of interest so great as to tempt the common person to rule against me as he did.

5. I move for good cause for this court to accept this affidavit.

6. I unfortunately did not realize the requirement when I filed a similar motion in this Court in the Civil rights case, given the voluminous pressures I apprised this court that I faced.

7. I dare not file an addendum in the Civil Rights case now. This court has chilled my First Amendment right to petition by substantial burdens in the form of government threats of compelled religious violations against my religious belief against debt, given poverty and my assertion of the 13th Amendment, and my assertion of obstacles to my access to resources including research which causes a substantial burden to my access to this Court and the exercise of my 1st Amendment right to petition, to bend my will to the States by force of the fires oh hell, not freely. US Amend I, V.

8. I truly believe those who create debt slavery by compelled force, not a meeting of minds, or any debt sins. Those who are enslaved to debt are tempted to go to hell by making money savior and God. Jesus teaches you cannot serve God and money. *Matthew* 6:24. It is my religious exercise of belief to serve God, not money. I believe churches teach people to go to hell when they collect money as savior for others, which is the mark of the beast. In *Matthew* 6:1-54, Jesus teaches us to give alms in secret or not all. Jesus teaches, do not give to get. Giving out of one hand to get out of the other teaches people business is love or charity. This lie damns people to hell by teaching them to love money to extract money from one another, driving out love for one another replaced with the love of material gain under the false belief business is contributing good, charity or love. I believe Jesus teaches people go to hell for organized

charity, fundraising, exploiting child labor by selling girl scout cookies and volunteering because in *Matthew* 6:1-4, Jesus teaches “You will have no reward from your father.” I believe the only reward we have from God is eternal life and the riches of saving other people’s souls from hell to share a fuller type of love with God the last day for an eternity in heaven. God is awesome. In his parable where laborers worked for different amounts of time but gained the same pay, God shows us the glorious wisdom that we may all receive the same salvation, a fuller type of love with God, not more or less than those who became saved from their sin at the end with little time doing what was right in the eyes of God. This humility helps us to love others without resentment, to look at people as the wonderful treasure they are, not moth and rust, or our own works. God is smart. He drives out the sin of Satan pride with eternal life saving humility and mercy that saves us from the default the second death to be no more.

9. If Judge Phipps is removed and any ruling is granted in my favor, Judge Phipps is clean of that and should not be punished by Trump. Judge Phipps appeared to expressed his immediate indication that he does not necessarily agree with me in response to my initial brief in the other matter. Yet, it appears Judge Phipps desires the Court to be clear and to be made clean of law suits whose rulings in my favor harm his prospects at nomination to the USSC.

10. I only discovered Judge Phipps became a member of the panel on my case on June 30, 2023

11. I was taken aback in light of the conflict of interest I noticed the Courts about contained in the Civil rights case, *Kelly v Swartz*, 22-3198 and in this case on June 30, 2023 when I filed a motion to recuse 4 judges. Judge Phipps rendered adverse orders against me in the civil rights case. It is prejudicial to have the same judge, Judge Phipps, to determine different issues on related matters where the advocate in the other case speaks in his mind if not on the

papers, prejudicing me with the false allegations by the State of Delaware's counsel and the false allegations of the Delaware Supreme Court asserted to claim the real issues of discrimination against me based on my genuine not fake belief in Jesus and to cover up years of State Court misconduct. Jesus teaches people commit lawlessness when they judge based on mere appearance or marketing instead of rightly. See, *John 7:24*.

12. Actual prejudices occurred in that Judge Phipps ruled against me unexpectedly by unreasonably denying a stay or additional time on June 30, 2023 in this case. My case manager told me the Court would grant me time. I relied on her comfort that I was okay to my detriment.

13. In bad faith this Court appeared to ruin a weekend where loved ones came for the 4th of July in the area by increasing pressure given the substantial burden of poverty, health, religious objection to debt, lack of time, no access to Westlaw or Lexis at home and other burdens by rendering orders in two cases against me prior to a holiday weekend, where the law library would be closed.

14. I cannot tell my parents bad news without rebuke. I called them, told them and they threatened to cut off my phone and kick me out. My parents get upset easily. They have already indicated they intend to cut off my inheritance because of these law suits. Whether the threats are real or just parents indicating I cannot turn to them when problems arise I do not know. I know that I was scolded for calling them in college if I ever needed things like proof reading. I am sorry I am a poor typist. I seek to practice real estate not litigation with my former firm by overturning the DE Order.

15. Over the weekend, my mom indicated she intended to cut off my phone since I alerted her there were orders against me. She did it before. I noticed this Court of that in affidavits in the DE District Court, she may do it again.

16. I love my parents very much. I am grateful to them, but I love God even more, and will stand up for my faith in Jesus Christ even though the courts appear to threaten me with death and bodily harm by not accommodating me based on my asserted religious right to live and not die for the lawless lusts and vanity of men cloaked in the color of law or otherwise.

17. In my affidavits I told this Court I assert my right to live and not die for the sinful convenience or other vanity of the court and government based on exercise of my religious belief to live for God, and not die for mere men which is damnation in hell by making men God.

18. I required time and asserted and required accommodation when I did not face all of the substantial burdens I face now. My health has diminished, and I assert my religious belief and religious exercise of required to retore my health and sustain what cannot be restored. My condition and health show good cause, especially given this Court knows I suffered an eye injury and has should have reviewed the papers on that.

19. I have gained weight too. After my mom's best friend said I looked anorexic I felt so ugly and ate more hoping to become womanlier since my surgery seemed to stilt my growth, only to gain fat in ugly places. This has never happened before. I have maintained the same weight for more than 25 years before this 2023.

20. In high school, I had surgery where the doctor removed my ovary. The doctor said I would only have my period every other month. He was wrong. I had it every month, and every month I became dangerously dehydrated requiring gallons not cups of water, rest and exercise in order not to collapse, faint or die.

21. I still require this. It has never gotten better. It seemed to be the same for the past 20 years. But it got worse and is worse during this litigation. My health has worsened due to the fact none of the courts accommodate me to prevent irreparable injury in terms of loss of my fundamental rights and my property interests, even harm to body, life and potential loss of eternal life.

22. I know that I must assert my right to time, rest and exercise. After the surgery in my youth I fainted. I learned to prevent fainting due to severe dehydration I had to drink gallons of water, rest and exercise. Drinking unusual amounts of water is the most important accommodation.

23. One time I blacked out and peed my pants in a class in college. Everyone left me, I awoke on the floor of a UD classroom all alone after the class in Western medicine.

24. In undergrad and law school I took classes and healthcare and learned how wicked and evil most care was in that it harmed people, and I believe damned people to hell. I have religious objections against healthcare, mental healthcare, carelessly referring people to professionals or to purchase products because I believe it teaches people man, man's work, including technology, science or money to pay for a product or service is savior instead of God's Word, misleading most of humanity on the path to hell. I also believe people to go to hell for blindly doing what they are trained to do, paid to do, or told to do when they harden their heads and hearts from caring to know how their products or practices oppress or harm others. Not knowing, believing a lie, confusion, misunderstanding is guilt to God. See *Math 13*. *2 Cor 4:4*, *Hosea 4:6*. I believe Courts can help the blind see, and the dumb hear to help people know in order to turn away from sin to be saved from certain destruction in the fires of hell as being too disgusting to live for valuing moth and rust at the cost of sacrificing the life or liberty of another

person God loves. I oppose human sacrifice for material gain, even knowledge by science. I have religious objections on anyone collecting data on me or statistics. I also believe people sin for cremation, using others peoples' organs or blood samples for testing or otherwise. See *Amos* 2:1. Jesus teaches us through the holy spirit to judge correctly to discern children of the devil from children of God. *Matthew* 12:34-38. God teaches most people are children of the desolate one, the evil one, sadly without eternal life. (Isaiah 54, more are the children of the desolate woman than of her who has a husband") Jesus teaches the way to gain eternal life is hard, and few people escape hell. See *Matthew* 7:13-15, *Luke* 13:23-28. God commands us not to obey the traditions of men to violate God's law. *Mark* 7:8. The Bible teaches me keep myself separate by not sinning merely for the convenience or pleasure of the world. *Romans* 12:2.

25. I proposed ways to improve healthcare when I ran for office in 2018, which I incorporate herein by reference.

26. I believe people go to hell for their careless words, should they not repent. *Matthew* 12:35-37. I believe people sin for telling other people to pay for a product or pay for a professional to eliminate problems by those who sustain positions and profit so long as the problem is managed and not eliminated. *Romans* 1:25 This makes money to pay a professional, man or man's science or work God in place of God. *Matthew* 6:24.

27. I have religious objections to healthcare and I believe people go to hell for believing all mental health theories which are based on scientific conditions also known as temptations which teach people's will to be bent not free in Christ, reflecting the image of the devil and his children.

28. I am licensed to teach 6 subjects. I studied courses on psychology and behavioral and mental health theories. I believe so many mental theories I had to learn to gain my license

teach children to go to hell, to be the evil, by chasing happiness, their hearts, to be enslaved not free but controlled and managed by those who entice their desires by reward or threat of harm to bend their substantially burdened will to the dictates of mere men in place of God. Kids learn not to think things out, not give into to temptation of immediate gratification and happiness. They do not learn to lay down their desires to love God and love others as themselves. God teaches our body is not our own. Our bodies are temples, and are Gods. It is a sin to destroy our bodies for mere man or money by what others sell or give us. God teaches those who destroy his temple, people's bodies will be destroyed in hell for loving mammon more than God by respecting his desire that we love one another without human sacrifice for material gain even the lie of sustaining the world. Business is not the sin. Human oppression, sacrifice of life or liberty for convenience and material gain is sin because people love what they can get, moth and rust more than one another untampered by love written in the hearts of the born again or the just rule of law. I especially oppose BF Skinner which taught the mark of the beast. He taught the lie there was no unconditional love, and that people lived solely based on conditions of reward and avoidance of harm to be controlled without free will by those who enticed their desires by conditions, also known as temptations.

29. During the lawsuits the dehydration has increased resulting to my inability to restore my health.

30. On the record, I noticed this court, PA and the district courts as well as the USSC that I collapsed on the floor of the post office due to severe dehydration. I requested a stay based on need, physical need. None of the courts cared about upholding my fundamental right to live, my religious belief to live and not die by human sacrifice for mammon of the courts and government.

31. I asserted and did not waive my rights at any time. Despite that the courts create substantial burdens and harm to my health.

32. During the original disciplinary proceeding, I asserted my rights, and was compelled to attend a hearing as I recovered from the shingles and allergies without time to prepare, my asserted right to perform discovery, subpoena witnesses and other violation of my asserted and not waived fundamental rights.

33. I told the DE Court in Kelly v Democrats, Kelly v Trump and the Disciplinary matter that I faint and may die if I am not afforded accommodations by attaching the same Exhibit 43 I provided this Court. They knew or should know that I assert a right to fair proceeding giving my personal abilities to sustain life and health and not die by human sacrifice for the vanity of the state who doesn't care about life or health unless we attorneys or parties demand it.

34. This Court is aware that I injured my eye and lost vision, and my eye is blurry by severe dryness.

35. The Courts have disregarded my asserted rights, including my right to live, the superseding Constitutional laws and statutes in my cases. The Delaware Supreme Court members have behaved above the law in the disciplinary case by firing witnesses, concealing evidence in my favor to fix the sham proceedings against me.

36. In my cases I see how lawless lusts not the impartial rule of law reign.

37. I do not think disciplining judges is the answer. I think attorney advocates have a duty to uphold the rule of law when judges violate it in cases and controversies including my Civil Rights case, and this case where the lower Court booby trapped me. I think the courts must

encourage attorneys to fulfill their duty of upholding the Constitutional rights of the public, the people and the attorney's own rights without fear of vindictive retaliation by the courts.

38. Business, professional licensure should not supersede the Constitutional rights of private citizens, even me as a private party with a professional license to practice law.

39. I write under duress. My health has diminished.

40. On Monday, July 3, 2023 I called my case manager in this case. She indicated her surprise. She did not expect the court not to deny time. She said Courts usually grant time even less time. We were both taken aghast.

41. My case manager indicated she was not going to be in July 4, or July 5th but I could email her or call the Court since this is due by or before July 5, 2023.

42. I have limited time, and require a stay in order to defend my faith in Jesus, not money or material gain as God to be controlled by those who control resources instead of to freely lay down my desires and needs to do what is right, the will of God love to overcome lusts.

43. This Court denied me time, and I have to file a motion for reconsideration by July 14th should this court not grant consideration of the motions by a new panel pursuant to my requests in the motion accompanying this affidavit.

44. The substantial burdens due to other law suits, health, debt, familial situation, time, unexpected surprise are good cause under the circumstances to consider this affidavit.

48. Judge Phipps' conflict is so great a reasonable person would conclude bias or prejudice in my case under the facts.

49. Judge Phipps was placed on a list of potential nominees to the US Supreme Court by President Trump.

50. Donald J. Trump (“Trump”) is running to become President of the United States in 2024.

51. I believe Trump will likely be reelected.

52. Trump will likely nominate Judge Phipps again should a Supreme Court Justice retire

53. The Delaware Office of Disciplinary Counsel state they brought the Disciplinary proceeding against me for suing President Trump. The Delaware Supreme Court cite my religious beliefs contained in my Religious Freedom Restoration Act petition against President Trump for the reason for the discipline.

54. I seek to overturn Kelly v Trump in the civil rights case. In addition, this case is based on my lawsuit against the one who may benefit Judge Phipps should he rule against me and essentially for Trump, by demeaning my law suit against Trump.

55. Phipps has a personal stake in my law suit. He has an interest in safeguarding Trump in order to gain a potential seat at the US Supreme Court.

56. This temptation to gain the most powerful seat on the planet, a position at the US Supreme Court is so great as to create a reasonable person to include there is an appearance of bias or there is actual bias against me in this case and in favor of the Government.

57. Judge Phipps also has other conflicts of interest I incorporate herein by reference in my June 20, 2023 Motion to recuse, and attachments thereto showing conflicts of interests.

58. Judge Phipps may also be offended by my religious belief that Trump misleads people to hell. Judge Phipps may also be offended I drafted 5 proposals to impeach President Trump 1. Based on his violations of criminal law 18 USC 227 for encouraging the firing of NFL players for peacefully exercising their First Amendment right to petition against alleged disparate

treatment against blacks within the criminal judicial system, 2. Violations of 18 USC 227 for encouraging economic harm to members of the press exercising their First Amendment Freedom, 3. An impeachment regarding the porn star activity by the President, 4 relating to kidnapping babies at the border, and profiting private partners by overcharging payments to their commitment facilities, 5. A proposal relating to the war powers act, I incorporate herein.

59. No one is above the law, nor is anyone below the law's correction with mercy, not even the President.

60. With regards to Judge Scirica, I was absolutely horrified terribly mortified to discover the conflict of interest rather recently. I outlined my concerns in the Delaware District Court case I incorporate herein by reference by referral to Kelly v Swartz, 21-1490.

61. I seek to destroy what Judge Scirica works on the disciplinary rules as chains that eliminate freedom under the illusion of upholding it by beholding judges to serve what I believe is the mark of lawlessness that misleads humanity to hell, business greed at the cost of human sacrifice of life or liberty.

62. I strongly oppose regulating the courts to partiality to business by barter or exchange. This urges the courts to serve greed not humanity or the liberty that allows beautiful disorder and criticism which helps us improve and gain humility needed to escape the certain default for most of humanity loss of eternal life due to pride.

63. I noted on the Delaware record my desire to prevent regulation of the USSC and my hope I could eliminate judicial discipline of federal judges.

64. Judge Scirica is the Chair on the rules of federal judicial discipline I seek to eliminate. He has a personal interest in ruling against me as I seek to overturn his hard work.

65. I also seek to amend my complaint to include Constitutional arguments against the DE disciplinary proceedings and certain Delaware Disciplinary Rules rules I argued on the record in the civil rights case.

66. These rules mirror the rules Judge Scirica works on, and attacks his work.

67. I sought to destroy the work of Jude Scirica first in the Civil rights case and now may seek to attack the rules he works on in this case.

68. In the Civil rights case, at Delaware District Court, Number 21-1490 Kelly v Trump, I alerted the Court of my concerns against Judicial discipline and the elimination of people judges or other hardship and concerns in the attached documents I incorporate herein by reference, and in additional Docket items 23, 53, 55, and 56 which I may not be able to upload in the DE District Court case.

69. I truly believe preventing the regulation of the US Supreme Court and eliminating the corrupt disciplinary rules against federal judges and requiring life term appointments for all federal judges, with the ability to choose different appointments would aid in preventing the schemed overthrow of the rule of law to eliminate it by automation by those who reign over people by the mark of the beast, business greed, with no unconditional love.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 7/4/23

Meghan M. Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

(302) 493-6693, Not acting as a lawyer

Defending my First Amendment private right to

believe in Jesus Christ as God, not money or

mammon as God

Affidavit

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

Dated: July 4, 2023

Meyhan Kelly

(printed)



(signed)

MEGHAN MARIE KELLY, ESQUIRE

34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939

**The Honorable Colm F. Connolly
Care of the Clerk of Court
Office of the Clerk
United States District Court
844 North King St Unit 18
Wilmington, DE 19801-3570**

RE: /Kelly v Swartz 1:21-cv-01490

April 13, 2022

Dear Honorable Colm F. Connolly:

I write to provide an update. Per one of my March 2022 letters, the clerk refused to include my exhibits on the electronic record, despite the fact I timely presented them to the Court in person, by dropping them off at the law library, more than a week in advance of the filing date. (Exhibit A)

The Clerk confirmed she would take my physical exhibits and scan them in, prior to their due date. The filing of the exhibits is material to my case to show, in part, the Board of Professional Conduct, (hereinafter, "Board"), the Delaware Supreme Court ("Court") and Defendants colluded, and continue to collude, in conspiring to deny me the opportunity to be heard, in fact denied me a fair and impartial opportunity to be heard, and ignored and did not hear various motions,

including but not limited to motions dated December 18, 2022, December 31, 2021, January 12, 2021, January 13, 2021, January 15, 2022, and January 31, 2022.

Then, in bad faith, with intend to harass me, and fix the proceedings below, the Board had the audacity to claim I sat on my rights, in their report, when they sat on my motions and denied my requests **two days** before the hearing and rescheduled hearing. They sat on my pleadings **twice**, both times delaying, in bad faith, with intent to prejudice me, both times affording me merely **two business days** before the scheduled proceeding to respond. (Emphasis intended). (See Exhibit B for the procedural history below.)

The Board sat on my motions, in bad faith with unclean hands to ignore and deny my any opportunity to be heard on them. Then the Board had the audacity to accuse me for delaying, as they delayed. I at no time delayed, but have fought hard to assert my rights despite the Defendants willful ignorance of my formal pleas for relief. Id. Far, worse, the Court appeared to deny my opportunity to be heard, by seeking to exclude the Exhibits, containing the motions the Board and the Court ignored and did not afford a fair opportunity to be heard on, even on appeal.

