

Appendix K

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,	§	APPEALS COURT
Respondent.	§	CASE NUMBER: 22:37372
v.	§	DISTRICT COURT
United States District Court,	§	Misc. No. 22-45
Eastern District of Pennsylvania	§	Judge, Paul S. Diamond,

Appellant Meghan Kelly’s motion for reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for a new panel to re-consider motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023

I Meghan Kelly, Esq., pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. R. 2, 35, 40, my 5th Amendment right to a fair trial to defend the exercise of my 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 a different impartial panel or an en banc panel re-hearing on the papers of the Order dated June 20, 2023 on the Court’s denial of my motion to recuse Judges Phipps and Scirica and to prevent the participation of these two judges on the Third Circuit in this matter and related matters. (Exhibit A, Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI”) 3DI-47).

I further move this Court pursuant to US Amendments I, V, and Federal Appellate Rule 2, and its equitable powers for good cause for a new panel to consider my Motion to vacate order at 3DI-37, Motion to correct motion to vacate at 3DI-38, Motion by Appellant to for Leave to Exceed Word Limit, 3DI-40, Motion by Appellant to Correct the Record, at 3DI-41, Motion for time, at 3DI-42, and Motion to stay at 3DI-45, since a grant of a recusal is an admission the proceeding was biased in violation of my 5th Amendment procedural due process right to be heard by a fair impartial proceeding, making the Order attached hereto as Exhibit A-1 void or voidable, as well as the Order at 3DI-48. (3DI-47).

I incorporate herein and reargue by reference the Motion to file unconforming documents at 3DI 17, Motion for reconsideration of Order dated January 17, 2023, with regards denial of waiver of costs, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights at 3DI-19, Motion to vacate an Order at 3D-37, Motion to correct the Motion to Vacate the Order at 3DI-38, Leave for More pages, 3DI-40, Motion to Correct the Record at 3DI-41, Motion for more time at 3DI-42, Motion to recuse 4 judges, 3DI-43, Caveat to Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica wherein I moved him for judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent non-lawyers and non-judges from practicing law or taking the place of people judges without government authority, 3DI-44, Motion for a stay at 3DI-45, and this Court's orders at 3DI 46, 3DI-47, and 3DI-48. I simultaneously file herewith a Motion for leave to exceed the word and page limit, and an affidavit to be incorporated herein in its entirety with exhibits thereto. I also incorporate the entire record below in the District Court, and aver.

1. The proceeding involves questions of exceptional importance which to my knowledge have not previously been addressed by any Court. The answers the Court provides may promote the impartiality of the federal courts and preserve the United States from an unnaturally schemed overthrow. The answers may also preserve not only my Constitutional liberties but the Constitutional liberties of the people from the government backed foreign and private partners elimination of all Constitutional protections under the threat of removing the ability of people to buy and sell but for their exercise of religious belief in Jesus's teachings which do not conform to the secular or religious belief of the government, or the government backed foreign or private partners.

2. The proceeding also involves the important question as to whether anyone with a license to practice law has any First Amendment private freedoms to 1) petition, 2) religious belief, 3) association as a Christian, Catholic, Democrat without removal of the association as a lawyer but for the exercise of the right to petition to safeguard religious beliefs contained in private speech the government finds repugnant, or speech to petition to correct government misconduct or mistakes without retaliation but for the exercise of the 1st Amendment right to petition or 1st Amendment right of private speech contained in petitions relating to grievances caused by government misconduct and mistakes based on subject matter, making the government above the law and lawyers below the law 4) Private speech outlining my religious beliefs in Jesus as God not money or mammon or professional collective gain as God which is the mark of lawlessness leading to damnation in hell, 5) and other private claims and rights from government infringements and violations, including, but not limited to, Equal Protections under the 5th and 14th, 6th Amendment right to self-represent, claims for a fair trial, claims for a right to pleadings in a case against me in Delaware Case Number 541, claims relating to a conspiracy under 1985 to cause me to forgo Kelly v Trump by Delaware supreme Court incited witnesses intimidation and threats, concealing evidence by sealing evidence in my favor to cover up procedural due process and misconduct by the state court, preventing my ability to call witnesses by ignoring my motions where I asserted the right to self-represent, to perform discovery, by scheduling the hearing within fewer days required to subpoena witnesses 8 days as opposed to 10, required by the state disciplinary rules and other harm such as firing two court staff to conceal evidence necessary to my defense, the reciprocal proceedings and this case, and other claims.

3. This case relates to the important question as to whether judges are above the Constitutional application of the rule of law and whether a lawyers in exchange for their license

to buy and sell as an attorneys are fictitiously deemed, despite no meeting of the minds, below the Constitutional application of the rule of law in exercising their private fundamental rights to petition, speak, believe, self-represent, associate, exercise of religious belief.

4. This case relates to the important question as to whether lawyers are below the Constitutional protections, and are in fact punished for upholding the Constitution by seeking to correct judicial misconduct and judicial mistakes to protect private rights, the public and the actual impartial rule of law.

5. This case relates to the important question as to whether federal judges should be corrected within the purview of the Constitutional limits without government compelled waiver of their 5th Amendment right in 1. Cases and controversies and 2. By impeachment, so as not to vitiate the 5th Amendment Equal Protections and right to a fair and impartial forum disciplinary proceedings or regulations of claimants would cause some claimants before the partial forums to suffer. This requires the court entertain and encourage and not chill attorney complaints to correct mistakes and misconduct by the judiciary.

6. Federal Judges affirmed they would “administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich,” even people whose religious-political beliefs judges disagree with, find repugnant or illogical, including me in my private capacity, regardless of my license to practice law. 28 U.S.C.A. § 453

7. This conflict of interest between Judge Scirica and I relates to whether attorney disciplinary proceedings and certain rules and judicial discipline violate the Constitution by requiring officers of the court to defer towards business interests of the courts, attorneys or the professional’s who are charged with discipline, even peers, at the threat of personal punishment instead of the Constitutional application to the rule of law in violation of the supremacy clause.

Lawyers and judges are tempted to adhere to the lesser regulatory laws to protect themselves instead of the Constitutional application of the rule of law to uphold the rights of those they serve, the parties, their clients, the public and their private exercise of fundamental right to religious belief in violation of the Equal Protections Clause of the 5th applicable to the Federal government and the 14th to States by disparately treating claimants whose beliefs conflict with the Disciplinary regulations' purpose.

8. The US Supreme Court appears to enslave the courts to the fickle fads of the public in *Williams-Yulee v. Fla. Bar*, 575 U.S. 433, (2015) decision instead of the impartial Constitutional application to the rule of law by holding, "States have a vital interest in safeguarding public confidence in the fairness and integrity of elected judges; the judiciary's authority depends in large measure on the public's willingness to respect and follow its decisions." This finding creates injustice by legitimizing an illegitimate purpose by finding courts must appease dictates of the mob or the majority at the sacrifice of every individual liberty upon approval of the collective authority of public perceived opinions. Justice is not a matter of popularity. Justice is a matter of truth, leaving leeway for appeal should judges get it wrong. The USSC errs in *Williams v. Pennsylvania*, 579 U.S. 1, (2016) by thinking, "Both the appearance and reality of impartial justice are necessary to the public legitimacy of judicial pronouncements and thus to the rule of law itself." As citizens we are required to uphold the Constitutional positions of congress, the courts and Congress, even if the public disagrees. It is not for the public to decide based on mere appearance. As a Christian I believe Jesus Christ's command not to judge based on appearance but rightly based on truth in *John 7:24*. I believe Jesus is God and Jesus is correct. The Courts err. The potential for actual injustice and the appearance of injustice must be to protect actual parties, not the fancies of the public or the alleged legitimacy of the

courts, and certainly not the rule of law as this promotes sin, aka lawless lusts, to serve partial favor of the courts at the cost of sacrificing the people and their liberty they are charged to protect. 28 U.S.C.A. § 453 There is no social contract by citizens with the government. There is no meeting of the minds. There is a contract with every government employee to accept reduced Constitutional rights in order to uphold the liberties of those they serve, even those the government disagrees with. Id. Justice is never a matter of popular opinion. Injustice occurred when Jesus Christ an innocent man, God himself died on the cross because Pilate allowed the mob to reign instead of the impartial rule of law. (*John 19:4-6*) Not all laws nor all sins lead to eternal death. Jesus indicated those who handed him over committed a greater sin. (*John 19:11*) I commit a sin if I do not correct the court to prevent the believed overthrow of the judiciary. I believe the US Supreme Court gives Congress case law to be used to impeach judges to actually cause public disrepute of judges. I have a duty to protect judges from harmful choices that may remove them from their seats based on fancies not truth but partiality towards fickle public opinion based on mere appearance. I was really upset after I read the judicial nominee questions Judge Phipps responded to because he alleged a duty to mere men's precedent as if they were mini-gods not the Constitutional rule of law. I read a recent decision where USSC told lower courts it must obey it. So, I am realizing judges are stuck. Only lawyers have the power to tell judges they are wrong or upper Courts are wrong as advocates. Lawyers must be permitted to do so, even if the lawyer errs, to prevent actual injustices the courts may not consider without the aid of an attorney advocate. With that said, I am concerned about judges lobbying while acting as attorney advocates on behalf of case law they favor by teaching in schools and speaking at special interest groups where not all of the population agrees with judicial partial views by a judge or special interest groups. Ultimately, I think it is up to lawyers to advocate for justice,

even if the courts disagree with them. Allowing regulation or discipline of federal judges creates injustice and should be stopped, while disagreement by attorney advocates should be permitted. Judges must not act as attorneys to grant themselves favor at the cost of prejudicing the public and lawyers in their public and professional capacity.

9. Judge Scirica has a conflict of interest with my case I was not aware of until recently. Judge Scirica chairs the Committee on Judicial Conduct and Disability. (*Kelly v Trump*, 21-1490, *Kelly v Swartz*, Civil Rights Docket Item (“CRDI”) CVDI 149.)

10. I contest the federal judicial disciplinary rules Judge Scirica drafts on Constitutional grounds. I oppose the elimination of life time limits on US Supreme Court justices and believe district court and Circuit Court judges should have life time appointments to prevent them from the temptation to normalize injustice by partiality to the Disciplinary rules as opposed to the preempting Constitutional application of the law, on religious grounds as a party of one with religious beliefs in God’s command against favoritism and for justice in the courts.

11. I declared my belief regulating the Court violates the constitutional rights of citizens the court serves, including me as a party of one, and allows for the schemed overthrow to occur in the DE District Court prior to discovering the conflict between Judge Scirica and I. Regulating the Court through disciplinary rules guarantees the partiality of the Court to the interests of those who discipline them instead of the impartial application of the rule of law. (Examples, (CRDI) 23, concerning my belief only the courts may prevent an economic crash and an overthrow of our government, CRDI-53,-55,56, 78, 95, 102, 104, 114, 127, 129, 131, CRDI 149-162). Favoritism towards those who serve the alleged professions’ collective convenience, productivity or the individual judge’s future or current seat or highly esteemed position creates unfair proceedings when conflicts arise. I seek to declare the disciplinary rules Judge Scirica

drafts are unlawful by amending my complaint in the civil rights proceeding to make that argument . I included certain arguments against certain DE Attorney Disciplinary rules and the Attorney Disciplinary proceedings I incorporate herein by reference but intent to reserve my right to include more arguments in the Civil rights proceeding, even if on appeal to the US Supreme Court in Kelly v Swartz at 3DI-43-8, 3DI-43-9, 3DI 43-10. Judge Scircia denied me the opportunity to be heard on my arguments, by denying my right to amend to contest certain state rules. Attached hereto please find my Motion for ECF rights in the District Court below, which I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety, wherein I contested an additional, different Delaware Disciplinary rule I wish to include in a complaint Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 7(d). DI 31.

12. The fact I argued on the record in the civil rights case, my desire to eliminate or prevent disciplinary rules of federal judges and the United States Supreme Court creates a conflict of interest. The appearance of a conflict requires a recusal and a new panel who is not swayed by Judge Brilliant mind and perceived expertise in a subject I disagree

13. I seek to amend my complaint in the civil rights case to include Constitutional arguments against the state disciplinary rules and proceedings against attorneys. I incorporate some not all of my proposed arguments against rules I proposed to the Delaware District Court at DI 58, and two state motions, incorporated herein at 3DI-43-8, 3DI-43-9, 3DI 43-10.

14. I oppose attorney self-regulation and third party professional regulation through professional boards on Constitutional grounds, on 1st Amendment religious grounds, on grounds the rules violate the Constitutions' 5th and 14th Amendment right of Equal Protections and procedural due process.

15. Standardized compelled practice eliminates free will needed to protect Constitutional freedoms of clients and professionals who do not conform to the standards. Standards makes professional practices above the law by deference of the courts to the standards even when such standards harm, oppress, kill, steal and destroy human life and health for the bottom line. The standards create partiality to profit, productivity not justice.

16. The conflict of interest between Judge Scirica's interest in carefully drafting federal disciplinary laws that mimic the disciplinary laws and disciplinary proceedings I seek to declare unconstitutional in the civil rights case, and in this case is prejudicial as a matter of fact, a matter of law as to create manifest injustice against me should the Order not be overturned.

18. "The Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause may sometimes demand recusal even when a judge has no actual bias." *Citing, Rippo v. Baker*, 580 U.S. 285, 137 S. Ct. 905, 197 L. Ed. 2d 167 (2017).

19. Recusal is required under the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause because "objectively speaking, the probability of actual bias on the part of the judge or decisionmaker is too high to be constitutionally tolerable." *Id.* In my case the probability that Judge Scirica would deny me the mere opportunity to be heard to contest the disciplinary rules he works on, or mirror the rules he works on, is too great as to cause actual in addition to apparent partiality to my claims and future claims, and past claims in other cases.

20. It is especially notable as two forums, the USSC and the DC ODC appeared to accept my argument the reporting requirements violate the 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination.

21. It was clear error of law for Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps to fail to disqualify themselves in this proceeding. A reasonable person would question the partiality of both Judge

Scirica and Judge Phipps under the facts of this case. “[A] reasonable person, knowing the relevant facts, would expect that the [Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps knew of circumstances creating an appearance of partiality, notwithstanding finding that the judge was not actually conscious of those circumstances. 28 U.S.C.A. § 455(a). *Liljeberg v. Health Servs. Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 108 S. Ct. 2194, 100 L. Ed. 2d 855 (1988)

21. “The operative inquiry is objective: whether, ‘Considering all the circumstances alleged,’ *Rippo*, at 907, ‘the average judge in [the same] position is likely to be neutral, or whether there is an unconstitutional potential for bias,’” *Citing, Isom v. Arkansas*, 205 L. Ed. 2d 373, 140 S. Ct. 342, 343–44 (2019) *Citing, Williams v. Pennsylvania*, 579 U.S. 1 (2016).

22. Considering all of the circumstances a reasonable person would find no judge in the position of Judge Scirica could ignore the potential unconstitutional bias based on the fact I am attacking his personal, hard work regardless of the fact he may not have a pecuniary stake other than the esteemed position of drafting the rules that regulate his peers which I seek to argue are unconstitutional in another case and potentially this case to prevent standardization of the court to an extent to allow the automation of the Court like certain courts in China have become peopleless, per the attached article without an exhibit page. ¹ Those whose exercise of individual

¹ *Isom v. Arkansas*, 205 L. Ed. 2d 373, 140 S. Ct. 342, 344 (2019) (At the same time, the Court has acknowledged that “[a]llowing a decisionmaker to review and evaluate his own prior decisions raises problems,” *Withrow*, 421 U.S. at 58, n. 25, 95 S.Ct. 1456, perhaps because of the risk that a judge might “‘be so psychologically wedded to his or her previous position’ ” that he or she will “ ‘consciously or unconsciously avoid the appearance of having erred or changed position.’ ” *Williams*, 579 U. S., at —, 136 S.Ct., at 1906 (*quoting Withrow*, 421 U.S. at 57, 95 S.Ct. 1456). And it has warned that a judge's “personal knowledge and impression” of a case may sometimes outweigh the parties’ arguments. *In re Murchison*, 349 U.S. 133, 138, 75 S.Ct. 623, 99 L.Ed. 942 (1955).)

Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 114 S. Ct. 1147, 127 L. Ed. 2d 474 (1994)(“Extrajudicial source is not the only basis for establishing disqualifying bias or prejudice;

not collective liberties which do not fall within the purview of the standards through automation in the peopless courts in China are not free, but compelled to mob rule for the convenience of court business.

23. In *Laird v. Tatum*, 409 U.S. 824, 93 S. Ct. 7, 34 L. Ed. 2d 50 (1972), Justice Rehnquist held that “Supreme Court justice has a duty to sit where not disqualified which is equally as strong as the duty to not sit where disqualified. (Per Mr. Justice Rehnquist, on motion to recuse.) 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 453, 455.

24. Thus, I requested an e banc hearing on the paper so as to remove any misplaced belief Judge Scirica would violate some dual duty. Merely because I seek to litigate against the rules he works on as Chair should not be taken as an attack upon him.

25. I seek an en banc hearing, **on the paper**, in order not to vitiate my access to the courts by causing a substantial burden upon my access to the courts due to costs, religious beliefs against debt for transcripts, health, and compelled violations of involuntary servitude to pay off debt I incorporate herein by reference in 3DI-19, and in the attach pleading filed in another court to be heard on the papers. I also made this request for an en banc hearing in the Civil case, where unfortunately Judge Scirica presided on all unconstitutional rulings.

26. The US Supreme Court held in *Williams v. Pennsylvania*, 579 U.S. 1, 14, 136 S. Ct. 1899, 1909, 195 L. Ed. 2d 132 (2016):

“Having determined that Chief Justice Castille's participation violated due process, the Court must resolve whether Williams is entitled to relief. In past cases, the Court has not had to decide the question whether a due process violation arising from a jurist's failure to recuse amounts to harmless error if the jurist is on a multimember court and the jurist's vote was not decisive. See Lavoie, *supra*, at 827–828, 106 S.Ct. 1580 (addressing “the question whether a decision of a multimember tribunal must be vacated because of the participation of one member who had an interest in the outcome of the

it is the only common basis, but it is not the exclusive one, since it is not the exclusive reason a predisposition can be wrongful or inappropriate. 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 144, 455”)

case,” where that member's vote was outcome determinative). For the reasons discussed below, the Court holds that an unconstitutional failure to recuse constitutes structural error even if the judge in question did not cast a deciding vote.”

27. Accordingly participation and recusal of Judge Scirica in the civil rights case and in this case, even if he was not the deciding vote required is required as a matter of law, as a matter of fact creating manifest injustice against me by vitiating my fundamental rights including the First Amendment right to petition the courts to demand the courts uphold my fundamental rights instead of exhibiting unlawful partiality and deference to sister courts in violation of the 5th Amendment Equal Protections components by courts protecting their own interest and not the Constitutional preempting liberties of the people they swore an oath to serve. I argue the courts must not punish lawyers for petitioning to safeguard Constitutional laws that protect claimants and their own private acts, but must allow it to protect the impartial rule of law, prevent regulation and preserve these United States from schemed overthrow.

28. Judge Scirica and Judge Phipps abused their discretion by not recusing themselves committing clear error of law, error of fact, creating manifest injustice against me by the Order, dated June 20, 2023 attached hereto as Exhibit A. It is especially damaging since Judge Phipps signed the Orders on June 30, 2023. Thus, I require a new panel or an en banc panel to please review this motion to eliminate the appearance of a conflict of interest, and an actual conflict of interest, so as not to deny me procedural Due process and vitiating of my fundamental rights. US Amend I, V, VI, XIII, XIV.

29. This law suit arises based on my private exercise of the 1st Amendment right to petition in a law suit against former President Donald J. Trump (“Trump”) to dissolve the establishment of government religion that created and continues to create a substantial burden upon my religious exercise. I incorporate herein by reference the pleadings I filed in *Kelly v.*

Trump at Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI”) 3DI21-4. I am a Christian, who associates as a Catholic who places her faith in God, not the church or priest as God. See, 1 *Corinthians* 2:5, *Matthew* 23:8, *John* 14:1.

30. The State of Delaware admitted it placed my license to practice law on inactive disabled but for my private-exercise of the First Amendment rights to petition in *Kelly v Trump*, exercise religious belief, exercise of belief, association, my private First Amendment right of protected speech to outline my genuinely held religious beliefs in *Kelly v Trump*. See, DE Disciplinary petition at 7 at 3DI21-6, August 23, 2021 letter 3DI21-7. Though evidence shows they also colluded based on my private exercise of the right to petition concerning bar dues, and private right to petition both the Chancery Court and Delaware Supreme Court concerning procedural due process defects caused by its own members and agents. Id. See, A-4, *Appellant’s Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to rein in its arms through its agents from unlawfully pressuring appellant to forgo or impede her case to protect her free exercise of religion by relief it deems just, and exhibits thereto, Exhibit 55 of the brief below, the December 1, 2020 letter regarding due process concerns to the Master, and the October 19, 2020 letter to the Master regarding the fact I am pro se, not represented by counsel, and, A-5. Appellant’s Motion for the Delaware Supreme Court to require the recusal of the honorable Chief Justice Collins J. Seitz, Junior in this matter, exhibits thereto, proof of payment of bar dues, emails to Mark Vavala confirming he did not incite the investigation, Letter from the Court in response to my request for exemption of bar dues for all attorneys facing hardship, Feb. 5, 2021 request for relief from bar dues, my concerns relating to recent US Supreme Court cases. Citing, (3DI-21-4.)*

31. I discovered the Delaware Supreme Court incited its arms to attack me during *Kelly v Trump* in an attempt to cause me to forgo my First Amendment right to petition since the

Delaware arms, Judge Kenneth Clark of the CCP, and DE-Lapp communicated information only the Delaware Supreme Court had as reasons for the attacks, namely my bar due petitions.

32. Per the attached email I sent to Judge Diamond the e-filing service showed the DE Court also sought to fix the decision on appeal in *Kelly v Trump* to prevent the USSC from seeing the alleged procedural due process violations by DE Supreme Court members and staff. (Exhibit B) Then the State-Court fired staff to cover up its own misconduct while preventing me from subpoenaing the witnesses to conceal the cover up by affording me 8 days when the rules require 10 to subpoena witnesses for hearings. The state court denied me the right to self-represent, notice, a fair opportunity to be heard and other denials too numerous to include herein. I attach my appellate brief in the civil rights case, Exhibit C, the motion for reargument of denial of my appeal, Exhibit D, and my Reply in the original disciplinary proceeding as Exhibit E and incorporate herein in its entirety for more detail.

33. The attached letter, labeled Exhibit F shows the Delaware Supreme Court participated in witness tampering, vitiating my First Amendment right to petition, First Amendment right to speech, religious belief, association, procedural due process and other violations which occurred during *Kelly v Trump* by copying the Disciplinary Board Administrator Karlis Johnson on my request to excuse notary requirements during the global pandemic, especially since President Trump had covid at the time of my request, dated October 20, 2020.

34. The DE Disciplinary proceeding was also brought to conceal the DE Supreme Court's misconduct in sealing petitions where I allege the DE Court committed violations of my right to petition in violation of procedural due process without providing me, a party in *Kelly v*

Trump notice or an opportunity to be heard to prejudice my case, and schemed state disciplinary case. (3DI 21-5)

35. This reciprocal case was brought based on Delaware adjudicating me disabled, but for religious speech outlined in my Religious freedom restoration Act petitions in Kelly v trump.

36. It is my private religious belief President Trump reflects the image of the devil by business greed at the cost of human life and liberty unrestrained by love written on his heart or the just rule of law to prevent him from oppressing, enslaving, controlling, killing, stealing and destroying human life or liberty to get as much as he can for as little as he can.

37. It is my private genuine religious belief Trump teaches people to reflect the image of the devil to give into temptations to do what they want, chase happiness, serve lawless lusts, their own desires or the desires of their own family or people, to the extent they oppress and harm others to serve their own, causing harm here and loss of eternal life unrestrained by love written on the hearts of the saved or the just rule of law.

38. I believe judges may choose to save not only the victims of other people's sins, but the eternal lives of wrongdoers by transforming them into right doers, by no longer sacrificing human life and liberty to serve business greed. *Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23.*

39. Former President Trump nominated Judge as nominees to become US Supreme Court justices. President Trump is running for President in 2024. I believe Trump will likely be reelected.. Trump will likely nominate Judge Phipps again should President Trump be elected and another justice retires.

40. My religious belief President Trump served lawlessness, also known as sin, under the color of religious and secular law presents a conflict of interest with Judge Phipps' personal stake in supporting Trump to gain a seat at the highest Court. Trump may grant him a life-long appointment as US Supreme Court justice. This creates at least the appearance of a conflict so great a reasonable person would question the prejudice and notice the bias to violate my right to a fair proceeding and due process. US Amend V.

41. Merely because I note this inherent temptation to rule against me to serve his own political position should not be taken as a negative reflection upon Judge Phipps. The conflict of interest in this case would tempt the common man to corrupt justice unconsciously.

42. Judge Phipps conflict is exacerbated by the fact I seek to void Kelly v Trump due to procedural due process violations that shock the conscience to allow for another law suit against Trump.

43. Judge Phipps may be offended by my religious beliefs contained in my petitions, or at least create the appearance of bias by the temptation to be partial towards the one who may and will likely benefit him. This creates the appearance of impropriety and possible actual impropriety I seek to prevent.

44. I respect Judge Phipps, but this case requires his recusal. My complaints about President Trump's misconduct in profaning my God's Word for his own vanity should not be attributed to this well respected judges. Nevertheless, the appearance of conflict is too great to allow Judge Phipps to judge me in this case. Judge Phipps violated due process and my right to an impartial proceeding by participating in the Orders, dated June 30, 2023.

45. “[Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica’s] unconstitutional failure to recuse, in violation of due process, constitutes structural error not subject to harmless-error review, even if the judge in question did not cast a deciding vote on a multimember court.” *Williams v. Pennsylvania*, 579 U.S. 1, 136 S. Ct. 1899, 195 L. Ed. 2d 132 (2016). However Judge Phipps appeared to so participate making the violation even more grave.

46. “A multimember court must not have its guarantee of neutrality undermined, for the appearance of bias demeans the reputation and integrity not just of one jurist, but of the larger institution of which he or she is a part.” *Id.*

47. This I require both judges be recused.

34. Under objective standards in my case, “ the probability of actual bias on the part of the [Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica] is too high to be constitutionally tolerable.” (*Rippo v. Baker*, 137 S. Ct. 905, 907 (2017), Citing *Withrow v. Larkin*, [421 U.S. 35, 47](#), [95 S.Ct. 1456, 43 L.Ed.2d 712](#) (1975); *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 872 (2009)). “The *Tumey* Court concluded that the Due Process Clause incorporated the common-law rule that a judge must recuse himself when he has “a direct, personal, substantial, pecuniary interest” in a case. *Ibi*” *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 876 (2009). In this matter, Judge Scirica;s personal interest in opposition to my claims is too prejudicial to my case to afford me a fair proceeding. US Amend I, V.

35. ““A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process.” *Murchison, supra*, at 136, [75 S.Ct. 623](#)” *Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 876 (2009). The Court cannot grant a fair proceeding with Judge Scirica’s participation, and this Court violated due process by allowing Judge Phipps participation in the June 30, 2023 Orders.

36. “The Court asks not whether a judge harbors an actual, subjective bias, but instead whether, as an objective matter, the average judge in his position is likely to be neutral, or whether there is an unconstitutional potential for bias” *Williams v. Pennsylvania*, 579 U.S. —, —, —, 136 S.Ct. 1899, 1905, 195 L.Ed.2d 132 (2016) (“ (internal quotation marks omitted).”); See, *Rippo v. Baker*, 137 S. Ct. 905, 907 (2017) (“we did not hold that a litigant must show as a matter of course that a judge was “actually biased in [the litigant's] case”)

37. Should this Court find Justice Phipp’s actual participation and Judge Scircica’s potential involvement violated due process, I seek relief from this court to prevent needless waste of judicial resources.

38. The “Federal Rules of Civil Procedure treat orders that are entered without due process as void, permitting reopening of the case. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 5; *Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule* 60(b)(4). The panel’s inclusion of Judge Phipps violates Due process. US Amend I, V.

39. Reopening the case would be needless should this court grant this motion on recusal.

40. To prevent the need to reopen the case, I move this Honorable Court pursuant to US Amendments I, V, and Federal Appellate Rule 2, for good cause for a new panel to consider my Motion for a Rehearing on Denial of the original Appellate Brief find out Third Circuit Docket Item (“3DI” 3DI-199).

41. Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure Rule 2 provides, “On... a party's motion, a court of appeals may for good cause-suspend any provision of these rules in a particular case and order proceedings as it directs.” Fed. R. App. P. 2

42. Since granting my motion for a rehearing on the denial of the recusal of Judge Phipps and Scirica would show a procedural Due Process violation of my right to a fair trial occurred by requiring a recusal, I would be left without a remedy before this Court unless the Court suspends the rules of Rules “for good cause” to uphold my right to a fair and impartial forum to safeguard my exercise of fundamental rights without punishment and elimination of my liberties and property interests in my licenses to buy and sell as an attorney but for my religious belief in Jesus Christ as God, not mammon, money and material gain as God. Citing Bible, *Matthew 6:24*. Appealing the Matter before the US Supreme Court would be a waste of resources for all should this Honorable Court require the recusal of Judge Phipps and Scirica. Thus, this Court must suspend the rules to prevent waste of resources and likely elimination of my Constitutional rights

43. I have shown good cause to suspend the Rules to allow a different panel to consider my Motion to vacate order at 3DI-37, Motion to correct motion to vacate at 3DI-38, 3DI-40, Motion by Appellant to Correct the Record, at 3DI-41, Motion for time, at 3DI-42, and Motion to stay at 3DI-45, should this Court grant my motion for reargument to recuse Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica. Id. Safeguarding my Constitutional rights also shows good cause.

44. I move for a panel on the papers only since poverty creates a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and the cost for a transcript and to travel are so great under my circumstances as to deny me the First Amendment right to petition to defend my exercise of my Constitutional rights.

45. I also do not feel well. I had surgery as a teenager I apprised this Court and every court of and assert my religious exercise of belief to the right to live.

46. I move this panel for reconsideration on the papers only in order to sustain my health. I am required to take time to drink inordinate amounts of water and rest that the average person does not require to stay alive. I require time to sustain my health. A hearing would take away time.

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants this Motion.