I asked the ODC their stance on a possible motion to compel the clerk to include my hand delivered exhibits, on the electronic record. The Court merely had one copy and refused to scan in the copies to afford all of the reviewing judges

all of the record for ease under three separate docket numbers Misc 541, 58, and the Board case Number 115327.

However, instead of fighting more paper battles that would likely not be given a full and fair hearing by the Court, I decided to drive to Del Tech to use their scanner, since the Court, through the clerk, Lisa Dolph, indicated I was not worth the Court's time to scan in the physical documents. (Exhibits C, D).

I must preserve the electronic record for likely appeal to the US Supreme Court.

Despite having prior approval to use their scanner, the librarians at Del Tech gave me a hard time and denied me use initially, based apparently on my **political, orientation**. (See Exhibits E and F). I ran for office in 2018, as a democrat. I sued the democrats to run for office in 2020, against Representative Lisa Rochester, without violating my religious beliefs against collecting donations or signatures to file for office.¹ While I strongly, obviously, require and uphold the separation of government from religion, I will not compromise my faith in Jesus to gain a government position. So, I displeased democrats because I sued them, and I

¹ See, *Matthew* 6:1-4. I believe people go to hell for teaching business is love, should they not repent. I believe people go to hell for giving charity seen, participating in fundraising or organized charity, giving out of one hand, to get out of the other, including tax breaks, marketing, or socializing, under the guise of alms. Jesus teaches they will have no reward from their father, meaning no eternal life.

displeased republicans because I proposed five separate articles of impeachment and contacted all 541 federal law makers to impeach former President Donald J. Trump. In addition I sued former President Trump and attempted to substitute President Biden to end the government establishment of religion. Nevertheless, the fact my political-religious beliefs displeases others does not justify disparate treatment in a public forum based on political-religious association, exercise, speech, beliefs or petitions.

Eventually, Del Tech allowed me to scan in the documents. I sent the scans to Lisa Dolph, the Clerk of court while copying opposing state counsel.

The Clerk of Court agreed to upload my Exhibits, after I sent her scans. Exhibit G.

I want to alert you, besides having a hard time gaining access to the scanner, I also have had difficulty at times gaining access to the law library. Various bailiffs at the law library located in the same building as the Justice of the Peace Courthouse, denied me access to the law library or gave me a hard time, at times.

I thought it was because I did not have my bar card. I think I mailed my former law firm my old bar card. I planned on rejoining them after *Kelly v Trump*. I ended communications with my former law firm in August 2021. I did not want to apprise them of the state's case against me, as I feared I would lose job prospects should I contact them. (Exhibit H)

I asked the clerk for a replacement card. A replacement card was not issued, despite the fact she agreed to issue one, until months later, after I called her in tears because the bailiff refused to allow me in, and requested a replacement card again. She emailed the bailiff to confirm I indeed am a lawyer, and am allowed to enter the law library. I was able to gain access that day.

A replacement card was then swiftly provided within a week, upon this second request. My first request appeared to be ignored, despite the fact, the Delaware Supreme Court's Clerk, Lisa Dolph, agreed to send me a card. *Id.*

A Bailiff at the Law library still gave me a hard time accessing the law library, and I noticed lawyers had electronic law library card access which opened the law library's locked doors, and I did not.

It dawned on me recently, for some reason the Court required I hand in my law library card during the pandemic, despite disparately treating me, since other lawyers kept their law library card. My former law library card gave me 24 hour access to the law library.

I applied for another card. The law librarian crossed out the times requested, and put a limited time on the card. I was issued a replacement card I picked up on April 4, 2022. (Exhibit I). It appears the bailiffs treated me differently because other lawyers had the library card that unlocked the library. It may have been strange for them to get up and unlock the door, whereas other lawyers could unlock

the door without assistance. Now, I have a library card, and cannot afford to go to the law library often since gas costs around \$4.00 a gallon.

In addition Defendants suit against me prevents my employment as an attorney. I desire to work as a lawyer and maintain my active license to practice law, to serve God. Justice is a command by God. *Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23*. It is not merely about making money. I made no money when I drafted articles of impeachment, sued the Presidents, but I did something more valuable than money, I stood up for my religious and political beliefs. My belief in Jesus is not negotiable, not to be sold for a job. I am not selling my soul to gain the world, only to lose eternal life with God. Defendants seek to disparage my character to, *inter alais*, hide the state's misconduct and persecution against me based *inter alias* on my religious beliefs in Jesus Christ, and my political beliefs, and exercise.

Besides, the additional political-religious persecution, showing the need for the Court's protection, not maltreatment, the clerk treating me disparately by refusing to accept the exhibits on the electronic record as the Court does for other lawyers. Other attorneys can afford to file and serve. I am impoverished, and cannot. Poverty and convenience of the Court is not justification for disparate treatment in the exercise of the fundamental right to petition the Court for grievances under the First Amendment applicable to the State pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment either.

More issues arose, globally since you last addressed any pleadings in my case. Russia invaded Ukraine as a contributing planned factor to cause an economic crash, to eliminate the dollar, to replace it with something more sinister, crypto currency, and to eventually replace the Courts' and governments' ability to govern and guide, down the line too.

There may be another World War, WWIII, if the courts do not stop it, by looking at and eliminating the reason for the conflict, the desired elimination of the petro dollar, planned crash of the economy, and the United States introduction of its own crypto currency.²

I outlined how to protect the baby boomers, and reverse or prevent the schemed economic crash in my original complaint and my last motion. There is so much harm and evil schemed. Since, my law suit relates to my religious-political beliefs and exercise too, if afforded the opportunity, I hope to guide you and my opponent, Zi-Xiang Shen, to prevent World War III, and show you how to prevent or reverse the planned economic crash too.

Protecting my fundamental rights is important. If I am persecuted for my exercise of protected activity, it means others are not protected by the Constitution either.

² Crypt means catacomb or grave. The name of the currency refers to death, which is sick because there is harmed schemed to intentionally worsen conditions, causing sickness or death to create more debt control, over even governments, rendering governments without inability or power to govern down the line. It is disgusting humor, not a funny joke.

Nevertheless, I desire to ask you to consider saving the world too, albeit, in another law suit, hopefully by Zi-Xiang Shen or another Attorney General may bring against President Joseph Biden, to require he prevent the economic crash, prevent the planned elimination of fiat currency by coining to care for the people, without interest or debt, as opposed to coining to control the people through oppression and forced servitude.

I believe people go to hell for believing giving people jobs is helping them, or for saying “teaching a man to fish is better than giving him a fish,” should they not repent.³ See *Romans* 4:4 This deceptive teaching, that job creation is to be praised, glorifies the mark of the beast, business greed, the mark of those with the mind of the antichrist, and contributes to the global corruption of those who shape the world through temptations, substantially burdening freedom, to let their will be done, like Satan, seeking order, control and the lawless reign of lusts, their convenience and such, instead of the just rule of law by caring for people while safeguarding their individual liberty to believe, act and work by the dictates of their conscience, even to make bad choices, and to disagree with you and me, not the dictates of government backed private partners in a manufactured economy, not

³ See, *Exodus* 5:1-21, In the Bible, the pharaoh gave the Israelites busy work, not for improved production, but to prevent them from having time to worship God to be saved from hell. The pharaoh required the Israelites pick up straw to build pyramids, in response to their request for time to seek and worship God.

a free economy, which stifles innovation by suppressing freedom of thought, and speech with the lie from Lucifer, that money innovates.

Jesus teaches you cannot serve God and money. *Matthew 6:24*. I stand by God. God teaches those who behave based on mere conditions, training and what they are told to do, with no use of their brains, their conscience mind to think, to know, in order to unconditional love, do not go to heaven. They do not choose to do God's will, which is sad.

Attached, as Exhibit J, please find the attached book, *Report From Iron Mountain, on the possibility & Desirability of Peace*, allegedly by Leonard C. Lewin.

See page 107

“We propose the establishment, under executive order of the President, of a permanent War/Peace Research Agency, empowered and mandated to execute the programs described in (2) and (3) below. This agency (a) will be provided with **nonaccountable funds sufficient** to implement its responsibilities and decisions at its **own discretion**, and (b) will have authority to preempt and utilize, without restriction, any and all facilities of the executive branch of the government in pursuit of its objectives. It will be organized along the lines of the National Security Council, except that none of its governing, executive, or operating personnel will hold other public office or governmental responsibility. Its directorate will be drawn from the broadest practicable **spectrum of scientific disciplines, humanistic studies, applied creative arts, operating technologies**, and otherwise unclassified professional occupations. It will be responsible solely to the President, or to other officers of government temporarily deputized by him. **Its operations will be governed entirely by its own rules of procedure.** Its authority will expressly include the **unlimited right to withhold information on its activities and its decisions, from anyone except the President.**”

Please note, this book has been criticized. Yet, the wicked, abominable plans contained therein are being schemed out before our eyes now. I am not sure if the entity described above indeed exists. Yet, I am concerned about unlimited funding to serve science without any laws preventing such studies from being used to kill, steal or destroy humans to serve business greed. The more waste, the more likely experts will get more grants and play money for something different. Our system may eliminate this use of money to create waste and stifle innovation, which is the source of corruption, and I believe damnation in hell for those misguided by money as God and guide. The book discussed creating intentional waste, even contemplating placing poison in the water, for debt control, which makes sense. Since central banks also gain more control over the governments, entities and individuals and the world the more debt, and worse off humanity is. It makes sense there goal is more wasteful wars, polluting products under the guise of clean products, like the thick plastic bags we use at grocery stores today in Delaware. They alleged to be used to prevent waste by being reusable, but it makes more waste, and is not safe to reuse during a global pandemic.

The goal of the book, and the central banks and leaders, is to intentional create harm and waste, for debt control. I am struck by the planted environmental problems, waste space ideas, and eugenics, suggested in the books, which appear

to be creating waste today, especially alluded to in the back of the book, the Fourth Industrial Revolution, attached as an Exhibit to the Complaint.

In 2018, I ran on, in part, an environmental platform, thinking for myself as a leader should impartially do. Money is never the solution, just laws that decrease the pollution while lifting the burden off of the backs of the people to care for them is the solution. Leaders sin when they sacrifice individuals and individual liberties to organizations, entities which serves the mob reign of lusts and lawlessness, not the impartial rule of just decrees with mercy and correction. The global proposals to save the environment are horrific increasing the burdens on the backs of the common man by penalties and increasing the price of goods by allegedly conserving resources by rendering them unaffordable. The global plans do not clean the environment. The global proposals just waste money for debt control as designed. The laws proposed are not good for the environment or the people, tempting our leaders to behave like a pack of wolves, eating the people, instead of shepherds caring for them. This book was disgusting to me.

Also find the complete Book, referred to in Exhibit H to my initial complaint, *The Creature from Jekyll Island*, by G. Edward Griffin, a *Second look at the Federal Reserve*, which explains how banking works. (Exhibit K, but Exhibit page omitted). Please note, I do not endorse the political comments in the book. I disagree with the author's political attacks against my party, social security

and welfare. God commands secular welfare, without recognition, or benefit, in the form of forgiveness of debts. *Deuteronomy* 15:1, *Matthew* 6:12, *Matthew* 18:21-35, *Matthew* 6:1-4.

In addition, the Torah requires that property owners allow the poor, the foreigner and the widow to harvest their crops at no charge, for free, to live off of them the next seven years by selling the food or eating it. *Exodus* 23:10.

Allowing the fields to lay fallow for the poor, is doing it for God, by showing we live not based on bread alone, but for God, to love God, by loving the least of these, even our enemies. (*Proverbs* 13:23. “An unplowed field produces food for the poor, but injustice sweeps it away.” By injustice, when people love money, merriment and material gain for their own, hardening their hearts from caring to love others. This is injustice which damns people to hell. Mercy is required., not selling the poor for a pair of sandals. God will damn people to hell for teaching giving the poor jobs is caring for them. People should have free choice, not forced take it or leave it choices by those who enforce or draft unjust laws that actually create poverty and exploit it.) Hence due to my religious-political beliefs of loving humanity, not sacrificing and selling the souls of other people to serve material gain, I support welfare, unearned required to serve need directly to individuals, not greed or business through not for profits or businesses.

Also attached, is a third book released in 2022 by the World Economic Forum Founder, *The Great Narrative, For a Better Future*, by Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret, which outlines schemes to control, not care for the world which are built on the other two books I provided this Court, *Covid 19-The Great Reset* and the *Fourth Industrial Revolution*. See Exhibit L, exhibit page may be omitted).

There is a fourth Book I was not able to retrieve, called *Shaping the future of the Fourth Industrial Revolution* that the World Economic Founder allegedly drafted, which may have schemes this court may unravel.

I am providing these books to you now, for elaboration down the line in hopes to show you, if afforded an opportunity, how to unravel wicked schemes to prevent or reverse a planned economic crash to eliminate the fiat petro dollar, replaced with the lawless crypto currency to be ultimately controlled by those who gain more power and more profit the more waste, the more harm to humanity, prevent WWIII, and prevent the dissolution of laws which safeguard individual liberties. My political beliefs, speech, association, and exercise are in issue, which gives me an opportunity to plant a seed, an idea, in your heart, in hopes you may safeguard our United States from dissolution down the line as planned.

The system is rigged to stifle innovation, to reward the lawless reign of lusts, under the guise of law and order. The system is rigged to stifle innovation by

bought by donations, grants or profit based university teachings, science and training, standardization and conformity, stifling free thought, to improve professions. Professional standards tempt judges and lawyers to be lazy, to avoid using their own brains, and to sin against God, by contributing to corruption by deferring to experts and dumbed down professionals instead of correcting uniform standardized bad care, that kills, steals and destroys for the bottom line. This injustice must change to prevent the cancer causing products and pollution instead of rewarding it by fundraising, or grants which is sin too.

No profession should self-regulate with the backing of the government through professional boards. Collectively groups of professionals, as opposed to individuals, look after their own image, marketing, profit, convenience, not the people's. Self-regulation creates injustice per se, and dumbs us down, with the type of dumbness that I believe damns people to hell, blinding eyes with money, not seeing clearly to love others, unconditionally, required by God. I believe people go to hell for doing merely what they are trained to do. I believe God requires us each to use our own brain, our conscience mind to think, in order to know, in order to love. Unconcern is sin which damns even little kids to hell per *Ezekiel* Chapter 9. Not knowing, not seeking to know individually without relying on others to hold our hands is sin leading to hell. Jesus teaches "call no one your teacher but God." I believe we should encourage critical thinking, not marketing reliance on

professionals and experts who have a conflict of interest, position, praise and profit. If more people critically thought, instead of blindly relying on experts, we might have a better world where fewer people were harmed to serve the mark of the beast, business greed not good. We were all taught to go to hell young, to worship the beast, to bear its mark on our foreheads, our minds, and right hand, business greed, not good. We all have a mark on our foreheads already, the mark of Christ or the antichrist. Does a person's thoughts reflect on the mind of Christ, the Word of God or the desires and lusts of mere men which is not love. See *John* 14:21, *Deuteronomy* 6:7-8, *Deuteronomy* 11:18, *Exodus* 13:9, 16, *Ezekiel* 9:4, *Revelation* 7:2-3, regarding the mark of the saved.

The government teaches lawlessness, the reign of lusts as the rule of law by partnerships with private entities to perform government service through barter or exchange. I beg opposing counsel or an attorney general to use 18 U.S. Code § 201 to end private government partnerships. No government money should be given to private entities as opposed to individuals or governments. The government serves the lawless one, Satan, by worship of business greed at the cost of human sacrifice of life, health and individual liberty, instead of protecting humanity, under the deception of law and order, mere control by lawless lusts. It is an abomination.

The government serves lawlessness by backing private entities and partnering with them, making it difficult to correct private partners in Court, rendering them to be above the law.

An attorney general is my hope to end donations, signatures, grants to private entities and government-private partnerships, and from private entities to government officials or candidates in elections through 18 U.S. Code § 201. The governments partiality to its partners at the cost of human sacrifice should end, to uphold true justice with mercy, for correction. The government should care for the world, not seek to control it as the lower case god of the world does, the devil, and his children, children of the devil, people who reflect his image. Citing 2 Corinthians 4:4.


The last week of March, the World Government Summit conducted a meeting where like Satan, they sought to shape the world to their will. If you do not use the just rule of law to stop them, I believe all of our freedoms will be substantially be burdened down the line, more so than any other time in history.

During the meeting Internet 3.0 was discussed, and block chain, which is very dangerous. It creates the illusion of deregulating the internet, which means it eliminates the rule of law to protect precious people, and allows misuse of data, potentially increasing the odds of setting people up for alleged crimes, manipulating health data, and vital statistics.

Thank you for your time.

April 13, 2022

Respectfully Submitted,



/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
Bar Number 4968 (words)

4,021

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

Dated: April 13, 2022

Meghan Kelly (printed)

Meghan M. Kelly (signed)

Exhibit B

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

In the Matter of a Member of the Bar of the) Board Case No. 115327-B
Supreme Court of the state of Delaware) Misc. 541,
Meghan M. Kelly, respondent.) Supreme Ct. No. 58, 2022

Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Objections to the Report and Recommendation on
Petition to Transfer to Disability Inactive Status, but for my exercise of
Constitutionally protected conduct and motion to vacate and overrule the Board’s
decision by signing the attached order

AND NOW this March 21, 2022, pursuant to Delaware Disciplinary Rule 9
(e), respondent, Meghan M. Kelly, pro se, hereby objects to the Board on
Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court’s (individually “Board,”
Collectively with the petitioner, “State”) Report and Recommendation on Petition
to Transfer to Disability Inactive Status to place me on “disabled inactive attorney
status until a qualified mental health expert can certify (my) fitness to practice
law,” but for my exercise of the right to petition the courts to address a grievance
against my person caused by President Donald J. Trump’s establishment of
government religion, for my religious beliefs, and exercise of Constitutionally
protected rights, including my free exercise of association, religion, speech, and the
right to petition the Courts to inter alias safeguard my religious beliefs in Jesus, not

money or business greed as savior, and moves the Court to vacate and overrule the Board's decision by signing the attached order. ¹

1. In addition to the basis of objections included herein, additional sources of my objections are included, and incorporated herein by reference, in the Memorandum(s) of Law in Support of my Objections I file contemporaneously herewith, and are to be considered collectively, as one including Respondent's Memorandum of Law in Support of my Objections to the Report and Recommendation on Petition, and to the Petition, as Unlawfully brought by the state, as applied, with no legitimate purpose, to conceal lawless acts by the State and Delaware Courts, in violation of my First Amendment protected Constitutional exercise of rights and in violation of my Due Process Rights by denying me a fair and impartial trial in a fixed proceeding.