Dated July 3, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
Inactive license
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(6272 words) PRO SE

Appendix L

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,	§	APPEALS COURT No. 22-3372
Respondent, Appellee	§	
v.	§	DISTRICT COURT No. 22-45
United States District Court,	§	District Court Judge
Eastern District of Pennsylvania	§	Judge Paul S. Diamond

Appellant Respondent Meghan Kelly’s Motion for leave to exceed the word and page limit in her motion for reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for a new panel to re-consider motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023

I Appellant Meghan Kelly, pursuant to the Court’s equitable powers and Federal Rules Appellate Procedure Rule 2, right to Equal Protections, a fair proceeding and access to the courts, given physical limitations I noticed this court on, poverty and religious beliefs against debt, and assertion of my right against involuntary servitude under the 13th Amend, and time constraints, and any other applicable rule this Court deems just move this Court to permit me to exceed the word limit in my Motion for leave to exceed the word and page limit in her motion for reconsideration of Order Dated June 20, 2023 denying the recusal of Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica and Pursuant to FRAP Rule 2 for a new panel to re-consider motions denied by this Court on June 30, 2023 (hereinafter “motions”).

1. I Meghan Kelly, for good cause, respectfully request, the Word limit be excused in the above captioned Motions.
2. I filed the motions under great duress, and have limited means and time to research, due to health and poverty conditions creating a substantial Burden.
3. This Court rendered 6 Judgments against me on June 30, 2023, I have until July 14, 2023 to file Motions for reconsiderations on the 6 Orders. I do not have access to lexis or Westlaw research at home. In order to gain access I must go to the law library. The law library is closed and I have limited means to pay for gas in order to travel the round trip which is about 40

miles. I do not know how I will have time to research and draft motions in light of the heavy 4th of July traffic, costs and my limited means. I am trying to do so while not waiving my rights before your Honorable Court, and other forums.

4. I also must appeal a June 30, 2023 decision in Kelly Swartz, DE District Court Number 21-1490, Third Circuit Number 21-3198, the Civil rights case relating to similar subject matter and additional facts and issues or otherwise seek to sustain my case against the Delaware Supreme Court, Delaware Disciplinary Counsel and Board for equitable relief, damages and nominal damages.

5. The amount of words I request I exceed the 3,900 limitation in my is 2,378, in the amount of 6,272 words.

6. I thought about bifurcating the motions into two motions, but I do not feel well at all, and do not have time in light of the fact I must file a Motion for reargument on the unexpected order or orders by this Court, dated Friday June 30, 2023 by Friday July 14, 2023, pending this court's determination on the papers filed herewith. Obviously, if this Court grants a new panel to review all of the Motions contained in 3DI-47 I may not be required to file motions for reargument on the same by July 14, 2023. 3DI 47-48.

7. Receiving the three Orders from the Third Circuit during a holiday weekend when loved ones were visiting nearby was tough. I am not allowed to upset my family and get into trouble when I talk about thins. Then, I get into trouble for not talking about things. I told my parents and they threatened to cut off my phone again and to kick me out. I love them, but they are freaked out by all of this.

8. I am reasonably emotionally distraught too.

9. I thought about drafting a motion indicating I might just take a disability inactive order as I require time and a stay in order not to be compelled to violate my right to private religious belief to sustain and restore my health and religious exercise of life, and to safeguard my right to petition in fairly in this case and other cases, so as not to be compelled to draft subpar pleadings to prejudice me by government force, not free choice.

10. I do not have time to draft a brief, and to fight this case while I will overturn the civil rights case and fight multiple Defendants in the civil case which will require all my resources. I do not know what I will do. It appears I have limited time until July 14, 2023 to figure it out. I am not acting in bad faith. I am asserting my rights imperfectly under government compelled conditions in order not to waive my rights.

11. If I do not overturn the Order in this case, I will likely have 6 new law suits against me based on a new order, or at least the USSC, since their Rule 8 does not include disability only a lawsuit for discipline.

12. I am prejudiced at the threat of 6 new law suits if I do nothing. I need time to research and think instead of being compelled to act against my will to harm myself for the pleasure of the court who is charged to uphold asserted, not waived Constitutional rights for all, even those they disagree with, even me.

13. Even appealing this law suit to the USSC places me in danger. I think that is why the USSC denied my request to link Appeal 22-7695 with application 22A981 in order not to waste judicial resources to begin needless additional law suits by the USSC and other courts.

14. This case arising from reciprocal discipline of a Delaware Order placing my license on inactive/disability relates to a petition I brought against former-President Donald J.

Trump under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to protect my exercise of belief in Jesus Christ without government sponsored persecution in the state of Delaware.

15. I had to assert my right to live and not die for the sinful vanity of others when I had the means to go to the gym to care for my health and life by drinking gallons of waters. Now I am without means and time required. I am suffering. I provided doctors' notes and pictures previously. My vision is becoming blurry again. I do not want to lose my eye sight because of denied requests for time required I to sustain my life. The severe dehydration I have due to a surgery and due to the exacerbation the pressures of the government has placed upon me endangers my health and life.

16. The Court has 6 different cases worth of information in the voluminous pleadings in both Third Circuit matters. I am overwhelmed. I imagine the court the Court is overwhelmed of the 20 years of DE Court religious discrimination and place of origin discrimination against me and the voluminous amount of information relating to this case. Yet, the Court must fulfill its duty by granting me an actual opportunity to be heard in accordance with the 5th Amendment procedural due process requirement by reviewing the voluminous pleadings, without violating the Equal protections component of the 5th, based on bulk of asserted rights and evidence.

17. I think I must request a stay to grant this court time it requires and time I require. I am still not sure what I will do. I have until July 14, 2023. I do not feel no well at all. I do not want to die. When I affirmed in a letter to the Eastern District Court I collapsed due to dehydration at the post office, the Court cared not if I died.

18. I actually got the shingles in the DE disciplinary proceeding and was forced to attend sick while being denied my asserted right to subpoena witnesses while the Court lied before God and men saying I had time to call them when the rule says you must call witnesses

within 10 days. There was only 8 days before the hearing, which made it an impossibility to adhere to the time constraints.

19. I have not waived my right to a fair proceeding in any case given my limitations, poverty, religious belief, and stated right to religious belief to care for my health and not die. I provided this court with my health records unashamed relating to the bad health care I received which has weakened me for life requiring I take time to alleviate the harm in order not to die for the sinful vanity of men, for wicked lawless lusts the desire for convenience, productivity, profit and avoidance of costs. I believe those lusts reflect the mark of the beast in the Bible. Human sacrifice for material gain is always naughty. It serves greed not humanity. If business, even the courts own business, is left unrestrained from killing, oppressing, harming and stealing life and health to sustain problems, position and profit than businesses are above the law, and there is no free man or women. We are just slaves to serve the way to hell unrestrained by love written on the hearts of men or just decrees by the courts to save lives and eternal lives.

20. I am a child of God, a believer in the Word which is not the Bible but in the holy spirit leading certain people in the bible and people today. I believe in God the father son and holy spirit. My God will exist even if all bibles are eliminated or changed. The elimination or the desecration of the Bible appears to be part of a global agenda in decades to come. My God is, even if no Bibles exist. With the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, God's law guiding us not to be tempted by lusts to love God and one another is written on the hearts of men to accept or reject according to the inspired prophesies of Jeremiah in Chapter 31. These are my religious beliefs. I do not force the force the court to adopt my religious beliefs. Yet I do recognize this court may save lives and eternal lives and is our hope of a hero by "justice in the courts." Justice is never vengeance, even if it disagrees with my private beliefs. Citing *Amos*

5:15. Vengeance is God's not ours, and those who take vengeance on others or use people as an example by punishing them disparately in violation of the Equal Protections Clause to compel the populace to conform to the will of the state or government backed partners violate my God's law on impartiality and against favoritism. Favoritism is not excused by favoring people in associations and disfavoring those who disagree with associations we are members in. See, *Exodus* 23:6 ("You shall not deny justice to the poor in their lawsuits."); *Deuteronomy* 1:17 ("Show no partiality in judging; hear both small and great alike. Do not be intimidated by anyone, for judgment belongs to God."); *Deuteronomy* 16:19 ("Do not deny justice or show partiality. Do not accept a bribe, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and twists the words of the righteous."); *Isaiah* 10:1 ("Woe to those [meaning damned to hell are those should they not repent] who enact unjust statutes and issue oppressive decrees, 2to deprive the poor of fair treatment and withhold justice from the oppressed of My people, to make widows their prey and orphans their plunder.").

21. The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides: "No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . ." U.S. Const. amend. V.

22. Due Process relates to the administration of justice, and thus the due process clause acts as a safeguard from arbitrary denial of life, liberty, or property by the Government outside the sanction of law. I

23. I assert my right to due process for the exercise of my private First Amendment right to religious belief, exercise of belief, property interests in my license, association, petition, speech and Equal protections in the form of an accommodation by allowing additional words and pages for good cause due to substantial hardship and lack of time to exercise the 1st Amendment

Right to petition fairly in this case, as I also seek to safeguard my rights in other cases without government compelled but forced waiver.

24. The Delaware original disciplinary case and this reciprocating case represents examples of government persecution based on my exercise of religious beliefs, contained in my speech in my petitions to the Delaware Courts.

25. In the August 23, 2021 letter DE Disciplinary Counsel indicated my religious beliefs contained in my speech contained in my private-religious petitions is the source of their concern of my mental fitness to practice law. In the DE ODC's petition at 7, the Disciplinary Counsel points to my references to the bible e, as evidence of a disability. Third Circuit Docket Items ("3DI") 3DI-3, page 34, and 3DI21-4.

26. This Reciprocal Order by Appellee is based on the Delaware Order I seek to overturn based on lack of subject matter jurisdiction since the DE Supreme Court acted as witness, judge and prosecutor's assistant.

27. This Court has inherent equitable powers over their process to prevent abuse, oppression, and injustice. *Gumbel v. Pitkin*, 124 U.S. 131 (1888). This Court must grant my request to prevent injustice by denial of words which essentially denies me the opportunity to be heard in defense of my religious speech reflecting my religious beliefs in my Freedom of Religion Restoration Act Complaint against former President Donald J. Trump. US Amend I, V. 3DI 21-4 pages 126 through 248.

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

29. Nevertheless, the Constitutional issues must be addressed in this case as well as the civil rights case to protect not only me, but others beyond me from professional government backed persecution based on exercise of fundamental rights.

30. A professional's private exercise of First Amendment exercise of speech, association, religious belief, religious exercise, and the right to petition to defend the exercise of Constitutional freedom in their private capacity must not be eliminated in exchange for a mere license.

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

32. Nor should I be punished for my exercise of the right to access to the courts to defend my religious beliefs because the original disciplinary Court finds my citations to the Bible and religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions illogical. See, *Brief of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, the Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission, the International Mission Board, and Dr. R. Albert Mohler, Jr. as amici curiae in Support of Petitions before the US Supreme Court by the Little Sisters of the Poor Home for the aged, Denver Colorado, et.al, Petitioners v. Sylvia Matthews Burwell, Secretary of Health and Human Serviced, et. al, No.15-105, 2015 WL 5013734 (US).*(The Court allowed references to the bible in other RFRA petitions); See, *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 682. ("Courts have no business addressing whether sincerely held religious beliefs asserted in a RFRA case are reasonable.") *Also see, Africa v. Pennsylvania*, 662 F.2d 1025, 1025 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 456 U.S. 908 (1982); ("Judges are not oracles of theological verity, and the founders did not intend for them to be declarants of religious orthodoxy.); *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872, 887, ("Repeatedly

and in many different contexts, we have warned that courts must not presume to determine the place of a particular belief in a religion or the plausibility of a religious claim.”); *Cantwell v. State of Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 60 S. Ct. 900, 84 L. Ed. 1213 (1940); *Remmers v. Brewer*, 361 F. Supp. 537, 540 (S.D.Iowa 1973) (court must give "religion" wide latitude to ensure that state approval never becomes prerequisite to practice of faith); *Presbyterian Church in U. S. v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church*, 393 U. S. 440, 450, (1969) (holding that “the First Amendment forbids civil courts from” interpreting “particular church doctrines” and determining “the importance of those doctrines to the religion.”); *Ben-Levi v. Brown*, 136 S. Ct. 930, 934; See, *Holt v. Hobbs*, 574 U.S. 352; *In re Eternal Word Television Network, Inc.*, 818 F.3d 1122, 1140 (11th Cir. 2016)(“The Supreme Court cautioned that "federal courts have no business addressing" such questions of religion and moral philosophy.” (Internal citation omitted)); *Thomas v. Review Board*, 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981), "religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit First Amendment protection.").

33. “To be sure, a state may not condition the grant of a privilege, [a license,] or benefit upon the surrender of a constitutional right.” *Minn. Ass'n, Health Care v. Minn. Dept., P.W.*, 742 F.2d 442, 446 (8th Cir. 1984); *Citing, Western Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of Equalization*, 451 U.S. 648, 657-58, 664-65 (1981); *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404-05, (1963).

34. “The doctrine that a government, state or federal, may not grant a benefit or privilege on conditions requiring the recipient to relinquish his constitutional rights is now well established.” *Citing, Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 34 (1970); *E.g., Cafeteria Workers v. McElroy*, 367 U.S. 886, 894; *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404; *Speiser v.*

Randall, 357 U.S. 513, 519-520; *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493, 499-500; *Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding*, 344 U.S. 590, 597-598; *Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n*, 271 U.S. 583, 593-594; see *Van Alstyne, The Demise of the Right-Privilege Distinction in Constitutional Law*, 81 Harv. L. Rev. 1439, 1445-1454 (1968); Comment, *Another Look at Unconstitutional Conditions*, 117 U. Pa. L. Rev. 144 (1968). As stated in *Homer v. Richmond*, 292 F.2d 719, 722: ("One may not have a constitutional right to go to Baghdad, but the Government may not prohibit one from going there unless by means consonant with due process of law.")

35. "Neither the state in general, nor the state university in particular, is free to prohibit any kind of expression because it does not like what is being said." *Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 35-36 (1970)

36. The United States Supreme Court in *Kennedy v. Bremerton School Dist.*, No. 21-418, at *15 (June 27, 2022) held, "Where the Free Exercise Clause protects religious exercises, whether communicative or not, the Free Speech Clause provides overlapping protection for expressive religious activities."

37. In that case, the Court granted a professional coach the right to exercise private religious belief and speech, indicating the state's punishment violated the Coach's first Amendment right applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment, despite his association as a government employee or agent.

38. I must argue this case must be extended to me to prevent the state, federal government and additional governments' including Appellee's punishment of me, but for the exercise of my exercise of my religious belief, as outlined in my speech in my petitions, no matter how repugnant or illogical my religious beliefs appear to the state and Federal government.

39. Freedoms are not for sale, in exchange for professional licenses. When the courts make business the law, by making professionals the law, by self-regulating, money, not freedom, or the people, is protected. Individuals and individual liberty are instead sacrificed under the lie money grants freedom when it creates slavery by how it is coined.

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

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

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

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

Wherefore, I pray this Court grants my motion.

July 4, 2023

Respectfully submitted,
/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693(3,441 Words) PRO SE

Appendix M

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,	§	APPEALS COURT
Respondent.	§	CASE NUMBER: 22:37372
	§	DISTRICT COURT
	§	Misc. No. 22-45
v.	§	DISTRICT COURT
United States District Court,	§	Judge Paul S. Diamond
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

Exhibits to Affidavit

Exhibit 1

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

Exhibit 2

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 43rd AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I am scared about being thrown away for my religious belief in God not money or mammon, material things like basic necessities as mater and savior in my life.

2. Wen Jesus says what profits a man to gain the world to lose his soul, I believe Jesus.

3. This is not legal argument just concern because I am stressed and scared.

4. One of the federal judges on the Third Circuit panel reviewing my pleadings, Judge Scirica, is in charge of the committee that disciplines federal judges,

5. I want the courts to rule such disciplinary rules are unconstitutional by making judges partial towards the interest of those who doll out or threaten federal judges with discipline instead of the impartial application of the Constitution to the statutory or judicial by case law, aka common law, rule of law. Judge Scirica appears to be in charge of all disciplinary rules and changes governing federal judges, with the exception of the US Supreme Court. There is a conflict of interest with my aims for justice and preservation of the constitution.

6. I believe the courts may preserve the judiciary to preserve the rule of law by limiting correction of federal judges to 1. Cases and controversies like my cases, or 2. Impeachment.

7. I also am stressed because I fear the Appellate court is not reading my pleadings since I attached pleadings contesting notice, requiring discovery, motions to subpoena witnesses, argued violations of constitutional rights in my motions for reargument and other motions before this Court. In addition, I alerted the appellate court of my belief and evidence of belief that the Delaware Supreme Court participated in, incited and colluded in witness tampering in Kelly v Trump and the Disciplinary case.

8. In my Informa pauperis on appeal at the Third Circuit Docket Item (hereinafter “3DI”) I attach hereto as Exhibit A I pled the issues on appeal are:

I. Whether the District Court erred as a matter of law, overlooking or misunderstanding of the facts, and on Constitutional grounds in the Court’s November 2, 2021 order, and Memorandum of Law, dated November 2, 2021 in:

1. Denying Plaintiff’s motion to expedite,
2. Dismissing as moot Plaintiff’s motions for temporary restraining order and exemption from bond, preliminary injunction and exemption from bond, motion to e-file with waiver of costs, and motion to appear remotely, under the discretion of the court due to poverty and to protect the parties and the court during a global pandemic,
3. Denying Plaintiff’s letter-motion for emergency relief with permission to serve such letter/motion to Defendants along with the Complaint and other motions through the US Marshall.
4. Dismissing the case by abstaining under the Younger abstention doctrine, and
5. ordering the clerk to close the case,

Given the evidence shows the Delaware Supreme Court and Chancery Court or their members or agents incited or participated in the conspiracy to interfere, harass, or pressure me to forgo my case against former President Donald J. Trump, and substitution of President Biden for Donald J. Trump to protect my free exercise of religion, speech, and association from government sponsored persecution for such exercise, and to dissolve the establishment of government religion by seeking to enjoin former President Trump and current President Biden from enforcing executive orders creating a union of government-religious entity partnerships, including enjoinder of Executive Order No. 13798, maintained and reestablished by President Biden by his enforcement of E.O. 13798, and President Biden’s enforcement of Ex. Or. No. 13198, Jan. 29, 2001, as amended by Ex. Or. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021; Ex. Or. No. 13199, Jan. 29, 2001, as revoked by Ex. Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018; Ex. Or. No. 13279, December 12, 2002, as amended by Exec. Or. No. 13559, November 17, 2010; Ex. Or. No. 13559, Nov. 17, 2010; Ex. Or. No. 13831, May 3, 2018, and Biden’s enactment of Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021 (“executive orders”). These executive orders allow money or support to be transferred between government agents and religious organizations based on a bought or bartered for partnership between government and religion, not based on safeguarding freedom from forced government

religion or forced relationships with religious entities to gain the bartered for government support through such religious entities.

The money in the bought, not free union of church and state, is one reason why religious-political attacks seemed to have increased in recent years. President Biden's Valentine's Day executive Order, Ex. Or. No. 14015, Feb. 14, 2021, is troubling since it appears to allow government money to be bestowed to religious organizations, like churches in other countries. The Chancery Court and Delaware Supreme Court's agents' or members' interference in Kelly v Trump, and participation in retaliation against me in instigating a petition to disbar me as an active attorney for the exercise of Constitutionally protected rights were motivated by their members' or agents' desire to suppress or demean or disapprove of my petitions, religious beliefs, speech, political association, and, or poverty in violation of the First Amendment applicable to the Defendants pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment and in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1985 (2)(b) or 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The August 23, 2021 letter the District Court refers to in his memorandum refers to both Chancery Court and Delaware Supreme Court pleadings or petitions as the reason for the Defendants petition against me to disbar me as an active lawyer based on my faith in Jesus Christ, per paragraph 7, in the petition. Though it is remarkable that the District Court offers assurance of the Delaware Supreme Court's jurisdiction while omitting the reference to the petitions to the Delaware Supreme Court as the source the Office of Disciplinary noted for the reason to bring a petition against me.

I petitioned the Delaware Supreme Court to suspend lawyer fees for lawyers out of work during the pandemic. The Court denied my request, indicating they would make determinations on a case-by-case basis.

I made a second request, noting I could not ask the honorable court to violate the Constitution by selective application towards me, as an attorney within a similarly situated class of lawyers facing economic hardship in violation of the Equal Protections Clause applicable to the Court pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment.

No response was given by the Delaware Supreme Court. I paid the fees. Two months later, De-Lapp an arm of the Delaware Supreme Court and co-conspirator with the Defendants threatened me, requiring a response to their desire to investigate me within 10 days, based on my request for a waiver of fees to the court. How did they know to retaliate against me for the petition, unless the Delaware Supreme Court or their agent told them? De-Lapp's agents obviously were not concerned about helping me pay for the attorney active license registration fees since I made such payment two months before they threatened me.

The Delaware Supreme Court may have had pure motives, concern for poverty by reporting my poverty to the arm. Those motives appeared to turn sour since the Delaware Supreme Court never responded to my second letter relating to relief from lawyer registration fees.

Recently, the Delaware Supreme Court agent ignored my requests to attend a Delaware CLE, which was unusual for her, and appeared to be in conspiracy to retaliate against me and black ball me from participating in activities open to Delaware barred lawyers, based on the petition Defendants brought against me concerning my belief in Jesus Christ.

In addition, one of the Delaware Supreme Court justices came into the law library and asked for federal court jury instructions, I believe to prepare to sue me or help a court agent to sue me. The evidence shows a member of the Chancery Court appeared to seek to sabotage my case, by preventing me to almost miss my filing deadline, and by instructing me to cross off local counsel's address on my praecipe to prevent service, to prevent my case going forward based on

her disagreement with my political, religious beliefs or to cover up mistakes or misbehavior. The same staff member appeared to write on my October 5, 2021 praecipes, and underline the praecipes I drafted on October 12, 2021 to testify and be a witness without cross examination for the appellate justices to gain clarification, instead of filing them as I presented them, unmarked. I do not want her to get into trouble.

In April, 2020, Judge Kenneth S. Clark of the Court of Common Pleas interrogated me at BJ's, a bulk grocery store, located in Millsboro, DE in a threatening matter, apparently backed by the Office of Disciplinary Counsel ("ODC"), disapproving of my religious beliefs and law suit. The evidence, if accepted as pleaded shows 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. Whether the Delaware District Court is the only court which may afford me a fair trial since the Chancery Court lacked jurisdiction to enjoin the Defendants' unlawful proceeding, as applied, since the facts arose in the Chancery and Delaware Supreme Courts, creating the appearance of lack of impartiality or actual partiality.

II. Whether the pleadings if accepted as true evidence the Delaware Supreme Court, the Preliminary Executive Committee, and Board of Professional Responsibility for the state of Delaware, lack subject matter jurisdiction due to illegality of the petition brought in retaliation against me for the exercise of my protected rights motivated by Defendants' desire to punish me based on my First Amendment exercise of the right to petition, associate, speak, exercise religion and, or poverty, requiring the issue to be remanded to the District Court.

III. Whether the pleadings if accepted as true evidence the Delaware Supreme Court, the Preliminary Executive Committee, and the Board of Professional Responsibility for the state of Delaware lack subject matter jurisdiction, based on violating my procedural and substantive due process grounds, as applied, since the Delaware Supreme Court appeared to participate in the Defendants' interference in my exercise of protected rights, and petition against me for the exercise of those rights, requiring the issue to be remanded to the District Court for consideration.

IV. Whether the Delaware Supreme Court, the Preliminary Executive Committee, and the Board of Professional Responsibility for the state of Delaware lack subject matter jurisdiction due to the fact the appellate court, the Delaware Supreme Court appeared to instigate, participate in the interference in my law suit *Kelly v Trump*, and the retaliatory procedure Defendants brought, denying me of a fair trial as I cannot ask the Delaware Supreme Court members to be witnesses, to ask them about their apparent participation, in a case they preside over. Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 605, 28 U.S.C.A. 605, "The presiding judge[s] may not testify as a witness at the trial."

Whether the evidence if accepted as pleaded evidence the members of the Delaware Supreme Court are material witnesses to the facts relating to the Defendants' petition, and should dismiss or at least enjoin the petition based on lack of subject matter, to be remanded to the District Court.

V. Whether the petition must be dismissed by the Defendants under 28 USCS § 455 (b)(1) (5)(iv) and 28 USCS § 455, (a),(b)(1), since the Delaware Supreme Court members' impartiality might be reasonably be questioned as the facts evidence the Delaware Supreme Court's members or agents appeared to have instigated or participated in the ODC's and their agents' or co-arms interference with my case *Kelly v Trump*, and retaliation against me by bringing the petition I

seek to enjoin, but for the exercise of protected freedoms, motivated to suppress my religious beliefs, speech and petitions.

VI. Whether the facts pled which were not discussed by the district court, if proved, would show the proceeding brought by Defendants, is unlawful as applied, and the issue should be remanded to the district court for consideration.

VII. Whether my claims for infliction of emotional distress and potential damages which were not discussed by the district Court, should be remanded to the district court for consideration.

VIII. Whether in the interest of justice, I should be permitted to include a claim for nominal damages against the Defendants, in light of the expedited nature and irreparable injury I face.”

9. I pointed to the issue I believe the Supreme Court incited the discipline in interference of Kelly v Trump as judge, witness and fact finding jury.

10. I attach my Appellate Brief at Third Circuit Court docket item 98 hereto as an exhibit. In my appellate brief page 15 I allege:

“The state court does not have subject matter jurisdiction or jurisdiction is voidable. The Younger abstention is not appropriate to enjoin a forum without subject matter jurisdiction. The Delaware Supreme Court is without jurisdiction for its violations of procedural and substantive due process. Its judgments must be deemed void. (*See, May v. Anderson*, 345 U.S. 528, 537 (1953) “It is void ... if it denies due process of law.”); (*Pease v. Rathbun-Jones Eng. Co.*, 243 U.S. 273, 276 (1917) Judgments “ are void for lack of due process of law, or should be set aside for error.”). The state-court does not have subject matter jurisdiction or jurisdiction is voidable. The Younger abstention is not appropriate to enjoin a forum without subject matter jurisdiction. The Delaware Supreme Court is without jurisdiction to rule on its own alleged violations of procedural and substantive due process, violations of First Amendment rights, conspiracy and collusion under 1985, or whether it had subject matter jurisdiction. Its judgments in Kelly v Trump and in the disciplinary cases may only be deemed void by the Federal District Court, not the state court.....”

Footnote 2 “*Constr. Drilling, Inc. V. Chusid*, No. 03-3786, 2005 WL 1111760, at *3 (3d Cir. May 11, 2005) (The Third Circuit held, “A judgment may also be void if a court "acted in a manner inconsistent with due process of law.”); See Respondent’s Exhibits to the Hearing (“R-Ex”) Exhibits 35, 37 Part 2, 42, R 44”

11. In the attach Brief I allege at Page 16

I had no adequate opportunity to raise my federal claims in state court. I asserted Constitutional defenses. Nevertheless, the state court precluded my meaningful opportunity to be heard on my defenses and motions, prevented discovery, denied me the opportunity to call witnesses, denied me access to the law library, sealed pleadings to conceal evidence, and fired two witnesses to prevent their testimony in my favor to prejudice the proceeding against me. (DI 55, 70-75, 77) [maybe I should have directed the courts eyes to the motion to expedite and the motions for

rehearings to see the attached documents, examine additional facts, and legal arguments but I did that in my motion for a rehearing]

“There was no opportunity to ask the Delaware Supreme Court to void its own decision in Kelly v Trump and the disciplinary matter or to seek equitable relief, money damages or nominal damages against itself and its agents and arms. I seek to sue the Delaware Supreme Court. They cannot decide the case against itself, because they are a defendant. The Delaware Supreme Court is partial to the state and itself. I am entitled to an impartial judge, in accordance with the 1st and 14th Amendment procedural and substantive Due Process protections.”

Footnote 3 “US Const. Amend I, V. (See, Schweiker v. McClure, 456 U.S. 188 (1982) reversed on other grounds; Gibson v. Berryhill, 411 U.S. 564, 570 (1973); Ward v Village of Monroeville, 409 US 57 61-62 (1972) (“Petitioner is entitled to a neutral and detached judge in the first instance.”); In Re Murchinson, 349 US 133, 136 (1955); Tumey v State of Ohio, 273 US 510 (1927); Withrow v. Larkin, 421 U.S. 35, 46 (1975); McCool v. Gehret, 657 A.2d 269, 277 and 280 (Del. 1995) (“ excluding evidence [in my case emails] of efforts to influence a witness' testimony [to exclude evidence] constitutes reversible error. ...“Opinion testimony by a judge creates the appearance of partiality on behalf of a litigant, is greatly prejudicial to the adverse party...”); Inc. v. Lopez, CIV. No. 14-1223 (PG) (D.P.R. Oct. 27, 2015); United Church of the Medical Center v. Medical Center Comm'n, 689 F.2d 693, 701 (7th Cir. 1982); Utica Packing Co. v. Block, 781 F.2d 71, 77 (6th Cir. 1986); Hammond v. Baldwin, 866 F.2d 172, 177 (6th Cir. 1989).”

12. I made other arguments and claims to void subject matter jurisdiction in my original appeal. I added two different arguments and ran out of room to add more case law showing the limited exclusive jurisdiction of the state forum which prohibits my federal claims in the disciplinary proceeding based on the limited subject matter jurisdiction of the Board and Delaware Supreme Court in disciplinary proceedings. I also made a cool neat new argument relating to personal jurisdiction over the Supreme Court and its members.

13. I am scared since one judge has a conflict of interest with my beliefs in limiting correcting judges to the constitutional purview without waiver. I oppose regulating judges.

14. I do not want to be taken out and eliminated, potentially cancelled even by the US Supreme court who makes my pleadings invisible. I hope the removal of my items from the docket on appeal of the PA Order is just a mistake. I will contact them as I am grateful for the attempts, but fearful in case the blank docket was by design. Nicole Traini, the Clerk of the PA

Supreme Court indicates the Court's Clerks talk with other courts which is not fair when the courts may be parties not merely judges .

15. It is also unfair that the federal government who has more resources has 60 days to Answer a complaint where common folk like me, a regular person, has fewer days. Since, one of the reviewing Appellate judges works in one of the federal rules committee may read this, maybe he can argue changing the rules that disadvantage the common person while creating an unfair advantage to government workers and agents possibly in violation of the Equal Protections Clause to safeguard life and liberty as opposed to government power would be more just and fair. Judge Scirica is a big deal. He has the power to change history by amending rules that control the federal courts.

16. I also write because I believe there is harm schemed. Money and might cannot save us, minds of brilliant judges and possibly brilliant lawyers like my opponents and US Attorney General David Weiss may save us.

17. When I ran for office I learned how icky organized charities, fundraising and lobbying was. It was dirty compromising good for evil for people to win. Compromising other people's lives and liberty are not a matter of barter or exchange. People are not for sale. People are priceless. I believe people are misled to harm and damnation in hell for organized charity, fundraising, selling things for school boosters and girl scout cookies because they teach people the mark of the beast is charity, business greed driving out love from the hearts of men, replacing it with the love of money and material things, praise, profit or position, which is the mark of the beast.