2. In addition to the objections incorporated herein and in the documents included by reference: 1. I object to the Report and Recommendation on Petition, and the Proceeding, as unlawful as applied to me, in violation of the procedural and substantive due process clause, and in violation of the Equal Protections Clause applicable to the State pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment by the State's disparate treatment against me, in collusion, or conspiracy, obstruction,

¹ Report and Recommendation of Petition to Transfer to Disability Inactive Status, dated Feb. 17, 2022, I did not receive until Feb 18, 2022 by email, which I objected to as improper service, not paper form, ("Report") at 2, I maintain my objection herein based on improper service.

participation, and interference with my exercise of protected activity in defending my exercise of fundamental rights in the Matter of Meghan Kelly, Board No 11537B, and Supreme Court Number 541, denying me a full and fair opportunity to be heard, and Equal and fair access to the Court's, making the Board's decision void, to prevent manifest injustice and fraud. (Transcript as amended with Corrections 6-7, 78, 87, 69, 73-79, 81, 83, 87, 94-96, 98-194, 110-11, 162-164, 171, 190-192, attached as **Exhibits Z**, and **CC**); 2. I Object to Report and Proceeding as unlawful, as applied to me, brought without lawful purpose, under the color of the law in retaliation against me, discriminating against me by disparate treatment and punishing me, but for my exercise of fundamental rights, of speech, political association, the right to petition the courts, religious exercise and my religious beliefs in violation of the First Amendment applicable to the State pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment. (Exhibit Z and CC and its entirety.); 3. I object to the Report and Recommendation on Petition, and to the Petition, as Unlawfully brought by the state, as applied, with no legitimate purpose, brought to conceal or trivialize illegal state agent behavior, in interference with my petitions relating to waiver of bar dues due to economic hardship, and my petitions relating to *Kelly v Trump*, including petitions relating to state attacks against me to harass, interfere or forgo my lawsuit against former President Trump and to prevent future petitions, in violation of my First Amendment protected Constitutional exercise of

rights, and in violation of my Due Process Rights by denying me a fair and impartial trial in a fixed proceeding. (Id.); 4. I object to the Report and Recommendation on Petition, and to the Petition, as unlawful as applied to me, in violation of my procedural and substantive due process rights, due to the Delaware Supreme Court's apparent participation in inciting the complaint filed against me on or about November 5, 2021 in the state forum, rendering it impossible for the court to grant me a fair trial by its own apparent participation on the state's behalf. (Id.); 5. I object to the State seeking to compel me to violate my religious beliefs by undergoing a mental professional examination or lose my active license to practice law, but for my religious beliefs. (Id.)²

I. Procedural History, with some Argument, Numbered for ease

3. In September of 2020, I initiated a law suit against former President Trump, *Kelly v Trump* in the Chancery, No. 2020-0809, Delaware Supreme Court, No. 119-2021, and the United States Supreme Court, No. 21-5522, to alleviate a government burden upon my religious exercise, pursuant to the *Religious Freedom Restoration Act*, 42 USC § 2000bb-2000bb-4 ("RFRA"), by the establishment of government religion. (See, The ODC's Petition Exhibit A, Second Amended

² I originally started drafting these 5 objections in Memorandums of Law, but I lost my files on a memory stick as I was attempting to save it on a backup memory stick around March 16, 2022, and was required to swiftly draft my objections, in an urgent matter with less importance on the ease of the reader, and with more importance preserving my objections for appeal, since the Court declared "no further extensions would be granted." (Exhibit HH)

Complaint, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**) (Please refer to the attached table of exhibits of objections for ease in identifying exhibits)

4. In October of 2020, a Chancery Court staff member, Arline Simmons, directed me to cross off the address of the Attorney General for the District of Delaware, to apparently prevent service and obstruct my case from going forward. (See, *Meghan M. Kelly's answer, defenses, and objections to ODC's petition to transfer Meghan M. Kelly, Esquire to disability inactive status*, with a table of contents, and exhibits 1-34, attached in its entirety as **Exhibit K**, referred to herein as "Ans" and "Ans-Ex" for Exhibits, and see, Ans-Ex 4, attached hereto as **Exhibit B**)

5. On October 19, 2020, I wrote the Chancery Court Master, the Honorable Patricia W. Griffin, ("Master"), a letter concerning the fact I was acting as a party, not as an attorney, as I sought to retrieve subpoenas. I also indicated my concerns of an economic crash, and my hope the court would prevent or reverse a planned economic crash with tools attorneys may use to cut through entities. (**Exhibit B-2**).

6. On November 2, 2020, the Master drafted her final report dismissing my case allegedly based on lack of standing, as frivolous.

7. I did not know of the Master's final report until November 6, 2021, despite contacting the Court after the decision and prior to this date. I contacted

the Court by phone to check on the status of the subpoenas either before or after election day, of November 2020, and the Chancery court staff member, Arline Simmons, advised me to hold off on picking up subpoenas until routine paper work gets to me. I asked if I was in trouble. She indicated I was never in trouble. I googled my name, Friday November 6, 2020, and discovered indeed I was in trouble. The Master ruled against me on November 2, 2020. I drove up to the Court House to pick up the decision on November 6, 2020. I was required to file something by the next business day, Monday November 9, 2020, or waive my right to petition. Arline Simmons misled me to almost miss my deadline to file an appeal to the Master's final report, based on her apparent disagreement with my political-religious beliefs or deeming me unworthy of a right to be heard based on my poverty and lack of resources.

8. On November 9, 2020, I filed a letter with my Notice of Exceptions with the Chancery Court, dated November 6, 2020, petitioning the Court regarding the Chancery Court staff member misleading me to almost miss the appeal filing deadline, my confusion as to why I did not receive a subpoena for the amended complaint and the second amended complaint to serve the US Attorney General, and my concerns relating to President Trump inciting an insurrection, with attached parts of the insurrection act and newspaper articles, showing the use the military's threat of force to incite violence, under the deception of keeping the

piece. (This is found on the record as an Exhibit to December 1, 2021 letter filed with the Delaware Supreme Court, matter 541, and is attached hereto as **Exhibit B-3**).

9. On December 1, 2020, I filed a letter petitioning the Honorable Master Patricia Griffin for help relating to the Chancery Court’s staffs’ “disparate [treatment towards me] based on my wealth, political affiliation and or religious orientation, and [indicated I would] continue to receive such treatment without her assistance.” (Asw-Ex 27, Page 1 of December 1, 2020 letter, attached as **Exhibit C**).

10. Master Griffin granted me relief on December 7, 2020, by letter. (Ans-Ex 28)

11. On December 11, 2020, I wrote a letter to Master Griffin thanked her for her relief, and indicated my shock she helped me. I outlined other disparate treatment I received when I asked for help, including when my Delaware bar materials were destroyed at Widener by a flood through the ceiling of a dorm room, and I asked the arms of the Supreme Court for help, only to get scolded, and when rat babies infiltrated my Law School apartment as I studied for my finals and the Pennsylvania Bar, only to have increased rent from the law school. (See, Ans-Ex 28, attached hereto as **Exhibit D**, excluding some internal exhibits)

12. I filed an appeal with the Chancery Court on or about December 5, 2020. The right to a speedy trial was suspended during this time, due to the state of emergency of the global pandemic.

13. On January 6, 2021, to our nation's horror an attempted insurrection at the capital occurred, to keep President Trump in office.

14. On that same day, January 6, 2021, the Vice Chancellor Paul A. Fioravanti, Jr., accepted my appeal, probably with a courageously loving heart to safeguard our nation from a coup by keeping his thumb on the President should the attempted insurrection spread.

15. On January 20, 2021, Defendant Trump was removed as President and replaced with President Biden.

16. On January 7, 2021, I sent a petition unrelated to *Kelly v Trump* to the Delaware Supreme Court. I sent a letter to Chief Justice Collin Seitz seeking suspension of lawyer fees for lawyers unemployed during the global pandemic. I attached negotiations with my former firm, who I hope will still consider me for a potential position performing real estate settlements. (Ans-Ex-20, attached hereto as **Exhibit E**).

17. On February 2, 2021, I received a letter from Delaware Supreme Court, dated February 2, 2021, noting the Court would make a case-by-case determination of waiver for attorney dues. (Ans-Ex-21).

18. On February 5, 2021, I sent the Delaware Supreme Court a second request concerning DE attorney dues, indicating I could not ask the Court to violate the Equal Protections Clause by treating me disparately when five or more other lawyers were similarly situated. I made a second request relating to the fees for 2022. (Ans-Ex-23, attached hereto to as **Exhibit F**.)

19. On February 6, 2020, I paid \$353.00 for my active attorney dues on February 6, 2021. (Ans-Ex-22).

20. On March 26, 2021, the Vice Chancellor overruled my exceptions to Master's final report and affirmed the Master's rulings on grounds of standing.

21. In the middle of April of 2021, Judge Kenneth S. Clark, of the Court of Common Pleas in Delaware, used the color of law to intimidate me to cause me to forgo my case, interfere or harass me for my pleadings in *Kelly v Trump*. Judge Clark confronted me at BJ's, located in Millsboro, Delaware, a grocery store warehouse, and required I call him or come to his chambers for an interrogation. I declined. I asked Judge Clark if the ODC (a.k.a. Office of Disciplinary Counsel), instructed him to interrogate me. He shook his head up and down, indicating yes, the arm of the Delaware Supreme Court instigated his interference with my law suit. I told Judge Clark "I was disappointed in him" for interfering with my access to the courts. He knew better.

22. On or about April 20, 2021, I appealed the Vice Chancellor's decision with the Delaware Supreme Court.

23. On May 24, 2021, DE-Lapp sent me an E-mail with a letter threatening me, by requiring I respond to their request to interrogate me in person or virtually, within 10 days, because they heard I was having trouble paying my bar dues, after I already paid my attorney dues. (Ans-Ex 24, attached hereto as **Exhibit G**).

24. The next day, on or about May 25, 2021, rightly upset by DE-Lapp's threat, Judge Clark's and the Chancery Court staff's obstruction of my case based on poverty, religious beliefs or political beliefs, I filed *Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to reign in its agents from unlawfully pressuring Appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion by relief it deems just*, to petition the court to alleviate "actions by state government agents taken to apparently impede and obstruct my access to the courts."

25. To my horror, I realized that DE-Lapp appeared to have received the information relating to my request to suspend attorney fees from the Honorable Chief Justice of the Delaware Supreme Court, since I wrote him a request to suspend lawyer fees for lawyers unemployed during the global pandemic. So, on May 28, 2021, I filed *Appellant's Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the Honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this*

matter. I later discovered the entire Supreme Court reviews petitions relating to bar dues because I asked the clerk of the Court.

26. The Delaware Supreme Court affirmed the decisions below, on July 7, 2021.

27. A timely petition for rehearing, was thereafter denied on the following date, July 19, 2021.

28. On August 23, 2021, the ODC sent a letter to me indicating it reviewed several pleadings from the Chancery Court and the Delaware Supreme Court. The ODC alleged the contents of my pleadings “raised concerns about my fitness to practice law.” ODC requested I submit to a mental evaluation. (Ans-5).

29. I responded to the ODC via email,

“No, I will not be evaluated. I have religious opposition to mental health and healthcare. Do not interfere with my case any further. I am trying to file a writ of cert as we speak.

Stop impeding justice, to bend my freedom of conscious to your will. My belief in Jesus may appear to be crazy to you, but my freedom to believe as I choose is a protected right, same as they right to an unobstructed trial. Desist in contacting me.” (Ans-Ex-6)

30. On August 23, 2021, I filed a writ of certiorari with the US Supreme Court from the Delaware Supreme Court’s order dismissing the case. My computer crashed that same date. (Ans-Ex 1 and Ans-Ex 8).

31. On August 28, 2021, I sent another email to the ODC stating,

“This email is to confirm, I will not be evaluated, as such evaluations violate my religious beliefs. I alerted the US Supreme Court to the same in

my petition for writ of cert, relating to emotional damages related to the President's conduct.

Desist impeding in my right to access to the courts without government obstruction and retaliation for exercise of my first Amendment rights. I am an injured party, not an attorney practicing law in this case.

A court staff member sought to sabotage my case by misleading me to almost miss the filing deadline to appeal the Master's final report, dated November 2, 2020.

That same staff member instructed me to cross off the civil process clerk's address on a praecipe to impede the case from going forward. That member objects to my religious association beliefs in support of Trump and government agents exercise of religion while governing.

Judge Clark also sought to interfere with my case. Government and court attacks against a party in an active case to impede justice, based on my case, is inappropriate and unlawful.

I do not seek disciplinary recourse at this time should this arm of the Supreme Court and other members of the government refrain from persecuting me based solely on exercise of my Constitutional rights based on religion, association or poverty.” (Ans-Ex 7).

32. On October 25, 2021, I filed a complaint in the Delaware District Court against the Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B. Swartz, Chief Disciplinary Counsel, David A. White, Disciplinary, Counsel Kathleen M. Vavala, Office of Disciplinary Counsel, Board of Professional Responsibility for the Supreme Court of Delaware, the Preliminary Investigatory Committee, and Delaware Attorney General, Kathleen Jennings, in her capacity as Delaware for interference with Kelly v Trump, to enjoin this unlawful action, and for damages for emotional distress. (ODC’s Hearing Exhibit 5, Attached as **Exhibit H**)

33. On October 26, 2022, I contacted Renee Buskirk, at the ODC concerning requesting information from Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Jr., to

determine whether he or the entire court incited the petition by the state against me for my January and February requests relating to license dues. (**Exhibit H-2**, Also found in *Respondent Meghan M. Kelly Amended Exhibits to Hearing she made a special appearance to attend reserving her objections to dismiss based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to the Court's members participation in inciting the unlawful petition and lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to illegality as applied*. Exhibit 48)

34. On November 1, 2021, the United States Supreme Court denied my writ of certiorari in *Kelly v Trump*, No. 21-5522, and the case closed. (**Ans-Ex 1**).

35. On November 5, 2021, the ODC brought a Petition to Transfer to Disability Inactive.

36. On November 18, 2021, the ODC filed a letter with the Court to request appointed counsel on my behalf despite notice of my objections based on religious beliefs, via emails to the ODC.

37. On November 22, 2021, I sent a letter to the Delaware Supreme Court regarding my intent to object to appointed counsel based on religious grounds and poverty. (**Exhibit I**)

38. On November 23, 2021, I sent the Delaware Supreme Court a letter regarding my intent and stated,

“I intend to file objections to the Office of Disciplinary Counsel’s (“ODC’s”) petition filed on November 4, 2021, with the Board on

Professional Responsibility to transfer me to disability inactive based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

The evidence will show the Delaware Supreme Court through its members or agents instigated the ODC's proceedings against me which creates manifest prejudice against me, or at least appeared to instigate the ODC's proceedings against me, giving the appearance of lack of partiality, and the inability to grant me a fair trial in the above referenced matter.

In addition, the ODC brought the proceedings against me, unlawfully as applied, in violation of my protected rights under the First Amendment applicable to the ODC pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment.

This Honorable Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction based on illegality of proceeding.

The Chancery Court lacked jurisdiction to enjoin the ODC since the facts arose in the Chancery and Delaware Supreme Courts, creating the appearance of lack of impartiality or actual partiality." (**Attached as Exhibit J**)

39. On November 19, 2021, I mailed out my answers and objection to the petition on November 19, 2021. (The Answers and Exhibits are all incorporated herein by reference, and are referred herein as "Ans," and are attached as **Exhibit K**, with its own table of contents, and exhibits thereto)

40. On November 30, 2021, after the deadline for me to provide my answer to the petition, Office of Disciplinary Counsel Patricia Swartz indicated by E-mail, she did not receive the answers in order to commit fraud to throw out the case, despite the confirmation of receipt indicating otherwise. (**Exhibit L**)

41. That same day, November 30, 2021, I mailed out a second set of answers. I returned home to respond to Patricia Swartz's email. She indicated in her email my answers came in the mail that day, November 30, 2022, which was

an impossibility, since, I just mailed the second set, prior to responding to her.

(Exhibit L)

42. On December 1, 2021, I filed a letter with the Delaware Supreme Court regarding Patricia Swartz's conspiracy to commit fraud to throw my case out, by denying service after the deadline. **(Exhibit L)**

43. On Fri., Dec. 10, 2021, the Board signed a notice of a hearing. I was not provided proper notice on Dec.10, 2021. The Board did not send notice to me until **December 24, 2021**, 18 days before trial in violation of the 20-day requirement under the Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. R. 9(d)(2). (Emphasis intended)

44. On Mon., Dec. 13, 2021, the Delaware Supreme Court appointed counsel, despite having notice of my objection to counsel, which caused me great emotional distress.

45. On Thur., Dec.16, 2021, I received the Court Order regarding the appointment, by US Mail.

46. On Fri., Dec. 17, 2021, counsel contacted me. I immediately indicated my objection to his appointment.

47. On Sat., Dec. 18, 2021, I filed the attached letter with the Board, objecting to absence of service of notice of the hearing, notice that I intended to file a motion with the Delaware Supreme Court on Monday, and a request to

suspend a hearing until after I am afforded an opportunity to perform discovery, and after a determination on counsel is made, including appeals to safeguard my 6th Amendment right to self-representation. **(Exhibit M)**

48. On Mon., Dec. 20, 2021, I filed *Respondent's Motion for reconsideration of order dated December 13, 2021, appointing counsel despite my notice of intent to object, and objection of improper service of the Board's Notice of Hearing, dated December 10, 2021*, with the Delaware Supreme Court, with a copy to Petitioner, and the Board, albeit the Board's copy was mailed Dec.21, 2021. **(Exhibit N)**

49. On Dec. 21, 2021, I mailed a letter to the Court rejecting appointment of counsel. **(Exhibit O)**

50. On December 21, 2021, appointed counsel contacted me by E-mail, and I declined his representation.

51. On December 22, 2021 appointed Counsel contacted me again, and I fired him, while copying others, via email, for my safety in defending the exercise of my Constitutionally protected activity.

52. Appointed Counsel moved to terminate his appointment on Dec. 23, 2021.

53. On December 24, 2021, I received the Notice of the hearing by US Mail, prior to the time permitted to represent myself, and merely 18 days before

the hearing, date January 13, 2022, in violation of Pursuant to Delaware Rules of Disciplinary Procedure Rule 9 (d)(3) requiring notice “at least 20 days in advance.”

54. I objected to insufficient notice, and at no time waived such objections. I was not afforded an opportunity to gather, present evidence or cross examine witnesses. I merely received 18 days notice. I was not given a fair time or opportunity to perform discovery and prepare my defense in this rushed proceeding to persecute me for my faith in Jesus Christ, and for bringing petitions to address grievances.