18. In *Matthew* 6:1-4, Jesus teaches people will not go to heaven for alleged alms. "They will have no reward" for giving out of one hand to get out of the other," even for fun,

connections, marketing, praise or tax breaks. Giving to get is business, not the sacrificial alms Jesus speaks of we are commanded to do in secret without acknowledgment.

19. I learned unelected lobbyists control government agendas. Elected officials sin against God by not using their own independent thinking skills, for being ruled over by lobbyists who like the devil, entice their desires to bend their will to their controlled agendas. I believe we all must use our own brains in order not to give into temptations to do what we want, in order to do what is right. Those who live based on fickle ever changing desires for happiness based on conditions are weak although the evil lawless one, the devil through his children misleads people to hell by teaching flexibility and evolution are strength. Giving into temptation despite the pretty word flexibility or ugly word evolution is slavery to sin and death in hell to be controlled by those who entice our desires by scientific conditions, not free in Jesus Christ.

20. Per the attached Exhibit C, please find a page of Covid 19, The Great Reset, by evidencing a lobbyist agenda to eliminate grocery stores. The book also discusses the elimination of retail brick and mortar stores.

21. Please see the attached publication Debt Overhang and the Retail Apocalypse, August 2022, By Jack Liebersohn, Ricardo Correa, and Martin Sicilian found at the Federal Reserve's Web site, <https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/ifdp/debt-overhang-and-the-retail-apocalypse.htm>, attached hereto as Exhibit D, which discusses the retail apocalypse.

22. Please note, the hike in prices and decrease in volume is designed to push small business and retail stores into closing down.

23. The plan is to deplete the boomers' retirements by reducing the worth in their stocks by forcing stores they invest in to close down. The wealthy who are in the know of the agenda may write off losses from their off shore profits to avoid taxes.

24. Once the retail spaces are empty, investors may buy them on the cheap. The rich make more profit by buying cheap, to rent or sell high by contrived scheming design, not smarts or luck.

25. There are worse times schemed ahead beyond this tiny part in a much larger scheme.

26. I think only the courts may save people and governments, not money or might.

27. I believe judges are special and that justice in the courts is a command by God for a reason because the courts have the power to save lives and eternal lives. Amos 5:15.

28. I am scared. It is very scary that one of the judges is in charge of the disciplinary rules committee, in charge of disciplining judges. I believe the rules themselves make judges less fit to judge due to the risk of judicial partiality to pleasing those who administer the rules instead of independently critically thinking to uphold the impartial rule of law.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/4/23

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

Exhibit 3

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 44th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I write in haste because I am scared, and do not have time.
2. I apologize for the typos. I am a bad typist and am scared as I am punished for my faith in Jesus and Christ, and for standing up for the Constitutional rule of law from government violations.
3. I believe the rule of law is in danger. The courts and lawyer positions are in danger. I believe there is not only a scheme to transition the economic system into a credit debt deceptive techno-slavery system under the guise of saving the environment only rewarding destroying it for the power and profit of central banks and other private and foreign powers. I also believe there is a plan to slowly eliminate the rule of law to allow entities to do as they please without restraint to prevent them from oppressing, enslaving, killing, stealing and destroying human health, life and liberty for material gain.
4. I am a child of God. I see people, even enemies, as the treasure to safeguard and respect, not tools for material gain.
5. I believe people must use their own brain, their free will to escape the second death in hell. So, I seek to protect freedom of the people to think, to believe, to speak, associate

by the dictates of their conscience, not the dictates of the government, or those who control the resources of basic life by unjust gains.

6. Protecting people's freedom to believe differently than me, to criticize to allow us to learn from one another as opposed to force fed religious or secular beliefs is not only upholding my belief in Jesus as God, but it is upholding the Constitutional superseding laws.

7. I sent the email, attached hereto as Exhibit A to the US Supreme Court in which I stated:

“Good morning,
Thank you for your attempts. I saw you allowed the name search to enable me to search the above referenced matter. However, when I click on the docket, it comes up blank per the attached documents labeled Exhibits B through E.

I also searched by case number 22-7695, and it came up blank too.

It is possible Robert Meek or another staff member requires time to link the application to the main docket number to place all items relating to the same subject matter.

Nevertheless, due the past alleged alleged technical issues this Court through its staff asserted created problems in another appeal, I am sending the filed documents, as of May 30, 2023 via email too.

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

Not acting as an attorney advocate acting on behalf of another. Defending my private right to religious belief in Jesus as savior and God not money and mammon, such as necessities as savior and God which I believe misleads people to loss of eternal life in the second death in hell for trust in moth and rust to care for their own to be enslaved not free in Jesus Christ by those who through unjust gains control resources money and material things such as water and such. (Jesus calls these people children of the devil)

Thank you for your time.”

8. I sent the Supreme Court my PA appeal Number 22-7695, and related documents in three additional emails, including one stating:

“Good morning,

Please see the attached for your convenience. Danny Bickle indicated this Court has technical issues with my documents, and I err on the side of precaution by sending the documents separately by email to prevent the irreparable injury should they be lost or deleted by mistake.

Thank you,

Meg

Meghan Kelly

34012 Shawnee Dr

Dagsboro, DE 19939

(302) 493-6693

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Not acting as an attorney advocate acting on behalf of another. Defending my private right to religious belief in Jesus as savior and God not money and mammon, such as necessities as savior and God which I believe misleads people to loss of eternal life in the second death in hell for trust in moth and rust to care for their own to be enslaved not free in Jesus Christ by those who through unjust gains control resources money and material things such as water and such. (Jesus calls these people children of the devil)”

9. I believe this Court may stifle the plans to eliminate the rule of law, the courts and people judges and people lawyers, and prevent the overthrow of the government, not the mere replacement of the economy, by in part upholding the Constitutional laws that restrains judicial, executive and congressional acts which violate the people’s liberty interests, in my case and others.

10. We do not have a mere Republic. We have a democratic republic, where two branches give us the illusion of fair representation by the vote. Albeit lobbyists buy this no longer free alleged interest or liberty in the vote creating disparate treatment arguably in violation of the 5th Amendment’s equal protections component as applied to the federal government and 14th Amendment applicable to the state and local governments, without even a discussion as to the concerns with the electoral college.

11. The executive and executive branch give us an alleged republic in the form of representation.

12. The judicial branch is the only branch that gives us freedom and a democracy in this Democratic-Republic.

13. The judicial branch is most important in balancing and restraining the other two branches to preserve the Constitutional liberties and lives of the American people from being sacrificed under the lie of the common Good or the guise of saving the world or the lie the vote is a waiver to eliminate other Constitutional rights for the collective good.

14. Your branch is most needed. Otherwise, we have no freedoms and are mere products to buy and sell by the government's private and foreign partners by contracts or treaties. The souls of other people are not for sale to serve lawless lusts, business greed, power, profit and position of those who exploit them under the lie of serving or helping them.

15. I believe there is an attack on judges to eliminate the judiciary to eliminate the rule of law, as I mentioned previously.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.

19. 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.

20. 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.

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

22. Thank you for your time. I write in haste with tears in my eyes, because my voice may be cancelled out and eliminated by even the United States Supreme Court by concealing my pleadings too.

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

24. 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.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/5/23

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

Exhibit 4

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 45th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I write in haste because I am scared, and do not have time.
2. I apologize for the typos. I am a bad typist and am scared as I am punished for my faith in Jesus and Christ, and for standing up for the Constitutional rule of law from government violations.
3. I believe the government must dissolve partnerships with religious organizations to preserve freedom of religion.
4. I believe the government must dissolve partnerships with private and foreign powers, when such partnerships violate the Constitutional rights of the American people to preserve freedom, to prevent slavery of the people to serve partners’ dictates, which eliminates free will.
5. Business is not freedom. I believe the attached article in Exhibit A discussing a case holding giving an employer the right to not pay for insurance that covers healthcare it disagrees with robs the employee of free choice of belief, backed by the government. ²This may

² On an aside, I cite articles since they are admissible as evidence under the periodical exception to hearsay of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 803, (18). Similarly present sense impression, state of mind, and excited utterances are also admissible. Should anything happen to me, opposing counsel or US AG may be able to use these affidavits to prevent an economic crash and the planned unnatural fall of the US to preserve this

possibly murder employees for money if alleged care really could sustain their life. The case eliminates freedom by government backing of buying and compelling beliefs upon employees to serve greed, not any personal individual good of employees. They save costs by potentially buying rights and selling the souls of the workers leading to potential death. It is government backed human sacrifice.

6. I believe people sin leading to the fires of hell for believing money is protected free speech or freedom should they not unharden their heads and hearts and repent. It is bought speech. Free speech is not for sale by barter or exchange which eliminates the freedom liberty component.

7. The focus on money as savior to care for their own family or others through business or organized charity drives out love from the hearts of men for God and others replaced with the love of money. The Bible teaches the love of money is the root of every evil. I believe God is not kidding.

8. Those who entice people to give into temptation by reward or threat of harm to bend their substantially burdened will serve lawless lusts, not Constitutional freedom, but control. I believe little kids are taught to go the way to hell by fundraisers, boosters and by selling girl scout cookies under the guise of good for evil greed, leading to their damnation in hell should they not be born again I believe judges commit lawlessness before the eyes of God for confusing lawless lusts with the impartial rule of law, by partiality towards profit, money and material gain as savior, as freedom and God. I believe it is enslavement to sin and death in the fires of hell, not freedom.

government. I cited newspapers in Kelly v Trump since I knew they were admissible as evidence under this exception not to be demeaned like this Court appeared to do in one of its orders. It is acceptable under the rules.

9. My religious beliefs are genuine. Those within the government whose eyes are evil by speaking of job creation enslave people to work for their private partners who receive unjust, disparate favoritism arguably violates the 5th Amendment Equal Protections component applicable to the federal government, and the 14th amendment equal protections based on First Amendment belief and exercise of beliefs applicable to the states. Plus, I believe it damns those who give or accept government contracts and grants to hell for unjust gains should they not repent. The Bible speaks of unjust gains. The impartial rule of law should be used to restrain businesses from creating subpar, polluting products. Just decrees not money is the solution to save lives and eternal lives. Money is not God. Matthew 6:24.

10. I believe people go to hell for teaching money is the solution through charities, business or fundraising making money God. Matthew 6:24.

11. That said, in recent news, per the attached newspaper article, labeled as Exhibit B, a state, Oklahoma, is allegedly allowing a religious school to receive 100 percent pay and backing through taxes. I believe this establishment of religion based on business, buying the backing of the church will damn many people to hell by teaching religion is a business that may be bought and owned by the government as opposed to a matter of Constitutionally protected free choice. See, *Flast v. Cohen*, 392 U.S. 83 (1968)(tax payer had standing to contest pay of tax money which conflicts with religious belief. Though I believe taxes under US Amend XVI violates God's teachings. The way money is coined is based on slavery, eliminating freedom by debt is in contravention of my faith in Jesus. I leave this issue aside).

12. I am quite upset. I do not want people to go to hell.

13. Part of the global plan is to demean religion as a mere business to eliminate diverse religions, making the mark of the beast, the twice dead, those without eternal life, lawless

lusts, business greed by barter or exchange under the guise of saving the world the only acceptable belief. This plan to make religion a business is to eliminate freedom of religion and religious belief in Jesus the Christ. (Please see attached Exhibit C where evidence of UN schemes are prevented. Please note I do not condone the preachers preaching, just citations. This preacher teaches people like me are naughty since I associate as a Catholic.)

14. Jesus teaches people who perform business as worship are not welcome in heaven. Citing John 2:16.

15. Most of the world in existence may be damned to hell by the temptation to worship the beast, business greed, (money and material gain as savior to care for their own as God through business or charity in place of God) if the courts do not dissolve the establishment of Government religion.

16. I am scared. I filed a motion to recuse Judge Scirica in both Third Circuit matters, this appeal and Kelly v Eastern District Court since I seek to attack attorney and judicial disciplinary rules on Constitutional grounds. See, Exhibit D

17. Judge Scirica is a big deal. Per the attached, he has the power to control and persuade the Supreme Court, making him possibly more powerful than the US Supreme Court.

18. That power is compromised when lobbyists seek to control a no longer independent judiciary like mobsters by threats of discipline. Per the attached petition to members of the federal rules to discipline judges, lobbyists sought to gain control over the rules and judges by allowing non-attorneys to practice law without a license. (Exhibit E)

19. Recall, the reason I ran for office in 2018 is that out of state entities were practicing law without a license, messing up the chain of title on deeds, losing revenue for the state, and taking advantage of my deceased esteemed colleague Dick Goll, Esquire. No one

would stop it. So, I decided to run for office to stop it myself. **Maybe Judge Scirica may draft rules to stop entities from practicing law without a license, harming the public while making a mockery of the judicial system by acting above the law's reach.**

20. There is a plan to eliminate lawyers and judges by people who control technology through entities.

21. Defendant and PA ODC should protect the rule of law, the courts, the justice system and country by correcting and regulating these non-attorneys who destroy the fabric of the rule of law that holds the government together.

22. None of the Disciplinary rules allow Defendants to prevent harm and elimination of the rule of law to serve the lusts of those who may buy their will be done by eliminating every single freedom by making people for sale products.

23. Maybe I should have addressed the need to draft rules to prevent the overthrow of the courts and the government by adding rules relating to non-attorneys practicing law without a license on behalf of another to prevent the schemed unnatural overthrow of our government. Those who teach of the fall of America like the fall of Rome teach lies to mislead and deceive the public based on their ignorance or wicked vanities.

24. Our hope of the hero to save us, to save themselves is the courts not with money like a mobster, or might like a misbehaving biting kicking child, but with their brilliant minds, to care to think, to know, to do what is right, not immediately convenient or self-serving, only to harm themselves and others down the line.

25. I am concerned because my law school professor allegedly used a secretary in private practice, to give the Honorable Hardiman the same secretary. I am concerned because he

interviewed Justice Thomas too. I believe the rule of law should be governed by those who serve the people, not those with internal connections.

26. I am concerned since this same professor interviewed Justice Thomas, with whom I often disagree.

27. I disagree with Justice Thomas in the attached excerpt of his dissent of a recent voting rights case where the Supreme Court protected black voters from intentional contrived discrimination. (Exhibit F)

28. I am grateful the US Supreme Court allowed law suits under 1983 to prevent old people from being drugged up like vegetables easier to tend to be doomed to hell because I believe we must use our brains to go to heaven. The US Supreme Court saved lives, liberty and eternal lives in the attached excerpt of case. (Exhibit G).

29. My case manager said I would be granted time in response to my motion for more time to file an appeal in the appeal of the PA Eastern District Court case. My parents departed and are on their way here from Florida now. They are coming late due to this week's news on the air pollution in Delaware and North East allegedly to be caused by the Canadian fires.

30. I am relying on her comforting words so I may prepare for their arrival and spend time with loved ones.

31. Many of my cousins are lawyers. I think my Uncle Luke's daughter, Hannah is coming to Delaware for the reunion. Hannah Kelly is going to law school next year. Her big brother already completed law school at Duquesne and is in private practice. Her other brother Luke went to Duquesne on a soccer scholarship. He may still be attending school.

32. I am grateful Hannah is showing the world women are people to respect, not things or property or products to market items.

34. Per the attached article, Exhibit G, Saudi Arabia is artificially decreasing supply to increase the demand and prices. Everything will get more expensive in the fall. If the post office decreased prices, including stamps to a quarter, the price of shipping goods would be reduced, reducing the alleged manufactured cause of inflation. I told the post office about this over a decade ago, but no one listens to my ideas or does anything about it. Again, that is why I ran for office myself in 2018, to improve the world by doing something about problems, not using problems to serve my own agenda to serve my seat.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/9/23

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

Exhibit 5

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 46th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I write in haste because I am scared, and do not have time.
2. I apologize for the typos. I am a bad typist and am scared as I am punished for my faith in Jesus and Christ, and for standing up for the Constitutional rule of law from government violations.
3. The US Supreme Court made my docket visible for Kelly v PA ODC, Number 22-7695 immediately in response to my emails, dated June 5, 2023.
4. I also asked the E-filing staff and Robert Meek to please link up the application relating to the same matter, Application A 22A981 to the docket Kelly v PA ODC 22-7695.
5. I called the case manager of the US Supreme Court, Lisa Nesbitt and simply asked form a return message on June 1, and followed up on June 2, 2023 leaving a request for a call back. I was compelled to send Robert Meek and the efilng on Monday June 5, 2023 when I did not hear back from her to prevent the needless filing of a motion to safeguard my Constitutional rights. Robert Meek and efilng immediately publicizing my petition per my email request.
6. I sent an email thanking Robert Meek and the efilng staff for making my case public, but I again requested they link the two docket items together to the same case.

7. On or about June 6, 2023, I left a more detailed message with Lisa Nesbitt, the US Supreme Court case manager for all cases, to please link up the two items together.

8. The application remains unlinked to the docket containing the petition.

9. I am overwhelmed in court and personal obligations.

10. My eyes are getting more floaters and I am at high risk for a retinal detachment. I believe dehydration increases the risk. I am alarmed by the worsening condition of my eyes. I have a simple eye appointment this week. Doctors indicated years ago if I see total black to come in immediately to prevent permanent blindness. That stuck with me because I do not want to become blind.

11. I am exhausted. I am asserting my rights imperfectly in order not to waive them under great duress, facing great irreparable injury, with little time to sleep and care for my health. I asserted my right to live in all courts.

12. My mom and dad are here. I love them. I am on thin ice. I am constantly scolded for suing Trump. I am in big trouble for even printing or working on anything.

13. My parents think my ideas are all bad, and are even tougher on me than this Honorable Court. I love them, but it is quite difficult, and I am in big trouble for upsetting him should I even talk of law suits.

14. My dad thinks my concern of an overthrow and my religious belief against science as a religion, instead of mere imperfect human study of God's work are folly. I love my dad and think he is the smartest man in the entire world, but I think God is smarter than my dad. So, I have to place my religious beliefs first, above my parents. In *Matthew* 10:37 Jesus teaches "Anyone who loves their father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; anyone who loves their son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." I believe Jesus teaches people go to

hell for placing their kids first, family first, parents first above loving others as self, and above loving God even more than our own lives. I think putting family (like work or money) first is idolatry, making family's desires God in place of God.

15. There is evidence of lobbyists seeking to destroy our government by removing the rule of law administered by the only branch that safeguards our freedom and gives us a democracy, the judicial branch.

16. Gathering signatures and receiving or giving money to lobbyists also known as charities is against my religious belief, even to run for office or for school boosters. I believe it violates Jesus's teachings in *Matthew* 6:1-4 which misleads people to exploit others, harm people and be damned to hell. I do not think it is a small thing to participate in organized charity, fundraising or volunteering. My religious beliefs are genuine, even if this court disagrees with them like my family disagrees with me. I love them, but I love God more. If it comes to compromising my faith in Jesus, there is no compromise by barter or exchange even with my family. Jesus is not for sale. I am in tears now. I hope this court does not think I am dumb even if it should disagree with my religious beliefs. I am not asking the court to believe as I do. My case is about protecting my freedom to believe differently than most, to protect the freedom to believe by the dictates of my own conscience without government economic, social or physical persecution for believing in Jesus Christ based on the dictates of my conscience, not the dictates of misguided churches or politicians or other government officials, including the courts.

17. When I ran for office in 2018, I learned the candidates were not free to use their own brains to think things out to do what is right. Candidates were bought and compelled to spew the force-fed thoughts of the voters or the lobbyists who bought them by donations, signatures or support.

18. I am not the same. I choose to use my free will to independently critically think, to discern what is right or convenient, not people pleasing only to harm the people down the line to serve my seat. I choose to try to seek to repent when I mess up, to brainstorm when my ideas do not work to come up with different ideas. I do not choose to blindly trust men as God which leads to harm and damnation in hell for reliance on experts, professionals or scientists. It is adultery with God to make professionals God and guide in place of critically discerning information in light of what is right. See, *Romans 2:15* (“They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things [science, products, services, professionals like demi-gods] rather than the Creator.”)

19. Lobbyists are talking about eliminating people lawyers and people judges at the World Economic Forum and the World Government Summit.

20. This is not mere talk but planning, where China already has peopleless courts. The WEF book, the Fourth Industrial Revolution mentions reducing to eliminate lawyer jobs 2025-2027.

21. Sebastian Thrun already alludes to the elimination of people judges and people lawyers in this 2018 World Government Summit at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NsdmPiBc9TI>.

22. I believe the Courts are in trouble. Meaning we are all in trouble since the courts protect individuals and individual liberty from being sacrificed under the lie of the common good through the vote. The Courts give us civilization with the just rule of law. The Courts protect us from human sacrifice of life and liberty within limits to prevent citizens from taking the life or liberty of others with the just rule of law. The Courts limit the other two branches by placing a check on congress and the president’s power to prevent human sacrifice, enslavement and

elimination of liberties for mammon, money and material gain as God. I believe worship of mammon reflects the mark or image of the beast of the beast spoken of in the bible.

23. I filed a motion for a caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica to move him for judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent non-lawyers and non-judges from practicing law or taking the place of people judges without government authority with the Third Circuit attached hereto as Exhibit A.

24. I hope Judge Scirica drafts disciplinary rules authorizing state office of disciplinary counsel to sue non attorneys for practicing law without a **license in the courts, as opposed to before secret proceedings by professionals of a Board.**

25. I sought Judge Scirica's consideration of drafting disciplinary rules to grant the US Attorney General and possibly the state Office of disciplinary counsel authority to sue non judges acting as judges without government authority.

26. I forgot to make the request lawsuits be done in open court as opposed to a secret board proceeding. That is critical in drafting federal disciplinary rules on judges judging without government authority designed to take the place of the courts through business, alleged charities or not for profits, and the banks, or in the alternate to take the place of people judges in the name of equality by automating alleged justice.

27. This may preserve the integrity of the judiciary. I believe the attacks are real, done to intentionally replace the judiciary with automation to destroy the only branch that gives us freedom and a democracy in our democratic-republic leading to an overthrow.

28. I hope the courts save the rule of law that binds this Country together in our Democratic Republic to prevent the fall of the United States. We need the courts to save us.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/11/23

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

Exhibit 6

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 46th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I write in haste because I am scared, and do not have time.
2. I apologize for the typos. I am a bad typist and am scared as I am punished for my faith in Jesus and Christ, and for standing up for the Constitutional rule of law from government violations.
3. The US Supreme Court bestowed kindness by scheduling the conference date September 26, 2023, per the attached for Kelly v PA ODC, Number 22-7695. (Exhibit A)
4. My application for the same matter is still not linked up like other cases have their applications linked up Application Number 22A981 per the attached docket sheet. (Exhibit B)
5. Maybe the Supreme Court found my religious belief that people go to hell for teaching money is guide, savior and God should they not be made clean by unhardening their heads and hearts.. I believe churches teach people to go to hell under the guise of heaven by organized collections to give to another. This teaches people to go to church to seek to give or get money as savior as God in place of Jesus. I believe this is worship of the beast sin, seeking money with the evil eye looking at others to contribute by societal, compelled, conditional pressure not true charity per Jesus *Matthew* 6:1-4.

6. Jesus teaches you cannot serve God and money. *Citing Matthew 6:24*. I choose to stand with God not misguided children of the devil who sacrifice individuals and individual liberties under the lie of the common good. This sacrificing of humans and individual liberty under the lie of saving the world will be used in the new economic system.

7. The new economic system is the opposite of freedom. I believe we each individually have to think things out and use our own brains to escape the default death in hell the last day. I am not God. I want to encourage people to use their own brains, not experts, professionals or leaders. I believe every person must use their own brains to escape certain damnation in hell. I encourage people to be critical thinkers, even of my ideas. That disorder makes us smarter and improves the world.

8. The convenience of sameness through standardization is at the loss of every individual liberty. The sameness is not fair, but forced conformity under the threat of dying if you should not conform to the will of those who unjustly control resources.

9. The equality under the UN schemers will market is their will be done, in an attempt to substantially burdening free will damning most of humanity to hell by compelled automated sameness under the pretty deceptive words: justice, equality and fairness. The market a lie as truth. Their agenda is unjust oppressive coerced control and slavery. I am not okay with the elimination of every freedom under the sameness equality they scheme. I protect people's free will to say Meg Kelly your ideas stink too. We get smarter and learn from one another when we are free to speak without government backed retaliation for exercising free speech. I believe we are in danger and need the courts help. When my case starts I may not be able to alert this Court of the harm schemed since I must focus on my case.

10. We need to protect equal protections under the law to allow the exercise of individual liberties not the compelled lawless, Satanic global slave debt system which eliminates all liberties under the threat of dying of want. The equality under the Equal Protections Clause of the 5th and 14th Amendments means freedom to choose by the dictates of our conscience, not forced sameness by the dictates of those who control resources, including technology. This new economic system violates my religious beliefs against debt because I believe it enslaves people to be damned to hell. My religious beliefs are genuine. I am so sad so many people will be damned to hell if the courts do not save them. My religious beliefs are not fake. I want the courts to save the world instead of destroying mine.

11. Attached, please find notice of the next world economic forum meeting scheduled in China June 27 through the 29th. They are scheming fast. We need the courts to be our hero to reverse the economic system that will be used to transfer to yet another economic system to overthrow our government. I hope the courts grant me time to listen to their schemes in hopes to allow me the opportunity for the courts to potentially unravel them. (Exhibit C)

12. I filed the attached Motion for a stay in the Third Circuit case Kelly v Eastern District of PA, 22-3372. (Exhibit D)

13. I also filed the attached motion for a Second caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica to move him for judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent judges from speaking engagements on behalf of political think tanks such as the lobbyists at the Federalist Society. (Exhibit E)

14. I inadvertently failed to attach the article regarding Justice Ginsberg's inappropriate comments concerning President Trump which should have been labeled Exhibit D. (Exhibit E)

15. I see you and my esteemed schoolmate Bill Stickman spoke at the Federalist Society as recently as April 28, 2023. (Exhibit E, internal exhibit). Such engagements with lobbyists where judges lobby by telling their views or supporting views makes me uncomfortable.

16. I sat near Bill in one class in law school. I respect him. He is smart, kind, quick thinking and funny in real life. However, I do not respect or condone behavior that eliminates the impartiality of the judiciary. This includes speaking engagements before interest groups.

17. Preserving fair and impartial federal and state courts is not merely good government; it is compelled by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. The ability to present one's case to an impartial tribunal is a fundamental component of due process.

18. Thus, I believe the freedoms of the judiciary, including the freedom to associate, should be construed to be limited under the Constitution in order to uphold, not chill the freedoms of the citizens they serve. US Amend I, V, XIV, XIII. Without the Constitutional restraints on judges, freedoms are eliminated by judicial conduct that chills citizens exercise of liberties. The Constitution acts as a restraint on the government, not as a license to be used both as a sword and shield against the citizens, making the judiciary and the government above the law.

19. "The administration of justice by an impartial judiciary has been basic to our conception of freedom ever since Magna Carta. It is the concern not merely of the immediate litigants. Its assurance is everyone's concern, and it is protected by the liberty guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment." *Bridges v. California*, 314 U.S. 252, 282 (1941).

20. “The state’s interest in ensuring that judges be and appear to be neither antagonistic, nor beholden to any interest, party, or person is entitled to the greatest respect.” *Morial v. Judiciary Comm’n*, 565 F.2d 295, 302 5th Cir. 1977).

21. I feel slimy when I hear about judges speaking at forums, even colleges. I am concerned when I read about judges teaching at colleges because it creates injustice and favoritism. Judges influence and encourage people to believe and argue points favoring what judges teach, chilling diverse viewpoints, instead of allowing litigants to persuade the courts as opposed to students and audiences to the viewpoint of the judges. It is as if judges become the advocates instead of the arbiters of justice, making courts unfair forums for one or both parties.

22. I believe judges’ opinions or dissents should speak for themselves. I think is wrong to allow judges to act as attorneys to argue their views in interest group forums, including the Federalist Society.

23. I love people. I live in Sussex County, DE where the confederate flags sway and where most people disagree with me. I do not hate them. I talk to people who think differently. So, we can learn from one another to seek truth, without compromising integrity.

24. I talked with my esteemed colleague, Karl Haller, Esquire. He shared his views with me. He liked all the judges the Federalist Society recommended, and supported former President Trump’s stance in backing the Federalist Society’s choice on judges. I actually did not know this entity may pick judges or have sway in persuading the government to choose them before talking with a more educated lawyer. I certainly did not know this before filing the Motion attached as Exhibit E.

25. I asked Karl Haller whether he thought it was appropriate judges spoke at or supported the Federalist Society, a lobbyists interest group.

26. Karl Haller said he needed to think about it.

27. I know that Bill Stickman worked with Honorable Thomas Hardiman, and that my professor is involved in helping people become judges. After all professors at law school help their students or esteemed colleagues get jobs.

28. Nevertheless, gaining judicial positions and helping your friends get liked by interest groups in order to gain a judicial seat is not fair or just. Lobbyists like the Federalist Society should not control the judiciary. Nor should the judiciary be beholden to this interest group. I think that judges are smarter thinking things out independently, than collective controlled by societal peer pressured fickle forced thoughts of interest groups' desires to be controlled by the lobbyists who entice the collective desires of the group not free to do good by protecting individuals and individual liberty from being sacrificed to serve interest groups.

29. My mom called me "mean girl" for writing this since Bill Stickman is my friend in real life, and I attached a notice Judge Colm F. Connelly and Bill spoke together at an interest group forum as recently as April 28, 2023. (Exhibit E) The Disciplinary Orders are placing a strain on my familial relationships. I love my family even if they disagree with my tightly held religious beliefs too, and my belief justice in the courts is a command by God. Citing Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23. It is my religious belief judges who commit injustice for convenience and material gain are in danger of damnation in the fires of hell. *Isaiah* 10:1-3. I sit up straight whenever God says "Woe to you". I hear damned to hell are you should you not turn away from your sins, and clean your mind, heart, and hands (lives) of sin. I believe it is more loving to correct one another than to allow people to be misguided to be damned to hell

30. I thought Bill Stickman defriended me on Facebook when he became a judge. I was concerned he thought I was too opinionated to be publicly displayed as a judge's friend. I

was relieved when I did a Facebook search and it appeared he deactivated his Facebook. I think that choice was praiseworthy in that he recognized his speech would be more limited in order to safeguard and not chill the freedoms of those he serves. US Amend I, V, XIII.

31. I do not want to be a hypocrite. I believe the only way to guide misguided judges is 1. Cases and controversies and 2. Impeachment.

32. However Judge Scirica is in charge of federal judges. If he is acting outside of the scope of the Constitution to control a no longer free and independent but partial judiciary (partial towards self-interests in self-regulating), I thought I might as well ask him to uphold the Constitution since attorneys who require courts not violate Constitutional law are punished not praised for upholding the Constitutional rule of law.

33. Lawyers should not be disciplined for holding the courts to the Constitution in cases and controversies. Yet here I am, and my Delaware colleague Richard Abbott faces potential discipline for requiring the government adhere to the constitutional restraints that make us free and not for sale slaves to the governments' private and foreign partners.

34. I would prefer the courts humbly discern petitions by claimants concerning its own mistakes or possible misconduct rather than cowardly, unconstitutionally throwing the rule of law out the window to serve its own partial convenience and interests by punishing attorneys for exercising their First Amendment right to petition to safeguard private liberties from government mistakes or misconduct.

35. Injustice will occur if my colleague Richard Abbott, Esquire is similarly punished for exercising his First Amendment right to petition against apparent government selectively targeted disparate treatment based on firm size, connections or partiality towards interest groups.

36. The government should not be above the law, nor should lawyers be below the law's protections.

37. I seek to preserve the government by requiring the government adhere to the Supreme law of the land, the Constitution which restrains its conduct from enslaving the people for its own vanity or to private and foreign partners to preserve these United States.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/18/23

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

Exhibit 7

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 48th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I write in haste because I am scared, and do not have time.
2. I apologize for the typos. I am a bad typist and am scared as I am punished for my faith in Jesus and Christ, and for standing up for the Constitutional rule of law from government violations.
3. Over the long weekend, I discovered with horror that some US Supreme Court justices politick as active members of the Federalist Society per the attached Exhibit A.
4. Please see the attached Wikipedia page which shows 1. Supreme Court Justice Samuel Alito, 2. Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, 3. Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch, 4. Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh, and Supreme Court Justice Amy Coney Barrett as alleged active members of the Federalist Society, a lobbyist think tank. (Exhibit A).
5. In my *motion for a Second caveat to my Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica to move him for judicial consideration of drafting laws to prevent judges from speaking engagements on behalf of political think tanks such as the lobbyists at the Federalist Society*, I wrote

“3. Judges should remain impartial....

4. Individual exercise of Constitutional freedom is chilled when the only impartial government branch, the judiciary engages in partial, biased, politicking, association, support and speaking engagements.

5. The First Amendment of the US Constitution protects citizens' freedom to associate without disparate unequal favoritism by the courts towards certain associations and disparate treatments towards individuals whose ideology do not conform towards the courts favored lobbyists associations including the Federalist Society. (US Amend V, Equal Protections Component, and procedural Due Process protections of a fair not politically biased proceeding)

6. While I oppose regulating federal judges through federal rules, it appears the alleged potentially unconstitutional acts of the judiciary are left unchecked by the purview of the limits on judicial conduct by cases or controversies or impeachment.

7. Federal Judges should have more limited rights under the First Amendment in order to uphold and not chill the Constitutional freedoms of those they are charged to serve.

8. I respectfully move Judge Scirica for judicial consideration of drafting rules to prevent judges from speaking engagements on behalf of political think tanks such as the lobbyists at the Federalist Society and other political organizations or entities to protect the impartiality of the courts.

9. I believe attorneys, even attorneys labeled disabled have a duty to require the impartiality of the courts, not the mere appearance, but actual impartiality of the courts within the purview of the Constitutional limits to prevent favoritism towards the partial political interests of lobbyists like the Federalist Society. Judicial opinions and dissents should speak for themselves without encouraging favoritism towards certain viewpoints in lawsuits through judicial lobbying by speaking engagements or lobbyist groups.

10. My religious beliefs require I uphold the impartiality of the courts as a religious exercise as a party of one. (See. Deuteronomy 1:16-17, "...Hear the disputes between your brothers, and **judge fairly** between a man and his brother or a foreign resident. Show **no partiality** in judging; hear both small and great alike...."

6. I believe teaching positions and speaking engagements compromises the integrity of the judiciary.

7. I see that Judge Scirica appears to participate in both.

8. On June 20, 2023 Justice Scirica denied my motion for a recusal and my two motions for exceptions in this appeal. (Exhibit B). Judge Scirica appears to disagree with me.

9. On June 20, 2023, Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica also denied recusals in the Third Circuit matter Kelly v Eastern District Court of PA, Number 22-3372. (Exhibit C).

10. I filed the attached motion for a recusal of 4 judges in the Eastern District of PA District Court appeal, I incorporate herein without an exhibit page.

11. I believe the courts are in trouble and a way to preserve the courts is to allow correction of its members within the purview of the Constitutional limits of 1. Cases and controversies or 2. Impeachment, without waiver.

12. I thought asking the courts to please eliminate impartiality by asking Judge Scirica to require it may help.

13. Judge Scirica seems to disagree. Maybe asserting my rights in cases to allow the US Supreme Court to somehow hold the courts may only be disciplined within the purview of the constitution is the answer.

14. With that in mind, I mailed out the attached motion to the Eastern District Court of PA June 20, 2023 where I confronted the court for twice booby trapping me to get out of work at the cost of eliminating my Constitutional rights. I actually mailed out the motion prior to receipt of the orders rejecting my attached motions. The out received my motion on Wednesday June 21, 2023 by US Mail, per the confirmation of receipt attached.

15. I keep noticing new and different Constitutional issues with the Delaware disciplinary rules or application of the rules.

16. I noted in my motion to the District Court in the Eastern District of PA,

“I object to the courts eliminating me, a private party or other claimants for exercising the First Amendment right to petition to correct mistakes or misconduct by the Court and its agents. That teaches the world judges are above the Constitutional rule of law, and professionals are below the Constitutional law’s protections. This is injustice.

35. I also object when the state or federal courts look at parties unequally in favor of the state and its agents to the disadvantage of the population’s lives and liberties. This violates the Equal Protections Clause of the 5th as applied to the federal government and the 14th as applied to the state.

36. For example Del. Law. R. of Disciplinary Proc. Rule 7(d) provides grounds for discipline includes “[Failure] to furnish information to or respond to a request for information from the ODC, the PRC, the Board, or the Court, unless a protective order has been obtained from the Board or the Court.” This rule is a government compelled violation of an accused’s 5th Amendment right against self-incrimination under the threat of discipline. Cooperation with the state should not be praised as a mitigating factor of handing over the noose to one who seeks to hang you by dicta in case law. It is unjust when judges note cooperation with praise to get out of work only to discipline the one they applaud.

37. As a Christian I believe God when he teaches it is sin when judges show favor towards the state’s agents or partners by doing what government’s counsel commands, in violation of the 5th Amendment. That is not fair but creates a fixed system bent towards injustice by sacrificing individual claims and constitutional freedoms towards slavery not freedom to the government and government backed foreign and private partners. I seek to preserve the integrity of the courts in my other cases. I also seek to defend my religious belief in Jesus in Kelly v Swartz a civil rights case.

17. Attached to my motion are other pleadings where I contest Delaware Disciplinary Rules, but I think have other concerns too.

18. I am grateful for time. I am not doing so well health wise. My eye doctor said my eyes are super dried out. I am quite dehydrated. The floaters have increased which is scary. I need time to rehydrate and care for my health in order to restore my health.

19 I am grateful for time. On June 20, 2023, I went to my friend’s funeral a marine Bill Jones. His funeral was on his birth date. I am honored to call him my friend. He disagreed with me on most things. I would have it no other way. That is what a true friend does. We get smarter when we talk freely on diverse views without threat of reprisal. He made me smarter. (See, Proverbs 27:17 proclaims: “As iron sharpens iron, so one person sharpens another”). I thank God for him, and pray he feels a fuller type of love with God on the last day at the resurrection from the bones from the grave for judgment.

20. On a side note, Bill Jones leaned toward former President Trump. He also sympathized with the confederates since President Lincoln killed his own people. I think President Lincoln misbehaved for using violence, instead of words and the just rule of law.

21. Bill Jones was correct. The reason why I cited my concern President Trump may use the insurrection act as President Lincoln did in Kelly v Trump was to prevent him from murdering man for political vanity. I think judges are more powerful and kinder than might. I believe our hope to prevent the schemed overthrow is the courts with words not weapons or wealth. It is judges who grant or deny us freedom, not money nor military might. Without you we are for sale products not a free people.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I do not feel so well. So, I apologize if I am unable to provide with updates this week.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/21/23

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

Exhibit 8

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 49th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I write in haste because I am scared, and do not have time.
2. I apologize for the typos. I am a bad typist and am scared as I am punished for my faith in Jesus and Christ, and for standing up for the Constitutional rule of law from government violations.
3. I am a bit stressed. I am not feeling well. I am very dehydrated.
4. Stamps are also going up to 66 cents from 63 cents on June 10, 2023.
5. Years ago I proposed the post office reduce the price of stamps to make them affordable so more people would purchase them so the Post Office may make more profit in bulk.
6. Decreasing the price of US postage shipments by boxes would also reduce inflation by making it cheaper than competitor. This would help the Post Office make more money in bulk by reducing the cost of shipment of products to stores and customers decreasing prices while increasing the amount of products shipped by lowering the price of competitors.
7. The attacks against the post office based on money are frivolous as the post office may reduce costs and increase profit by selling more in bulk. The attacks are by design to eliminate the freedom of speech without government invasion of privacy in a safer form than the

internet. The increased strain based on additional postage costs exacerbates the burden upon me based on government economic persecution, preventing me from buying and selling as a lawyer but for my religious belief in Jesus as God not money and material gain as God. *Matthew 6:24*.

8. I sought to decrease the economic burden of postage and paper from being so great as to prevent my access to the courts in the Eastern District Court of PA. On June 22, 2022, I called the Eastern District Court of PA to confirm it received *Motion Respondent Meghan M Kelly's Motion for permission to use electronic filing, and waiver of paper copies before this Honorable Court, and an exemption from PACER costs to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights*, per the tracking number 9534615388663171428910 was received by the District Court at Philadelphia, PA 19106 on June 21, 2023, at 1:47 pm.

9. The District Court's staff Dan indicated it has not been processed yet. He forwarded me to Gail Olson's voice mail. No one picked up. So, I sent the attached email, attached herein in Exhibit A, wherein I indicated:

"Re: 22-45 efilng request sent to docket/ Think about it/I am slammed in multiple matters
From: Meg Kelly (meghankellyesq@yahoo.com)
To: paed_clerksoffice@paed.uscourts.gov
Cc: gail_olson@paed.uscourts.gov; chambers_of_judge_paul_s_diamond@paed.uscourts.gov; meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
Date: Thursday, June 22, 2023 at 10:49 AM EDT
Good morning,

Per your request in the email below, I mailed a Motion for ECF access on Tuesday June 21, 2023, which this court received Tuesday June 22, 2023, per the attached tracking and postal receipt with tracking number.

For the convenience of the Court, I also emailed Gail Olson all of the papers included in the motion. However, I had to break down one exhibit as too large. In the paper copies I provided it to you with a large binder so it is easier to scan in. I have a hard time taking off the giant staples.

This morning June 22, 2023, I called this District Court and spoke with Dan at the pro se desk. He indicated the Court has not yet docketed the motion. I alerted him to the fact this is on appeal with the Third Circuit 22-3372. So, I wanted to confirm this Court would docket the matter and not mistakenly not docket it in light of the appeal.

I understand it may take a day or two docket. Could you please confirm receipt.

Thank you,
Meg
Meghan Kelly
34012 Shawnee Dr.
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

On Tuesday, May 16, 2023 at 08:17:16 AM EDT, PAED_clerksoffice
<paed_clerksoffice@paed.uscourts.gov> wrote:

Meghan you will need to request e-filing on your case. Just mail in your filing and ask for e-filing. Don't send anything else, just the one request for e-filing. The judge will do an order and then, you have to go on PACER like you did, but this time you need to ask as a party, not an attorney. While on this case you are a party (pro se), and I can not link up your account to your name if you select attorney.

I have to reject your request, because you neither requested ECF on your case, and there is no order, and you selected attorney instead of party.

10. The Clerk's office responded promptly on June 22, 2023, "We have received your filing and it will be filed as of yesterday when it was received." (Exhibit B).

11. I also sent Judge Diamond the attached email labeled Exhibit C along with the attached *Petitioner Meghan Kelly motion for a caveat to her Motion for this Court to recuse Judge Scirica* in hopes he may use his brilliant mind to come up with ideas to prevent the slow schemed, intentionally planned elimination of our government where I stated:

"Please see the attached. I believe judges will be replaced if the courts do not address this issue. Judge Scirica denied this same motion in the civil rights case. Yet, this motion is still pending above.

If I could get the US Supreme Court to limit correction of judges to the purview of the constitution's limits without waiver under 1. cases and controversies and 2. impeachment, maybe the courts could prevent the planned overthrow of the government.

Maybe this Court may come up with better ideas.

Thank you for your kind consideration.”

13. I also wrote the PA ODC Supreme Court counsel concerning possibly drafting a Supplemental brief to the US Supreme Court relating to safeguarding the institution of the Courts by preventing non-lawyers and non-judges from lawyering on behalf of others and judging without government authority. Exhibit D.

14. I have informed this court of my belief there is an attack through societal peer pressure and Congressional pressure to control a no longer independent but partial judiciary guaranteeing injustice that will incite the automation of the courts, to eventually eliminate the rule of law if left unstopped by the lawless lusts of those who control technology. Although the dependence on enslaving the court to lawless partial lusts, what I believe is the mark of the beast business greed, still remains by judge's misplaced concerns about productivity, costs, avoidance of costs at the exchange of selling other people's souls and freedoms creates inherent injustice should it not be weeded out. The way money is coined and distributed by governments, banks, the Federal Reserve and the government is the problem which is leading most of the world to harm and I believe certain damnation in the fires of hell the last day by slavery to money as God and savior. *Matthew 6:24*. The way money is coined enslaves judges to eliminate freedom by barter or exchange allowing the wealth, well connected, and powerful to essentially be above the law by allowing business not freedom to be the aim of the government. Thereby, the government protects profit, productivity, positions, not people, making the people slaves to a fixed slave system, where the judges are enslaved to the mark of the beast misleading man to hell too . I

proposed a way to coin money correctly by demanding it by Congress without enslaving the people and violating my religious belief and religious exercise in Jesus Christ's words.

15. Requiring the impartiality of the courts within the purview of the Constitution by cases like my own or through impeachment may preserve the institution of the rule of law from schemed overthrow until attorney advocates may argue for justice before the courts. Just decrees must be demanded so additional partiality and injustice may be weeded out by advocates in lawsuits by removal of unjust laws and precedents.

16. I believe there is a plan to eliminate the impartial rule of law which preserves freedom of the people from private and foreign economic, physical or social compelled slavery.

17. Our current rule of law is partial and bent towards injustice by the manner how money is coined by enslaving Americans to pay back money the government grants or contracts to give to private and foreign government partners. The people are enslaved to pay back the money the government grants to entities or contracts with entities plus interest in violation of the 13 Amendment. The money is created based on slavery by delegating the Article 1 Section 8 coining power from congress to private entities the federal Reserve, the banks, the World Bank, BIS, the global money changer and the IMF. These entities make money out of debt. It is debt slavery. The 16th Amendment was created to serve slavery not freedom by taxing the people to pay back the unjust gains to the governments' private and foreign partners. The government system of coining is a system based on collusion and legalized bribery. The government praises slavery by calling it job creation wherein it arguably violates the Equal Protections Clause by giving grants and contracts based on barter or exchange, business greed, which is the mark of lawlessness that damns people to hell in the scripture sacrificing individuals and individual liberty for material gain.. See the Bible *Romans* 4:4. US Amend I, V, XIII. Those who

participate in charity and job creation collude in exploiting the needy to serve the greedy by tax breaks, marketing, for fun or other exchange, benefit, or gain in violation of Jesus's teachings leading to hell under the guise of good. In *Matthew* 6:1-4 Jesus teaches do not give alms seen. When you give, give in secret, not knowing your left hand from your right. This means do not give to get which is business not good or charity. Jesus teaches if you give to get, even connections, you will have no reward from your Father, meaning you will go to hell should you not repent of such evil abominations. I believe people sin leading to damnation in hell for fundraising, volunteering, for giving scholarships to students for tax breaks, and for organized charity. It drives out love for one another replaced with the love of money and material gain. *Matthew* 6:24. Organized charity, fundraising and charity teaches people to seek money and material worldly things as savior in place of God. They look at other people with eyes like the devil's to be destroyed in hell for even thinking people must contribute, give money or material gain, contribute to their controlled, collective, not free will to be worthy of life or to do good. They no longer look at people with clean eyes as worthy of respect and love unearned required. They look at others enslaving them to the sin of children of the devil making money and material gain savior leading to their certain damnation in the fires of hell. US Amend XIII. Little children are taught to reflect the image of the devil young. Little children will more likely be damned to hell should they die, which makes it a far more heinous tragedy when they are murdered. They are not innocent but misguided and bent towards evil unless born again, with fewer opportunities to be saved from the default of the majority, loss of eternal life. *John* 3. See *Ezekiel* Chapter 9 to confirm that even children will be destroyed in hell the past day. I am not going to go into the intricate details of how science based on scientific conditioning through behaviorist teaching theories like BF Skinner also known as temptations is used to damn many to the fires of hell.

18. Money is currently lawlessly coined based on slavery debt. Debt is against my religious beliefs. The Bible teaches owe nothing to anyone but to love them. I believe people go to hell by compelling people into debt to survive. I believe most people go to hell since that is what God through the holy spirit and Jesus teach. See *Matthew 7:13-17* (few find life) , *Isaiah 10:22* (only a remnant saved). Th unlawful manner money is created is a source of temptation misleading many to hell. Debt makes money God and savior teaching the people to seek money as God. I do not want people to go to hell because they look at others with lust for money and material gain, or profit or pleasure instead of with clean eyes of respect unearned required. Children of the devil look at moth and rust as the treasure. Children of God see people as the treasure not to enslave and sacrifice but to safeguard and protect freedom, free will required to escape the certain default damnation and loss of eternal life the last day. I proposed a manner to coin money lawfully in my complaint without violating Constitutional freedoms or the 13th Amendment. I am not asking the courts to draft laws. I asked the courts to keep the laws, to obey the laws by specifically obeying and upholding the Constitutional law from government violations in all three branches.

19. The way is coined tempts most humanity to go to hell by living based on making money convenience, avoidance of costs, and productivity God. I understand historically the manner money has been created has been based on slavery. It is not smart or just to continue in wrong just because evil has reigned the world throughout history. Money is not freedom. The way it is coined leads to death in hell by making money God. It is the same lawlessness feudalism, slavery, communism and other economic models create leading the majority to hell in different generations throughout history if left unrestrained by love written in the hearts of man or the just rule of law. The Courts may require Congress coin money lawfully.

20. The new economic model will eliminate the Constitutional laws safeguards to protect the people from slavery. The new economic model is schemed to be transferred to another model after 2050 at some unknown time that will eliminate governments and the rule of law that safeguards free will needed to escape the default death in hell.

21. The new system of creating money is a far more oppressive form of coining that will control a no longer free but scientifically controlled people, who are ruled over by temptations to survive or go without. There will be no private ownership of property, not even money earned. There will no free people. The system will convert to one where people will be rented out as if they are products equal to the lumber, meat, or vegetables sold. People will be looked at as mere property of those who control the resources, not people worthy of respect and free will needed to escape the default damnation in hell, freedom.

22. The video link alludes to the elimination of judges and lawyers at the World Government Summit to be replaced by technology. The aim of the transitions will be to eliminate the rule of law. There is an agenda to eliminate lawyers and judges and the rule of law. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NsdmPiBc9TI>

23. We have bias and partiality in the courts by courts and advocates whose eyes and hearts are based on compromising evil for good by bartering away justice instead of discerning justice based on truth. Lawyers and parties' hands may be unclean too. We are the advocates whose duty is to shed light on truth, but our eyes are dark and evil when we care more about doing best for our own instead of what is right. Lawyers are to blame when standardized training dumbs them down tempting them not to think outside of the box of standards to uphold the freedoms of those whose exercise of rights do not conform to the standards adopted by the mob, or majority through the vote or otherwise.

24. It is my religious belief the judiciary branch is not a business. It made me so upset to see a statutes calling justice a business to be bought and bartered allowing the wealthy to do as they please, pay a fine as the cost of doing business while murdering and enslaving people for money by the manner money is coined and our poisonous foods, harmful cancer causing productions of certain products are never corrected. The disparate favoritism towards those with something to buy their will be done arguably violates the Equal Protections Clause. Judges misbehave to get out of work. There is no justice for many unless parties especially pro se parties assert their rights in order not to waive them.

25. Jesus, God the father and the holy spirit teaches me about true justice, protecting people's free will while correcting them when they harm or oppress others to protect the freedom of others too.

26. It is my religious belief that judges sin when they blindly uphold laws that violate the Constitution. They commit lawlessness that remains unaddressed possibly based on ignorance which is guilt to God, not innocence. I believe people sin for using people as an example in violation of the equal protections clause to control a no longer free people of the dictates of the government or government backed private or foreign partners, even congress people and judges.

27. Fees and penalties are unjust and serve the mark of lawlessness leading to damnation in hell when they are used to employ people to be savior by unjust gains, making money through compelled involuntary servitude in violation of the 13th Amendment savior.. I believe the government enslaves the people in this life and tempts them to the way to hell by adding fees to combat crime on traffic violations because this is the mark of lawless lusts, human sacrifice for material gain by compelled involuntary servitude by making money God. US Amend XIII.

28. In *Kelly v Trump*, I lamented the government should do its own work. If the government funds it, it should run it. No tax payer funds should pay contractors to maintain streets. The more they crumble, the more future business not freedom is supported by the government. No judge should be worried about evil men placing them under the microscope saying faster, more productivity is better, when that is a lie leading to injustice. Justice is a matter of truth, not a matter of business by barter or exchange. Money should be coined without slavery while safeguarding people's free will to buy and sell with the limits of just decrees that require safeguards to prevent made to break, repair or borrow, rent out, or replace products and subpar services. speed and amount is just more not just decrees. Just laws and justice in the courts is the answer with regards to correcting products and services that kill, harm, oppress or destroy human life to gain the world.

29. People mislead others to hell and exploitation of need to serve greed, to maintain the need to sustain the business gain by charities and businesses when they teach money and material gain to fund their business or studies is the answer. It funds inequity. Money is not the answer. The Courts are the answer. Justice in the courts is a command in the Bible. I believe judges may save not only lives but eternal lives by those who blind their eyes for a paycheck when they harm or oppress others to care for their own. I understand if the government coined money lawfully to fully fund the government without slavery and without taxes government employees' eyes would no longer be evil. There would be a reduced temptation to lawlessly seek to eat the sheep as opposed to tend and care for them. The just rule of law restrains people from human sacrifice and enslavement under the lie of the common good. Without the courts there is only injustice and reign by lusts and oppression leading to hell. It is not money that is savior of free will from temptations so great as to mislead most to hell, it is courts.

30. I understand that the stock market is a Ponzi scheme. There is no money to pay out for the baby boomers earned retirement. See the attached article labeled as Exhibit E to confirm government pensions will not be paid. The Bank of International Settlements indicates 80 Trillion in government pensions were written off for tax breaks or otherwise are not accounted for. They will not be paid which is very foreseeable and easy for lawyers and the courts to comprehend should we care to think things out.

31. The boomer's retirement would not be funded if more people made money by working. That is a lie leading to hell despite the people's ignorance or willful indifference teaching people to enslave others to care for their own, the sin against the holy spirit. More people working will not even care for their own. The more money created, the more debt due plus interest in the alchemy and the Ponzi scheme on how money is created if this court does not uphold the Constitutional freedoms of the people by cutting off the bondage to slavery and debt by requiring Congress coin lawfully. This Court's duty is not to dead men but to the people's Constitutionally protected interests.

31. With that said the new economic model is a far worse Ponzi scheme that will substantially burden mankind's free will at an extent that many will give into temptation to bend their will to the dictates of the world in place of God, damning most of humanity to hell if the courts do not stop it. When people talk of bubbles popping, they recognize there is nothing there. There are no funds despite the people earning money for retirement.

32. With regards to the Courts duty to uphold the Constitution. Their duty is not to men, judges in superior courts and their precedent. They have contracted for the government position at the bartered for exchange of upholding the preempting Constitutional laws that protect the people. Judges get it wrong sometimes. It takes great strength and humility to

improve and correct the judiciary by overturning superior courts precedent or generations of lawless application of the rule of law. That courageous act improves the world.

33. I read certain judges answers to questionnaires and believe some answers please Congressional persons to confirm their appointment, but violate the rule of law.

34. I am troubled judges do not use their own free will. They do not judge and discern truth as a matter of impartial application of the Constitutional rule of law. Instead they please the ears of those who confirm their nominations in congress by indicating their duty is to precedent, binding precedent as opposed to the preemptive Constitution application of the rule of law which safeguards precious people, not sacrificing them for the lie of gaining the world, material gain, position, profit or convenience, the type of lawlessness misleading people to hell. This lie of saving the world at the cost of sacrificing people's liberties and lives in stakeholder interests they did not consent to will be used in the new economic model. What if the Circuits know the US Supreme Court got it wrong, and they are stuck uniformly administrating injustice in violation of the Constitutional laws that protect people.

35. I am troubled by judges who state "I will fulfill my duty to observe and apply all binding Supreme Court precedent," even if it violates the Constitution. Maybe it is not the judges who err as greatly as people like me, claimants or attorneys who must act as advocates, not the courts. Maybe it is lawyers who are too blame when injustice reigns because professionals' eyes are on winning, business or money, not freedom or love for humanity.

36. This Court knows I believe organized charities and not for profits do not do good but give to get, even a paycheck, tax break, or connections. This Court knows I believe people go to hell for teaching the lie business giving out of one hand to get out of the other is charity or good or love because it drives out unconditional love from the hearts of man eliminating God

from their souls making everything and everyone a matter of barter or exchange leading to the exploitation of need to serve the mark of the beast business greed not good by freedom and unearned required respect for those the government serves and protects.

37. I previously indicated I believe judicial speaking engagements and judicial teaching gigs corrupt the courts by creating judge attorney advocates who advocate the beliefs they share and teach. These partial productions also tempt judges to support those who support their ideology including schools, associations and the Federalist Society.

38. Attached, please find an example where a party appeared to be prejudiced by a partial judge who spoke at a conference supporting the ideology of those who supported him as opposed to the claimant. (Exhibit G).

39. I oppose partiality by the Courts not only to preserve the right to a fair trial and procedural due process for Americans, but also because favoritism, partiality, and bias is against my religious belief in Jesus Christ. See the attached letter to the US Supreme Court where I outlined my religious beliefs.

40. I am a Christian, and I find guidance in the Bible. Please note, even if paper Bibles ceased to exist, my God still is. My belief in God the Father, the son and the holy spirit is not diminished should Bible's no longer be printed to allegedly save the trees. Nevertheless, God's word is revealed by those who are inspired by the Holy spirit in the Bible and in life now.

41. Pursuant to the Bible, Jesus says, "The greatest among you is your servant." (Citing, *Matthew 23:11*). Accordingly, living to serve self is not great. In fact, I believe the root of corruption in both business and government is serving those who serve you, thereby serving yourself, instead of the people the government is supposed to serve, all the American people.

42. God calls us to love those beyond our own even our opponents. I believe people sin against God when they merely serve their own children and families, and those who serve or affect them, instead of all the people they are appointed to serve in their position of life.. Jesus said even evil people care for their children. (See, *Matthew* 7:9-12, "Which of you, if your son asks for bread, will give him a stone? Or if he asks for a fish, will give him a snake? If you, then, though you are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children..."). Jesus said even those without God love those who love them, and greet those who great them. (See, *Luke* 6:32-35, "if you love those who love you, what credit is that to you? Even sinners love those who love them. And if you do good to those who are good to you, what credit is that to you? Even sinners do that. But love your enemies, do good to them, and lend to them, expecting nothing in return. Then your reward will be great, and you will be sons of the Most High; for He is kind to the ungrateful and wicked"); (See also, *Romans* 12:14); (See *Matthew* 5:44-45, "But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven."); (*Matthew* 5:46-47, "If you love those who love you, what reward will you get?... And if you greet only your people, what are you doing more than others? Do not even the pagans do that?").

43. I believe God calls us to love God foremost and to love others, even those outside of our own, even our enemies, as ourselves. (See, *Matthew* 22:36-40, The greatest command in the bible is to love God. Subordinately, Love others as yourself. All commands are weighted on these.).

44. Leaders who serve themselves and those who serve them are not good leaders. They are servers of self not public servants, even in Congress and Presidents unrestrained by love in their hearts or court correction to protect Equal Protections under the law. US Amend V,

XIV. The prophets in the Old testament, John the Baptist, Jesus and the apostles all bravely and courageously confronted leaders who did evil, by serving themselves instead of those they were charged with serving.

45. In *Ezekiel* Chapter 34:1-10, God scolds leaders, shepherd who take advantage of the sheep to serve themselves instead of caring for them. "Woe to you shepherd of Israel who only take care of yourselves! Should not shepherds take care of the flock? You eat the curds, clothe yourself with wool and slaughter the choice animals, but you do not take care of the flock...." Id. *Leviticus* 19:15 ""You must not pervert justice; you must not show partiality to the poor or favoritism to the rich; you are to judge your neighbor fairly"); (see, *Exodus* 23:6, "You shall not deny justice to the poor in their lawsuits."); (see, *Deuteronomy* 16:19, "Do not deny justice or show partiality"); (also see, *Deuteronomy* 1:17, "Show no partiality in judging; hear both small and great alike. Do not be intimidated by anyone, for judgment belongs to God. And bring to me any case too difficult for you, and I will hear it.").

46. I even shared my view on what using the name of God in vain means when I proposed a suggestion to Senator Tom Carper of Delaware. (See, Exhibit 9 at DI 3). I believe it means using the name of God, or religion or scripture for man's purpose instead of a true religious purpose, God's purpose.

47. I believe it would be wrong for Presidential candidates and congressional candidates to collect donations or signatures from lobbyists and people as it would create the appearance of influence and favoritism in violation of the bible's teachings as we are called to serve everyone's best interests, not merely those who support us, or pay us with lobbyists money. That is a sin against God. (See, *James* 2:, "do not show favoritism."); (*James* 2:9, "But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as transgressors."); (*Deuteronomy* 16:19,

"Do not deny justice or show partiality. Do not accept any bribes, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and twists the words of the righteous."); (*Proverbs* 18:5, "Showing partiality to the wicked is not good, nor is depriving the innocent of justice."); (*Proverbs* 24:23, "These also are sayings of the wise: To show partiality in judgment is not good."); (*Malachi* 2:9, "So I in turn have made you despised and humiliated before all the people, because you have not kept My ways, but have shown partiality in matters of the law."); (*Job* 34:19, "who shows no partiality to princes and does not favor the rich over the poor, for they are all the work of his hands?"); (*Job* 13:10, "Surely He would rebuke you if you secretly showed partiality.").