55. On December 28, 2021, I used the law library phone, since I did not have a phone at the time, due to poverty. I called the Administrator, Karlis Johnson, at the Disciplinary Board, twice, to confirm receipt of my motion, dated December 18, 2021, to suspend the hearing due to lack of notice, and need for time to determine whether I may represent myself, and time to prepare including time to perform discovery. The Administrator did not pick up, despite my message and trying a second time. (**Exhibit P, internal exhibit L**)

56. On Dec. 29, 2021, I sent a letter with exhibits with both the Delaware Supreme Court and the Board notifying them,

“The hearing is two weeks away, no determination has been made by the Court on my exercise of self-representation under the 6th amendment, and on religious grounds, and on my request to postpone the hearing so I may perform

discovery to adequately defend my exercise of Constitutionally protected activity which is the subject of this petition, per the state's admission." (Emphasis Intended), (**Exhibit P**, and Exhibits thereto). I also objected to insufficient notice, and at no time waived my Due Process Right to proper notice, 20 days in advance of any hearing.

57. On December 30, 2021, the Court excused appointed counsel, with about two weeks before the hearing date. (**Exhibit P-2, attached order**)

58. On December 31, 2021, I mailed a *Respondent's motion to enjoin expert observation and analysis of respondent at hearings and discovery; notice she will move for a protective order during the discovery stage; and requests to prevent costs as going into debt is against her religious beliefs*; Memorandum of law in support of this motion, table of contents of the exhibits, and exhibits thereto contained, dated December 31, 2021. (**Exhibit Q**, Motion, with a table of Contents for exhibits 1-10 thereto, but only attaching exhibits 4, affidavit of religious belief, and exhibits 9 and 10, horrific healthcare stories in the local newspaper).

59. Petitioner and the Court knew appointment of counsel violated my religious beliefs. The Board failed to provide proper notice of a hearing, and did not respond to my requests for an extension of time to grant me an opportunity to prepare.

60. I was so emotionally distressed by the State's denial of an opportunity to be heard on my motion, dated December 18, 2021, wrongful appointment of counsel, lack of a fair opportunity to research, prepare, perform discovery and subpoena witnesses, cross examine my accuser(s) in violation of the 6th Amendment, and the state's unreasonable disparate treatment towards me to impede an opportunity for a fair hearing, based on the state's disdain for my religious beliefs, calling my faith in Jesus a disability, that I developed what I believe was shingles and fell ill. I alerted the Petitioner and the Board. I was very sick, and vultures started attacking me as if I was already dead. I alerted the Board and the ODC that I contacted the state and federal agencies to assist me with the vulture problems too. (See, Exhibit S, and internal Exhibit E shows pictures of the vultures). The Federal government assisted me by hanging an effigy on a tree. I alerted opposing counsel of these intervening interfering circumstances. (See Exhibit GG, and see communications with federal agent and the federal permit for the effigy)

61. I alerted the state to my sickness, and the pest situation, the first week of January, 2021. I took covid tests which were negative, and thought I was having an allergic reaction which is very serious for me. I was probably worn out by the shingles. I oppose organized healthcare, as I believe people who blindly

trust in experts disobey God. So, I did not get a doctor's opinion. See, *Psalm* 146:3, *Psalm* 118:8-9, *Isaiah* 2:22, *Jeremiah* 17:5.

62. On Thur., Jan. 6, 2022, I E-mailed the Board and Patricia Swartz to check on the status of my request to delay the hearing in order to be afforded a fair opportunity to perform discovery to gather evidence to show the Board it does not have subject matter jurisdiction. (**Exhibit R**, E-mail contained in Exhibit B)

63. The Board did not respond to my Jan. 6, status update request on my motion relating to insufficient notice and motion for time to prepare a defense by suspending the hearing until discovery was closed.

64. So, on Monday, January 10, 2022, I followed up on my outstanding letter motion requesting the Board postpone the hearing, objected to improper service of the December 10, 2021 notice, and objected based on the fact I do not have a full and fair opportunity to prepare and conduct discovery for my defense via E-mail. (**Exhibit R**, E-mail contained in Exhibit B)

65. On January 10, 2022, the Board responded, "the hearing was on," in a form I could not appeal, via unsigned email, depriving me of the opportunity to be heard on appeal, despite informally, knowing I required additional time to prepare to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, knowing I was sick, and desired time to take care of the vultures, and ignoring the formal motions dated December 18, 2022, and December 31, 2022, regarding more important reasons to suspend the

hearing, I needed opportunity to perform discovery, research and prepare. (**Exhibit R-1**)

66. On January 11, 2022, I filed a Motion *Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's Emergency Objections and Emergency Motion filed with both the Board of Professional Responsibility for the Supreme Court of Delaware, and the Delaware Supreme Court, simultaneously, to postpone the hearing against me to prevent manifest injustice to afford me an opportunity to perform discovery, for opportunity to call witnesses and prepare a defense for the state's allegedly illegally motivated petition against her for her exercise of fundamental rights, motivated by the state's disdain for her religious political beliefs*, incorporated herein by reference. (**Exhibit R**)

67. On January 11, 2022, The Delaware Supreme Court swiftly granted an order denying relief based on jurisdiction, rightly so as the Board evaded review by avoiding rendering a formal order by its E-mail decision to evade review in violation of my Due Process right to be heard, which forced the Board to render a subsequent order, as they provided no orders for any of my other outstanding motions. However, the Delaware Supreme Court wrongly sought, in collusion with the State, to appeal before it was too late to prevent unconstitutional violations depriving me of a fair opportunity to defend my exercise of fundamental rights, denying me an opportunity to prepare, perform discovery, cross examine

witnesses, or subpoena witnesses, by permitting a partial, unfair, fixed hearing to persecute me based on my faith in Jesus Christ, in violation of the procedural and substantive due process clause, and the Equal Protections Clause applicable to the State pursuant to the 14th Amendment, and in violation of the First Amendment applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment.

68. The Delaware Supreme Court order provided:

“Upon careful consideration of the emergency objections and emergency motion to postpone the hearing (“the Motion”) filed by Respondent in this Court, the Motion is denied. Respondent is the subject of an ongoing proceeding in the Board on Professional Responsibility. The hearing panel chair assigned to Respondent’s matter decides “scheduling, administrative, procedural, and evidentiary matters.

The decisions of the panel chair or panel **may not be appealed before submission of the panel’s final report and recommendation to this Court.** When the panel submits its final report and recommendation to the Court or review, Respondent will have the opportunity to object to the report and recommendations **as well as prior rulings of the panel chair.** IT IS SO ORDERED.” (Emphasis is intended see, **Exhibit R-2**, the Order).

69. The opportunity for review “after the submission of the panel’s final report” is too late to prevent unconstitutional violations by the Board and the ODC, by allowing them, and ruling after irreparable injury took place. *Id.* Therefore, the Delaware Supreme Court permitted the Constitutional injury.

70. The Court in the footnotes of the order concerningly held:

“1 Respondent also filed the Motion in the Board on Professional Responsibility. 2 Del. Lawyers’ R. Disciplinary Proc. 2(c). Procedures and hearings for proceedings to determine incapacity are conducted in the same manner as disciplinary proceedings. *Id.* 19(c). 3. *Id.* 9(e); 19(c)” *Id.*

71. The Court appeared to assume my faith in Jesus Christ is a mental disability by referring to other proceedings to deem them to be.

72. On January 11, 2022, the Board granted an order postponing the hearing for eight days due to alleged illness, a reason not included in my motion. The Board knew I had shingles, a week before, but did not care about my health in their email response on January 10, 2022, indicating the hearing is on, with no formal orders on my prior motions.

73. The Board ignored, and did not afford me an opportunity to be heard on past motions, including motions dated December 17, and December 31, 2020, in violation of the substantive and procedural due process clause, and in violation of the equal protections clause as applied to me, by treating me disparately based on religious beliefs, in contravention to the norms of a fair proceeding.

74. On January 12, 2022, I wasted no time and appealed the Board's Order, immediately, under great distress at the violation of my fair opportunity to prepare, in a motion, called *Respondent's Motion appealing the Order of the Board on Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware dated, January 11, 2022, granting postponement of the hearing for 8 days due to illness, not a reason identified in my motion to grant postponement to afford me opportunity to prepare a defense, perform discovery, research, file motions, be heard on outstanding motion(s) unaddressed by the Board, to defend my exercise*

of fundamental rights and to preserve my license to practice law, on the grounds the amount of time is not enough and a hearing date should be postponed until after a fair opportunity to build a defense is granted, and moved the court to suspend a hearing date until the parties and the Board determine a fair opportunity to perform discovery has been allowed so as not to violate the norms of a fair proceeding, displaying disparate treatment towards respondent based on my unique religious political beliefs, in violation of the Equal Protections clause applicable to me as a party of one. Admittedly, there are some typos, in numbering. (Exhibit S, with Exhibits A -M).

75. The next day, January 13, 2022, I filed a motion for an emergency immediate decision on my January 12, 2022 appeal, called [Respondent's] *Emergency Motion for Immediate Relief requesting review of Respondent's Motion Appealing Order of the Board of Professional Responsibility of the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware, Dated January 11, 2022, Granting Postponement of the Hearing for 8 days due to illness, not a reason identified in my motion to Grant postponement to afford me an opportunity to Prepare a defense, perform discovery, research, file motions, be heard on outstanding Motion(s) unaddressed by the Board, to defend my exercise of fundamental rights and to preserve my license to practice law, on the grounds the amount of time is not enough and the*

hearing date should be postponed until after a fair opportunity to build a defense is given, dated January 13, 2022. (Exhibit T)

76. The same day, January 13, 2022, the State brought an answer to a motion rendered moot, by the January 11, 2022 Board's Order, to harass and distract me, knowing I argued I did not have enough time to prepare and present a defense, with no opportunity for discovery or to call witnesses.

77. The day after that, Saturday, January 15, 2022, I served a different motion with the Board to call specific witnesses, requesting subpoenas, and additional time to send requests for admissions and interrogatories to Defense Counsel, which were necessary for my defenses to this case, the illegality of the proceeding as applied, motivated by the state's desire to punish me for my exercise of protected conduct in contravention to the 1st Amendment applicable to the State pursuant to the 14th Amendment, and in violation of the Equal Protections Clause by disparate treatment towards me based on my religious beliefs and poverty, deeming me unworthy to be heard and unworthy of other Constitutional rights. The Motion is called *Respondent's more particularized Motion to suspend hearing to allow opportunity for her to research and prepare a defense, and request for opportunity to draft requests for admission, interrogatories and subpoena opposing counsel as witness, as a necessary witnesses to her defense, and subpoena other necessary witnesses, including but not limited to, Chief Justice*

Collins J. Seitz, Judge Kenneth S. Clark, due to his admission he interrogated me based on my exercise of fundamental rights incited by the ODC, and Arline Simmons, to show Unconstitutional motive for the petition, to allow the accused, the Respondent an opportunity to defend herself on the defense of illegality of proceeding, as applied to her, motivated by disdain for her religious beliefs, associated beliefs and exercise of fundamental rights, and lack of jurisdiction based on the Delaware Supreme Court's apparent participation in inciting this petition against Respondent. (Exhibit U, all exhibits are incorporated herein by reference)

78. On Tuesday, January 18, 2022, I followed up with the Board and ODC via Email, and asked “Please let me know the status of my [January 15, 2022] request to call witnesses, for subpoenas, time to perform discovery, and a suspension of the hearing date.” (Exhibit U-2)

79. The Board made its decision by E-mail, in an unappealable form:

“Ms. Kelly, please see the Board’s response below:

Unless this motion for continuance to allow discovery is unopposed by the ODC, the Board denies the motion for a continuance. The Board has at all times denied Respondent’s request for a continuance based on discovery issues due to the Respondent’s lack of discovery motions. One continuance was granted due to an illness alleged by Respondent of shingles. Respondent now makes a motion seeking time to subpoena ODC Lawyers and Judicial Officers as well as serve discovery on the ODC. The persons identified in Respondent’s motion were known to Respondent at the time of

her initial filing. Respondent has not discovered new information causing a need for a delay to conduct discovery. Thus, the Board denies this motion for a continuance.” **(Exhibit U-2)**

80. January 18, 2022 was the first time, I heard of the Board’s assertion for denying my request, allegedly, “due to the Respondent’s lack of discovery motions.” The first informal decision denying a suspension of hearing date, was on January 10, 2022, which did not assert this reason. **(Exhibit R-1)**. I merely had two days prior to the hearing. The January 15, 2022 motion filed with the Board identified specific requests for discovery. **(Exhibit U)** The Board acted unfairly, with intent to fraudulently mislead the courts on appeal, on its two decisions January 10 and January 18,th made in non-appealable form.

81. I responded by E-mail requesting the Board send me a formal order to appeal, which was ignored to deny me the opportunity to be heard on appeal to the Delaware Supreme Court, and the Us Supreme Court.” **(Exhibit U-2)**

82. After the weekend, two business days after my appeal, on Tuesday, January 18, 2022, the Delaware Supreme Court denied my appeal, which was based on protecting my fundamental rights. **(Exhibit V, attached Order, dated January 18, 2022).**

83. The Court’s January 18, 2022 order provides:

“Upon careful consideration of the motion appealing the order of the Board on Professional Responsibility dated January 11, 2022 (“the Motion”) filed by Respondent in this Court,1 the Motion is denied for the reasons

stated in this Court's January 11, 2022 Order. The Court **will not rule on any further frivolous motions or appeals** that Respondent files in this matter before the panel submits its final report and recommendation for the Court's review. IT IS SO ORDERED." Id. (Emphasis Intended).

84. The Delaware Supreme Court deprived me of an opportunity to be heard on appeal until it was too late, and violations of my right to a fair hearing already took place. Thereby the Court appeared to condone and collude with the irreparable injury against me by the state, by allowing the denial of a fair opportunity for me to prepare and defend my case. The Court also appeared to deem my defenses frivolous by deeming a fair opportunity to prepare and present them as frivolous, in violation of my substantive and procedural due process clause right to a fair opportunity to be heard, and in violation of the Equal protections Clause by denying me equal access to a fair proceeding to present my defense. (Exhibit V).

85. The State Court indicated it would not hear any frivolous motions, giving a colluding sign to the Board not to file an official order, to prevent my opportunity to be heard on appeal. The Board denied me the right to prepare a defense, to subpoena witnesses, cross examine necessary witnesses, and a fair opportunity to be heard, based on disdain towards my religious beliefs. The state proceeding was not a lawful proceeding. This is my hanging but for my belief in Jesus the Christ.

86. On January 20, 2022, I was not feeling well and I sent the Board and the ODC an E-mail indicating I was cancelling the hearing because I did not feel well, and was not afforded an opportunity to prepare in violation of my substantive and procedural due process rights. (**Exhibit EE**, Number 47, Exhibits to hearing)

87. I could not sleep at all by the lawlessness of the state, and did not want to waive my right to plead insufficiency of service of service of the Notice of a hearing. So, the next morning, on January 21, 2022, I attended the hearing by phone, a phone my mother sent to me as a gift for my birthdate in the nick of time, since zoom was not working on my computer.

88. On January 22, 2022, I E-mailed the Board, while copying the ODC, per the Board's request, Respondent Meghan M. Kelly's Exhibits to Hearing she made a special appearance to attend reserving her objections to dismiss based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to the Court members' participation in inciting the unlawful petition and lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to illegality as applied.

89. On January 23, 2022, I filed *Respondent Meghan M. Kelly Amended Exhibits to Hearing she made a special appearance to attend reserving her objections to dismiss based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to the Court's members participation in inciting the unlawful petition and lack of subject matter jurisdiction due to illegality as applied, to include emails to the Office of*

Disciplinary Counsel, to include two additional exhibits, the January 20, 2022 E-mail relating to cancelling the hearing, and one dated October 26, 2021, to show my intent to perform discovery or call Chief Justice Collins Seitz as a witness.

(**Exhibit Y**, Internal exhibits referred as R-Ex).

90. On January 25, 2022, I filed Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Due to lack of Adequate Notice, I incorporate herein by reference, as **Exhibit W**.

91. On January 31, 2022, the Board sent an E-mail copy of the transcript of the hearing, included in its entirety as **Exhibit Z**.

92. On January 31, 2022, I E-mailed Patricia Swartz requesting her exhibits. She forwarded them unmarked, and undistinguishable emails, except one, ODC's Exhibit Number 5, which was over 600 pages, which expended my resources to print out. Patricia Swartz sent a corrected copy of her exhibit list. I did not receive her first list prior to the hearing. (**Exhibit AA**)

93. On February 1, 2022, I objected to the form Patricia Swartz presented the documents on February 1, 2022, before the Board. (**Exhibit AA**).

94. At a quick glance of the transcript, I was horrified by the errors in the transcript, and sent an email to the Board and ODC regarding correcting the transcript. I missed the error where I requested Patricia Swartz be called as a witness. My request to call Patricia Swartz was left out of the transcript, and is rather a large error. David White and Patricia Swartz attended the hearing, and may

be called as witnesses to confirm I asked to call Patricia Swartz as a witness at the inception of the tele-hearing. (See **Exhibit BB**)

95. On February 1, 2022, I filed corrections to the transcript which are incorporated to every reference to the Transcript, which does not correct all inaccuracies. (**Exhibit CC**)

96. On February 18, 2022, the Board sent the *Report and Recommendation on Petition to Transfer to Disability Inactive Status* to the ODC and I by E-mail, with a paper copy received by me on February 24, 2022. (**Exhibit DD** “Report”).

97. The Board recommended placing me on “disabled inactive attorney status until a qualified mental health expert can certify (my) fitness to practice law,” but for my exercise of the right to petition the courts to address a grievance against my person, and constitutionally protected activity, based on my poverty, my religious beliefs, political affiliation, speech and association. *Id.*

98. On February 28, 2022, I filed the attached Respondent’s Unopposed Motion under Rule 15 (b) for a Ten-Day Extension to file objection for a variety of reasons that obstructed my ability to work on objections, including but not limited to computer technical problems, internet outages, wild life police coming to my door demanding federal papers for the vulture effigy, loved ones’ sickness and deaths, more deaths of loved ones occurred after this request, and the inability to

get into the law library without my replacement attorney card, I requested long ago. (**Exhibit GG**).

99. On March 1, 2022, The Court rendered an order on my Motion for an extension, dated February 28, 2022 and held.

“Having considered the Respondent’s Unopposed Motion under Rule 15(b) for a Ten-Day Extension to File Objections, the Motion is **GRANTED**. Objections are due by March 21, 2022. **No further extensions will be granted.**” (**Exhibit HH**).

100. During the first week of March, 2022, I discovered the law librarian was out due to the shingles. Having had the shingles before, I knew it probably was wearing her out, and may prevent her from coming in. The Delaware Supreme Court’s Sussex County locations requires pro se litigants to drop their Delaware Supreme court documents with the law library. Whereas they allow lawyers to drop off their documents at the Sussex Court-house location. The Court is treating me as a pro-se party, not as an attorney. So, I am required to conform to pro se filing rules. I asked the law librarians in Upper Delaware for help. Since I was unable to scan in documents at Del Tech, at the time, which eliminated my ability to file electronically, and the increase in gas made it unaffordable to drive to other Court locations. Filing alternatives and help was not granted.