48. Similarly, I think it is wrong for judges to accept speaking engagement and teaching positions, by making them partial to those who support the judges' ideology they teach. There is a temptation to be partial to the judge's own interests.

49. My goal is to safeguard the rule of law from the schemed demise. Jesus teaches no one knows when the end will be. I do not. I do know the devil distorts God's word to mislead people to harm and damnation in hell throughout history. I also believe the courts can save lives and eternal lives. Judges are special even if they mess up and make mistakes, and humbly seek to correct them, after all they are not God.

50. Jesus Christ taught "justice, mercy and faithfulness are greater laws than laws dealing with material gain because Judges can prevent harm here and damnation in hell if they only choose to care to know in order to love those they serve, even protecting those they are correcting. Matthew 23:23.

51. Impartial justice is a command in the bible because it is God's will to guide the misguided to save eternal lives. Amos 5:15.

52. I became a lawyer to do God's will. The devil is called the lawless one in scripture. How do you combat the devil? One way is through the just rule of law to guide the misguided. Throughout the Bible ignorance is guilt, misunderstanding, confusion, believing a lie as truth misleads people to harm others to be damned to hell for their confusion.

53. The Courts contribute to the fires of hell when they defer to professional standards and business practices that kill, steal and destroy human life and liberty for material gain. This is the same as human sacrifice by throwing people into the volcanoes for better crops.

54. We need the courts to judge the laws, judge the other two branches, judge themselves and their peers in cases and controversies, not disciplinary or regulatory proceedings. If the courts do not judge judges in cases and controversies others may seek to regulate the courts because the courts make judges above the law which plays into the real agenda to eliminate the rule of law down the line.

55. The Third Circuit on June 22, 2023 denied my motion for reargument of my appeal per the attached (Exhibit G)

56. I am stressed. Per the attached emails, Walmart prevented me from buying their cheaper ink. (Exhibit H).

57. I also am mourning the loss of loved ones. I lost 5 to 6 people on my street. Other streets our development lost more. I attended the funeral of Bill Jones last week. I have lost 1. 2. Tyson, Don Stevenson, 3. Richard York, 4. Heather Kaufman's live in grandmom, 5. Greg Tursline, and Bill Jones, all on one street since 2020. I imagine others have suffered similar losses.

58. I do not want to die. In the Bible death is labeled an enemy, but I do not feel well at all now. I am dangerously dehydrated and need time to recuperate.

59. I think I should try to draft a motion for a reargument on the denial for a recusal of Judge Scirca. I am just too worn out to work on it the next few days. I am not sure whether I should draft a motion for reargument on the denial of the recusal for Judge Phipps and Judge Scirica in the Eastern District Court of PA appeal, 22-3372.

60. I asked opposing counsel her position. She has not responded.

61. I am in awe to realize Danny Bickel at the US Supreme Court took time to talk with me. I did not know he was the motions clerk for the entire US Supreme Court for the entire country, not merely for assigned circuits. I asked him previously whether I could appeal the denial of the recusals prior to the Court's final decision. He said no. I have to do it at once.

62. I think he may have been mistaken. The answer may be a legal conclusion only a judge could render. The US Supreme Court previously denied a petition for cert relating to recusing a judge separately in the attached *Martin v Knox*, 112 S.Ct. 620 that is distinguished from my case in that the underlying recusal motion were allegedly without merit. This may arguably not create precedent that recusal motions may not be separately appealable given the split in the Circuits. The dissent indicated,

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

63. I am so disappointed in myself for not blindly deferring to what others say, but seeking to look up things myself. There appears to be a split in the circuit.

64. You know that I seek to separate government from religion to safeguard our freedoms to worship or not, despite the fact I outline why my religious beliefs require I seek to preserve the actual impartiality, not the mere appearance of the courts.

65. I am very dehydrated and I need time to recuperate.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/26/23

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

Exhibit 9

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 50th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. The summer reading before my First year in law school in 2001 included case regarding thermal radiation searches of homes in 1998 for pot plants. The US Supreme Court held the search for plants and humans by thermal searches was an unconstitutional search and seizure. *Killo v United States*, 533 U.S. 27 (2001).

2. Upon information and belief that technology is currently used by the government’s private and foreign partners to conduct searches of people through chips and wifi tracking now, through appliances, printers, HVAC, and other wifi connections.

3. Please see the attached articles by MIT dated 2015, as Exhibit B describing the technology. Anything smart or electronically monitored is dangerous in that it eliminates the right privacy and allows for business oppression. Marketers may seek to get as much as they can for as little by controlling what prices people see for goods they use. This technology tracks heat radiation to detect people’s bodies through walls. This can show when they shower, go to the bathroom, open the refrigerator or brush their teeth and other activities. This allows entities to sell products based on the tracked habits of humans.

4. I hate the chips act because it allows the tracking of every chipped item.

5. The overturning of *Roe v. Wade* removed the federal right to privacy, beyond the 4th Amendment right against evidence used in unlawful searches and seizures in criminal proceedings. We arguably have the state right for intrusion into the seclusion in DE, but federal agencies gave private companies the right to piggy back and use private people's wifi data. See, *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 129 (1973) ("This right in the concept of personal "liberty" embodied in the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause; or in personal, marital, familial, and sexual privacy said to be protected by the Bill of Rights or its penumbras")

6. I oppose abortion because I do not believe the babies go to heaven which breaks my heart. Jesus Christ teaches we must not merely be born; we must be born again. See *John 3*. These children were not only robbed of the opportunity to have life now, but they will not have eternal life either which makes me so sad since I look at people as the treasure and money and material things as moth and rust.

7. Yet, I am cognizant that the removal of the federal right to privacy by overturning *Roe v. Wade* will allow the overthrow of the government through private and foreign partners

8. If the courts place checks on the other two branches, and the private and foreign partners, we may be able to reverse or prevent the schemed overthrow.

9. In my last affidavit I noted I was upset applicants for judicial positions pledged their allegiance to mere men and their precedent instead of the Constitutional law as they sought endorsements. Yet, the courts should not be blamed for injustice. The blame should be pointed to lawyers, even lawyers placed on disabled like me. I am sorry for my misplaced concern. The finger must be pointed at myself and other attorneys. We misbehave when we are not courageous enough to persuade the courts of their error to uphold justice.

10. The attached excerpt of a recent Supreme Court decision, *Mallory v. Norfolk Southern R. Co.*, dated June 27, 2023, labeled Exhibit B held, ““If a precedent of this Court has direct application in a case,” as Pennsylvania Fire does here, a lower court “should follow the case which directly controls, leaving to this Court the prerogative of overruling its own decisions.” Rodriguez de *Quijas v. Shearson/American Express, Inc.*, 490 U. S. 477, 484. This is true even if the lower court thinks the precedent is in tension with “some other line of decisions.” Ibid. Pp. 10–12.

11. With regards to my last affidavit where I lamented on judicial nominees averring to obedience to superior courts even if it violates the Constitution, it appears it is lawyers, even lawyers placed on disability inactive are to blame for the injustices in the world, blinded by a pay check and dumbed down standardization, not the judges.

12. Lawyers have to be courageous by doing what is right, not what is self-serving or materially beneficial for their colleagues at the cost of sacrificing the rights of the weak and the different.

13. The Courts are in trouble. I was happy it placed a check upon states on June 27 in *Moore v Harper* by restraining state acts to the limits of preempting federal law. I believe that may help preserve the courts and the government from schemed planned attacks by showing government conduct must not violate Constitutional law making the government above the law..

14. I also believe the courts may preserve the judiciary by limiting correction of the judiciary within the purview of the Constitution’s authority without waiver by 1. cases and controversies like my own and impeachment.

15. Justice is not a popularity contest left to public fickle opinions.

16. The attacks against the courts are unnatural and planned to aide in a government overthrow. There are a number of ways to prevent the overthrow. One way I mentioned was to coin lawfully as I proposed in my Complaint. So the Central banks may no longer control a no longer free government or free people by debts and carbon credits to bend the will of the people to their dictates under the penalty of not being able to buy and sell.

17. When I ran for office I proposed laws that would prevent pollution without use of economic force to control and oppress the people to bend their will to the government or government backed partners. That is lawlessness. I am not anti-environment. I am anti-slavery and oppression which eliminates every constitutional liberty. I get smarter when people disagree with me and one another. That is how we learn from one another instead of the dumbed down standardization which creates subpar goods and services for material gain and convenience of those who sell a product.

18. The US Supreme Court released a unanimous opinion overturning the Third Circuit's opinion in *Gerald E. Groff v. Louis DeJoy, Postmaster General*, No. 22-174. I am grateful as a different ruling would have caused unrest by Adventist to feel unprotected to freely exercise religious belief to worship on the day they believe is the Sabbath. Some members of this group believe people go to hell for worshipping God on Sunday. They call it the Mark of the beast. I disagree, but protect their free will to belief by the dictates of their conscience. Members of this religion think my religious belief and association is naughty. So, it is especially important to protect this group as there is outrage against the establishment of government religion by government partnerships with the Catholic Church, my church. I sought to dissolve the partnerships in *Kelly v Trump* to protect the government, the church and the people's freedom to worship or not according to the dictates of their conscience not the dictates of the dollars or

government backing of certain religions, while ignoring others based on barter or exchange not freedom.

20. On June 29, 2023, the US Supreme Court in *Groff v DeJoy*, “Held: Title VII requires an employer that denies a religious accommodation to show that the burden of granting an accommodation would result in substantial increased costs in relation to the conduct of its particular business.”

21. The Court explained “aced with an accommodation request like *Groff*’s, an employer must do more than conclude that forcing other employees to work overtime would constitute an undue hardship. *Id.*”

22. On June 29, 2023, the US Supreme Court also appeared to overturn affirmative action in *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*.

23. Money and material advantage is not justice as a matter of truth. I hate when the court looks at history instead of discerning facts before them in light of truth, not past truths. Affirmative action may be over. It is sin to teach throwing money at things is justice. I believe it teaches the way to hell by making money God in contraventions to Jesus’s teachings in *Matthew 6:24*. I believe it is not okay to disparately treat outsiders to care for your own regardless of race, religion or place of origin even if affirmative action is over. The Equal protections clause of the 14th and 5th remains, though businesses and charities often treat certain groups better than others to sell products based on popularity of a groups’ stance. If businesses are selectively backed by government through words, grants, contracts or other support they arguably perform a government function and should not be allowed to mistreat or not serve customers based on orientation or belief. The Supreme Court cases are in conflict with my beliefs.

24. I drafted an article of impeachment for congress to impeach President Trump based on his violation of criminal law 18 USC 227 by his incitement of economic persecution of NFL players who exercised their First Amendment right to peacefully protest against certain disparate treatment against blacks in the criminal judicial system. I sought to protect the oppressed by seeking justice not money.

25. This case, *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*, must not needlessly cause unrest by lobbyists who seek money not justice. The Courts must not be partial to people pleasing, popularity or fickle fads. It is up to lawyers to persuade the courts when they believe the court is wrong, not the mob reign of everchanging lawless lusts. Sometimes lawyers get it wrong too. That does not mean they should be punished for disagreeing with the court.

26. I do not feel well at all. I hope this court does not think less of me because I require time to care for my life, health and loved ones, and may not be able to write for awhile despite my concerns on Web3, the WEF meeting June 27-29 and other agendas that will be used to overthrow the government down the line, should the courts not stop them.

27. I do not approve of judges politicking, but whether judges conquer is up to the courts. Attached, please find a picture of my schoolmate I esteem Judge Bill Stickman and I upon graduation. Bill and Judge Connelly spoke at the Federalist Society on or about April 28, 2023. I see the US Supreme Court justices do the same too. It is not up to regulators to correct the court but lawyers in cases and controversies where their loyalty is questioned like the Board questioned my loyalty to the profession, whereas my loyalty is to the impartial rule of law.

28. Attached also find some pictures of my friend Sarah Cha Cha, now Carter and I at Chamber events where the government colluded with private partners to plan a fixed not free

economy. Senator carper disagreed with my health care proposals to protect sick and old people which broke my heart. Notice his grimace when pictured with me as opposed to Sarah. When I ran for office, he also grimaced in the attached picture. Despite my failure to persuade Senator Carper, loss of an election and dismissal of Kelly v Trump, I do not regret doing what I believe was right. I would regret doing nothing. It is possible I may have moved someone's heart who may move the mountains I failed to shake.

29. On an aside, I took time away from the practice of law because I thought I was going to get married to the most wonderful man on the planet attached here. That did not work out. Yet, he will remain the love of my life the rest of my life. So, I do not regret putting God, people I love, and justice not business or money first, even when I fail or fall.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 6/29/23

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

Exhibit 10

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 51st AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. The Third Circuit rendered two judgements against me in the Eastern District of PA case, per the attached orders on Friday June 30, 2023. I must draft motions for reaguments on all of the denials. I am just so tired and distraught. The Third Circuit also filed an order in this case on Friday, June 30, 2023, per the notice this Court received at DI-160.

2. I feel like a rug has been pulled under my feet and a dagger stabbed into my heart.

3. I have to draft motions for reagument on a bunch of denied motions and appeal in the Third Circuit regarding to the Eastern District of Pa, but I do not have time and I do not feel well.

4. I am pretty upset.

5. I am in trouble for my religious beliefs in Jesus as God, not money and material gain as God. I am in trouble for believing people blinded by seeking money and material gain to care for their own to the extent they do not see clearly on how their training, work, job or conduct harm or oppress others sin. I believe people go to hell the last day for making money and material things God, by making business God. *Matthew 6:24*. I do not want people to go to hell. I believe Judges may save people blinded by desire for money to provide for themselves to see clearly by court correction to prevent their certain damnation in hell by serving the mark of

children of the devil, business greed unrestrained with God's law of love written on their hearts or the just rule of law. *Jeremiah 31*. I believe judges have the capacity of saving eternal lives.

6. I believe judges guarantee injustice when they blindly defer to professionals, workers, businessmen, philanthropists, experts and their mere studies, science, technology and products.

7. By such deference, judges make professional standards, business practices, services and products above judicial correction when they oppress, harm, kill, steal or destroy human life and health to sustain positions, profit or power. I believe Judges essentially serve lawlessness leading to hell by allowing human sacrifice of liberty or life for convenience, productivity and material gain. I think it is lawlessness in the eyes of God not to use your brain and think things out by blindly deferring to the corrupted science and professionals without discerning the innate conflict of interest.

8. I desire judges to judge not professionals. The blind, convenient deferment to science, mere studies, and professionals allows their professional misconduct to be above the law's court correction to prevent their certain condemnation in hell. It makes men, mere professionals, God, misleading people to harm and damnation in hell for idolatry. The fact professionals and the people they mislead and deceive did not know they caused harm by doing what they were trained to do does not remove the harm towards others. I believe people go to hell for not knowing they commit oppression, or human sacrifice of life and liberty for material gain by doing what they are trained to do. I believe people go to hell for not caring to know, for misunderstanding, for their confusion, for their unconcern, or belief in a lie should they not unhardened their heads and unhardened their hearts. I do not want people to go to hell.

9. I believe judges are special because they may not only prevent harm and save victims of other people's sins of business greed by selling products that kill them, they may save the blind and dumb wrongdoers soul from losing eternal life on judgment day.

10. I desire the judges be free from the temptation and pressure of productivity and profit to commit injustice for convenience by requiring Congress to fully fund their pay without taxation by coining correctly without slave debt in violation of the 13th Amendment and my First Amendment Freedom of religious belief, as applied. The private entities and the banks should no longer govern by slavery. Congress should take back its coining power to coin to eliminate slavery to protect people's freedom as opposed to enslaving them to enrich those the government disparately favors in violation of the Equal Protections Clause of the 5th and 14th Amendment by government grants and contracts in a fixed not free economy where the unlevel playing field is based on government business not government service. Business serves greed not humanity. The government cannot govern and guide misguided businesses who kill, steal and destroy when the government colludes with the wrongdoers by government backing through words or money.

11. People I have spoken with say the government is too corrupt and will not coin freely to fund the government without slavery. The courts may eliminate corruption. Judges have free will and may do it in another case to prevent slavery on a greater level.

12. The two new schemed economic models violate my religious belief on a greater level by enslaving people to debt on every transaction until people and the governments will no longer own any material thing and will be owned by those who control the resources without restraint in the form of law. The Central banks are rendered above the law to be the letter of the law above court correction under the carbon debt/credit plan. Upon information and belief after resources are transitioned to entities eliminating private property a second economic model will

eliminate governments. There are literally books that allude to such schemes like the Club of Rome's 2052. I am not pulling this out of thin air. I believe the courts are in trouble, meaning we are in trouble. As the economic transition worsens the court must know there is a way out to reverse or prevent the planned dissolution of these United States.

13. If advocate attorneys may require the other two branches obey the Constitution, judges can make our country free, not for sale slave people to private and foreign partners. Judges would no longer be tempted to create injustice by the mark of the beast, desire for material gain, convenience, productivity by sacrificing justice as a matter of truth if Congress coined lawfully. Attorneys are supposed to advocate against slavery by removal of temptations not allow governments to rule like the lawless one Satan by temptations of reward or threat of harm, aka scientific conditioning to entice the people to bend to the governments will substantially burdening freedom by their disparate backing of business and charities in a fixed, unlevel, not free market place in violation of Equal protections and slavery.

14. I believe the government commits lawlessness before God leading to the participants certain damnation in hell when it uses money based on slavery by how it is coined to violate the equal protections clause by granting not for profits, businesses, churches and charities money to perform government business by grants or contracts. Giving to get is business. The government destroys freedom by enslaving people to exploit the needy to serve the greedy. I believe people sin when they create jobs under the lie job creation in a slave, fixed market is good. I believe God teaches those who receive unjust gains by barter with the government sin leading to their certain damnation in hell should they not repent. Should the courts separate business from freedom, the government collusion with the private sector would cease. Then, the government may uphold the Constitutional freedoms of the people from slavery of many to serve

the few who barter for power, profit or positions with the colluding government through legalized bribery under the guise of bartering for government contracts. I think it is wrong even though we are trained to praise evil as good. Judges can change the world by righting wrongs which have occurred for over 100 years since the Federal Reserve was created in 1913. Just because the templars and other countries coined through debt slavery even in Roman times does mean we should continue. Babylon allegedly may be the first nation to enslave people to debt by the manner they coined money which we mimic today. The debt slavery manner money is created oppresses people in this life to enrich those who receive unjust gains leading to damnation in hell in the next by making money savior to pay off those people owe not freely but artificially.

15. I believe people are misled to harm and damnation in hell by the salve system of coining. The two new economic models of money creation increase temptations leading to harm and hell. I am in tears. I believe the courts may save their lives and eternal lives. This does not relate to my law suit, but I am using this opportunity to plant a seed in your heart in hopes the courts may be our hero at another time, preferably with some else bringing a suit.

16. I did not know how bad the world was until I ran for office. In my last affidavit I showed pictures where I attended functions only business people and government agents attend. The common people had no voice. They planned a fixed not free economy by money and forced business by government legalized bribery by giving entities money to do what they were told. I love dressing up and wearing sparkles like people did in the batman movies, but I learned it was dirty and sinful to attend functions where I learned only a select few rule over the many by government backed private economic pressure.

17. I learned allowing lobbyists and organizations to pressure the government through money or support in elections eliminates individual freedom for business by backing or other barter or exchange. The government serves greed not the people it exploits to serve the economy which serves some, not all selectively in violation of the Equal Protections Clause.

18. It was weird when I ran for office I reached out to groups asking how they proposed to fix the problems they market like trash or pollution. No one had solutions. Those I contacted just wanted money. I did not ask for support, but for their answers. They had none. I believe people go to hell for teaching money is the answer by fundraising, charity, work or otherwise, should they not repent.

19. I believe the answer is drafting just decrees or seeking justice in the courts. Judges are part of the solution that eliminates the problem.

20. I am astonished at congressional proposals, and lobbyists for lamenting about judges buying and bartering in the market and for personal relationships when the other two branches' hands are unclean. The other two branches seek donations which I see as legalized bribery or favor or benefit in exchange for grants or contracts. They misbehave and must "pull out of the beam out of their own eye before pulling a splinter out of the court's eye." Citing Jesus. Every person has an interest in every case before the US Supreme Court since their opinions create case law that governs and guides all of our activity to limits to protect freedom.

21. I have religious beliefs against organized charity, fundraising or lobbying, which may create unique standing should the courts ever need to eliminate the undue influence and corruption of money and material gain by bought backing within the other two branches of government.

22. My religious beliefs are genuine.

23. I sent Judge Diamond proof the Delaware Supreme Court sealed material evidence in my favor to fix the proceeding against me, attached hereto I also deferred to the the Eastern District of PA District Court's request request and sent the attached Motion for ECF access, excluding exhibits.

24. As I have been reviewing the docket, I noticed undisputable proof the DE Supreme Court enticed the state attacks against me in Kelly by Trump and the Disciplinary proceeding. Attached, please find the DE Supreme Court letter where the Court copied the Disciplinary Board during Kelly v Trump, prior to this law suit. I filed this letter with this court with notice I contested certain Disciplinary rules prior to this Court's Order issued that same day. See DI 58, DI 59.

25. I am so upset, but I thank the court's staff. I need to wipe m tears and work on overturning the Third Circuit orders.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 7/2/23

Meghan M. Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693, Not acting as a lawyer
Defending my First Amendment private right to
believe in Jesus Christ as God, not money or
mammon as God

Exhibit 11

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 52nd AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I told my parents about the bad news today, the orders I must appeal and potentially 6 new law suits with a certain one by the US Supreme Court should I not overturn it.

2. Instead of comforting me, they freaked out and threatened to disown me by cutting off the phone making me move out.

3. I love my family but I cannot turn to them when bad things happen without facing the wrath of my parents, even rat babies in law school or school papers. Hence, I do not have proof readers, without wrath.

4. I am so distraught and was thinking about retaining an attorney should I overturn the Third Circuit’s order in this case if he would take the case without costs.

5. Jesus teaches us not to have an advocate when we are brought to court. I am taking the Defendants to court. So, this may be different. There is only one attorney I would choose.

6. I certainly would have fewer means to advocate on behalf of myself if my parents cut off my phone again as they did before.

7. I just cannot tell them bad news. I am sorry I upset them because I love them. They also disagree with my religious beliefs which is difficult.

8. Attached find an old picture of my dad, baby brother, and one of my brother's best friends, an FBI agent Mike Trilio, spelling unknown ("Mike").

9. Back in 2007-2008, I learned through my brother, who if I recall correctly, learned through Mike that everything on our computer was accessible to hacks even if we unplugged our lap tops. Ever since 2007-2008 I took out the battery in every lap top before they prevented us from taking out the battery by sealing them in.

10. There's been evidence of a scheme to eliminate the dollar to allow a digital feudal system under the lie of saving the environment only to enslave the people while profiting wrong doers who make more money and sustain their positions so long as the pollution problem persists.

11. The new system allows the Central banks to reign unrestrained by the government, even controlling the governments. The new system allows the banks to increase debt, to increase recoupment of property on secured loans to allow for slow control of resources. Then, the next economic model will be forced upon us which will eliminate governments after 2050 if the courts do not save us.

12. I may not be able to think of a way to include how the court may prevent the dissolution of the US, but I am trying. My hope of a hero is the courts, even if it is in a different case by a different party.

13. The digital back doors to our computers and devices allow for block chain, crypto currency and tokens to implement the new economic model.

14. The Patriot's Act required the back doors to our digital devices to be open, which is needed in order for digital currency to work.

15. The Patriot's Act may not be in effect, but the purpose of it to allow for this digital economic system remains.

16. If Congress drafted laws to coin correctly and to close the back doors to our devices because the Courts rendered tracking of everything we buy and sell as an invasion of right against government backed searches and seizures under the 4th or under the penumbra of the 5th Amendment procedural Due process right of privacy Roe v Wade declared, maybe this court may stop a slow digital overthrow.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 7/2/23

Meghan M. Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693, Not acting as a lawyer
Defending my First Amendment private right to
believe in Jesus Christ as God, not money or
mammon as God

Exhibit 12

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 M Kelly’s **Second** Motion to stay the Proceeding until the conclusion of Respondent’s originating disciplinary proceeding until a final non-appealable determination is made or the time of appeal has lapsed. Plaintiff further moves the Court, for good cause for permission to file an Amended complaint 30 days after the stay is lifted

I, Plaintiff Meghan M. Kelly, move this Court to stay this proceeding until conclusion of the Delaware disciplinary proceeding by a final non-appealable determination or the time of appeal has lapsed. Plaintiff further moves the Court, for good cause, for permission to file an Amended Complaint 30 days after the stay is lifted. Simultaneously herewith, I am filing a motion under FRCP R 60(b)(1)(2)(3)(4)(6) to alter and amend the orders, dated November 2, 2022, December 22, 2021, and April 26, 2022, I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety.

Background

1. I agree not to practice law on behalf of another, without this Court’s authorization.
2. On 7/13/2022, I filed a motion to stay the proceeding pending a determination in the state proceeding including appeals to the US Supreme Court, or the time for appeal lapses, I incorporate herein by reference. (DI 80). Every docket item (“DI”) and the exhibits thereto in other DIs I incorporated herein by reference by every DI reference.
3. On 7/17/2022, I filed *Plaintiff Meghan Kelly’s Motion to Withdraw Plaintiff’s Motion to amend the complaint pursuant to FRCP 15(a)(1) and FRCP 15(a)(2) to include additional parties, eliminate a party, include additional facts and include additional requests for relief,*

dated January 24, 2022, Docket Item 43 and intent to request leave be granted to amend the complaint, as a matter of right, after the state proceeding is complete, including appeals to the US Supreme Court, or the time of appeal has expired, and to serve such Amended Complaint, with an amended praecipe, with corrections, as opposed to the original complaint through the US Marshall, I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety this Motion, especially the legal citations in the footnotes, and arguments to amend the complaint therein. (DI 81)

4. On various dates, I filed Motions to Amend the Complaint, and related documents, including a Motion to withdraw my initial motion to amend, while maintaining such amendments therein, in order to include additional amendments, and Rolling Motions, Under FRCP Rule 15. I incorporate herein by reference these documents, and the documents referred to in the DI numbers. (DI 43, 55, 56, 58, 69-75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85).

5. I seek to *inter alias* amend the complaint in the civil rights case, *Kelly v Swartz* to *inter alias* void the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding and the Delaware decision in *Kelly v Trump*. The outcome for or against my case in both proceedings will affect the outcome on any decision before this Honorable Court because the litigation relates to the same conduct.

6. I also seek to amend the Complaint to include additional causes of actions and facts that have arisen as a result of the August 10, 2022 State Disciplinary Order placing my active license to practice law on disabled/inactive.

7. On September 7, 2022, the Delaware Supreme Court denied my motion for reargument. I intend to appeal this decision with the US Supreme Court.

8. I face a total of 8 cases, this civil rights case, the 6 potential reciprocal cases or appeals, and the appeal of the original discipline case. I am seeking to stay disciplinary cases.

9. Fighting all 8 cases at once creates a substantial burden upon my access to this court and the US Supreme Court on appeal, due to time constraints, my poverty and religious beliefs against debt. (Bible, *Romans* 13:8)

10. PA Disciplinary counsel opposed my stay in its reciprocal discipline case. (Exhibits A, B, B-1, and Internal Exhibit F and D-1 of B-1, incorporated herein by reference)

11. I require a stay from this Court as I fight off the reciprocal proceedings, and seek a meaningful opportunity to appeal the Delaware disciplinary order with the US Supreme Court.

12. A determination on appeal by the US Supreme Court of the original disciplinary matter may lead courts to vacate pending disciplinary proceedings.

13. A stay is required to protect my meaningful access to the courts.

14. The additional law suits have increased costs, caused me to panic, lose sleep, and gain baby white hairs. If I expend all my resources in terms of time, paper and other costs, by defending all cases simultaneously only to run out of resources, I would be prevented from defending my exercise of fundamental rights in any case to its conclusion.

15. A lawyer's right, my right to pursue my profession constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and of which I cannot be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the state's disagreement with my religious-political beliefs.

16. I must be afforded access to the courts to defend my license to practice law from being placed on inactive disabled but for my faith in Jesus Christ, and exercise of fundamental rights.

17. I am utterly poor. A stay is required to prevent a substantial burden and obstacle to my access to the Courts, and compelled violation of my religious belief against debt, in contravention to my First Amendment right to access to the Courts applicable to the Federal Courts via the Equal Protection component of the 5th Amendment, for me, a member of class of one due to religious beliefs against incurring debt combined and due to utter poverty. *See, Abdul-Akbar v. McKelvie*, 239 F.3d 307, 317 (3d Cir. 2001) (“This requires us first to determine whether Appellant is a member of a suspect class or whether a fundamental right is implicated. Neither prisoners nor indigents are suspect classes.”) *Citing, e.g., Pryor v. Brennan*, 914 F.2d 921, 923 (7th Cir. 1990); *Harris v. McRae*, 448 U.S. 297, 323, (1980) (noting that poverty is not a suspect classification); (*But see, Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 370 (1996) “[A]t all stages of the proceedings the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses protect [indigent persons] from invidious discriminations.”)

18. “Because this case implicates the [Constitutionally protected] right of access to the courts,” in defense of my First Amendment rights, determining whether removing the substantial burden upon my religious beliefs and access to the courts by granting stay, to prevent needless or unduly burdensome costs, is determined under a strict scrutiny basis test. *Citing, Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004).

19. The Supreme Court noted, “There can be no equal justice where the kind of trial a man gets depends on the amount of money he has.” *Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 370 (1996); (internal citations omitted)

20. Justice Stevens, with whom Justice Brennan, Justice Marshall, and Justice Blackmun joined, in dissenting of US Supreme Court in *Murray v. Giarratano*, 492 U.S. 1, 18 (1989) recognized,

“When an indigent is forced to run this gantlet of a preliminary showing of merit, the right to appeal does not comport with fair procedure. . . . [T]he discrimination is not between ‘possibly good and obviously bad cases,’ but between cases where the rich man can require the court to listen to argument of counsel before deciding on the merits, but a poor man cannot. . . . The indigent, where the record is unclear or the errors are hidden, has only the right to a meaningless ritual, while the rich man has a meaningful appeal.” *Douglas*, 372 U.S., at 357-358

21. I expected to rejoin my old law firm after standing up for something more important than money in *Kelly v Trump*, my free exercise of religious-political belief, exercise of religious and political speech, and association as a party, attorney, democrat, and Christian, without government incited persecution, but for my exercise of fundamental rights.

22. Defendants’ state proceeding against me creates a government incited economic substantial burden upon me, and prejudices me by forcing me into a maintained state of poverty by preventing me from seeking to get my former position back at my old law firm as an attorney, or any work at a law firm. Defendants conduct harms my reputation to make me less attractive to employers should I alert my former firm or other firms of this proceeding against me, harming my prospects of employment by the libelous accusations against me. While, poverty is not a suspect class, my right to meaningful access to the courts, despite the inherent burden of poverty, and my religious beliefs and strongly held religious exercise relating to my religious belief against indebtedness is protected.

23. Fundamental First Amendment rights of speech, belief, exercise of belief, and association are implicated, in this case. Thus, this Court must have a compelling reason to deny my request for a stay of the proceeding to prevent potentially irreparable to me, narrowly tailored to meet the important justification.

24. There is no compelling reason to deny my request for a stay. Defendants are not prejudiced, nor is the public. Nor is any justification narrowly tailored to meet any compelling

reason. This Court must grant a stay. This Court may stay the case, with no prejudice, while potentially avoiding needless work for the court, the appellate courts and the parties.

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

Legal Authority to grant a stay

26. “This Court has discretion to stay a civil proceeding.” *Sec. & Exch. Comm'n v. Hvizdzak Capital Mgmt.*, Civil Action 1:20-154, at *1-2 (W.D. Pa. Aug. 11, 2021); *Citing. Landis v. North American Co.*, [299 U.S. 248, 254](#) (1936); *Bechtel Corp. v. Local 215, Laborers' Int'l Union*, [544 F.2d 1207, 1215](#) (3d Cir. 1976). “While staying a case is an extraordinary measure, *United States v. Breyer*, [41 F.3d 884, 893](#) (3d Cir. 1994),...courts will not hesitate to grant a stay when the interests of justice seem to require it.” *Id, Citing, See Kashi v. Gratsos*, [790 F.2d 1050, 1057](#) (2d Cir. 1986); *see also United States Secs. and Exch. Comm'n v. Santillo*, No. 18 Civ. 5491, 2018 WL 6039324 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 2, 2018); *Aluminium Bahrain B.S.C. v. Dahdaleh*, No. 8-299, 2012 WL 5305167 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 25, 2012); *Walsh Secs., Inc. v. Cristo Prop. Mgmt., Ltd.*, [7 F.Supp.2d 523](#) (D.N.J. 1998).

27. “The Court's discretion to stay a matter is ‘incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants. How this can best be done calls for the exercise of judgment, which must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance.’” *Id, Citing, Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254-55. “In deciding how to exercise this discretion, the Court must ‘initially assess to what

extent the issues in ... cases overlap, and consider the status of the ... case, including whether the defendant has been indicted.” Id. *Citing, Int'l Fidelity Ins. Co. v. Podlucky*, No. 07-0235, 2007 WL 2752139, at *2 (W.D. Pa. Sept. 19, 2007) (*citing In re Derivative Litig.*, No. 06-02964, 2007 WL 1101276 (E.D. Pa. April 11, 2007)). “Then, the Court must weigh the following factors: (1) the plaintiff’s interests and the potential prejudice to plaintiff of a delay; (2) the prejudice to the defendant; (3) the interest of the Court; (4) the interests of third parties; and (5) the interest of the public.” Id. *Citing, Golden Quality Ice Cream Co., Inc. v. Deerfield Specialty Papers, Inc.*, 87 F.R.D. 53, 55 (E.D. Pa. 1980)).

28. Per the Western District of Pennsylvania District Court, in *Sec. & Exch. Comm'n v. Hvizdzak Capital Mgmt.*, Civil Action 1:20-154, at *2 (W.D. Pa. Aug. 11, 2021), “the Court is not to consider whether [the civil matter and disciplinary matter] ‘overlap in their entirety,’ but whether and to what extent the issues overlap.” Id. “The record presently before the Court [in my case] demonstrates adequate similarity of issues weighing in favor of a stay.” Id. at *3 The case relates to some of the same facts and issues, albeit not all.

Interest of the Court

29. The Court has a strong interest in judicial efficiency. Staying this action could restructure the proceeding in this Court because collateral estoppel could prevent re-litigation of issues adjudicated on appeal in the original disciplinary matter. Thus, the interests of the Court weigh in favor of a stay, to prevent needless waste of judicial resources, by a superseding US Supreme Court decision.

Defendant’s Interests, third parties interests and the public’s interest

30. There is no prejudice towards the Defendants, third parties or the public by a delay, should a stay be granted. I agree not to practice law in this jurisdiction, without this court's authorization. I require time and meaningful opportunity to both defend myself on appeal in the original proceeding, and to also present my case in the civil rights proceeding.

31. The public and third parties are not harmed by a stay. Yet, the public may be harmed if a stay is not granted, by setting a precedent that the state may eliminate Constitutional liberties in a government compelled exchange for the license to buy in sell in a profession, to force its will upon citizens to serve business greed, not good. Should I not be granted meaningful opportunity to contest the original case on appeal to the US Supreme Court, then every citizen may be in danger of being adjudicated disabled, for merely believing differently than the state, or for standing up for their religious-political beliefs in Court.

**The need to preserve the right to plead the defense of Good cause in a motion at a later
time**

32. I have good cause to contest the decision the Delaware Supreme Court made in placing me on disabled inactive, but for the exercise of my First Amendment right to religious-political speech, religious-political belief, religious-political-exercise, and my exercise of the right to make religious-political petitions. Yet I am impoverished. I lack time and resources to fight both the appeal and the civil rights case and 6 other potential reciprocal cases simultaneously. Albeit, I may have to appeal the Third Circuit's automatic decision which disparately treats attorneys adjudicated disabled by affording them fewer Constitutional protections than attorneys disbarred and suspended attorneys, before the US Supreme Court. It appears the Third Circuit only allows disbarred and suspended attorneys to contest the original disciplinary proceeding on

due process and Constitutional grounds, not lawyers adjudicated disabled like me. See, R.A.D.E 6 and 16.

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

34. I seek to void the Delaware Disciplinary decision in the civil rights case, in addition to other relief. Should the US Supreme Court rule in favor or against me, in the original disciplinary case, it will likely affect the outcome of this Court's determination based on the same and similar facts.

35. In addition, new and additional facts seem to consistently arise in my case that are material to my defense in the outcome of this proceeding.

36. Denial of a stay would cause a substantial burden upon my access to the courts due to my poverty, limited time, resources, and my religious beliefs against indebtedness. Should a stay be denied, I would be required to expend limited resources on all matters, only to risk running out of resources. This would prevent me the ability to plead and defend my case in any matter. I beg you for a stay, to prevent potentially needless costs, and sacrifice of my First Amendment liberties.

37. The Disciplinary proceeding prevents me from seeking to rejoin my former law firm, where I intended to perform real estate settlements. I am impoverished, and have cancelled my car insurance as unaffordable. I have been getting allergy related diarrhea from biking to the post office. I do not have the means to fight all reciprocal suits at once.

38. The Delaware Court's members, agents and/or their arms have selectively persecuted me, with disparate treatment based on religious-political animus, poverty animus and place of origin animus, for years, even prior to my admission to the Delaware bar. Notably, two judges persecuted me based on place of origin animus. Retired Court of Common Pleas Judge, Smalls called me a "Philadelphia lawyer" during my first proceeding as if that was a bad word. Judge Slight told me to "go back to Pennsylvania" after I answered a question correctly, and appeared to steal his thunder. His face was not smiling, and he was seriously scolding me.

39. When I ran for office in 2018 in Delaware, I made a bumper sticker to combat the prejudice by the state, including Delaware judges, that stated "There is no Delaware Way. There is an American way where we respect all people regardless of race, religion, or place of origin, (even Pennsylvania)." I placed it on my vehicle.

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

41. I plead with this court to grant a stay. Please afford me the opportunity to plead my case concerning the defects in the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding, after a final nonappealable decision is granted in the originating disciplinary case.

Prejudice against me, the Respondent, is Great

42. The prejudice against me should a stay be denied is great in the form of additional loss of my fundamental rights, and other hardships, related to the loss of my former position at a law firm, and government compelled poverty.

43. I have good cause to contest the decision the Delaware Supreme Court made in placing me on disabled inactive, but for the exercise of my First Amendment right to religious-political speech, religious-political belief, religious-political-exercise, and to make religious-political petitions. Yet I am impoverished. I lack time and resources to fight both the appeal and the civil rights case and 6 other potential reciprocal cases simultaneously. I will face irreparable injury if a stay is not granted. *Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 770 (1987).

State Court additional facts background

44. On 8/15/22, I filed a Motion for good cause with the Delaware Supreme Court (hereinafter “state-court”), 1. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 9, to Unseal the Record, 2. to declare self-regulation of attorneys, other Professions, and judges unconstitutional, making business above the law, by making the dictates of professionals, or bureaucrats within agencies, as opposed to laws enacted by congress people, checked by the vote of the people, the law, and 3. in lieu of and in the alternative, eliminate the secret trial requirements of professionals before Boards, including the Board on Professional Responsibility, requiring the choice of an open or confidential forum left to the accused professional, instead of requiring a secret proceeding, concealing the accused’s defense, to the advantage of the accuser state, in violation of equal protections, and due process 1st and 14th Protections, incorporated herein by reference. (DI 85-6)

45. On 8/19/22, I filed, a Motion to 1. declare the Reporting Requirements unconstitutional, requiring by written rule I violate my 5th Amendment right not to testify against myself to the government in order that the government may have evidence to prosecute me, 2. Declare the Case and Controversy requirements are not met in the system of attorney self-regulation, and related documents, I incorporate herein by reference. (DI 85-8)

46. On 8/19/22, Defendant Kathleen Vavala (“Kathleen”) reached out to me indicating she had allegedly contacted every jurisdiction I am licensed to practice law in, and to reject my request for extensions of time.

47. Instead of fighting Kathleen for time do a better job, I filed a Motion for Reargument immediately, the next day 8/20/22.

48. On 8/20/22, in reliance of Kathleen’s assertion, I also rode my bike 8 plus miles round trip, to mail out reporting information to two jurisdictions in receipt of merely my letter invoking the Fifth Amendment. (Exhibit C)

49. I desired to avoid automatic discipline for failure to report the Order Kathleen allegedly sent to other jurisdictions including the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court.

50. On 8/22/22, I mailed out boxes of the state court’s record to the US Supreme Court.

51. Kathleen did not report the order to the Supreme Court of PA or the US Supreme Court.

52. I previously, pled the Fifth Amendment and asked for a waiver of the reporting requirements from the arm of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court or for additional time to report should a waiver be denied. (Exhibit D)

53. Pennsylvania Rules of Disciplinary Enforcement Rule § 91.51 (5), requires I self-incriminate within 20 days or face other discipline.

54. As a result, of my reliance to my detriment on Kathleen's statement, I incriminated myself before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Disciplinary proceedings have commenced. US Amend V.

55. By good luck, the US Supreme Court rejected my 8/20/2022 reporting letter. (Exhibit E)

56. Nevertheless, the Eastern District of PA's District Court's admissions officer verbally indicated, she will report the outcome to the US Supreme Court if I fail to respond to the court's 30 day reciprocal discipline letter, in a timely fashion.

57. Upon second glance, I think the admission's officer may be mistaken. (Exhibit F)

58. I filed various documents and motions in the Delaware Supreme Court I include herein by reference, in DI 85.

59. On 8/27/2022, I filed a letter with Delaware Supreme Court, where I sought permission to outline legal theories the Court may reverse or prevent an economic crash. In the letter, I outlined the conflict of interest the Federal Reserve has in its role in how money is coined. I also noted my intent to seek a mistrial for Kelly v Trump, and outlining the conflict of interest the Federal Reserve has in its role in requesting paper money for the banks. (Exhibit G)

60. On 9/2/2022, I filed Respondent Meghan Kelly's Motion pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 8, for good cause, to waive record, transcript fees and court costs by the Clerk and this Court for the transfer and preparation of this Court's docket or record to other courts, under Rules 9 and 20, should other courts require this court's record (Exhibit H)

61. On 9/7/2022, the Court granted my waiver of fees for any court requesting the Delaware Disciplinary record, but denied all other motions.

62. The State-Court wrongly limits my property interest in my license, as punishment for the exercise of my First Amendment rights, because the Court disagrees with my religious-political beliefs, contained in the speech in the petitions..

64. The State-Court also requires denies my requests for exemptions, and requires I violate my religious beliefs against mental or health examinations, and against representation in defense of my belief in Jesus despite my religious beliefs, and 6th amendment right to represent myself, should I reopen the case.

65. The State-Court also requires I violate my religious belief against declaration and swearing in, and denies all my arguments reasserted in my Objection, Reply, other documents, and raised in the Motion for reargument.

66. I must be afforded the opportunity to amend my complaint to include additional facts and to add additional relief.

67. I move this Court to allow me to amend my complaint as a matter of course, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 (a) (1), 30 days after a final determination is made on appeal of the disciplinary proceeding before the US Supreme Court.

68. This Court did not permit me to serve the original complaint. (D.I. 16-17, 30-31, 59-60).

69. This Court did not permit me to file an Amended Complaint, and denied me a ruling on it. (D.I. 43, 59-60).

70. Since, then the need to amend again, has become apparent, as I discovered more evidence of the sham proceeding. I seek to preserve my right to amend the complaint as a matter of course, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 (a), as well as in the interest of justice under other provisions of Fed. R. Civ. P. 15. (See, *De La Cruz-Saddul v. Wayne State University*, E.D.Mich.1980, 482 F.Supp. 1388 “Plaintiff had right to amend without leave where no answer had been filed.”); (Also see, *Adams v. Quattlebaum*, D.D.C.2004, 219 F.R.D. 195 “Plaintiff enjoys absolute right to amend complaint once at any time prior to responsive pleading or granting of motion to dismiss.”)

71. No complaint has been served, and no answer has been filed to any motion to amend the complaint. (DI 2, 43). See, *Centifanti v. Nix*, 865 F.2d 1422 (3d Cir. 1989) (“Federal district court abused its discretion in denying motion by attorney in civil rights action against Justices of Pennsylvania Supreme Court for leave to amend complaint to delete excessive detail unnecessary to mount general constitutional challenge to procedural rules under which Supreme Court considered petitions for reinstatement of suspended attorneys.”); *Murphy v. Off. of Disciplinary Couns.*, No. CV 17-1239, 2019 WL 4752059, at *26 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 30, 2019), *aff’d*, 820 F. App’x 89 (3d Cir. 2020) (“While recognizing that Murphy is not the typical pro se plaintiff, [because he is a lawyer], a district court should generally provide a pro se plaintiff with leave to amend unless amending would be inequitable or futile. See *Grayson v. Mayview St. Hosp.*, 293 F.3d 103, 114 (3d Cir. 2002) (stating general rule)).

72. A stay until 30 days after a final determination of the State-disciplinary proceeding by the US Supreme Court is appropriate. Dismissal is an abuse of discretion. See, *Deakins v. Monaghan*, 484 U.S. 193 (1988) (“Federal district court must stay rather than dismiss claims that are not cognizable in parallel state proceeding.”); *Id* at 202, (“In reversing the District Court's dismissal of the claims for damages and attorney's fees, the Court of Appeals applied the Third Circuit rule that requires a District Court to stay rather than dismiss claims that are not cognizable in the parallel state proceeding.”); *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Stroud*, 179 F.3d 598 (8th Cir. 1999); *Carroll v. City of Mount Clemons*, 139 F.3d 107(6th Cir. 1998); *Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 517 U.S. 706, 719 (1996) (“we have applied abstention principles to actions ‘at law’ only to permit a federal court to enter a stay order that postpones adjudication of the dispute, not to dismiss the federal suit altogether.”); *Abbott v. Mette*, No. 20-CV-131-RGA, 2021 WL 1168958, at *4 (D. Del. Mar. 26, 2021), *aff'd*, No. 21-1804, 2021 WL 5906146 (3d Cir. Dec. 14, 2021) (A court “has no discretion to dismiss rather than to stay claims for monetary relief that cannot be redressed in the state proceeding.”); *Abbott v. Mette*, No. CV 20-131-RGA, 2021 WL 327375, at *3 (D. Del. Jan. 31, 2021) (“As a general matter, assuming that a federal court has jurisdiction over a case, the federal court's “obligation to hear and decide [the] case is virtually unflagging.” *Sprint Commc'ns, Inc. v. Jacobs*, 571 U.S. 69, 77 (2013) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)); *Crane v. Fauver*, 762 F.2d 325 (3d Cir. 1985) (“District court should have retained jurisdiction over correctional officers' civil rights action arising out of their discharge, even if it properly declined to exercise jurisdiction over federal claims, and stayed action pending outcome of related state proceeding where officers were relegated for prudential reasons to state proceeding which could only afford them dismissal of charges and back pay, with attorney fees only to extent that back pay award was reduced by interim earnings,

but officers sought constitutional damages and attorney fees, and new complaint upon termination of state proceedings may have been time-barred.”); *Williams v. Hepting*, 844 F.2d 138, 145 (3d Cir. 1988) (The Third Circuit held, “Accordingly, we hold that the district court should have stayed instead of dismissed without prejudice...Because these particular federal court claims for damages seek relief that is unavailable in Williams' ongoing state proceedings, the allegations should be stayed pending the outcome of his state court appeal on the underlying conviction.”); *Nimer v. Lichfield Twp. Bd. of Trustees*, 707 F.3d 699; *Carroll v. City of Mount Clemens*, 139 F.3d 1072 (6th Cir. 1998); *Watkins v. Ohio Dep't of Educ.*, No. 2:21-CV-04482, 2022 WL 672565, at *8 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 7, 2022)(“ Further, when a plaintiff seeks both equitable and legal relief, many courts in the Sixth Circuit stay the entire case rather than treat each form of requested relief differently.”); *Brindley v. McCullen*, 61 F.3d 507, 509 (In a § 1983 action for damages, the Sixth Circuit ruled that when Younger abstention is invoked, stay rather than dismissal is the appropriate disposition. A stay “avoids the costs of refiling, allows the plaintiffs to retain their place on the court docket, and avoids placing plaintiffs in a sometimes difficult position of refiling their case before the statute of limitations expires.”); *Maraan v. Off. of Ohio Disciplinary Couns. for Supreme Ct. of Ohio*, No. 1:18CV645, 2021 WL 3173311, at *3 (S.D. Ohio July 27, 2021) (Court “stayed until the conclusion of the state disciplinary proceedings, rather than be dismissed.”), citing, *Kalniz*, 699 F. Supp. 2d at 975 (explaining that where a plaintiff is bringing constitutional civil rights claims in a federal court case in which Younger abstention was proper, the stay protects against the possibility that the statute of limitations could deprive the plaintiff of the opportunity to present the merits of her damages claims); *Yamaha Motor Corp. v. Stroud*, 179 F.3d 598 (8th Cir. 1999)(when damages are sought in § 1983 action subject to Younger abstention, and damages are not available in

pending state proceeding, federal action should be stayed, not dismissed); *Night Clubs, Inc. v. City of Fort Smith*, 163 F.3d 475 (8th Cir. 1998) (when § 1983 complaint seeking damages is subject to Younger abstention, federal action should be stayed rather than dismissed); *Centifanti v. Nix*, 865 F.2d 1422 (3d Cir. 1989) (“**Suspended attorney who had been denied reinstatement to bar brought civil rights action against Chief Justice and Justices of Pennsylvania Supreme Court** alleging various **constitutional defects in procedural rules** under which Supreme Court considers petitions for reinstatement of suspended attorneys.....The Court of Appeals, Cowen, Circuit Judge, held that: (1) federal district court had subject-matter jurisdiction; (2) **district court abused its discretion in denying attorney's motion for leave to amend complaint**; (3) district court properly denied attorney's motion to compel discovery of privileged documents; and (4) attorney's complaint was not barred by state statute of limitations for **tort actions** or by principles of res judicata.”)

Wherefore, I pray this court grants this motion.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939,
(302) 493-6693, meghankellyesq@yahoo.com,
No 4968, Inactive, pro se

Exhibit 13

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 THIRD AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. On November 30, 2022, the United States Supreme Court granted my motion for an extension of time to appeal the Delaware Disciplinary proceeding per the attached Exhibit 1, I incorporate herein by reference.
2. On November 30, 2022, the PA Supreme Court also granted an extension of time until December 23, 2022 to respond to an order, but the PA Supreme Court rejected my letter providing an update that the US Supreme Court accepted a filing. I incorporate the rejection and letter as Exhibit 2.
3. I called the Court because it is material to my outstanding motions that I may potentially be heard before the US Supreme Court, including my Motion for reargument on the PA Supreme Court order denying my stay.
4. Should the US Supreme Court hear my appeal, its findings may make the reciprocating order moot should it be vacated.

5. Additionally, I would prefer all witnesses be called before your Honorable District Court instead of calling witnesses multiple times potentially needlessly hundreds of miles away from their homes in Pittsburgh, PA or before the US Supreme Court in DC.

6. If the attached letter labeled in Exhibit 2 remains rejected, I may file I motion before the PA Supreme Court.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

November 30, 2022 Respectfully submitted,

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

(302) 493-6693

34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

INACTIVE 4968

Exhibit 14

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 FIFTH AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. PA Clerk of Court Nicole Traini rejected the Motion to Amend my motion of reconsideration, despite my case manager Josh’s kind suggestion to file it. I referred to and attached this rejected Motion to the Fourth Affidavit, DI 103.
2. On or about December 19, 2022, I filed the attached, *Respondent Meghan M Kelly’s Second Motion for a stay due to circumstances increasing prejudice and harm, new facts arising necessary to my defense of reciprocal order, and additional questions that require answers in order to defend myself in response to the reciprocal order in the alternative a continuance of 6 months*, incorporated herein as Exhibit 1. I wish I was afforded opportunity in terms of time to shorten it, and research more thoroughly, but I am fighting for time. I have been submitting things imperfectly in order to not waive my rights.
3. I do not know whether the PA Supreme Court Clerk Nicole Traini will deny me an opportunity to be heard by rejecting the document, just as she refused to file the letter.
4. PA Case manager Josh told me the Court and he will not review documents if it they are not on the docket. He indicated he will not review the rejected letter or other rejected documents

I previously submitted. This prejudices me by denying me an opportunity to be heard should this latest motion be rejected too.

5. PA ODC also filed a response to my Second Motion to Dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on December 13, 2022. He alludes to In the Matter of Charles Dee Septowski's reciprocity petition, a Texas attorneys' petition whose case is distinguished from mine in that he engaged in misconduct prior to his retirement in PA in 2010. I am not at liberty to attach the petitions since they remain confidential.

6. The First petition for misconduct against Texas Attorney Charles Dee Septowski's was filed on or about December 18, 2009.

7. PA ODC misleading alleges that I said "all" of the misconduct when I asserted correctly that misconduct occurred prior to Texas Attorney Charles Dee's retirement in 2010. The PA rules allow for discipline, which occurred prior to retirement, while the Texas attorney had an active license to practice law.

8. PA ODC concedes that each and every one of the other cases he cites, but I distinguished are distinguished from mine in that the claimants did not contest the reciprocal discipline.

9. How may the Court know when the misconduct arose if no attorney facing discipline contests it.

10. I have not had time to respond to December 13, 2022 PA-ODC's answer in response to my Second Motion to Dismiss.

11. On December 20, 2022, PA-ODC filed an Answer to motion for the clerk to accept my rejected exhibits and exhibits included in additional pleadings.

12. I do not have the ability to draft an answer by Friday December 23, 2022. Because the Clerk refused to accept three filings where I allege, I am prejudiced by denial of a stay or an extension of time, it is not on the record.

13. PA Supreme Court previously rejected a 45-day extension, but later granted a 14-day extension.

14. I hope the Court accepts the most recent document I filed and does not deny me a meaningful opportunity to be heard.

15. I do not feel well at all. I risk death if not granted time to rest, exercise, drink water and care for myself as I have alleged before God and man, in Exhibit 43 to DI 4. I told the Delaware Supreme Court, the Chancery Court, the Third Circuit, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in the same exhibit.

16. I am accustomed to people having hardness of hearts. I must assert my right to live, to live for God, even if others do not want to be inconvenienced by my limitations.

17. Every month I lose five pounds of water weight and require gallons of water. I have not had the time or the means to drink so much and I am quite dehydrated beyond a week.

18. I am not afforded water and time to care for myself. My mouth is dry and my teeth are getting damaged by the severe dehydration. I feel weak, dizzy and badly due to severe dehydration. I literally must drink gallons of water, but am denied time.

19. Water and time are the cure, not healthcare. I have religious objections to healthcare. Bad health care is why I suffer.

20. I believe PA ODC's goal is to bury me in paper to prevent my appeals to the US Supreme Court, without regard to my life health despite notice by previous filings.
21. I believe the Courts are in danger. I filed the attached with the Third Circuit, Exhibits 2 and 3, alerting the court while I am afforded an opportunity.
22. The judiciary is in danger. Without people judges lawlessness, business greed without restraint from oppressing, killing, stealing and destroying may reign. This risk must be extinguished with the rule of law, not popularity contests, the vote or societal peer pressure.
23. We are all in danger without people judges. There is no one to protect individuals or individual liberty from being sacrificed to entities under the guise of the common good.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Dated: December 20, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan Kelly, Esquire
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(302) 493-6693
INACTIVE 4968

Exhibit 15

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 TWENTY FIRST AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. On March 29, 2023, I sent United Supreme Court staff’s emergency clerk Robert Meek an email regarding *inter alias* my concerns delays in docketing the latest pleading may prejudice me as to render my matter moot given my emergency situation. (Exhibit 1)

2. On March 30, 2023, I received the electronic notification via email US Supreme Court scheduled the petition for April 14, 2023. (Exhibit 2).

3. I was devastated. April 14, 2023 is too late to grant me relief as to deny me access to appeal in the Delaware Disciplinary case which is due April 8, 2023. I simply cannot sue in all cases due to my poverty being a substantial burden, my religious beliefs against debt, lack of time, and my invocation of the 13th amendment unless the Court granted me an accommodation.

4. The US Supreme Court showed me it would not help me by convening the conference on April 14, 2023.

5. I cried at this apparent loss, but I acted quickly. On April 1, 2023, with tears in my eyes I submitted the attached Motion to withdraw both my application with Justice Jackson and my petition for judgement by US mail. However, I only uploaded on docket number No. 22-6783. (Exhibit 3). The Court was scheduled to receive this motion on April 3, 2023.

6. On April 5, 2023, the Court rescheduled both the application and the petition before judgement to April 21, 2023. (Exhibit 4)

7. I was confused. I did not understand why the Court rescheduled a petition I moved to withdraw as relief would be granted too late as to render my request moot.

8. I saw that I forgot to upload the withdraw on the Application. So, I uploaded the pleading on April 5, 2023. (Exhibit 5)

9. The Court never accepted my motion to withdraw for docketing yet despite the fact the post office indicated likely receipt would be April 3, 2023. I called my case manager. She indicated I did not have to send out another motion. She said the Court sees it on the docket even if they did not accept it as filed yet.

10. I sent Robert Meek an email to confirm receipt of my motion to withdraw and my confusion as to why the Court must convene March 21, 2023. (Exhibit 6)

11. I also sent opposing counsel and US AG David Weiss an email hoping they would prevent the slow overthrow of the government to the private and foreign partners. (Exhibit 7)

12. I proposed they consider using the contracts clause of the constitution to protect individuals, recipients of social security, government workers pay and their pensions as opposed to entities accepting grants and contracts. I argue entities should be deemed unprotected by the Contracts clause as agents of the government not protected as individuals. This is not the law, but should be the law to preserve our government by caring for its workers, sustaining them, not sacrificing them and the people for entities without hearts who gain unjust gains.³

³ See, the dicta in *Weinberger v. Salfi*, 422 U.S. 749, 772 (1975)"); "Like Social Security, and unlike most private pension plans, railroad retirement benefits **are not contractual**. Congress may alter, and even eliminate, them at any time." This should change to protect those who accept social security, government pay as government employees and government pensions. Also see, *Frisbie v. United States*, 157 U.S. 160, 166 (1895) ("The pension granted by the government is a matter of bounty. "No pensioner

13. I believe people who give and receive government grants and contracts on behalf of an entity sin and commit lawlessness by creating an oppressive slave forced market, not free and fair, in violation of US Amend I (as applied to me with regards to my religious beliefs), US Amend XIII, and U Amend V, the Equal Protections component of the 5th Amendment by disparately treating recipients based on political capital, favoritism, and costs and speculating material gains creating an unfair economy. I have religious beliefs against partiality. See, *James* 2:9 (“But if you show favoritism, you sin and are convicted by the law as lawbreakers.”). Government grants based on partisan support creates an unequal application of the rule of law through policies though the case law in the Third Circuit and some others allows it.⁴ The case

has a vested legal right to his pension. Pensions are the bounties of the government, which Congress has the right to give, withhold, distribute, or recall, at its discretion. *Walton v. Cotton*, 19 How. 355.” *United States v. Teller*, 107 U.S. 64, 68. Congress being at liberty to give or withhold a pension, may prescribe who shall receive it, and determine all the circumstances and conditions under which any application therefor shall be prosecuted. No man has a legal right to a pension, and no man has a legal right to interfere in the matter of obtaining pensions for himself or others. The whole control of that matter is within the domain of Congressional power. *United States v. Hall*, 98 U.S. 343.”) Federal pay and federal pensions of contracted employees should be protected under the Contracts Clause to prevent impending harm. Without federal employees, there is no federal government.