101. On March 3, 2022, I sent a letter Motion, and proposed order to the Court, requesting permission to drop off my documents to the Sussex County,

Delaware Supreme Court location, should the law librarian be out on May 21, 2022 before 4:30 PM, when the Court closes. (Exhibit II).

102. On March 8, 2022, the Court granted me contingent permission to drop off documents at the Delaware Supreme Court, should the law librarian be unavailable. (Exhibit JJ).

Establishment of Government Religion; Planned Economic Crash, my hope the Courts will save us by guiding the misguided other two branches to coin money to care, instead of coin to control, before the government loses control of governing power and lawlessness occurs, The State finds my religious, political beliefs and petitions repugnant, this explains some political-religious beliefs, which are in issue to prove discriminatory purpose

The State alleges it brought this petition because it reviewed my pleadings in the Chancery and Supreme Court relating to my law suit against President Donald J. Trump to dissolve the establishment of Government religion, to alleviate a government incited substantial burden upon my free exercise of religious beliefs, in September of 2020. The state disagrees with my religious and political beliefs and petitions. (Ans 5).

Prior to filing the case, someone talked about shooting me for my stickers on my vehicle, which show my religious-political beliefs, and others have accused me of not being a Christian since I am a democrat and do not support President

Exhibit E

Re: 2022, 58 Fw: Quick Library scanner access/Public UD Alumni patron

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: lisa.dolph@delaware.gov; kathleen.vavala@delaware.gov; renee.buskirk@delaware.gov;
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Wednesday, March 30, 2022, 01:16 AM EDT

Looking back, maybe I have been mistreated because of my religious beliefs by the state, but not enough to make me fear for my freedom of religion to file a complaint like I did against President Trump.

The violent threats based on religious political beliefs is where I drew the line, and drafted the complaint. Albeit, eternal lives are more important, and that obviously what I care about most.

Good night,
Meg

On Wednesday, March 30, 2022, 01:04:39 AM EDT, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good evening,

Per the email below, it was really sad for me to be rejected when I went to Del Tech.

The police people said I was welcome there anytime and to contact them if I am treated badly again. The Del Tech staff were really mean to me and said everyone knew who I was, as they rejected me despite receiving permission to use their facilities, I think in regards to politics.

Have you ever received threats or mistreatment against you based on your religious political beliefs? I never did until President Trump. Then I spoke up loudly against his misbehavior and drafted 5 articles of impeachment to safeguard the freedoms we all hold dear, and contacted 541 federal law makers about that because serving God through justice with mercy through correction is more important than money. See Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23. Justice, guiding the misguided, may save eternal souls. Money just feeds the flesh. Justice is not for sale, or injustice is guaranteed. Those who focus on money, merriment and material gain for their security or the security of the people, will not have eternal life, should they not repent, which is sad. Jesus calls it the evil eye, not seeing clearly to love others without an exchange or trade, even at a loss. Matthew 6:21-25.

I unstapled all my documents for exhibits B through J. I will attempt to scan it in correctly and send it to you.

That way uploading it should not take long, and maybe I will not be required to file a motion. I will check in with you after I am done.

I am still disappointed.

Thank you and good night,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
No 4968

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: Bobbi Barends <bobbi.barends@dtcc.edu>; Lisa Dolph <lisa.dolph@delaware.gov>; Margaret Naylor <margaret.naylor@delaware.gov>; Zi-Xiang Shen <zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2022, 04:50:29 PM EDT

Subject: Re: Quick Library scanner access/Public UD Alumni patron

Hi Bobbi

I am at Del Tech now. They are refusing to allow me to use the computer or scanner.

Thank you,
Meg

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 11, 2022, at 3:05 PM, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi Bobbi,

Thank you so much. I actually took a week to print out thousands of documents, instead of one scanned in copy and dropped off papers.

This is great to know for next time, when I am not backed up.

This is a big help. I am behind because of printing, and it is too late this time to scan since I have to use every minute I can to draft documents.

Your scanner will be a big help in the future.

Thank you so much.

Very truly,
Meg

On Friday, March 11, 2022, 02:35:06 PM EST, Bobbi Barends <bobbi.barends@dtcc.edu> wrote:

Hi Meg,

Thank you for your email. As a result of the lifting of the State of Emergency and all vaccine/testing/masking mandates, the public may, once again, access our campus library.

Thank you,

Bobbi

Bobbi J. Barends, Ph.D.

Vice President and Campus Director

Delaware Technical Community College

Jack F. Owens Campus

21179 College Drive

Georgetown, DE 19947

302.259.6020

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 8:44 AM
To: Bobbi Barends <bobbi.barends@dtcc.edu>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: Quick Library scanner access/Public UD Alumni patron

Good morning,

Could you please let me know when the public may use the Del Tech library?

You have the best scanner, which may scan voluminous documents.

I was turned away from the library before and was told alumni of UD alumni could not use the library at the inception of the state of emergency.

Yesterday, I saw some requirements were lifted from the students, but did not see whether any were lifted from the public's access from the library yet.

Could you please let me know the status of public access to the Del Tech Georgetown campus library? If it is still inaccessible to the public, could you please let me know when restrictions are lifted?

Thank you.

Meg Kelly

UD Alumni

Exhibit F

Re: 2022, 58 /Del Tech Fw: Quick Library scanner access/Public UD Alumni patron

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: lisa.dolph@delaware.gov; kathleen.vavala@delaware.gov; renee.buskirk@delaware.gov;
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Thursday, March 31, 2022, 07:47 PM EDT

She allowed me to use the computer, and said sorry she was wrong. I think after talking with the police officers.

I apologize for not clarifying. I am glad to be home now, after spinning my wheels getting nothing done.

I hope you had a better day.

Very truly,
Meg

On Thursday, March 31, 2022, 07:36:21 PM EDT, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good evening,

This morning a staff member at Del Tech offered to copy my license to keep it on file, after I handed over my license to register for computer use. I said no thank you. She indicated it was for my convenience, in case I forgot my ID. I said no thank you but thank you for offering.

She was weird. My suspicion was correct.

Later this afternoon, after I went to the law library to file for a library card, I went back to Del Tech to scan in more paper documents.

Donna, a different lady, asked to photo copy my license, after I handed her my license to register for a computer. I said no thank you. I am not comfortable with that, due to identity theft. She said it was a new policy, and I asked her if they have a written policy. She did not answer. I indicated I would not use the computer then. I have a lap top in the car. Thank you.

Officer Gary came by, and I thanked him and discussed the disparate treatment in a public forum, apparently based on my political association. He confirmed she said sorry. I think he made her. Officer Gary was so kind to me. He treated me as a human, with kindness, despite my religious political beliefs, association and petitions.

The scanner did not work, and I stayed an hour or so in hopes it would start working. It did not work.

It is not easy for me to spend money I do not have on gas to travel 46 miles to Del Tech to scan, especially since the scanner stopped working. The ODC's case against me is preventing me to rejoin my old law firm, which prevents me from having a company car and money. I would like to give my car back to him.

When I indicate concerns towards tools I may need that suddenly become unavailable like Zoom, printers, the internet, computers, scanners, I am by no means intending to delay responses. Obstacles sometimes come up, unplanned, at the worst of times.

Whereas others with family close by or resources may have alternatives. I do not.

Thank you for understanding.

Have a good night.

Very truly,
Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693
No 4968

On Wednesday, March 30, 2022, 01:16:36 AM EDT, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Looking back, maybe I have been mistreated because of my religious beliefs by the state, but not enough to make me fear for my freedom of religion to file a complaint like I did against President Trump.

The violent threats based on religious political beliefs is where I drew the line, and drafted the complaint. Albeit, eternal lives are more important, and that obviously what I care about most.

Good night,
Meg

On Wednesday, March 30, 2022, 01:04:39 AM EDT, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good evening,

Per the email below, it was really sad for me to be rejected when I went to Del Tech.

The police people said I was welcome there anytime and to contact them if I am treated badly again. The Del Tech staff were really mean to me and said everyone knew who I was, as they rejected me despite receiving permission to use their facilities, I think in regards to politics.

Have you ever received threats or mistreatment against you based on your religious political beliefs? I never did until President Trump. Then I spoke up loudly against his misbehavior and drafted 5 articles of impeachment to safeguard the freedoms we all hold dear, and contacted 541 federal law makers about that because serving God through justice with mercy through correction is more important than money. See Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23. Justice, guiding the misguided, may save eternal souls. Money just feeds the flesh. Justice is not for sale, or injustice is guaranteed. Those who focus on money, merriment and material gain for their security or the security of the people, will not have eternal life, should they not repent, which is sad. Jesus calls it the evil eye, not seeing clearly to love others without an exchange or trade, even at a loss. Matthew 6:21-25.

I unstapled all my documents for exhibits B through J. I will attempt to scan it in correctly and send it to you.

That way uploading it should not take long, and maybe I will not be required to file a motion. I will check in with you after I am done.

I am still disappointed.

Thank you and good night,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
No 4968

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: Bobbi Barends <bobbi.barends@dtcc.edu>; Lisa Dolph <lisa.dolph@delaware.gov>; Margaret Naylor <margaret.naylor@delaware.gov>; Zi-Xiang Shen <zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2022, 04:50:29 PM EDT
Subject: Re: Quick Library scanner access/Public UD Alumni patron

Hi Bobbi

I am at Del Tech now. They are refusing to allow me to use the computer or scanner.

Thank you,
Meg

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 11, 2022, at 3:05 PM, Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi Bobbi,

Thank you so much. I actually took a week to print out thousands of documents, instead of one scanned in copy and dropped off papers.

This is great to know for next time, when I am not backed up.

This is a big help. I am behind because of printing, and it is too late this time to scan since I have to use every minute I can to draft documents.

Your scanner will be a big help in the future.

Thank you so much.

Very truly,
Meg

On Friday, March 11, 2022, 02:35:06 PM EST, Bobbi Barends <bobbi.barends@dtcc.edu> wrote:

Hi Meg,

Thank you for your email. As a result of the lifting of the State of Emergency and all vaccine/testing/masking mandates, the public may, once again, access our campus library.

Thank you,

Bobbi

Bobbi J. Barends, Ph.D.

Vice President and Campus Director

Delaware Technical Community College

Jack F. Owens Campus

21179 College Drive

Georgetown, DE 19947

302.259.6020

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 8:44 AM
To: Bobbi Barends <bobbi.barends@dtcc.edu>
Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
Subject: Quick Library scanner access/Public UD Alumni patron

Good morning,

Could you please let me know when the public may use the Del Tech library?

You have the best scanner, which may scan voluminous documents.

I was turned away from the library before and was told alumni of UD alumni could not use the library at the inception of the state of emergency.

Yesterday, I saw some requirements were lifted from the students, but did not see whether any were lifted from the public's access from the library yet.

Could you please let me know the status of public access to the Del Tech Georgetown campus library? If it is still inaccessible to the public, could you please let me know when restrictions are lifted?

Thank you.

Meg Kelly

UD Alumni

Exhibit H

Bar card 4968 / Misc 541 115327 B

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: lisa.dolph@delaware.gov

Cc: patricia.schwartz@delaware.gov; david.weiss@usdoj.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com


Date: Tuesday, December 21, 2021, 10:48 PM EST

Hi Lisa,

Yesterday I requested another bar card since I mailed out my card to my former law firm expecting to start working as a real estate attorney.

Please let me know when you seek to issue another. I hope I do not lose my potential job because of this action.

Thank you,
Meg


She said she would order one,
but did not until
I made another request.

Fw: Library card/Lisa Dolph

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)
To: lisa.dolph@delaware.gov
Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com; margaret.naylor@delaware.gov; galen.wilson@delaware.gov
Date: Thursday, March 31, 2022, 08:21 AM EDT

Hi Lisa,

Thank you for the lawyer ID. The security guards still give me a hard time, at times, despite having the ID. Other lawyers like Michael Mgruerty (spelling unknown) have a key card that allows them to open the door.

It appears the law library is reissuing cards. I was forced to turn mine in. If I get a new card that may resolve the problem.

It is difficult when I do not have access to the tools I need to research.

Thank you,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(302) 493-6693
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
4968

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>
To: Naylor, Margaret (Courts) <margaret.naylor@delaware.gov>; Galen Wilson <galen.wilson@delaware.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2022, 08:15:34 AM EDT
Subject: Library card

Hi Peggy,


I talked with other lawyers and their library cards work now. I no longer have a library card because for some reason the Superior court required I give it to them when I went to them and did not understand why it was shut off during the pandemic. That was before we discovered why.

I went to the web site, and saw card applications for cards are now available.

It appears this is why it is now working for lawyers.

Could you please process my card request, attached hereto? This will be a big help because the security guards sometimes give me a hard time. This makes sense when they see Michael using his own card without inconveniencing them by requiring they leave their posts when you are not available to open the door.

Thank you,
Meg

 law library card.pdf
496.4kB

Thank you Meg is in the law library now

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: lisa.dolph@delaware.gov

Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Friday, February 25, 2022, 11:44 AM EST

Hi Lisa,

Thank you for helping me get into the law library today.

This is not the first time I have been turned away. Thank you for ordering another card. I understand the supply chain disruptions cause delays.

Very truly,
Meg
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Exhibit I

State of Delaware



**Kelly
Meghan**

Affiliation/Title:

Private Attorney

Department/Division:

Law Library



Issued: 4/1/2022 Expires: 4/1/2122

"State Property" Not an ID Card

This credential is the property of the State of Delaware Government. Counterfeiting, altering, or misusing violates State Code. The bearer of this card is a designated Press/Guest/Visitor. After credential verification, bearer should be given access to controlled area.

Return to:
Delaware Capital Police
150 Hill, Jr. Blvd South
Dover, Delaware 19901
302-744-4399

© 2011 DELAWARE DPJ



APP 5
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

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

Appellant Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Motion to recuse the Honorable Judge Anthony J. Sirica to preserve my Due process Rights under the 5th

I Meghan Kelly, pursuant to FRAppP Rule 27, my 5th Amendment right to a fair trial to defend the exercise of my private 1st Amendment rights of petitioning, speech, religious belief, exercise, and association, 28 U.S. Code §§ 144 and 455, 29 CFR § 2200.68, or other applicable law move for the recusal and to prevent the participation of the Honorable Judge Anthony J. Scirica in this case.

1. I asked opposing counsel for her stance per the attached Exhibit A. She has not objected.
2. I requested a panel rehearing of the original panel.
3. The Honorable Judge Anthony J. Scirica is on the original panel.
4. Judge Scirica has a conflict of interest with my case I was not aware of until after I filed my motion for a rehearing on June 3, 2023. (Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI”) 3DI-199

3. I have stumbled upon evidence the Honorable Judge Anthony J. Scirica appears to be the former chair of the Executive Committee of the Judicial

Conference of the United States, former chair of the Standing Committee on rules of Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States and was a member of the Advisory Committee on Civil rules. The Honorable Judge Scirica currently chairs the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability and is a member of the Committee on International Relations. I attach, and incorporate herein as affidavit 41 as necessary information providing evidence I incorporate herein, at District Court Docket Items (“DI”) DI 149, as an exhibit hereto.

5. To my horror I discovered Judge Scirica is the current Chair I believe there is an attack on judges to eliminate the judiciary to eliminate the rule of law, as I mentioned previously.

6. Should judges give into the temptation to behave as cowards and defensive, they will be controlled by those who entice their desires not free to uphold the freedoms of the people by the impartial application of the Constitution on the rule of law.

7. I believe the courts must limit the purview of correcting judges to the purview of the Constitutional limits without waiver, 1. Cases and controversies such as mine, 2. or impeachment, to preserve these United States from schemed overthrow.

8. I am terrified, absolutely mortified that one of the reviewing judges is in charge of the rules disciplining the federal judges. I believe such rules

guarantee injustice by judges who fear punishment and seek to uphold the mere rules to the extent they compromise the impartial rule of law.

9. I believe regulations will be used to assist the other two branches to exceed the Constitutional limits to impeach and control a no longer free, independent and impartial judiciary. This may be used to eliminate the courts down the line if left unstopped.

10. The fact I argued on the record below, my desire to eliminate or prevent disciplinary rules of federal judges and the United States Supreme Court creates a conflict of interest.

11. I also argue certain disciplinary rules violate the Constitution and create injustice and constitutional violations leading to harm, and though not states below certain damnation in hell.

12. My case is not about vengeance, but correcting and protecting the Defendants and those they misguidedly harm, including my colleague. My colleague Richard Abbott, Esq. appears to be in trouble for requiring the government adhere to the impartial rule of law, including a county and the members of the Delaware Supreme Court without disparate economic treatment arguably in violation of the Equal Protections Clause applicable to state and county governments via the 14th Amendment.

13. I seek to preserve the Constitution, the rule of law, and the government from schemed very real threats of dissolution and demise.

14. Thank you for your time. I write in haste with anguish, because my voice may be cancelled out and eliminated by even the United States Supreme Court by concealing my pleadings too. I incorporate herein by reference. DI-121-DI-154.

15. This Court may guide even misguided judges to preserve the rule of law.

16. I believe this Court may preserve these United States should it only care to entertain the individual liberty interest of those who do not conform to the standardized beliefs and conduct of the alleged norm, like me.

17. No disciplinary rules or regulations should control the federal judiciary. Disciplinary rules and regulations create injustice by tempting federal judges to partiality towards Disciplinary Rules or tempts them to act with favoritism towards those who administer or draft the rules, making judges puppets not independent critically thinking discerners of the facts as applied to the Constitutional laws which safeguard life and liberty. The fear of punishment for alleged violation of disciplinary rules interferes with judges' capacity to independently administer the impartial application of the Constitution to the superseding rule of law upon the people and other two branches. Disciplinary rules

creates injustice and allows judges to be set up as I have been set up for the partial whims of a vindictive Delaware Supreme Court which abused its discretion to serve its unconstitutional unrestrained lusts.

18. Other branches may not eliminate the only check the courts have upon the other two branches by regulating the Constitution away which preserves our rights, the people's rights, not merely the Court's rights and duties. The argument the Courts may waive their right to self-incrimination by waiving the 5th does not allow them to waive the rights of the people of the substantial burden the disciplinary rules will have and have upon their equal protections by the courts. The Court may not waive the rights of the people only to be deceived into placing the United States Supreme Court under a greater microscope and certain horse and pony impeachment shows to get misbehaving men election seats. This makes a mockery of the courts and justice.

19. I argue below consistently the Supreme Court and federal judges must only be corrected within the purview of the Constitution's provisions of 1. Cases and controversies like my case, or impeachment to preserve the Court and prevent the planned attacks that will be used to eliminate the rule of law and government if the courts do not stop it. The courts must not waive the Constitutional limits by allowing disciplinary rules and regulations to preserve the impartiality of the courts to safeguard the Constitutional freedom of the people. The disciplinary rules

compromises the partiality of the integrity of judges making them partial to disciplinary rules or those who control or administer them instead of the impartial application of the Constitution to the rule of law.

20. I used my case for problems with the Courts within the purview of cases and controversies to prevent harm. For example, I have a problem with the United States Supreme Court docketing my pleadings. I have previously drafted a motion to place exhibits on the docket of my PA Appeal. Kelly v PA ODC, 22A981. Then, I had problems searching and viewing the docket. So, the public may also have a problem. The reasons for the problem may be a human mistake or by intentional vindictive design in violation of the First Amendment with the goal of dissuading me from petitioning the courts and the 6th Amendment right to public record and the Equal Protections Clause as applied to me because of disparate treatment by the US Supreme Court. The proper place to remedy any harm is by going to the one who may have committed the alleged mistakes or misconduct directly. If that does not work the proper place is the court in my case to correct mistakes or misconduct, not disciplinary cases by those who seek to control a no longer free and independent court. Those who enforce or apply disciplinary rules serve business greed not good by upholding what is not for sale, freedom. These rules eliminate justice. The Disciplinary rules create the deception of maintaining a standard to care for the people, when it merely cares for profit and position

allowing misconduct to continue in a standardized more massive way. Deferring to standardized rules and conduct within a profession allows harmful and even deadly conduct and standardized care or products to be above correction. The Courts tend to misbehave by deferring to alleged experts, scientists and professionals, essentially colluding with them to eliminate freedom in favor of making a no longer free people for sale.

21. Standards also allow the automation and elimination of people judges and people lawyers under the lie sameness is fairness and equality when it is elimination of Equal protections under the Constitution which protects every freedom to think, believe and act according to the religious dictates of one's own conscience when religious beliefs do not fit in the box of standards the algorithms permit.

22. While, I saw this conflict may be an opportunity to argue certain Federal Rules are unconstitutional in passim, such as the disparate favorable treatment the federal rules grant federal officials, agents and employees in that they have a longer period to respond to a complaint 60 days. Whereas common people like me are afforded fewer days to respond to a complaint arguably in violation of the Equal Protections Component of the 5th Amendment applicable to the federal government with no rational basis, but an evil one, valuing convenience, and business weightier than the Constitution and federal rights of citizens, the prejudice

is too great for this slight potential opportunity to make our system more just, fair and free.

22. While the courts are granted statutory authority under the Rules Enabling Act Rules Enabling Act, and amendments thereto 28 U.S.C. § 2071-2077, the Court limited that power within the rules and by case law. “No rule can enlarge or restrict jurisdiction. Nor can a rule abrogate or modify substantive case law.” The federal courts acceptance of disciplinary rules abrogates substantive case law by guaranteeing injustice not equal application of the rule of law by their own sinful vanities to sustain their seats. US Amend V, XIV (Equal Protections)

23. On an aside, I am a Christian. I believe people commit lawlessness called sin when they train others to seek money and material things Jesus Christ calls Mammon as God, savior, master or guide in their life. *Matthew 6:24*. I believe sin is lawlessness leading to damnation in the fires of hell despite ignorance, should people not repent. *See, Bible 2 Corinthians 4:4, Matthew 13*. I do not want people, even judges to go to hell for their confusion, nor do I want them to sacrifice people’s lives or Constitutional liberties for material gain of the alleged many or the few. That is the same lawless lusts those in ancient religions committed when they sacrificed humans in secular-religious worship for material gain or better crops. Under the similarly false belief many unjust policies, rules, regulations or laws in the US sacrifice, exploit and oppress the poor so some may

get as much as they can for as little as they can while teaching the poor and middle class to praise the conniving, not smart oppressors. Constitutional challenges to such government conduct must be permitted under the Equal Protections arguments and arguments against involuntary government backed slavery under the 13th Amendment.

24. Government grants and contracts are repugnant to me. It is the same as throwing people in a volcano for a false God Money and mammon when the Courts sacrifice the poor under the lie job creation is savior. See Romans 4:4 where I believe God scolds us that job creation is not charity or good. I believe those who create jobs, like President Biden alleges, and train people to be their colluding private partners trained slave in a fixed not free subpar economy by education from kindergarden through 12th grade enslave the people to their dictates. I believe they serve Satan and will go to hell if left uncorrected or unrepented by government backing or charitable backing. Courts should save lives and eternal lives, not throw them into the fire to burn or sacrifice the weak, the poor, the lame like a wolfpack eating not tending the sheep. Such educational goals do not safeguard freedom, but eliminate it by government backed forced control in contravention of the 13th Amendment. The value of the human is not based on business, money, marketing or material gain, but is immeasurable. God calls the disparate favoritism by government contracts and such unjust gains, which I believe

arguably violates the Equal Protections Clause component of the 5th when the federal government backs by words or grants, contracts, marketing material support in an unequal fixed slave not free market. See *Romans* 4:4, *Matthew* 6:1-4. I believe lawyers, even lawyers labeled disabled have a duty to uphold Constitutional liberties from being sacrificed for material gain under the lie of the common good, the deception the vote is a waiver of every other Constitutional liberty or the lie of saving the world.

25. There is a new replacement economy which will use the lie of saving the world only to manufacture harm to control it under the new carbon credit debt system. The arguments I make under the equal protections clause and the 13th Amendment against government contracts and grants to entities should be made to prevent the fixed, slave, controlled market that will eliminate every single one of our Constitutional freedoms by eliminating the courts and governments authority to restrain entities who will rule of control of resources, not based on just decrees.

26. The new economy will be replaced again to eliminate the government and the rules of law that restrain businesses and charities from harming, oppressing, killing, stealing and destroying human life and human liberty under the lie of the common good if the courts do not stop it. I attach DI 147, and an additional article in hopes this Court may see through the government backed private partners lobbyists plans.

27. One way to prevent the schemed attacks on the courts is to prevent them from getting set-up to fall by preventing regulating the US Supreme Court, and to allow cases including mine to correct the Court. Please see DI-121-DI 154 to see when I have concern with the Supreme Court I go to them the Court or other courts to correct it in the open. Going behind their backs in a secret Board or agency proceeding, when it may be based on mere misunderstanding creates injustice, confusion, and biased administration of the rule of law by those who destroy Constitutional liberties in favor of the mark of lawlessness leading to certain damnation in hell, the mark of the beast, business greed. The secret disciplinary proceedings dumbly mercilessly destroys people, making professionals dumbed down puppets, not free to use their own brains to improve care to serve people as opposed to the profession's wicked desire to market, gain profit, power and maintain positions. DI 77-79

28. I seek to eliminate the disciplinary rules Judge Scirica is charged to care for. There is a conflict of interest. While I made an argument against the disciplinary rules below, I also have constitutional arguments against a number of specific Delaware Disciplinary Rules beyond the arguments made below I must be afforded an opportunity to make so as not to violate my procedural due process opportunity to be heard and the right to petition.

29. Due process is violated by allowing a judge who is charged with drafting or improving disciplinary rules which mimic state rules I seek to make Constitutional arguments against. Judge Scirica's inherent bias and a personal interest against part of my case since Judge Scirica likely takes special care in revising the rules I will attack. There is bias against my arguments based on a personal stake he will subconsciously defend. There is an appearance of impartiality regarding arguments attacking something he personally worked hard to create.

30. I write in haste. Please excuse any typos because I do not want the Honorable Judge Scirica to needlessly invest time in reviewing my motion for a rehearing before the original panel, nor do I desire to waive my rights by asserting them too late. I apologize. I am a poor typist.

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants this motion

June 8, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693
Not acting as a lawyer
(2,710 words)

Under religious protest as declaring and swearing violates God's teachings
in the Bible, I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct

Dated: June 8, 2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)



(signed)

Exhibit A

21-3198 Stance recusal Judge

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)
To: zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; caneel.radinson-blasucci@delaware.gov
Cc: meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
Date: Monday, June 5, 2023 at 03:08 PM EDT

Hello,

I am freaked out about the conflict of interest of Judge Anthony J. Scirica. I am thinking about filing a motion to recuse, but I do not think I have time in light of my other matters and obligations. My family is coming this week and next, possibly longer for a reunion. It is my dad's cousins. They want to meet up before they are dead since they are old. My dad's cousin Claire is not doing well and may die of cancer soon.

Could you please provide a stance should I file a motion to recuse Judge Scirica. Again, I am a little freaked out by his involvement in the federal judiciary rules committee, with particular concern he is in charge of rules I desire to eliminate.

Do you think I am panicking for no reason and I may use this to eliminate the rules by one on the committee who has power to discuss such changes to Justice Roberts.

I am panicking. When in doubt, think more. Yet, I should ask your stance before I draft a motion.

Thank you,
Meg

Exhibit B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Meghan Kelly)	Civil Action No.: 1:21-1490 (CFC)
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.)	
Swartz, et.al)	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY’S 41st AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

Comes now Plaintiff Meghan Kelly, I declare and affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

1. I have a weather alert on my phone, so I was scared to file my motion for a rehearing tomorrow or Monday June 5, 2023 because the electricity may go out. See Exhibit A. the weather alert from yesterday June 2, 2023 which remains into effect today June 3, 2023.

2. On June 3, 2023 I filed the attached Motion for a rehearing before the original panel, attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit B.

3. The original panel includes

1. Chief Justice Chagares appointed by President Bush with an Attorney General Experience,
2. Justice Scirica, a leading national expert of Attorney Disability per the attached exhibits contained in Exhibit C. He is a member of the US Judicial Conference. He serves as the Chair of its Committee on Judicial Conduct and disability. He also served as a UD Attorney General.
3. Justice Ambro who has worked at the largest home grown corporate law firm in the corporate center of the Universe Richards, Layton and Finger. Notably, this is my first law firm too. He also has experience in bankruptcy.

4. I am uncomfortable with the fact the Delaware Supreme Court is full of people with corporate law experience, and the federal courts are full of people with experience and expertise defending the big guys, entities or the government. The judges' specialty and training to defend government and collective entities may create an obstacle in preventing the government and entities from sacrificing individuals and individual liberty under the deception of the collective good.

5. The collective good is free speech that allows disorder and criticism to improve dumbed down training by standardization, especially when judges defer to medical standards that harm and kill patients instead of correcting them to improve the profession by safeguarding life and liberty foremost above profit and material gain.

6. With said, maybe the judges are cognizant of the new economic model, not based on profit but on debt control by private entities who will eliminate the government if left unstopped.

7. If you look at my Complaint at DI 2, you will see my criticism for the new beneficial entities which are used in a different ponzi scheme of taking what is not theirs' under the guise of charity or the common good. These beneficial entities will be used in the new economic system which eliminates the profit model, for a slave debt credit system.

8. The WEF already alluded to the elimination of saving accounts at page 144 of the Book the Fourth Industrial Revolution found at Docket Item 12 if I see it correctly. I attached Page 144 as Exhibit D to show the reduction of savings to my believed elimination of savings in the new techno slave credit debt economy schemed beyond 2030.

9. I am not blinding my eyes when people are schemed to be oppressed by those who gain unjust gains of resources to control and enslave the people and the government as

master only to eliminate the government which is charged with safeguarding individuals and individual liberty from those who sacrifice people and liberty for material gain like the religious groups used to throw people into volcanoes to secure good harvest and material gain.

10. I have a duty under the Constitution and before God to seek to safeguard free will, an individual liberty which will be substantially burdened with every freedom to be eliminated to be bought and sold by only those who may afford them.

11. I also am heartbroken and upset since the US Supreme Court appears to be making it difficult to see my appeal on its docket per the attached Exhibit E., possibly to conceal my genuinely held religious-political beliefs the certain cases violate the Constitution, and violate the laws of God, endangering the souls of the judges who render unjust decrees in the name of God. Isaiah 10:1-3 “Woe to those who make unjust laws, to those who issue oppressive decrees, to deprive the poor of their rights and withhold justice from the oppressed of my people, making widows their prey and robbing the fatherless.”

12. I am charged to correct and protect, even the courts to uphold the rule of law from the schemed lawlessness that lies ahead if the courts do not humble themselves to stop it.

13. We need the courts to be the heroes instead of the villains by protecting liberties of those they disagree with, even their seemed enemies.

14. The only check upon courts should be 1. Cases and controversies and 2. Impeachment, not disability or disciplinary proceedings.

15. The fact Justice Scirica is in charge of a committee to discipline judges is troubling since this is outside of the purview of the Constitutional limits.

16. I thank this Court, and opposing counsel. I am disappointed the panel overlooked the fact I included disciplinary orders and pleadings attached to my motions for reargument and

made legal arguments related to the new and additional information they appeared to have overlooked given the voluminous amount of materials. I also included the materials in other pleadings prior to the last Order appealed at DI 59-60.

17. I am distraught.

18. I thank Judge Colm F. Connelly, opposing counsel and the staff for everything you have done, your time and consideration.

19. I pray my case continues, but should it end on appeal at the US Supreme Court, I am not going to regret standing up for my faith in Jesus Christ, not money, as guide, master and God in my life. Matthew 6:24.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/3/23

Meghan M. Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693, Not acting as a lawyer

Under religious protest as declaring and swearing violates God's teachings
in the Bible, I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct


Dated: June 3, 2023
Meghan Kelly (printed)
 (signed)

Exhibit A

Coastal Flood Watch

Severity: Moderate

Possible threat to life or property

Alert in Effect

From 6:00 PM (EDT), June 3, until 2:00 AM (EDT), June 4

Description

...COASTAL FLOOD WATCH IN EFFECT FROM SATURDAY EVENING THROUGH LATE SATURDAY NIGHT...

* WHAT...One to two feet of inundation above ground level possible in low-lying areas near shorelines and tidal waterways.

* WHERE...In Delaware, Inland Sussex

Exhibit B

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,)	Case No 21-3198
)	Case No. 22-2079
v.)	
PATRICIA B. SWARTZ, et. al.)	

Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Petition for a Panel Rehearing

Appellant Meghan Kelly’s petition for a panel rehearing under Fed.R.App.P. Rule 40 of this Court’s Order and opinion on 4/20/2023, at Third Circuit Docket Items (hereinafter “3DI”) 3DI-181-182, and aver.

1. The Court abused its discretion by dismissing my appeal in part as moot, since the issue of enjoining an unlawful proceeding is capable of repetition yet evading review, and the Court commits a clear error of law, of fact, creating manifest injustice.

2. The Court abused its discretion by affirming the District Court’s judgments at District Court Docket Item Number (Hereinafter “DI”) DI-16-17, DI-30-31, DI-59-60.

3. The District Court and the Third Circuit Panel (collectively and individually also referred herein as “Court”) abused its discretion in affirming the District Court judgements. I showed availability of new evidence, clear error of law, clear error of fact causing manifest injustice requiring the orders below be vacated and the case be remanded to the District Court. Moreover, even without the new evidence contained in the motions of reconsideration and other motions the Court errs in affirming the judgments below. DI-2-16.

4. The Court overlooked the additional facts I alleged below showing violations of my 1st Amendment religious beliefs, 6th Amendment right to self-represent, 14th Amend. procedural due process violations, violations of Equal Protections, and

specific facts showing lack of adequate notice, denial of asserted rights, denial of fair meaningful opportunity to be heard, to call witnesses, to cross examine my suspected accusers, to prevent evidence in my favor, additional conduct causing emotional distress manifesting in the shingles, the state's elimination of evidence in my favor and other voluminous evidence on the record below, including in my motions for a reconsideration. DI-14, DI-20 through DI-24, DI 29, DI-34 through DI-37, DI-39 through DI-44, DI-47 through DI58, and additional docket items after the Order at DI-60. This new and additional evidence contained in DI-14 through DI-58 must not be ignored. It is part of the record on appeal. The Court also erred by ignoring my challenges to state rules. See DI 58, for one example. I met the standard for reconsideration.

5. As an example in my First Motion for reagument and the amendments thereto, I discussed the State's violations relating to appointment of counsel. I immediately informed the state court I declined representation. I faced foreseeable emotional distress at violating my beliefs in Jesus by such appointment over my objection. Jesus teaches us to let the holy spirit to be our advocate when we are brought to the courts for our religious beliefs. The fact I fought hard to fire the counsel who was removed less than two weeks before the improperly scheduled hearing date, does not remove the Defendants' and the Delaware Supreme Court's violation of my First Amendment right to religious belief and exercise of belief and Sixth Amendment right to self-representation, to opportunity to call witness and other rights applicable to the state pursuant to the 1st, 6th and 14th Amend.

6. The US Supreme Court in *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 95 S. Ct. 2525, 45 L. Ed. 2d 562 (1975) held,

“Sixth Amendment does not provide merely that defense shall be made for accused but grants to accused personally the right to make a defense; right to self-representation to make one's own defense personally is necessarily implied by structure of the amendment.” U.S.C.A.Const. Amend.”

7. The Delaware Disciplinary procedure was so lacking in notice or opportunity to be heard before the Delaware original disciplinary proceeding as to constitute a deprivation of due process in the Delaware form. There was such an infirmity of proof as to give rise to the clear conviction that this court could not, consistent with its duty, accept as final the conclusion by the state court.

8. The Court refused to give me pleadings in a case against me to conceal the fact it denied me the opportunity to be heard in objecting to the appointment of counsel, Number 541. I am entitled to records used against me as a party in a proceeding. I am entitled to see if my pleadings were on the record or if I was denied an opportunity to be heard in contravention to 1st and 14th Due Process with disparate treatment based on religious-political belief and poverty. *US Amend I, XIV. See, N. Jersey Media Grp. Inc. v. United States*, 836 F.3d 421, 434 (3d Cir. 2016).

9. The lawyer Disciplinary proceedings before the Defendants and Delaware Supreme Court deprived me of a meaningful opportunity to be heard, the opportunity to prepare, call witness, receive adequate notice, the right to self-represent, to present evidence without the State forum's collusion to conceal evidence and other vitiations of my asserted, not waived Constitutional protections and rights in the Delaware Disciplinary Proceeding. *Greene v. McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474, 475 (1959) (“this Court will not hold that a person may be deprived of the right to follow his chosen profession without full hearings where accusers may be confronted and cross-examined”).

10. The US Supreme Court further held, “It is accused, not counsel, who must be informed of nature and cause of accusation, who must be confronted with witnesses against him, and who must be accorded compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor. U.S. Const. Amend. 6.” *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806, 95 S. Ct. 2525, 45 L. Ed. 2d 562 (1975). I was denied the right of notice, opportunity to confront and right other rights. The Court erred in ignoring these denials contained in my motions for reargument and other motions below.

11. The State denied me of the meaningful opportunity to litigate the question of subject-matter jurisdiction in the sham proceeding against me, and thus I may reopen that question in a collateral attack based on adverse judgment. This Court has not allowed me the opportunity to present the facts to show this. I must be afforded notice and the opportunity to be heard under the 5Th Amendment applicable to the federal courts to prevent unconstitutional vitiation of rights by this Court. US Amend I, V.