⁴ *Lundblad v. Celeste*, 924 F.2d 627, 628 (6th Cir. 1991); (“ We conclude that no legal principles developed under the Equal Protection Clause “clearly establish” that state officials may not award public contracts on the basis of partisan politics or party affiliation. In *Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois*, ___ U.S. ___, 110 S.Ct. 2729, 111 L.Ed.2d 52 (1990), *Branti v. Finkel*, 445 U.S. 507, 100 S.Ct. 1287, 63 L.Ed.2d 574 (1980), and *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 96 S.Ct. 2673, 49 L.Ed.2d 547 (1976), the Supreme Court has developed principles under the First Amendment prohibiting the hiring and firing of employees on a partisan political basis, but the Court has not developed such principles under the Equal Protection Clause, nor has it extended these First Amendment principles to the area of public contracts. “); *Labalokie v. Capitol Area Interm. Unit*, 926 F. Supp. 503, 507 (M.D. Pa. 1996) (“Clearly, partisan politics lies at the very core of our democratic process, and just as clear is the notion that permitting those who hold public office to employ independent contractors based on political party affiliation provides an effective method to implement the administrations’ program. Policy implementation is just as important as policymaking”); ” *Downtown Auto Parks, Inc. v. City of Milwaukee*, 938 F.2d 705, 708 (7th Cir. 1991); *But see, McBee v. Jim Hogg County*, 730 F.2d 1009, 1026-18 (5th Cir. 1984)

("The spoils system, which views public employment as pure political patronage, inhibits the free functioning of the electoral process. 'Conditioning public employment on partisan support prevents support of competing political interest.' By holding a public employee's job hostage to his political activities or affiliation, the rebirth of the spoils system sanctioned by the majority allows an incumbent or a victorious challenger to accomplish indirectly what neither could legally do by mandate: the coercion of political support from the public employee."); *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 357 (1976) ("Patronage, therefore, to the extent it compels or restrains belief and association, is inimical to the process which undergirds our system of government and is "at war with the deeper traditions of democracy embodied in the First Amendment." *Illinois State Employees Union v. Lewis*, 473 F.2d, at 576. "); But see, *Umbehr v. McClure*, 44 F.3d 876, 879-80 (10th Cir. 1995) (This Court outlined cases in other of other jurisdictions where independent contractors may be eliminated based on the exercise of First Amendment liberties including speech criticizing politicians or political groups, and came to the opposite conclusion by protecting independent contractors for political criticism.). It appears there is a split. The Court in *Umbehr v. McClure*, 44 F.3d 876, 879-80 (10th Cir. 1995) noted, ("A"number of courts have held that governments may award or terminate public contracts on the basis of political affiliation or support. See *Triad Assocs., Inc. v. Chicago Hous. Auth.*,892 F.2d 583 (7th Cir. 1989) (holding that independent contractor claiming loss of and denial of contracts because of political affiliation was not protected by First Amendment), cert. denied,498 U.S. 845, 111 S.Ct. 129, 112 L.Ed.2d 97 (1990); *LaFalce v. Houston*,712 F.2d 292 (7th Cir. 1983) (holding that independent contractor claiming denial of public contract because of political affiliation was not protected by First Amendment), cert. denied, 464 U.S. 1044, 104 S.Ct. 712, 79 L.Ed.2d 175 (1984); ***Horn v. Kean*,796 F.2d 668 (3d Cir. 1986)** (en banc) (holding that **independent contractors whose contracts were terminated following a change in administration were not protected by the First Amendment**)(emphasis to show our Circuit rules the wrong way in favor of corruption and the partial application of the rule of law by government money and partial backing); *Sweeney v. Bond*,669 F.2d 542, 545 (8th Cir.) (holding that fee agents who were not employees but were "'more in the nature of independent contractors'" who were dismissed following a change in administration were not protected by the First Amendment); *Ambrose v. Knotts*,865 F. Supp. 342, 345 (S.D.W.Va. Oct. 17, 1994) (holding that independent contractor claiming termination of contract in retaliation for petition was not protected by First Amendment); *O'Hare Truck Serv., Inc. v. City of Northlake*,843 F. Supp. 1231, 1234 (N.D.Ill. 1994) (holding that independent contractor claiming removal from city towing rotation list because of political affiliation was not protected by First Amendment); *Inner City Leasing and Trucking Co. v. City of Gary*,759 F. Supp. 461, 464 (N.D.Ind. 1990) (holding that independent contractor claiming termination of contract because of political affiliation not protected by First Amendment); *MEDCARE HMO v. Bradley*,788 F. Supp. 1460, 1464-66 (N.D.Ill. 1992) (holding that independent contractor claiming termination of contract because of lobbying and other political activities not protected by First Amendment); see also *Lundblad v. Celeste*,874 F.2d 1097, 1102 (6th Cir.), vacated,882 F.2d 207 (6th Cir. 1989), reinstated in pertinent part,924 F.2d 627 (6th Cir. 1991) (en banc) (holding that it was not clearly established that independent contractor claiming denial of public contract because of political affiliation was protected under First Amendment), cert. denied,501 U.S. 1250, 111 S.Ct. 2889, 115 L.Ed.2d 1054 (1991). *But see*

law is wrong. I note, there seems to be a split by at least one court. Partiality based on political support in return for government contracts creates an unlevel unfair playing field where only those who have something to bribe politicians with may gain an advantage or control over a fixed, forced slave economy. I believe that politicians eliminate freedom through oppressive policies when they create jobs in a fixed unfair forced market. I believe politicians commit lawlessness leading to hell when they create a controlled market by creating jobs by government backing of private or foreign partners through money, instead of enacting laws to require goods and services which work, last and do not pollute and by made to break replacement parts, including chips. Manufacturers and individuals within businesses, not consumers, should be required to bear the cost of insurance, broken products and pollution the manufacturer and businesses create. People should not be enslaved to work to pay for services or replaced products that are made to break by design to increase profits. I believe free speech and freedom of conscience by criticism helps us learn and improve products and services. Those who focus on profits sacrifice people to create worse products and services to increase need to sustain their greedy gain. I actually am sad for those who give and receive government grants and contracts to entities to serve business greed as opposed to need to individuals directly because I believe they will be thrown into the fires of hell as too disgustingly dirty to live for eternity should they not repent. The Bible teaches those who receive unjust gains through oppression sin. It is a dirtiness of hearts, foreheads and hands. They receive favoritism by the government partiality creating an unequal unfair level playing field in a fixed not free subpar market with poorly made goods and services.

Horn, 796 F.2d at 680-85 (*Gibbons, Sloviter, Mansmann, Stapleton, JJ.*, dissenting) (rejecting view that independent contractors can be treated differently than employees for First Amendment purposes).

14. My religious beliefs are my own genuinely held religious beliefs. I share my religious beliefs not to compel the Court to believe as I do, or to prove my religious beliefs are the truth, but because

- 1) My religious beliefs are in issue as the wrongful reason the Defendants attacked me in violation of the witness tampering statute 1985 to cause me to forgo my lawsuit in Kelly v Trump.
- 2) My religious beliefs outlined in my petitions is also the reason Defendants admitted to bringing the disciplinary law suit against me for holding the government to the law against establishment of government religion in Kelly v Trump.
- 3) My religious beliefs are protected under the First Amendment.
- 4) And my religious beliefs may grant me unique standing in another case to reverse or prevent a crash or the schemed slow overthrow of our government.

15. I am pretty devastated the government thinks my religious beliefs in Jesus are so repugnant they do not deem me worthy of buying and selling as an attorney.

16. The US Supreme Court once announced, "It is wise to remember that the taxing and **licensing power** is a dangerous and potent weapon which, in the hands of unscrupulous or bigoted men, could be used to **suppress freedoms and destroy religion** unless it is kept within appropriate bounds." *Follett v. McCormick*, 321 U.S. 573, 579 (1944)(emphasis intended).

17. The licensing power should not be used to eliminate my religious beliefs, even if the majority and the state believes differently than I do.

18. I have religious beliefs against the improper way money is coined and distributed which may grant me standing in another case to reverse or prevent an economic crash.

19. I have religious beliefs against debt. Money is coined out of debt by banks through fractional reserve or as of 2020 no reserves. Money is also coined through the federal reserve because Congress wrongly gave its coning power away to banks who gain more profit the worse off and more debt we are in. There is a conflict of interest.

20. The government should not have any debt. The government should not require taxes either. If the Federal government coined without enslaving the people to pay it back with interest to the banks, the government would protect freedom. US Amend XIII.

21. Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 5: “[The Congress shall have Power . . .] To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measure.”

22. Congress wrongly gave away its coining power to the banks. The banks create money out of debt violating the 13th amendment by compelled servitude to pay the debt plus interest. This makes money master to pay for freedom from bondage to debt misleading people to hell. The Federal Reserve has made money a commodity to buy and sell instead of a tool to serve the people as a means of exchange. Congress should determine the value of money, not banks who manipulate interest for self gain.

23. Congress should take its coining power back, and should not borrow in violation of the 13th Amendment despite the fact Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: permits congress to create taxes “to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.”

24. If Congress coined money without enslaving the people and the government to debt, it would not require taxes to pay off debt. There would be no debt. The Government could coin money correctly to serve as opposed to enslave the people while protecting their liberty to buy and sell as they choose with the limit of just laws to prevent oppression, slavery, killing, stealing and destroying of others to serve the bottom line. The government would coin based on need, not exploitation to serve business greed.

25. Money should be the government's servant by coining without debt and interest to care for not control a free people. Presidents Lincoln and President attempted to coin correctly.

26. While President Jackson still used small state banks, he was correct about national banks. The Government should not be enslaved to any debt, nor should it enslave its people to pay debt. In my complaint I proposed the government pay off all its debt by coining without interest and debt to prevent the elimination of fiat currency and the transition to Central Bank Digital Currency which will be implemented on a larger scale July 2023. The government has the ability to pay off its debt while requiring banks to lend out what they have instead of creating money out of the fractional reserve ponzi scheme.

27. The Central banks are not loyal to the governments. 91 or more Central banks have entered an agreement Network for Greening the Financial System ("NGFS") under a carbon debt plan that allows the banks not the governments to enslave governments, entities and people based on involuntary compelled debt.⁵ The Central banks appear to be acting in concert to enslave governments to debt and credits, ruling over them by controlling money, making money guide and God of governments. The governments should be concerned with caring for the people while protecting the people's liberties.⁶ Instead, governments will be tempted to sacrifice liberties and the lives of the people under the lie of sustaining the world.

⁵ Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS), NGFS Climate Scenarios for central banks and supervisors, 2021,

https://www.ngfs.net/sites/default/files/media/2021/08/27/ngfs_climate_scenarios_phase2_june2021.pdf,

⁶ Delton Chen, Joel van der Beek and Jonathan Cloud, "Climate mitigation policy as a system solution: addressing the risk cost of carbon" Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment, vol. 7, no.

3, 2017, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/20430795.2017.1314814> ; and Delton Chen, Joel

van der Beek and Jonathan Cloud, "Hypothesis for a Risk Cost of Carbon: Revising the Externalities and Ethics of Climate Change", in H. Doukas, A. Flamos and J. Lieu (eds), Understanding Risks and Uncertainties in Energy and Climate Policy, Springer Nature, 2018,

https://rd.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-03152-7_8.

28. Banks have incentive to make people and governments worse off to gain more profit on interest in their non-central bank private banking capacity. The members of central banks include commercial banks.

29. I believe there is a plan to eliminate our government. A part of this plan seems to be to increase debt for private entities to gain control of resources and necessities to control a slave indebted people to the central banks and those the governments owe through grants or contracts. There appears to be a plan to eliminate currency after the transition to digital currency by control over all resources unrestrained by laws to prevent killing, stealing and destroying for the power, profit and positions of those who control the resources through entities. Albeit the time frame of elimination of money is not clear. In the book *2052 – A Global Forecast for the Next Forty Years is a 2012* by Jorgen Randers, *A report to the Club of Rome*, published 2012, the author predicts environmental harm, and the move towards a society based on a new spirit of the age, the same Zeitgeist movement the article I previously attached to a different affidavit discussed with the elimination of the rule of law, based on living based on satisfaction as opposed to monetary gain while eliminating individual liberties under the guise of the common good, including free speech. These lobbyists schemes, and agendas should not control the governments. The Fed Now Central Bank Digital currency will allow the Central bank to take over the government down the line. The Patriot's Act allowed the backdoor to be opened to our devices to implement this plan. If I could persuade the Courts to coin fiat currency correctly as Presidents Lincoln and Kennedy attempted to do, we may be able to safeguard the government and the rule of law. I understand this is not the case to ask you, and I must shorten my complaint, though I care about the baby boomers globally who appear to be schemed to be left with nothing to die off.

30. I do not want people to be harmed, die or go to hell based in living based on satisfaction or their desires, including desire for material gain to care for their own under a new economic model. Jesus teaches most people choose the way to hell. Many try to go to heaven thinking they are saved, but they sadly go to the hell the last day. *Matthew 7:13-15, Luke 13:23-228, Isaiah 10:22*. I believe people are misguided by their own desires, also known as sin, when their eyes are blinded from loving others.⁷ They cannot see clearly when their minds are focused on desires and goals instead of analyzing what is loving. Their desire to extract labor, volunteers, money, contribution, help for their own or material gain from another human blurs their vision from respecting and loving that other person or people unearned required. Oppressing others and eliminating their will, a.k.a. freedom to think under the guise of the common good through government backed private or foreign partners, including the United Nations is elimination of individual rights under the lie of safeguarding them. Collective groups merely sustain the power, profit and positions of those who entice their collective uniform interests through temptations including threats, shame, praise or reward. Entities as opposed to individual judges are controlled not free to independently think.

31. I believe justice in the courts is a command by my God. I believe judges may save not only lives, but eternal lives. Courts may help the blind see, and the dumb hear. So, they do not fall into the pit and lose eternal life. *Citing Matthew 15:14, Amos 5:15, Matthew 23:23*. The Bible teaches people go to hell because they do not know. (*Hosea 4:6*, “my people are destroyed from lack of knowledge.”) They believe a lie as truth. (*2 Thessalonians 2:10–12* “and

⁷ *James 1:1-15* (“When tempted, no one should say, “God is tempting me.” For God cannot be tempted by evil, nor does he tempt anyone; but each person is tempted when they are dragged away by their own **evil desire** and enticed. Then, after desire has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and sin, when it is full-grown, gives birth to death.”)

with all unrighteous deception among those who perish, because they did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this reason God will send them strong delusion, that they should believe the lie, that they all may be condemned who did not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness.”) They trust man, professionals, experts, scientists and man’s studies, professional services, technology or products blindly without using their brains, free will to critically discern what is right. (See, *Isaiah* 9:16 “For the leaders of the people have misled them. They have led them down the path of destruction.”); (Also see, *Romans* 1:25 “They exchanged the truth about God for a lie, and worshiped and served created things rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen.”) Professionals who mislead the people should be corrected in court not deferred to as demi-gods above the law’s correction for mere convenience, productivity and avoidance of costs which is human sacrifice, making workers and consumers below the law’s protection. Judicial partiality towards business creates injustice based on examining the facts based on material gain or loss instead of truth.

32. Justice is a matter of truth based on the facts, not compromise by barter and exchange allowing those with something to exchange in a more favorable position to buy their will be done.

33. I have religious beliefs against not only debt, but interest on debt. God teaches people go to the fires of hell to be no more losing eternal life for charging interests on debt should they not repent. (*Ezekiel* 18:13 “He lends at interest and takes a profit. Will such a man live? He will not! Because he has done all these detestable things, he is to be put to death [meaning the second death in hell]; his blood will be on his own head.”).

34. Jesus teaches people’s sins will not be forgiven if people do not forgive others of their monetary debts. See, *Matthew* 18:21-35. God teaches forgiveness is revoked and sins once

forgiven and forgotten are remembered and will damn people to hell if they go back to them, without repentance. (See, *Proverbs* 26:11, *2 Peter* 2:21-22, “It would have been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness than to have known it and then to turn away from the holy commandment passed on to them. Of them the proverbs are true: “A dog returns to its vomit,” and, “A sow that is washed goes back to her wallowing in the mud.”); (*Ezekiel* 18:26, “If a righteous person turns from their righteousness and commits sin, they will die [in the second death] for it; because of the sin they have committed they will die [in hell as too dirty to have eternal life.”). I believe once saved always saved is a lie misguided people repeat who travel the way to hell under the mistaken belief their salvation is secure.

35. Our economic system creates money the naughty lawless Babylon way to enslave to control humanity by creating money out of enslaving people to debt with interest, not to care for humanity while safeguarding their freedom with the limit to prevent individuals from enslaving others. Governments use money based on enslaving others to pay it back plus interest to entities when they give grants and contracts. That is wrong to enslave a no longer free people, enticing them to go the way to hell by making money their master in a fixed subpar economy. This money stifles innovation based on focus on material gain, not improvement of products and services. New money is sought through private or public funds for different not better products or more speculating research. It is a Ponzi scheme to fill the pockets of the few while enslaving the many to allow debt control of people as if precious people are products to control as opposed to respect. Those who enrich themselves oppress the people by the way money is coined, distributed and taxed to serve the government officials, banks and government partners who behave like wolves eating the sheep, the people, under the guise of acting as shepherds.

36. Money is created by enslaving people to pay back what does not exist plus interest. It is scarcity based on the lie if people worked they could pay it off. The money does not exist in fiat currency but is made out of nothing by the Federal Reserve and banks through fractional reserve and other means to enslave people to pay it back with interest. It is a Ponzi scheme. The stock market is nothing but debt, which gives people skin in the game of sin of making money, interest on debt. This enslaves the people to sin and death in hell too by making interest on debt. *Ezekiel 18:13*

37. This entire system makes money God, which leads to lawlessness misleading many to hell. Jesus teaches you cannot serve two masters God and money. *Matthew 6:24*. Those who focus is on money and material gain will sacrifice liberty and human life for the bottom line. This is lawless lusts, not the impartial application of the rule of law.

38. I believe many people are misguided, enslaved to sin and death in hell by their desire for wealth. I keep myself separate by living for God while showing love to others by exposing sin in hopes people are made clean. I do not want them to die in the second death. Money is not my savior or God. People who are blinded by their desire to make money to pay their bills and provide for their own family get burnt up the last day to be no more too, for allowing the cares of other things and the desire for wealth to squeeze the truth out of them. *Matthew 13*. What this world claims justifies, Jesus teaches damns.

39. I understand how our system is corrupted misleading many to hell by making money God and guide by those who make scarcity by design to increase profit, power, position and control over people. It is a trick.

40. I believe every politician who collects donations or signatures sins and is in danger of being thrown into the fires of hell the last day. My complaint against the democrats explains my religious beliefs more fully.

41. I believe little children are taught to go the way to hell young by fundraising. They are taught to look at others with disgustingly dirty evil eyes based on what they may extract from other humans, whether labor, money, help or material gain. They are taught to have an ugly heart young, to value material gain, not to value people unearned required. They are trained to value humans based on what they get from them as products to use. It makes me so sad. So many things others praise I see as evil misleading people to harm or hell.

42. I believe other people exist because they are loved by God. When people love their own more or material gain more than other people, they are willing to sacrifice Constitutional liberties and the life or health of others to serve their own. I believe people go to hell for loving their mother and father or son or daughter more than God, by placing their own family and own community first like Satan, should they oppress, ignore and sacrifice others outside their own.

43. I believe business greed by barter or exchange is the mark of those not saved from hell if left unrestrained by love written on their hearts or the just rule of law. Those whose eyes are on convenience, productivity, avoidance of costs, and material gain with no love and required respect for their fellow humans sin. We are not supposed to hate them for harming others. We are supposed to love even our enemies by correcting them in hopes they are not doomed to destruction the last day.

44. I believe Courts may prevent those reigned by lawless lusts, not the just rule of law in their hearts based on love, to prevent them from oppressing, killing, stealing and

destroying human life or liberty for material gain. People need not contribute money and material gain to others to be worthy of life. Money is not what gives life. The desire for money by those enslaved to sin and death in hell by making money master creates busy work, poor products and services because misguided people's eyes are on profit, money, material gain, productivity, position, power and avoidance of costs.

45. I believe people, especially elected officials, sin when they ask for volunteers, money, contributions, help in the form of fundraising in collective groups, through charities or entities. I believe they go to hell for this, as it is not true charity, should they not repent. They disobey Jesus. *Matthew 6:1-4* Jesus teaches me not to have disgustingly evil hypocritical eyes by looking at other people for contributions, volunteers, or for money under the guise of performing charity yourself. Instead Jesus says, "Go, sell everything you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come, follow me." *Mark 10:21*. Asking other people to give what you are not willing to lose is not charity, it is the creation of temptations by societal peer pressure by praise, not based on unconditional love or charity. It misleads the people to hell by teaching collective conditional conduct is unconditional love. I obviously have religious objections to organized charities and the newest type of corporations and alternative entities, beneficial corporations and entities. These violate Jesus' teachings in *Matthew 6:1-4*. I believe these new evil entities will be used to eliminate social security in the decades to come if unstopped by judges.

46. Jesus teaches we cannot serve God and money. We are to look at God as savior not as money as savior. In *Matthew 6:19-20*, Jesus teaches, "Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break in and steal.

But store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where moth and rust do not destroy, and where thieves do not break in and steal.”

47. The way that money is coined and distributed misleads many to love money, convenience, productivity and avoidance of costs more than one another leading to injustice by human sacrifice of life and liberty for material gain.

48. I believe many people are misguided, enslaved to sin and death in hell. I keep myself separate by living for God while showing love to others by exposing sin in hopes people are made clean. I do not want them to die in the second death.

49. I believe correction in court can prevent condemnation in hell.

50. I believe a lot of thing people praise are good are evil and lead to damnation in hell. I believe people sin when they are blinded by their desires, including their desires for convenience, happiness or for money and basic needs to care for their own, they no longer use their brains to think things out to love God or others as self.

51. I believe partiality is a source of government corruption and injustice which should be restrained by the courts to uphold the impartial application of the rule of law in accordance with the 5th Amendment’s equal protections component.

52. I believe people sin by fundraising and by collecting signatures. It compromises public servants’ ability to impartially serve all, by the temptation to serve those who support their seats with grants or government contracts.

53. I disagree with case law holding money and material gain meets the rational basis standard for government conduct in our fixed, forced subpar economy where goods and services are made worse off by design to serve profit by oppressing the people. I think courts are wrong, especially since the people are enslaved to pay back unjust gains with interests in a fixed not free

or fair economy by the way money is coined. I think judges are blinded by how money is coined out of debt by fractional reserves, or zero reserves since 2022, to eliminate Constitutional liberties to enslave the people who make unjust gains to private and foreign partners through grants and contracts with interest. I believe lawyers have a duty to uphold the Constitution by telling judges they violate the Constitution by allowing elected officials and their private and foreign partners to enslave a no longer free people in a fixed economic system by holding money and material gain to pay bills or for the general welfare is a legitimate reason for the government's disparate selective partisan application of the law by government grants and government contracts to entities.

54. I believe the government should help individuals in need directly, unearned, required, without exploiting their need to serve entity greed. I believe individuals who give and receive government grants and government contracts sin leading to their damnation in hell by unjust gains to serve business greed should they not repent. The government partiality to those who appear to save the most money or who back their interest creates unequal unfavorable treatment towards others based on social capital, wealth and resources, arguably in violation of the 5th Amendment's Equal Protection' component in light of my disagreement with the rational basis standard while violating the 13th amendment and my First Amendment religious beliefs to pay it back. The rich do not have the smartest ideas but usually the worst most oppressive which oppress and enslave the common man to serve the bottom line. Grants and government contracts create an unequal playing field of wolves who serve lawless lusts for material gain to fund corruption not good. I am especially troubled by case law which allows favoritism in a fixed not fair or free market to serve political seats and interests.

55. The government should not have to pay any bills. The government should not be enslaved to the private entity the Federal reserve nor should the government and the people be enslaved to banks or to mere entities the government claims to owe money to through government contracts or grants. This makes money the government's master, not the desire to care for as opposed to control the people while protecting the people's free will from government backed substantial burdens. The money received by grantees and government private or foreign contractors or beneficiaries receives are based on enslaving the citizens to pay back the debt with interest in violation of the 13th Amendment and my religious beliefs against debt.

56. The government may coin correctly without debt and interest, and the government may stop colluding with private and foreign partners by ending partnerships. Independence is needed to protect the liberty of the people from oppression from the private and foreign partners who are rendered above the law since the government's backing makes them the letter of the law. Besides, there appears to be a plan to eliminate governments down the law replaced by deeming private or foreign partners above the law. If the government seeks to preserve the government and the laws that make us free, then the government must consider dissolving loyalty and partiality towards partners which eliminate the people's equal protections under the law in an unfair government backed market.

57. The US Supreme Court held in *James v. Dravo Contracting Co.*, 302 U.S. 134, 168 (1937) "The federal power to contract for supplies or services is as necessary and as fundamental as the power to borrow money. Thus it has been said, speaking of a tax upon government obligations:" Neither are necessary.

58. The federal government should not contract with private and foreign entities, but should contract with government employees to pay for their services without taxation or debt by

coining correctly. It is a lie that the government has the power to borrow money, when it has the power to create it out of nothing to care for as opposed to creating it out of debt to enslave to control the people. The government creates slavery when it agrees to debt, not freedom. Debt is against my religious belief because I choose to be a slave to God by doing what is right, not money by doing what is wrong to get as much as I can for as little without restraint in the form of love in my heart or the just rule of law. The Bible teaches the love of money is the root of every type of evil. 1 *Timothy* 6:10.

59. The artificial debt is against my religious beliefs, and makes the United States a slave to those it owes. I proposed ways to prevent the elimination of fiat currency in my complaint in hopes to prevent the schemed elimination of the government down the line.

60. The Courts have the power to deem the private bank practice of coining American money as an unlawful delegation of Congressional power in violation of Article I, Section 8, Clause 5: The Courts may also think outside the box to prevent the overthrow of government by dissolving government partnerships to prevent enslaving the people in a fixed subpar economy,

61. The other two branches may consider creating institutions without debt. They may coin interest or money to care for the people's needs including retirement, while allowing people to buy and sell by free choice, not exploitative forced choice to serve entities who bribe or buy through donations elected officials in return for supporting the official's seat or conditional platform.

62. Money may be coined without government borrowing correctly without violation the 13th Amendment or my religious beliefs that a free people should not be a slave to earn money leading to their death in hell by making money master instead of God to pay off unjust gains received through government grants and contracts. Jesus Christ teaches us do not store up

wealth. Jesus Christ teaches you cannot make God and money both master. Elected officials who make money their savior, or teach jobs, money, the economy and earnings is the savior or freedom lie. They knowingly or unknowingly sacrifice Constitutional protected freedoms and the people they are elected to serve for material gain. They do not protect people or people's freedom but enslave them for material gain. That rational basis argument that eliminating freedom and enslaving people for money will not fly on judgment day.

63. The World will not be okay if judges do not uphold the impartial rule of law and the impartial application of the rule of law by ending government contracts and grants to entities who behave as partners with the government. When the other two branches application of the law becomes partial towards partners in a forced not free economy judges should tame the law makers' and President's lawless lusts with the impartial rule of law.

64. Even if you disagree with my strongly held religious beliefs against money as guide and God, against organized charity, volunteering and fundraising, and against government-private and government -foreign partnerships based on religious grounds, you know my unique religious beliefs may grant me standing in another case if the worst happens.

65. I am heartbroken. Thank you for considering my concerns. I will place them on the back burner and focus on my case. Though I care about old people losing their savings, retirement and social security. There is another way to care for as opposed to control the people by coining correctly.

Dated 4/8/23

Respectfully submitted,

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

Exhibit 16

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 TWENTY SECOND AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. Upon information and belief there is a plan to slowly overthrow the government.

2. Creating a moratorium on home foreclosures may slow down the plan to recoup resources including land by private and foreign entities who seek to control the government only to overtake the government down the line. My former law firm makes money off of foreclosed lender owned properties which are called Real Estate Owned properties (REOs) because they have a meticulous reputation in representing lender owned buyers. So, if I rejoined my former law firm, I would make more money the worse off people are. Yet, that is terrible. I do not want people to be worse off. Money is not my God and guide. I am commanded to love people, not sacrifice them to serve monetary gain to care for my own. I would rather earn less money and care for people than make more money under the lie money is the savior to save oppressed people. I believe just laws and justice in the courts is the savior of oppressed people.

3. I believe in the courts and individual judges who independently critically think, even if you disagree with me. Without independent critically thinking people judges, none are free. We are for sale products to exploit for material gain as opposed to serve, unearned required should money, material gain, even gaining the world be the aim. I believe that elected officials, judges and even lawyers serve lawless lusts for implementing and arguing for unjust decrees, by

valuing money, convenience and avoidance of costs more than individual liberty and people. I believe people go to hell when they teach justice is a matter of barter or exchange, or compromise, which compromises evil for good instead of truth. I believe people go to hell when they teach justice is a business which makes the rich and well connected and those with something to barter with other than their souls able to buy their will be done like Satan.

4. I ran for office in 2018 on an environmental platform. Yet, I proposed ways to care for the environment and decrease pollution without burdening the backs of the common people. Unlike the green global plan I did not require the common people pay to clean up someone else's mess to increase unjust gains. I believe people serve lawless lusts leading to their damnation in hell when they enslave people to their dictates under the guise of "doing their part." Such societal, economic or physical pressures eliminates freedom by the forced will of government backed private or foreign partners which creates a foundation to eliminate the rule of law down the line to be replaced by reign by lusts, the mark of the damned which is sad.

5. It is lawless vanities reflecting the image of Satan to require the government backed foreign and private partners will be done, eliminating free will by economic, social or physical force in a fixed slave market as schemed ahead. We should have a free market with laws restraining private and foreign entities from oppressing, harming, killing, stealing and destroying people for the bottom line. Just laws to stop rewarding made to break, repair, service or replace is the solution. The alleged green products, made to disintegrate still require pollution in production and transportation of the made not to last products. Money is the problem not solution. Money for research is the problem as it creates incentive to create problems to gain more money. Money contracted or granted to private or foreign entities creates an unequal playing field in a fixed not fair economy.

6. When I ran for office in 2018, I discovered lobbyists controlled the government and chose their leaders not the people. They talked at the 38th democratic meetings, “who should we pick.” They did not allow the people to choose in fair or free but fixed elections where lobbyists chose both sides. Artesian and other entities donated to both sides, making business backers above the law by the temptation to reward those who serve elected official’s seats. That is dirty and corrupt, not a fair or free elections, but a for sale election. I strongly disagree with Citizen’s United and other recent United States Supreme Court cases, where the court purports to safeguard freedom. Yet it blindly sacrifices individual freedom to serve entities without hearts. The court is confused and misguided by mere tradition and the temptation that standardized bad judgment eases costs, convenience and productivity at the sacrifice of justice. More injustice is not fair when the outcome of law suits is not about truth, but is a matter of bater and exchange leaving the rich, well connected and the powerful above the law’s correction since they barter and buy outcomes.

7. Citizen’s United is corrupt. I believe the vote should be the only fair and equally protected means to select leaders. No money should be given to elected officials. I believe the US Supreme Court is wrong in Citizens United and other cases where they sacrifice individuals and individual liberty to serve entities without hearts who have no power to do good.

8. Entities in turn are not free but are controlled by those who entice their collective interests by reward and threat of harm. We eliminate freedom when we bow down and worship the mark of the beast, conditional conformed lusts, with no power to unconditionally love, unrestrained by just laws to prevent people from enslaving and oppressing each other through social, economic or physical pressures like devils.

9. The Supreme Court has been wrong in a series of decisions, but I am disappointed in the Third Circuit who was previously in the right before the US Supreme Court overturned cases in the termination of the postal worker who was fired for practicing religious beliefs concerning the Sabbath. It is even more important to protect the US postal worker's religious belief to worship on the sabbath without government US postage pressure to forgo his religious belief to buy and sell as an employee. Why? There are political preacher attacks against Catholics and officials associating as Catholic who think people like me, the president and Catholic supreme court judges are naughty because the church changed the sabbath day. Though I usually go on Saturdays when I go. Some loud political preachers with 1000s of followers think we Catholics are naughty antichrist. Ask yourself am I naughty Do I love you as a human being, or would I sacrifice you to serve my own which is naughty. Human sacrifice is always wrong. There are lobbyists who distort religion to serve material gain. These misguided government partners serve greed not people by seeking material gain.