12. I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety along with the pleadings referred therein 3DI-98, the memory stick referred to at DI-58, and the District Court items DI-62 to DI-148 since this Court appeared to consider the additional Orders at DI-106, DI-111. The Court errs as a matter of law and as a matter of fact creating manifest injustice against me by ignoring the legal arguments, claims and additional facts on the record below. *Id.*

13. The Court errs as a matter of law for not considering my motion to withdraw my motion to amend the complaint at DI 43, my additional motions to amend the complaint as a matter of right to include additional claims, facts, foreseeable harm and additional information discovered and arising in the course of this litigation,

including but not limited to items in DI-43, DI-58, DI 69-75, DI-77, DI-81, DI-85-87. DI 95.

14. The Court abused its discretion in denying me the right to amend the complaint as a matter of right, despite the lower Court not ruling on my motion to amend which I withdrew and reserved the right to amend as a matter of right prior to the Order at DI 60, (DI 58) and more specifically after the order when the case is remanded DI 43, DI 58, DI 69 through 81.

15. My claims relate not only to my petitions in Kelly v Trump but also First Amendment violations of my right to petition applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment regarding petitions for bar dues. DI 2-4, 3DI 74. Should this case be dismissed the statute of limitations would foreclose me an opportunity to assert my claims anywhere in the only forum which may offer relief, the District Court. This Court was apprised of the Delaware Supreme Court's collusion in Kelly v Trump and the DE Disciplinary proceeding, and my claims for damages, nominal relief and equitable relief other than enjoining the disciplinary proceeding. DI 43, DI 58, 3DI-6 page 3 through 11, 3DI-26 through 3DI-29, 3DI-31-32, 3DI 36 through 3DI 46, 3DI 51 through 3DI 62, 3DI-68, 3DI-69, 3DI-71-3DI-76, 3DI-83-84, 3DI-93, 3DI-95 through 3DI-99, 3DI-103-107, 3DI-119-3DI-198; See, Reed v. Goertz, No. 21-442, at *5 (Apr. 19, 2023) (“*Ex parte Young* doctrine allows suits like Reed's for declaratory or injunctive relief against state officers in their official capacities.”) Id at 6-7 and 24 (*Rocker-Feldman* and 28 USC 1257 do not prohibit violations of procedural due process claims); See, *Centifanti v. Nix*, 865 F.2d 1422, 1430 (3d Cir. 1989).

16. Further whether Rooker-Feldman applies to claims I have not yet made is not ripe on appeal. The District Court did not review the merits of my claims. This appeal is limited to the improvident dismissal under Younger, and denial of my asserted right to amend the complaint once as a matter of right. The claims if accepted as pled show independent federal claims I must be allowed to argue before preemptive denial, including but not limited to void or voidable subject matter jurisdiction of the Delaware forum. US Amend V. I also seek to amend the complaint to include a number of new claims too numerous to outline that I must be afforded the opportunity to be heard on before being preemptively denied in violation of the US Amend V opportunity to be heard, including but not limited to assertions that DE Disciplinary rules are unconstitutional per se and some as applied which are not prohibited by the Rooker-Feldman doctrine. See, *Parkview Assoc. Partnership v. City of Lebanon*, 225 F.3d 321, 327-28 (3d Cir. 2000); *Skinner v. Switzer*, 562 U.S. 521, 532 (2011); Id at 33 n 10 (“The Court further observed in *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 292–293, 125 S.Ct. 1517, 161 L.Ed.2d 454 (2005), that “[w]hen there is parallel state and federal litigation,” state preclusion law may become decisive, but “[p]reclusion ... is not a jurisdictional matter.”).

17. This Court errs in finding no legal bar in presenting my claims before the state forum. The Disciplinary proceeding forbids asserting my claims for damages, nominal relief and equitable relief against the Defendants and State court under the state disciplinary proceeding. The proceeding is limited in subject matter jurisdiction under Del. Disc. Rule 1(a), 5, 10. Claims for damages, nominal damages and equitable relief are prohibited. See, *In re a Member of the Bar of the Supreme Court, of the State Enna*,

971 A.2d 110, 125 (Del. 2009), regarding limited jurisdiction. Moreover, even if the State Court entertained my claims, my procedural due process rights are violated by a partial, unfair, biased forum. US Amend I, XIV. The Federal Forum is the only forum which has jurisdiction over my claims. The Supreme Court had no jurisdiction to resolve claims for damages, nominal relief and equitable relief against the state and itself in a disciplinary proceeding. This creates a bar. The lack of personal jurisdiction over the Delaware Supreme Court members which violates the 14th Amendment also places a bar to my claims in the state proceeding. Allowing the State Court to rule in its own favor in a partial forum offends the notions of fairness and jurisdiction apparently may be upheld under the Fourteenth Amendment Due process Clause applicable to the Defendants and the state Court. The Delaware Supreme Court does not have personal jurisdiction over its own alleged Constitutional and federal violations wherein it is the judge and party. *Ins. Corp. of Ir. v. Compagnie Des Bauxites De Guinee*, 456 U.S. 694 702-03 (1982) ("The requirement that a court have personal jurisdiction flows not from Art. III, but from the Due Process Clause. US Amend XIV. The personal jurisdiction requirement recognizes and protects an individual liberty interest. It represents a restriction on judicial power not as a matter of sovereignty, but as a matter of individual liberty. Thus, the test for personal jurisdiction requires that "the maintenance of the suit . . . not offend 'traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.'" *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310, 316 (1945).

18. Younger does not require abstention to my case. The state case has concluded. There is no bar. Even if there was a case: 1. Younger does not apply to my claims for damages and nominal relief and different equitable relief I sought below. DI 2-

43, 58. The Court erred by dismissing instead of staying the case 2. Younger does not apply to federal constitutional claims or ancillary claims I had no opportunity to assert on the state forum, including but not limited to 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 1983, 1985, 1988, my defamation claims, claims for emotional distress, damages and nominal relief for First Amendment claims and the additional claims I should be afforded an opportunity to include in an amended complaint, which I do not have the space or time to outline at this point as improvident. 3. Bad faith, harassment, or extraordinary circumstances have arisen in my case that make abstention inappropriate including the Delaware Supreme Courts collusion with the Defendants by secretly knowingly concealing two material pieces of evidence necessary for my defense, and preventing their discovery to fix the outcome in bad faith. In addition the State Court incited the disciplinary proceeding for improper purposes. DI 58, DI 77. The Court selectively discriminated against me, compelled me to violate my asserted religious right to religious belief and self-representation causing emotional distress so great a police man checked on me, denied me of sufficient notice, denied meaningful opportunity to be heard, ignored my motions to subpoena witnesses and perform discovery. (DI 20-24, DI 34-39, DI 41). 4. The Courts erred in denying my right to amend the complaint as a matter of right to amend the complaint to include procedural and substantive due process violations, equal protections violations, 6th Amendment violations, Constitutional challenges to the Delaware Rules of Disciplinary procedure, ADA physical disability claims and other conduct and claims that required I add the Delaware Supreme Court and the members to my complaint on January 24, 2022. (DI 43, 3DI 98).

19. I must be granted leave to amend the complaint as a matter of right under FRCP(a), to correct any defects or arguments relating to a Younger dismissal to prevent manifest injustice that shocks the conscience in terms of loss of fundamental rights, and government punishment for the exercise of my rights, including the right to petition. See, *Mayle v. Felix*, 545 U.S. 644, 663 (2005). The Supreme Court in *Foman v. Davis*, 371 U.S. 178, 182 (1962) held the “outright refusal to grant the leave [to amend the complaint] without any justifying reason appearing for the denial is not an exercise of discretion; it is merely abuse of that discretion and inconsistent with the spirit of the Federal Rules.” This Court abuses its discretion by denying my asserted right to amend the complaint. 3DI 98.

20. The new and additional facts and arguments contained in my motions and pleadings must be considered to prevent abuse of discretion, clear error of law, clear error of fact and to prevent manifest injustice against me by denying me the opportunity to be heard to safeguard my exercise of First Amendment rights, creating loss of First Amendment rights and my interest in my ability to work in my profession

21. I respectfully request this Court vacate the District-Order, and remand the case back to the Delaware District Court for review, granting leave to amend the complaint in the amount of 30 days from the date of the order or longer period to allow me to consult with opposing counsel in good faith since I believe the courts and the government are in peril. I believe the courts are our hope of a hero to prevent or reverse an economic crash, which appears to be designed to eliminate the government down the line. I hope the court may use this case to safeguard the Constitutional limits which preserve these United States from demise.

22. The Third Circuit and District Court (hereinafter “Courts”) overlooked the fact I invoked my right to amend the complaint once as a matter of right under FRCP. Though the Court argues my plea to enjoin the case against me as moot. This is capable of repetition and evading review, and has created manifest injustice against me as well as other lawyers and professionals who have legitimate claims for which they should not be punished for making in violation of the First Amendment right to petition, merely because the claims are against the government or government agents. This disparately favors government agents in violation of the Equal protections Clause in their private and official capacity, making it impossible to correct misconduct by just decrees.

23. Court overlooked the fact I have colorable claims against the Delaware Supreme Court and its members in both their professional and personal capacity, under an Ex Parte Young theory as well as equitable claims for prospective and other relief. In Ex Parte Young, 209 U.S. 123, 28 S.Ct. 441, 52 L.Ed. 714 (1908).

24. Delaware brought a disciplinary case against me to conceal and cover up its violation of federal laws and my Constitutional rights, and to punish me for the exercise of Constitutional rights including but not limited to the First Amendment right to petition the courts for disparate treatment by its own members based on religious-political-or poverty animus and procedural due process violations. DI 2-4 My religious beliefs in Jesus outlined in my petitions are the source of Defendants adjudication of disability. They indicate my religious beliefs confuse Defendants. They cite my belief in the Bible as a source of the disciplinary proceeding at Number 7 of the petition. They cite my protected private speech outlined in my private petitions outlining my private

religious beliefs and exercise of religious beliefs in the letter dated August 23, 2023 as the source of concern of disability.

25. The baseless allegations the panel cites, that I allegedly “lack competence to practice law and endanger prospective clients, the public and the orderly administration of justice” is to cover up my petitions to the courts for the governments’ violation of the Constitution and federal law, including its own violations. The State Court intentionally secretly sealed my petitions in violation of my First Amendment right to petition to conceal material evidence in my favor to cover up its own violations of my procedural and substantive due process rights. This concealment is also a procedural due process violation.

26. The Court asserts my legitimate arguments are not cogent, in order to cover up its own misconduct, while further covering up State misconduct by adjudicating me disabled. It may not be convenient to uphold justice. It is easier to orderly administer standardized injustice than to uphold the 1st Amendment applicable to the State via the 14th to accommodate individuals whose religious beliefs or arguments are not standardized to the common norms. Nevertheless, the asserted Constitutional limits supersede eliminating freedom for convenience, productivity and administration of court business. Freedoms are not for sale, or none are free. We are for sale products to bargain favor with foreign and private government partners. My license to practice law was not exchanged for the freedom to belief in Jesus Christ or other Constitutional liberties.

27. This Appellate Court improvidently cites to the mere allegations that my religious beliefs in the petitions are not clear, unfocused [to the Defendants’ aim] and confused the Defendants. My religious beliefs need not be clear, nor do they need to

understand them for me to assert my First Amendment right to genuine religious belief without a government incited substantial burden but for the exercise of religious belief and other First Amendment rights. Moreover, they are relevant to this matter, Kelly v Trump, and the disciplinary proceedings even if Defendants do not find my religious belief in Jesus Christ not money as savior and God reasonable. *Matthew 6:24*.

28. This Court improvidently cites the false allegation my pleadings “were non-complaint with the Court rules.” There is no rule I violated during Kelly v Trump, or the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding.

29. Moreover, the Defendants were non-compliant with rules, preemptive federal law and the preemptive Constitution limits which restrain their conduct within the purview of superseding law. The allegation my defense of religious beliefs contained in my speech “were confusing and unfocused and irrelevant to the issues at hand” are to cover up the very real issues that were relevant to whether the disability proceeding was brought in retaliation for my exercise of the right to petition the State over the course of about 20 years, and my right to private religious-political belief, private-religious exercise of belief, private right to associate based on religious-political belief without being restrained by a mere license to practice law, and right to equal protections, procedural due process and to be free from collusion to intimidate me to cause me to withdraw my petitions in Kelly v Trump in violation of 1985 and 1988, the First Amendment applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment, other federal law, and state claims for intentional or reckless infliction of emotional distress, defamation and other claims.

30. Defendants made a motion by short letter despite my objection to appointed counsel in violation of my First Amendment right to petition. I certainly was permitted to draft a letter, dated December 18, 2022. Albeit, I also drafted motions. DI 1-DI 58.

31. This Court errs as a matter of law and as a matter of fact by claiming the “Delaware Supreme Court's order adjusting her status, claiming she was denied notice, discovery, an impartial judge, an ability to present evidence and witnesses, and the like are beyond the scope of this appeal.” I asserted these claims in legal and factual arguments below, including in my motions of reargument. They are material to the District Court’s clear error of fact, clear error of law and this appeal to prevent manifest injustice against me, and others by creating case law which will chill the exercise of professionals’ religious beliefs under the threat they may no longer buy and sell and die of want.

32. Even if the Court finds the fact my poverty, limited access to research, and poor typing skills create a burden to the Court. The Court has unclean hands as I asserted stays in order to gain time needed to research, draft and proofread petitions without waiver of rights. Moreover, I have not practiced law in years. If this Court finds me disabled, it does not grant the State a right to eliminate fundamental rights of every claimant they deem disabled or dumb, including me.

33. This case presents a unique important Constitutional question as to whether a disciplinary proceeding brought to punish petitions against the government, in violation of the US Amend I right to petition, and right to speech, on subject matter grounds, and the Equal Protections Clause is subject to voidability. Defendants seek to

discipline Colleague Abbott for petitioning against the County and Courts. Are the courts above the law, or will this Court rule judges may be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits 1. Cases and controversies and impeachment, without vindictive retribution for correction.

Dated June 3, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
INACTIVE, not acting as an
attorney on behalf of another
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(302) 493-6693

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

(Words 3,879)

Appendix C



Anthony Scirica

Senior Fellow

Anthony J. Scirica, one of the nation's leading jurists, is a Senior Judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He became a Senior Fellow at Penn Carey Law in 2013 and teaches courses in civil procedure and complex litigation. Judge Scirica was appointed to the Court of Appeals in 1987 and served as Chief Judge from 2003 to 2010. In addition to his service on the bench, he served as a member and then as Chair of the Executive Committee of the United States Judicial Conference, the governing body of the federal judiciary. He currently serves as Chair of its Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability and as a member of the Committee on International Relations. He has previously served as Chair of the U.S. Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure, Chair of the Judicial Conference Working Group on Mass Torts, and as a member of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules and the Multidistrict Litigation Panel.



[View hi-res image](#)

Contact Information

Email ascirica@law.upenn.edu



University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School
3501 Sansom Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
215.898.7483

CENTERS & INSTITUTES

LIBRARY

ACADEMIC CALENDAR

EVENT CALENDAR

ADMINISTRATION

PENN

Contact

Jobs

Support Us



Copyright 2023 University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School.
All Rights Reserved.
[Report Accessibility Issues and Get Help](#) | [The Fine Print](#)

 **Site Login**



Hon. Anthony J. Scirica

U.S. Court of Appeals, Third Circuit

Anthony J. Scirica, Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, is currently the chair of the Executive Committee of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Chief Judge Scirica is the former chair of the Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States and was a member of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules. He was also chair of the Judicial Conference Working Group on Mass Torts. He is a former member of the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation.

Chief Judge Scirica practiced law in Pennsylvania, where he also served as an assistant district attorney and a judge of the Court of Common Pleas. He was a

member of the Pennsylvania Legislature and also served as chair of the Pennsylvania Sentencing Commission. In 1984 he was appointed to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and in 1987, to the Court of Appeals. He is a member of the American Law Institute.

- University of Michigan, J.D., 1965
- Wesleyan University, B.A., 1962
- Fulbright Scholar, Central University Caracas, Venezuela

A person listed as a contributor has spoken or otherwise participated in Federalist Society events, publications, or multimedia presentations. A person's appearance on this list does not imply any other endorsement or relationship between the person and the Federalist Society. In most cases, the biographical information on a person's "contributor" page is provided directly by the person, and the Federalist Society does not edit or otherwise endorse that information. The Federalist Society takes no position on particular legal or public policy issues. All expressions of opinion by a contributor are those of the contributor.

PAST EVENTS

COMMENTARY



Feb
22
2012

Wednesday
12:00 p.m.
EDT

Is the Affordable Care Act Constitutional?

Pennsylvania Student Chapter

University of Pennsylvania Law School
3501 Sansom St
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Speakers:

Richard A. Epstein • Daniel Pollack • Theodore Ruger • Anthony J. Scirica

more

Topics:

Constitution • Federalism • Healthcare • Supreme Court • Federalism & Separation of Powers

more

Sponsors:

Pennsylvania Student Chapter


 In-Person Event

NYU LAW NEWS (/NEWS)

Third Circuit Judge Anthony Scirica outlines potential threats to judicial independence in Madison Lecture

Judge Anthony Scirica of the US Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit considered potential threats to judicial independence and the state of the judiciary's current self-governing accountability system when he delivered the 46th **James Madison Lecture** (<http://www.law.nyu.edu/academics/fellowships/haysprogram/litigationandlectures/jamesmadisonlectures>) on October 22.





Dean Trevor Morrison, Judge Anthony Scirica, and Professor Norman Dorsen

“Judicial independence is at the core of the rule of law,” said Scirica, a former chief circuit judge who also served in the Pennsylvania state legislature. He spoke of the traditional balance of power between the judicial and legislative branches, and described two recent legislative proposals that would, he said, threaten both the judiciary’s “decisional independence”—the ability of judges to render decisions without the interference of political pressures or their own ideologies—and “institutional independence”—the structural autonomy of the judicial branch as coequal to the other two branches.

Historically, he explained, the judiciary has conducted itself with the guidance of both formal structure and informal norms and customs. Congress, which has the authority to create and regulate the lower federal courts, has granted self-regulatory power to the judiciary while retaining an oversight role, Scirica explained. “This accommodation has preserved accountability in a way that insulates the judges from political pressures, but which also depends on a partnership between the two branches in cultivating judicial self-governance.”

From the late 19th through the mid-20th centuries, Congress acted in several ways to improve oversight over the judiciary, first by establishing courts of appeals and ending the practice of Supreme Court justices’ circuit riding, and later by establishing the Judicial Conference of the United States to formalize a self-policing system for matters of judicial misconduct and disability; circuit judicial councils and an administrative office for the courts were also created.

“It is notable that while Congress took these actions responding to concerns of judicial accountability,” said Scirica, “each action gave the judiciary the opportunity to strengthen its internal oversight, obviating the need for increased Congressional

oversight.”

But recent legislative proposals, he asserted, went well beyond previous Congressional acts. The current succession of potential bills arose initially out of concerns about all-expense-paid trips some judges took to privately funded educational seminars, leading to the House Judiciary Committee’s announcing its intention to investigate the effectiveness of judicial self-regulation. In response, then-Chief Justice William Rehnquist appointed a committee, chaired by Justice Stephen Breyer, that recommended mandatory rules of procedure across all circuits as well as a supervisory role for the committee over all misconduct and disability matters.

Scirica highlighted two proposed bills “that could alter the balance of judicial accountability, challenging the federal judiciary’s decisional and institutional independence and our traditional notions of separation of powers.” The first, which has been put forth in every Congressional term since 2006, would create an inspector general for the judiciary. The role would involve investigating not only waste, fraud, and abuse in administrative functions, but also questions of judicial conduct and disability. The Senate version of the bill would include the Supreme Court along with the lower federal courts.

The inspector general bills raise serious constitutional concerns, Scirica argued. “When a political branch of government can direct or influence these investigations, judges may no longer be insulated from encroachment, and the judiciary’s ability to check the power exercised by the other branches of government may be undermined.”

He also described a proposal to regulate the recusal process of Supreme Court justices. “Some may question the propriety of leaving the decision whether to recuse with the judge whose impartiality is being questioned,” he said, “but judges understand and respect the enormity and importance of recusal decisions.”

In the end, Scirica suggested that the purported benefits of both bills did not outweigh their potentially detrimental effects, and that the legislative and judicial branches did not have to be at odds.

“Members of Congress and members of the judiciary share a common bond as trustees of the long-term interests of an essential institution,” he said. “For a very long time now, the coequal branches of the federal government have respected each branch’s

decisional independence. This history is deeply rooted in the American political and constitutional tradition. Congress has honored this legacy by guarding judicial independence and self-governance. These longstanding principles of comity confirm that there is no need to create constitutional tension.”

Watch the full video of the Madison Lecture (1 hr, 10 min):

Posted November 5, 2014

EXPLORE THIS SECTION

© 2023 New York University School of Law.
40 Washington Sq. South, New York, NY 10012.
Tel. (212) 998-6100

Exhibit D

Shift 17: The Sharing Economy

The tipping point: Globally more trips/journeys via car sharing than in private cars

By 2025: 67% of respondents expected this tipping point to have occurred

The common understanding of this phenomenon is the usually technology-enabled ability for entities (individuals or organizations) to share the use of a physical good/asset, or share/provide a service, at a level that was not nearly as efficient or perhaps even possible before. This sharing of goods or services is commonly possible through online marketplaces, mobile apps/location services or other technology-enabled platforms. These have reduced the transaction costs and friction in the system to a point where it is an economic gain for all involved, divided in much finer increments.

Well-known examples of the sharing economy exist in the transportation sector. Zipcar provides one method for people to share use of a vehicle for shorter periods of time and more reasonably than traditional rental car companies. RelayRides provides a platform to locate and borrow someone's personal vehicle for a period of time. Uber and Lyft provide much more efficient "taxi-like" services from individuals, but aggregated through a service, enabled by location services and accessed through mobile apps. In addition, they are available at a moment's notice.

The sharing economy has any number of ingredients, characteristics or descriptors: technology enabled, preference for access over ownership, peer to peer, sharing of personal assets (versus corporate assets), ease of access, increased social interaction, collaborative consumption and openly shared user feedback (resulting in increased trust). Not all are present in every "sharing economy" transaction.

Positive impacts

- Increased access to tools and other useful physical resources
- Better environmental outcomes (less production and fewer assets required)
- More personal services available
- Increased ability to live off cash flow (with less need for savings to be able to afford use of assets)
- Better asset utilization
- Less opportunity for long-term abuse of trust because of direct and public feedback loops
- Creation of secondary economies (Uber drivers delivering goods or food)

Negative impacts

- Less resilience after a job loss (because of less savings)
- More contract / task-based labour (versus typically more stable long-term employment)
- Decreased ability to measure this potentially grey economy
- More opportunity for short-term abuse of trust
- Less investment capital available in the system

Unknown, or cuts both ways

- Changed property and asset ownership
- More subscription models
- Less savings
- Lack of clarity on what "wealth" and "well off" mean

less savings
Elimination of \$ in Bank accounts.

Exhibit E

21-1490 Fw: position on a motion 2913 dd3 Fw: (Number 22-7695)(Application Number 22A981) US Supreme Court appeal Kelly v PA Office of Disciplinary Counsel Re: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)

To: caneel.radinson-blasucci@delaware.gov; zi-xiang.shen@delaware.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Date: Saturday, June 3, 2023 at 03:56 PM EDT

Hello,

I am scared the electricity might go out tonight and tomorrow since there is a weather alert relating to flooding which could affect the internet cables.

I might file the motion Due Monday today or tomorrow because I am scared of the weather preventing my filing.

Per below, I am scared the US Supreme Court is concealing my pleadings since I questioned the eternal salvation of Justice Alito and Thomas in my pleadings. I am genuinely truly concerned and argued legitimate religious beliefs.

We should not have government established court backed religious doctrinal beliefs, for which I and others disagree with. We should maintain individual right to belief without government incited economic, physical or social persecution but for our diverse views which conflict with the government backed and established or approved religious or secular belief.

Should the Third Circuit deny my motion I should like to work with you on ideas to protect your positions, the government and the rule of law from schemed demise. Your pay, bank accounts are schemed to be dismantled into a new economic system which conflicts with my religious beliefs on a greater level than the current system. I do not believe you will be okay. Please do not give into temptation to be controlled by those who entice your immediate desires only to be misled to be used now, to be harmed down the line.

With concern,

Meg

Not acting as a lawyer

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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: Anthony Sodroski <anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us>

Cc: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, June 2, 2023 at 04:57:53 PM EDT

Subject: position on a motion 2913 dd3 Fw: (Number 22-7695)(Application Number 22A981) US Supreme Court appeal Kelly v PA Office of Disciplinary Counsel Re: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

Hi Anthony Sodroski,

The docket is not fixed. I may wait a couple of weeks to allow time for the court to fix it. If it remains disparately hidden, what is your position on a motion for the public to view the docket based on name search. I am hoping the court does not require a motion.

Thank you,

Meg

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dr.

Dagsboro, DE 19939

(302) 493-6693

Not acting as an attorney advocate. Acting as a party defending her First Amendment rights, including her belief in Jesus not money as God. Matthew 6:24

[Docket](#)

Docket



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

From: Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>

To: EFilingSupport <efilingssupport@supremecourt.gov>

Cc: Anthony Sodroski <anthony.sodroski@pacourts.us>; Meg Kelly <meghankellyesq@yahoo.com>; Robert Meek <rmeek@supremecourt.gov>

Sent: Friday, June 2, 2023 at 03:25:34 PM EDT

Subject: (Number 22-7695)(Application Number 22A981) US Supreme Court appeal Kelly v PA Office of Disciplinary Counsel Re: Supreme Court Electronic Filing System

Good afternoon,

I spoke with Danny Bickle earlier because the docket for the filed above referenced matter Case Number 22-7695 did not show up on the US Supreme Court's docket. That has been resolved. Danny indicated there was a system glitch, and I need not file a motion to assert my right as an accused for a public proceeding under the 6th Amendment. Nevertheless, the docket does not come up when I key search the name Meghan Kelly or Meghan Marie Kelly on the docket, whereas my other filings with this Honorable Court do come up, per the attached.

In addition, could you please link the application relating to this case Application Number 22A981 to this docket, docket Number 22-7695 too please?

I am copying Robert Meek too, since I previously made a request to link the two filings relating to the same matter together.

I copy opposing counsel too. Though, I note I sent him the petition with appendices thereto by email in addition to the paper copies. Nevertheless, the pleadings should be accessible on the court's online docket too by name search to preserve my right to a public proceeding as an accused. US Amend I, V, VI.

Could you please fix the additional glitch to please tie my name, Meghan Kelly, the party's name, to the docket as my other filings permit on this court's public docket

Thank you for your help. Have a good weekend.

Very truly,

Meg

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dr.

Dagsboro, DE 19939

(302) 493-6693

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Acting as a private party defending her exercise of First Amendment right to petition in defense of her religious beliefs, not acting as an attorney advocate on behalf of another

On Friday, June 2, 2023 at 02:11:13 PM EDT, <no-reply@sc-us.gov> wrote:

A new docket entry, "Petition for a writ of certiorari and motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed. (Response due July 3, 2023)" has been added for [Meghan Marie Kelly, Petitioner v. Pennsylvania Office of Disciplinary Counsel](#).



Does come up by number.pdf

112kB



Docket Search by Meghan Kelly part 1 of 2.pdf
75.8kB



Docket Search by Meghan Kelly part 2 of 2.pdf
74.3kB

Exhibit C



Join us

Sign in

5 predictions for energy in 2030



Image: REUTERS/Heinz-Peter Bader

10 Nov 2016

Jane Burston

Executive Director, Clean Air Fund

This article is part of the [Annual Meeting of the Global Future Councils](#)

The energy sector has probably undergone more rapid change in the last ten years than in the previous fifty. In a matter of a decade, [shale gas production in the US increased by more than a factor of ten](#), taking US gas imports to their lowest level since the early 80s. [Solar costs have come down so considerably](#) that solar as cheap as regular grid electricity in some parts of the world, despite prices being previously projected to increase over the same period due to poor availability of silicon feedstock. After the shock of the Fukushima disaster, many developed nations are exiting from nuclear, [despite reasonable public and government support before the disaster](#).

This graph shows the time-trend of dry shale gas production for the major shale gas producing formations. It clearly shows that the Marcellus Shale formation got off to a relatively late start but quickly became the national production leader.

Image: Energy Information Administration

With that rate of change in mind, I can confidently predict that the next ten years will be just as unpredictable as the last. Nevertheless there are trends appearing that lead me to think that the headlines we'll be reading about energy in 2030 will be largely positive.

Transporting myself to the future, here is my look at the top five trends that I think, and hope, we can expect to see.

1. A global carbon price is established

China's national emissions trading scheme had some teething problems after [starting in 2017](#), but by the early 2020s the scheme was responsible for fifty percent of China's emissions reductions. The presence of the scheme reduced concerns about carbon leakage and competitiveness in other countries, leading to more countries starting their own emissions trading schemes. All countries included the energy sector in their nascent schemes, with knock-on impact for fossil-energy prices and the attractiveness of investing in renewables worldwide.

After the European Commission decision to rectify the over-allocation of allowances in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme, the European and Chinese schemes were able to link. By the mid 2020s, the new Latin American and Canadian-Californian schemes had begun negotiations for inclusion, paving the way for a global carbon price by 2030. This means that there is one price, applicable all over the world, for the right to emit a tonne of CO2 into the atmosphere - providing a simple and powerful incentive to make the switch to clean energy.

2. Investment into renewables more than quadruples as divestment from coal becomes widespread

In 2013 the [US stopped investing in new coal-fired projects overseas](#), that same year the [World Bank Group limited its financing of new coal projects](#) and in 2015 the [Norwegian Sovereign Wealth Fund pledged its intention to divest from coal](#). Spurred on by increasing focus on the long term risk associated with stranded assets, pension funds and other

institutional investors followed suit throughout the 2020s, switching to investing in renewables on a global scale.

By 2030 there is over \$1.2 trillion annually invested globally in renewables, more than five times the investment into fossil fuels.

Image: renewableenergyhub.co.uk

3. Public engagement in energy soars in areas with community energy ownership

Many developed countries fell well behind their energy efficiency targets in the 2020s due to lack of public engagement. Consequently governments were forced to focus more on decarbonising energy generation, leading to increased financial incentives and reduced regulatory barriers for household and community renewables ownership.

In 2030, individual and community energy generation contributes to more than fifty percent of the energy mix in developed countries, up from less than five percent in 2016. Not only that but research shows that these areas have significantly higher uptake of energy efficiency technologies, vastly reduced energy consumption, and much lower resistance to previously divisive technologies such as onshore wind.

Politicians begin to see community energy ownership as the way to finally get citizens engaged in their energy future and to remove social and cultural barriers to the most affordable renewables.

4. Europe becomes the centre of production for next generation renewables

Having lost much of the production of [silicon solar PV to China](#), European governments saw the potential of advanced manufacturing techniques for gaining a lead in next generation renewables and invested heavily in R&D alongside multinationals.

Europe became the centre of production for thin film solar PV, where reel-to-reel printing with in-process verification enables panels with near-silicon scale efficiency being produced at a fraction of the cost. 3D printing enabled lower cost and faster production of very large wind turbine blades by reducing the complexity and energy intensity of production. In 2030, Europe finds itself at the heart of renewables production once again, with growing markets worldwide for the next generation technologies it is producing.

5. The fossil fuel lobby is (almost) a thing of the past

Widespread electrification of transportation and heat, the move to a smart grid, and the vastly increased need for energy storage created huge opportunities throughout the 2020s for new companies to get involved in the energy sector. As expected, progressive incumbents and start-ups led the field initially, but in 2030 the market is dominated by companies previously strong in other sectors.

Food retailers are using distributed cold storage assets to provide large scale and affordable energy storage, vehicle manufacturers are selling energy management as a service, and IT departments of major companies have moved from a cost centre to a profit centre by utilising their UPSs to provide half hourly grid-balancing.

These established companies know what market conditions they need for their new products to prosper, and how to get them. In 2030, the energy lobby looks very different. Powerful voices once concerned with agricultural subsidies or air quality targets are now asking for cost-reflective energy pricing and the removal of fossil fuel subsidies. The vested interests of the past are finding that their grip on power is in decline.

License and Republishing

Written by

Jane Burston, Executive Director, Clean Air Fund

The views expressed in this article are those of the author alone and not the World Economic Forum.

UpLink - Take Action for the SDGs

Take action on UpLink



Explore context

Energy

Explore the latest strategic trends, research and analysis



Exhibit D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Meghan Kelly)	Civil Action No.: 1:21-1490 (CFC)
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
Disciplinary Counsel Patricia B.)	
Swartz, et.al)	
Defendants.)	

PLAINTIFF MEGHAN KELLY’S 39th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

Comes now Plaintiff Meghan Kelly, I declare and affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct.

1. I was too scared to exceed the three page limit or delay in filing a Motion for an extension of time in the case Meghan Kelly v US District Court, Eastern District of PA, Number 22-3372. So today I filed the attached motion, excluding exhibits to be incorporated herein by reference as Exhibit A.

2. I limited it to three pages within the purview of the order because I was scared, and compelled by the order to eliminate citations and legal arguments, which prejudiced me should it be denied

3. I contacted my case manager early this afternoon. She is aware part of the motion to vacate an Order before the Honorable Third Circuit may be moot in the appeal of the Eastern District court of PA case, since I was compelled due to fear of delay and threat of punishment to reduce the page limit.

4. The government appears to have made a deal to avoid default, but the requirements of deal making to compromise the rights of Americans to be free from bondage to slavery to sin and death in hell by seeking money as savior may be removed.

5. I have an idea to safeguard the governments pay, pensions, and retirement, including social security, and the people's freedom from slavery that is outside of the box the government backed private partners the Federal Reserve and banks create.

6. If I was in government my job would be to protect the freedom of the people to even say Meg Kelly your ideas are bad. Why, there is no freedom if we compel people to adopt the standardized dumbed down forced thoughts and conduct of government backed private or foreign partners.

7. Besides, we get smarter when people care to disagree. We learn form one another by criticism, and healthy disorder. I prefer improvement and liberty to convenience caused by standardization.

8. Per Exhibit B, the World Economic Forum misleads the world by adopting policies to praise healthcare only to eliminate it down the line. The creates alleged agendas which appear to support or cause pollution while also feigning more money or power given to them for investments and control to their partners and central banks will create the solution.

9. I believe just decrees and justice in the courts is the solution. It is my religious belief money is the problem misleading the people to harm, exploitation by unjust gains given to those who control the people by controlling the resources. This eliminates freedom the Constitution protects. US Amend XIII

10. I also believe leaders mislead the people to damnation in the fires of hell by teaching the people mammon, money and material things is the savior to be enslaved by those who control money and material necessities of life.

11. I have a proposal to care for your ability to work and buy and sell by the dictates of your conscience within the limits of the Constitution so as not to enslave others while

protecting your freedom to say my ideas are bad. I attempted to outline it at DI 2. It is the same proposal Presidents Lincoln and Kennedy's executive orders are based on.

12. I believe those who give and receive government grants and contracts to entities are in danger of the fires of hell since the Bible speaks of unjust gains. The money creates an unlevel playing field where the government favors the wealthy, well connected or powerful who have more to barter with as they barter away by substantially burdening the freedoms of others in a fixed, forced, slave economy where people are trained to praise the job providing oppressors for the opportunity to earn mammon as savior in violation of my religious beliefs and arguably in violation of the 5th Amendment equal protections clause and the 13th Amendment against slavery, wherein the people must pay to support grants and contracts through taxes by compelled government force through the 16th Amendment.

13. I do not want people to be enslaved, harm or oppress others or be damned to hell. So, I may not discuss my legal theory in this case, but know should a collapse occur I have a way out proposed.

14. Opposing counsel or a US Attorney General may also prevent a controlled economic crash by going after the foundation before the house is built. They may attack private and public rules, policies and statutes that allow for the new debt credit system under the 2030 agenda to prevent harm to the United States government and the people.

15. The Courts remain my hope of a hero.

16. Per the attached Exhibit C, the US Supreme Court created a case number for my PA Appeal, Number 22-7695 Kelly v PA ODC, but it was not placed on the docket yet.

17. I called the Motions Clerk Danny Bickle. He promptly kindly answered. I explained the docket was not visible, and asked if I was required to file a motion to assert my 6th Amendment right to a public proceeding as an accused in a criminal like proceeding.

18. He responded it was a technical issue. I do not need to draft a motion. He assured me it would be fixed probably in a few hours today. On an aside, I previously asked US Supreme Court Clerk Robert Meek to please link the application 22A981 for an extension of time to my petition for Writ of Certiorari in Kelly v PA ODC. So, he is probably accommodating my request. That may be why the petition is not visible on the US Supreme Court's public docket. I was worried it might be due to the fact I disagreed with a number of the US Supreme Courts I discussed in the petition.

19. I am grateful to talk with staff so I do not needlessly file motions. I believe people staff make the judicial system more just and fair.

20. I have not drafted my motion for a rehearing on the Third Circuit's April 20, 2023 Order yet. I have to start now. It is due by or before June 5, 2023, this Monday.

21. It need not be perfect, but it needs to get done. If I do not assert my rights they are waived.

22. I hope the Third Circuit Court judges do not think I am dumb. I write in haste and am prejudiced by the voluminous amount of battles I fight. I am grateful for the courts, for the opportunity to petition, which is not the guarantee of being heard. US Amend I.

23. I am grateful for all of the staff at the Delaware District Court no matter what happens to me. I am scared and my eyes are tearing up as I draft this.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/2/23

Meghan M. Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693, Not acting as a lawyer

39 Affidavit Update

Under religious protest as declaring and swearing violates God's teachings
in the Bible, I declare, affirm that the foregoing statement is true and correct

Dated: June 2, 2023

Meghan Kelly (printed)


 (signed)

Exhibit A