10. Freedoms are not for sale, in exchange for professional licenses. When the courts make business the law, by making professionals the law, by self-regulating, money, not freedom, or the people, is protected. Individuals and individual liberty are instead sacrificed under the lie money grants freedom when it creates slavery by how it is coined. There is scarcity by design. The problem is not there are too few workers funding social security and tax coffers for pensions. The system is rigged.

11. I disagree with the Supreme Court's decisions in *Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colo. Civil Rights Comm'n*, 138 S. Ct. 1719, 1721 (2018); which is distinguished from my case in that I am punished for exercising my private individual religious belief, private religious-speech, in my private-personal religious petitions. Whereas a business receiving a government

license to buy and sell in *Masterpiece Cakeshop* was permitted to choose who is worthy of buying and selling, based on relationship on religious grounds.

12. I understand there may be 13th Amendment arguments against compelled servitude. And yet, business is not freedom. A license is freely accepted and the private holder must not disparately treat customers based on the exercise of the customer's free will to believe and live differently than the merchant. Again my case, is different in that I am persecuted by the state based on my exercise of fundamental rights, my private First Amendment right to petition, my private First Amendment right to religious belief, exercise of belief, My First Amendment right to be free from the government established forced religion, my private-First Amendment right to association, even as a Jesus-lawyer, my First Amendment right to speech and other rights, Equal protection, procedural due process, right to self-represent, call witnesses and so on. I am not seeking government authority to disparately treat consumers as unworthy to serve based on my disagreement of their religious or secular belief.

13. Some religions include involuntary servitude, forced caste systems and human sacrifice. If the government grants a license to private professionals to use religion to oppress, and blackball others through licensed or government backed businesses or not for profits, we are not free people, but are bartered for under a fixed government backed economy which protects discrimination not based on quality of goods and services but partiality.

14. Similarly, I believe the Supreme Court is misguided by money saved or gained by entities who under the guise of freedom of religion, control people, forcing their religious views, by business greed again in *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania*, 140 S. Ct. 2367, 207 L. Ed. 2d 819 (2020). Here, "The Supreme Court... held that ACA authorized Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) to exempt or accommodate

employers' religious or moral objections to providing no-cost contraceptive coverage." This arguably saves the employer more money in insurance costs, at the exchange of losing coverage for their employees, bartering away, selling other people's free choice, their souls, or freedoms, for the bottom line by forced choice. It is my religious belief this is based on the mark of the beast, business greed, under the guise of good. I see it as enslaving others to bend to the employer's religious will, diminishing their free will, by economic force, potentially losing a job. The Supreme Court is bartering away people's freedoms to artificial entities without hearts, businesses, not for profits and charities, without the ability to reflect the image of God, by unconditional love. Entities run on cash or conditional labor with no ability to unconditional love by their nature which is collective, contingent conformity. Jesus teaches you cannot serve God and Money. I choose God.

15. Money is not speech either. It is bought not free, not freedom of speech. If buying and bartering for a voice is free speech, only those with money power and connections, have the freedom to purchase a louder voice to be heard, in violation of the Equal protections clause component of the 5th Amendment applicable to the federal government by disparate treatment based on poverty and wealth. Wealth does not make one more important or more worthy of being heard. Looking at the bottom line creates unequal treatment and mistreatment of the poor. Do you serve people or greed, which I believe is lawlessness.

16. The US Supreme Court erred in *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 558 U.S. 310, 130 S. Ct. 876, 175 L. Ed. 2d 753 (2010). This Court erred in the finding "Use of funds to support a political candidate is speech." *Austin v. Michigan Chamber of Com.*, 494 U.S. 652, 110 S. Ct. 1391, 108 L. Ed. 2d 652 (1990), overruled by *Citizens United v. Fed. Election Comm'n*, 558 U.S. 310, 130 S. Ct. 876, 175 L. Ed. 2d 753 (2010)

17. The United States Supreme Court also erred in *Our Lady of Guadalupe Sch. v. Morrissey-Berru*, 140 S. Ct. 2049, 207 L. Ed. 2d 870 (2020), rendering religious organizations to lawlessly do as they please, fire employees unjustly without remedy. It appears that if a religion allows an entity to discriminate, to do what is most advantageous for the bottom line regardless of the harm, so long as they use the name of God or religion, including non-religion, artificial entities without hearts will chose their own religion, including non-religion forcing people no longer free to bend their will to serve business greed, the mark of the beast, without discipline to sacrifice material gain to love humanity, in the form of the rule of law, or love written on humanity's hearts per *Jeremiah* 31.

18. I believe lawyers, even lawyers labeled disabled inactive lawyers like me have a duty to uphold the Constitution by telling judges their rulings violate the Constitution, even if the rulings are based on misguided holdings 100 plus years old.

19. With that said, I believe the Courts have been wrong for about 100 years with regards to holding government pay, pensions and social security are not protected under the contract clause.

20. I also believe the courts are wrong by protecting colluding private partners in a fixed not fair unequal economic system. Government contractors should be deemed government agents unprotected by the contracts clause.

21. The money the government uses to pay entities is made by enslaving not serving the people by requiring they work to pay back the federal reserve with interest with money that does not exist. It is a Ponzi scheme requiring the citizens become slaves in a fixed not free economy. The proclamation that all men are created free and the free exercise of liberties is

violated by the manner money is coined electronically or otherwise by the private entity the Federal reserve and the banks.

22. In June 2023 a debt default may occur.

23. I desire to persuade our US Attorney General to sue President Biden to change case law and to protect the rule of law, by protecting the people who govern as government employees by protecting their pay, pensions and social security. Case law shows social security, pensions and government pay are not protected and may be wiped out.

24. Should government pay, social security and pensions stop payment this June, I want US Attorney General David Weiss or US Attorney General to sue the government under a contract clause theory to change 100s of years of bad law to prevent the schemed overthrow of our government by eliminating people judges and others. The schemed overthrow is designed by temptations. They entice the government employees to wrongly enslave the people by increasing taxes the people cannot pay. The taxes will cause foreclosures and bankruptcies decreasing tax revenue in bulk despite o and because of the tax increases. Our leaders refuse to think things out by giving into temptations to serve their immediate gratification at the cost of harming the people down the line.

25. I do not want old people to go to hell. I believe the most important time of your life that determines eternity is the day of your death. In Ecclesiastes the Bible teaches the day of your death is more important than the day of your birth.

26. I believe people go to hell for trusting in money as God and savior. If old people become bitter at losing retirement and pensions or I the blame others increasing oppression by requiring others to work to care for them by force, they will go to hell, which is sad. Those who trust in money as savior get thrown into the fire as unworthy of eternal life at the last day,

regardless of whether it is through charities or work. I do not want old people to be harmed, die or be doomed to hell because they are in despair and left to die in want because the case law does not protect government pay, pensions or social security under the contracts clause.

27. The case law serves lawless lusts, making the mark of the damned the law productivity, material gain, avoidance of costs and material gain at the exchange of sacrificing souls like Satan.

28. I pray US Attorney General David Weiss or Merrick Garland bravely confronts the courts to say they were wrong to correct them to save government pay, pensions and social security of even federal judges to care for the people.

29. I sent opposing counsel and US Attorney General David Weiss an email with research on this topic the law librarian kindly sent me. (Email attached hereto without the research attached). I hope David Weiss would be the hero we need to be a life saver and eternal life saver, not with money or might, but with his mind to persuade the courts to do justice, not injustice guaranteed if no one asks.

30. I am so concerned. Congress may be crying wolf to feign the hero or to get their will done by eliminating freedom by government control through barter or exchange. One day the wolves will come. I pray the Courts act as god shepherds caring for their flock, not sacrificing them to serve a pack who is schemed to turn on itself at some unknown time.

31. Now may be an opportunity for the US Attorney General to change case law to prevent harm to the people and the dismantling of the government by elimination of control to be controlled by those who control the money which is the global money changer and the central banks. There are plans to eliminate the government to be bank owned not free people.

Thank you for your time.

Dated 4/17/23

Respectfully submitted,

Meghan M. Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

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

Exhibit 17

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 TWENTY SECOND AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. The US Supreme Court has granted my petition by dismissing my appeal.

(Exhibit 1)

2. I asked the emergency clerk of the US Supreme Court Robert Meek to please stop deleting my electronic receipt of filings by deleting the documents on the efilings side. So, I am grateful he deferred to my request by not deleting my Different application on the efilings side.

(Exhibit 2) I appreciate his efforts to figure out why my filings were deleted on the efilings side not merely the docket side. I lost other receipts and confirmations of other certain documents submitted. That was weird, and may have been hacks. On a side note, I am concerned about preventing hacks, not allowing others to profit from them to maintain hacks that the back door to our devices allow in order to implement Private Central Bank Digital Currency. I believe the Patriot’s Act’s purposes was to open the back doors to our electronic devices to allow the digital slave system which will be slowly implemented through Central Bank Digital currencies if the courts do not stop it.

3. I am concerned about the US Supreme Court case *Gerald E. Groff v. Louis DeJoy, Postmaster General*, No. 22-174 . It is even more important for the US Supreme Court to protect free exercise of religious belief by protecting the religious belief of someone who

believes differently than the court to uphold the integrity and impartiality of the court. The Court must uphold and show the Constitutional limits safeguarding freedom applies to all, not some, not merely the religious or secular beliefs endorsed by the government and government backed private partners I see as government agents.

4. Do I agree with the postal workers belief concerning the Sabbath? No, but I would defend his right to believe differently than I do to the end. Love cares for and does not control.⁸ We must protect those who disagree with us or none are free. All are forced to worship by the government backed by private partners accepted or authorized belief. I hope the United States Supreme court protects the Amazon contracted postal man's religious belief without government authorized compelled economic pressure eliminating his right to buy and sell but for his religious exercise. This case is big. The decision will show us where the US Supreme Court members' hearts are 1. in upholding the greatest Constitutional laws to protect freedom and individuals or, 2. sacrificing individuals to serve business greed to entities who eliminate Fundamental rights by government backing or partnerships. I hope the Court helps the former postal contracted employee and does not sacrifice a person or their liberty to serve money.

5. There appears to be a long line of cases holding federal government pay, pensions and social security are not protected under the contract clause.

⁸ *Colossians* 2:16, ("Therefore do not let anyone judge you by what you eat or drink, or with regard to a religious festival, a New Moon celebration or a **Sabbath day**."); *Mark* 2:23-27, ("23 One Sabbath Jesus was going through the grainfields, and as his disciples walked along, they began to pick some heads of grain. 24 The Pharisees said to him, "Look, why are they doing what is unlawful on the Sabbath?" 25 He answered, "Have you never read what David did when he and his companions were hungry and in need? 26 In the days of Abiathar the high priest, he entered the house of God and ate the consecrated bread, which is lawful only for priests to eat. And he also gave some to his companions." 27 Then he said to them, "The **Sabbath** was made for man, not man for the **Sabbath**.")

6. I believe there is a plan to slowly overthrow the government by private control of the government. Regulating the courts by ethics will make it easier to argue imperfect judges who do not conform to the fickle partial desires of the regulators are less fit to judge than automation. Allowing ethics rules will make it easier to eliminate judges who may stop the overthrow of the United States.

7. I oppose regulating the US Supreme Court or ending life time terms to protect us. Members of the Courts should not be tempted by the partial interests of the ever-changing fickle fads of the masses, lobbyists, regulators or law makers such regulations would require, instead of the impartial rule of law. Judges should not be concerned with their appearance, but in truth to administer justice. (See, John 7:24 “Stop judging by mere appearances, but instead judge correctly”).

8. We are all in danger if the US Supreme Court gives into temptation to allow regulations that will only hinder and harm it and the American people by tempters who behave like devils by creating pressure to bend the will of the court to their dictates. Regulations will create a partial court mandating injustice by sacrificing impartial application of the Constitutional law to adhere to regulations as more important to protect selfish partial pay, position under the lie of impartiality. The threats against the federal courts to exceed Constitutional checks is an attack on the rule of law that limits private entities and government agents within the other two branches.

9. Ex post facto laws should not be enforceable against the Supreme Court or federal judges, either. Yet, argument may be had that the Court may waive the Constitutional defense. Moreover, disciplinary proceedings allows evidence of any conduct to be fair game to remove lawyers and judges despite the Ex post facto nature. I strongly oppose laws by unelected

bureaucrats or self-regulating controlling a no longer free United States Supreme Court. I believe the regulations will be used to mandate partiality and injustice towards mere regulations under the guise of fairness by taking away the Court's power to impartially uphold the freedoms of all under the Constitutional law

10. I see the attacks against the justices. It is okay to criticize. It is not okay to violate the Constitutional limits the other two branches have to place a check on the judiciary, 1. Cases and controversies, and 2. Impeachment.

11. Once you create standards by waiving Constitutional limits, you allow for automation to be used that can only think inside the box of standards placed in algorithms unlike people judges . People judges are needed to uphold the Constitution by granting accommodations of rigged standards in statutes and laws to people (as opposed to entities) to protect their Constitutional liberties. We have no freedom without people judges. All are reigned or sacrificed to the mob's reign of lusts through the popular vote, unrestrained by the just rule of Constitutional law as applied to people.

12. There is an attack on the courts to slowly eliminate the rule of law to allow entities to be above the law unrestrained by just laws needed to prevent private and foreign entities from enslaving, killing, stealing or destroying human health or life to serve material gain.

13. I have been consistent in warning this Court of an agenda to eliminate people lawyers, people judges, court staff under the lie sameness and compelled equality is equal protection under the law, when it is elimination of individual liberty by compelled conformity to serve business greed, not good.

14. I am horrified the current case law allows the elimination of federal pay, federal pensions and social security unrestrained by the contract's clause. Eliminating payment of

federal judges is another way court's may be regulating to conform to the pressures of partial entities instead of the impartial application of the rule of law.

15. The Contract's clause should protect people, not government agents who receive government contracts or grants to perform business, which is not freedom. Such money violates the 13th Amendment by enslaving the people to pay such unjust gains to mere entities with interest in the unlawful way money is coined and is schemed to be coined digitally until the plans to eliminate currency by control of resources, even people as products is implemented if not stopped. It is lawless lusts unrestrained by law. We need the courts to save us from lawlessness veiled as freedom, when it is enslavement to sin, and I believe death in hell.

16. The case law is clear, federal judges pay, pensions and paychecks are not protected. They are sacrificed to entities who serve greed not good. Case laws appear to protect government contractors, entities performing business, not freedom of the people. It is enslavement. The case law must change.

17. I sent my little cousins Ike and Tim an email hoping they would bring a suit in DC should everyone's savings, government pensions, government pay, and social security be wiped out against the government under a Rule 23 law suit. They work as attorneys in DC at Skadden and Sidley Austin. They will likely not do anything. I haven't spoken to either of my cousins in years. Yet, if the worst comes they may think about it with knowledge we are not stuck. We may ask the courts to save us. (Exhibit 3)

18. I sent US Attorney General David Weiss an email. (Exhibit 4). Since the US Attorney Generals may sue President Trump a US Attorney General may also screen Attorney Generals to allow one US AG to sue President Biden or Janet Yellen to safeguard federal pay, federal pensions and social security by changing years of bad case law. The Supreme Court

must protect government pay, pensions and social security under the contracts clause by overturning years of prior decisions or may lose their own pay and government position. The US AG may sue on behalf of self, as a federal employee or possibly on behalf of the people.

19. The US Attorney General may have a short window of time to try to save government pay, pensions and social security overturning a long history of denying the right to them under contracts clause.

20. This June 2023 we may hit the debt ceiling. US Attorney General David Weiss's pay may be temporally halted. Then in July the Central Bank digital currency may be rolled out under the feign of saving the people when it is an anti-hero.

21. I asked David Weiss to please consider suing Biden if there is a default on your and his federal pay, social security and pensions. Maybe I should have considered asking him to sue Janet Yellen instead since she was the former Federal Chair. Additionally, it would be good for the courts to learn more on how money is created out of nothingness to enslave not serve the people to enrich private and foreign government partners by suing Janet Yellen instead.

22. I hope he considers a writ of mandamus against Secretary Janet Yellen pursuant 31 U.S.C. § 5112 (k) to coin money without debt or interest to pay off all debts to prevent the elimination of fiat currency and the dollar, replaced by an electronic currency that will eliminate freedoms with use down the line, and to guarantee pay, pensions and social security under the contract's clause.

23. I believe your pay, pensions, social security and savings will not exist down the line. You or other judges on the courts may prevent that. Caring for you cares for others and may prevent schemes to overthrow these United States down the line.

24. There may be a short window of time for David Weiss to get a TRO from to enjoin Janet Yellen from stopping federal pay on a contracts clause theory which would change 100 plus years of bad case law.

25. I am sure he could think of another theory, but government employees are not protected unless the case law is overturned. Without government employees there is no government to serve or uphold the law, just entities through automation that exploit people as products under the lie of saving the world only to profit off of destroying it.

26. I asked for help from David Weiss and others. I tried to prevent economic pressure and societal pressure upon the courts used to bend its free will to the forced will of those who will continue to attack people judges to control a no longer impartial court should the courts give into temptation to allow for regulations.

27. It is up to the courts, should someone with standing ask the courts to save the courts. Finding someone with standing to save the rule of law is the hard part, especially if I am thrown away, left unemployable to be left to die of want since the courts indicate I am not permitted to buy and sell as a lawyer.

28. The case law is against caring for your government pay, pensions and social security. The case law does not serve the country but makes it for sale to private and foreign partners to be bank owned not free under the new economic agenda.

29. I am concerned Central Bank Digital Currency will control a no longer free court if pay, pensions, savings and social security are wiped out unless the courts prevent partial control over its members by the private entity.

30. I am emotional and physically worn out. It is upsetting to be sued based on my religious beliefs. My family is also upset with me for causing an economic strain. I am unable to work at my former law firm until I overturn the Delaware Order.

31. I am notifying this Court my phone has been cut off, and housing is no longer secure. I am not okay. I am not sure how I will be able to research.

32. My family is rather bitter towards me since I am sued too. They are embarrassed I am sued for my faith in Jesus and my licenses. I am walking on thin ice as my family visits. I am in tears. These lawsuits for my licenses reasonably caused embarrassment, hardship and economic and physical harm upon me, and hardship towards my family too.

33. I realize, I may have actually received less money than I believed. It is more like 200 a month as opposed to 600, but my mother just took away 200 she just gave me.

34. I hope the court helps me by rendering justice, not throwing me away showing the world the poor and those with diverse religious beliefs which do not conform to the mob or majorities are unworthy of freedom.

Thank you for your time.

Dated 4/18/23

Respectfully submitted,

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

Exhibit 18

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 37th AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. I am in tears. I think I forgot to name another Delaware lawyer in my PA US Supreme Court appeal.
2. I think I may have forgotten to name Richard Abbott, Esquire in the appeal I filed with the US Supreme Court on Tuesday. I wanted to use this attorney as an example of the Delaware Supreme Court and Defendants violations of the Equal Protections clause to extend the Constitutional arguments against reciprocal and collateral application of discipline, based on selective disparate treatment and favoritism. I am sorry if I failed to hold the government within the purview of the Constitutional limits to protect him.
3. I am in tears. I petitioned the DE Supreme Court concerning its own misconduct per the attached letter.
4. Claimants and the other two branches must be afforded the opportunity to correct the judiciary within the purview of the Constitution including cases and controversies like my case, and in the case of Richard Abbott.
5. Otherwise, judges are above the law, and Americans are below the Constitutional law’s protection by government compelled waiver to buy and sell through licensure, or under the new economic model which creates a far worse form of government backed private slavery. The

new economic model will eliminate the rule of law and the courts down the law, if the courts do not stop it.

6. I let God down for not preventing injustice by standing up for Richard Abbott, not as an attorney, but as a Christian in my own appeal of the PA Order.

7. I may take time today to mow the lawn and cry a bit at the loss of liberty to another human by the partial whims of a misguided Delaware Supreme Court. The state court sacrifices individual liberties and life for marketing business, its own vain appearance. Jesus Christ teaches me to judge correctly not based on appearance, to guide those misguided by sin, lawless lusts, desires for position, profit, power at the cost of sacrificing humans. John 7:24. Humans are not the states to bargain with, buy or sell or sacrifice. Freedom is not a bartered for exchange. Freedom is not for sale for business. Money is not freedom, to be controlled not free by those who unjustly coin or control it. There is no social contract under which Americans must sell their souls to be damned to hell for money or necessities mammon. Matthew 6:24. There is no meeting of the minds upon the people. The contract is only by government servants and government workers who agree to the limits of the Constitution. The laws are forced by threat of penalty upon the people. There is much talk about a new social contract, contracting the souls of others like devils ruling over others by temptations, also known as scientific conditioning. Souls of people are free, not for sale products for the governments to barter for favor to private foreign and private partners. The partners exploit people for profit and power which eliminates freedom by government backed compelled slavery through disparate treatment in a fixed not free economy through government contracts, treaties, delegation of power or backing. There is an aim to eliminate the government to eliminate the rule of law which restrains the government partners conduct down the line.

8. The world is in great peril, and needs the courts to save us, not condemn us for petitioning for help.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated 5/31/23

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

Exhibit 19

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 FIFTEENTH AFFIDAVIT UPDATE

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

1. The docket for the US Supreme Court that went missing reappeared on March 9, 2023, later March 9, 2023 reappeared.

2. My exhibits to the Emergency Motion to Expedite submitted March 3, 2023 on the docket disappeared.

3. I filed a letter to place them back on the docket, submitted March 10, 2023. Today, I called efilng and asked them to put it back on. They directed me to talk with Robert Meek. Robert Meek kindly called me, and told me to talk with Daniel Bickle.

4. The March 6 and 7 Motions for interim stay, and the letter related to the docket were rejected.

5. Unlike most other rejected pleadings, the receipts are noted as missing items on the efilng side, as Exhibit A. The only other document I noticed that went missing on the efilng side was a Rule 39 and 43 motion for a different US Supreme court matter. (Exhibit B)

6. Other rejected motions were merely removed as attachments to the docket. They were not removed from the efileing system as proof of service and receipt of electronically filed.

(Exhibit C)

7. On March 14, 2023, I showed the law librarian proof that other rejected documents were not removed from the efileing system to remove their receipt like the latest rejected documents strangely went missing.

8. I am worried about hacks. My selectively disappearing docket and disappearing efiled receipt of rejected items is weird and concerning. This is reason why we need people staff at the courts for computer glitches and fixes.

9. I filed a different application per the court's initial suggestion, not latest suggestion. I also filed a reapplication by writing a letter per USSC Law Clerk Daniel Bickle's suggestion to the Honorable Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson. The rule says I should file 10 copies, but Daniel said I only had to file a letter. I do not know whether the Court will accept the attached letter, given I relied on the staff, not the rule. (Exhibit D). Robert Meek said he would accept it without the copies of the application. I mailed it out on March 13, and as of March 20, a week later, the court did not confirm receipt.

10. Since other documents were rejected, including a mere letter the staff suggested, I am not certain relying on the staff's kind suggestions is the same as the Clerk's acceptance.

11. The staff told me not to file a motion for reargument within the 25 days allotted under Supreme Court Rule 44.

12. I was panicking. I learned my lesson to rely on the rules not the staff. I sought to file it during the deadline relying on the rules not the staff, but I was too late to file within the deadline, due March 17, 2023. My printer was too slow.

13. However, I thought I saw another way to get new orders and information before the Court. I have to introduce new information on why emergency relief must be considered.

14. The Third Circuit indirectly denied my motion to move the conference date, by issuing a different notice with the same date on Friday with the April 11, 2023 date, by responding to my attached Motion to dispense of the need for a hearing. Meaning my motion to prevent the issue from becoming potentially moot was indirectly denied.

15. I strongly disagree with case law in the footnote holding motions not addressed are denied.⁹ I think the finding that unaddressed motions are denied yet appealable is unjust. It

⁹ The Third Circuit in *United States v. Claxton*, 766 F.3d 280, 291 (3d Cir. 2014) reasoned, "... we are guided by decisions of several of our sister courts of appeals that have treated a district court's failure to rule on an outstanding motion as an implicit denial of that motion. See e.g., *United States v. Jasso*, 634 F.3d 305, 307 n. 2 (5th Cir.2011) (treating a district court's failure to rule on a motion for reconsideration as an implicit denial); *United States v. Depew*, 210 F.3d 1061, 1065 (9th Cir.2000) (treating a district court's failure to rule on a motion for employment of an expert witness as an implicit denial). In *Tollett v. City of Kemah*, the Fifth Circuit addressed a new trial motion that remained outstanding on the district court's docket following the entry of the final judgment in that case. 285 F.3d 357, 370 n. * (5th Cir.2002). In concluding that it would address the motion on appeal, the court emphasized that "[d]espite the district court's failure to rule, neither side subsequently requested that it do so." *Id.* (emphasis in original). Likewise in this case, the entry of the Judgment and Commitment order following Claxton's sentencing constituted "the entry of a final judgment or of an order inconsistent with the granting of the relief sought by the motion [for a new trial]." *Norman v. Apache Corp.*, 19 F.3d 1017, 1021 (5th Cir.1994). Neither party raised this issue before the District Court and we will treat Claxton's motions as having been implicitly denied and consider them on the merits."

In *Zirinsky v. Zirinsky*, 87 Conn. App. 257, 265-66 (Conn. App. Ct. 2005), The Court rationale,

"*Ahneman v. Ahneman*, supra, 243 Conn. 479. The court further stated: "The trial court's decision not to consider the defendant's motions was the functional equivalent of a denial of those motions. Like a formal denial, the effect of the court's decision refusing to consider the

should be clear error for a Court to ignore motions by failing to rule on them. The case law allows judges to violate claimants due process opportunity to be heard. Even though claimants may plead on appeal it was merely denied, it may have been denied because judges do not care to serve all claimants with an equal hand in violation of the First Amendment right to petition, and the 5th Amendment's equal protection component. This was shockingly upsetting to me. Judges may pick and choose who is worthy to be heard, without any remedy other than allowing claimants to appeal to be remanded back to the same judge who may not read their pleadings. I believe this case law should be reversed. Nevertheless, I still have an appealable or a new reason why the US Supreme Court just address my Petition or give an interim stay to prevent the deprivation of the First Amendment right to petition and the 5th Amendment Due Process opportunity to be heard on appeal. On March 17, 2023 the Court issued a new notice of a conference date, while denied my Motion to reschedule the Conference date so as not to deprive me of an opportunity to be heard on appeal to the US Supreme Court.

16. In *Ritter v. Migliori*, No. 21A772, and Number 22-3, I saw that the United States Court uploaded a letter with attached additional new Court document(s) to be considered for an application to Justice Alito on why a stay was needed. The letter for this emergency was addressed appropriately to the Emergency Clerk Robert Meek while copying the Clerk of Court. This letter was accepted by the Court and docketed. (Exhibit E)

defendant's motions during the pendency of the appeal was to foreclose the possibility of relief from the court on those issues, unless and until the resolution of the appeal required further proceedings. Indeed, the refusal to consider a motion is more deserving of appellate review than a formal denial, because the defendant not only has been denied relief; she has been denied the opportunity even to persuade the trial court that she is entitled to that relief." *Id.*, 480.

17. So, a letter by me with any new or additional pleadings or orders below which materially affect the application should also similarly be accepted by the court with pleadings attached thereto to prevent unequal application of the law with regards to access to the courts in contravention of the 1st and 5th Amendment's Equal Protection's component. It appears this is a way new and additional documents that are material to the case have been docketed before the US Supreme Court before.

18. I am trying to act fast, so my rights are not waived. I am acting in good faith. I do not want to be compelled to withdraw my complaint due to lapse of time deeming it moot.

19. Sadly, on March 20, 2023 Robert Meek called me back, and indicated he would not accept a similar situated letter since it was not contained in the initial application with new application to Justice Jackson. I do not know if this rejection would be proper. This is confusing. Robert Meek also indicated he would reject my different application. Today is full of bad news.

20. There were other complications I emailed Robert Meek, opposing counsel, efilings and David Weiss attached hereto, including the fact the word "emergency" was removed from my Emergency pleading to expedite the case, which will prejudice me should it be considered a mere motion, not an emergency motion. See the attached emails. Robert Meek indicated it was deemed a motion not an emergency application. So, I am prejudiced. This is the worst.

21. In addition my exhibits were removed from the March 3, 2023 pleading to expedite the case. While the Supreme Court Rules indicate the Court would only upload orders below, will upload pro se claimants' filings who do not efile to the efilings system, going out of

the way to remove material evidence incorporated into the pleadings that were previously uploaded on the system is prejudicial to me denying me an opportunity to be heard in full.

22. Robert Meek indicated the disappearing docket issues were a technical issue. So, I merely seek to get it fixed to prevent a partial, prejudicial review. Id. Robert Meek directed me to talk with Daniel Bickle about this, not him.

23. With regards to additional harm, my mom's best friend Shelly Chamberlain, Delaware Speaker of the House Pete Schwartzkopf's sister in law, said I looked anorexic skinny, in a loving way. She was worried about me months ago. So, like a knucklehead sinning against God for feeling ugly, I gained fat, not necessarily weight by eating too much without time to work out. It made me uglier and rounder not more attractive.

23. I was surprised Speaker of the House Pete did not help me when I ran for office. He was running on his own ticket with strange backlash from the upper Delaware lobbyists who sought to control members of the House as puppets. I have known him since I was a little girl, sharing thanksgivings with his sister-in-law, and at times him, and other holidays over three decades. It just surprised me how he dissociated himself from me, when I ran for office.

24. I also got the attached notification last week concerning PA placement on disability, which embarrassed me before my lawyer and law school friends.

25. I also wanted to alert the Court that my lawyer relatives are not helping me because they are not allowed to help me. It is not that they do not love me. My Cousin Ikey Adams partner of Sidney Austin and little Cousin, Tim Mastrogiacomo of Skadden in DC, are not licensed to practice law before your court.

26. Unjust laws protect people and their free will. Unjust laws serve lawless lusts like productivity, money and material gain to control people by sacrificing a free people to a forced economic will which creates worse products and services by lack of criticism and forced standardization. I believe those who enact or enforce unjust decrees or government backed policies are in danger of damnation in hell. When God says “Woe to you,” I sit up.¹⁰ I hear damned to hell are you unless you unharden your heads and unharden your hearts and clean your dirty mind, dirty hands and dirty heart. I believe people go to hell for blindly doing what they are trained to do, told to do, required to do without using their free will to think things out to determine what is right, love to overcome wicked lusts including convenience or productivity at the cost of oppressing a slave people in a fixed, not free economy.

27. In the article attached to the Motion without an exhibit page, the important part was cut off which lobbyist’s stated,

“How can the use of Laws be eliminated?

Today we try to **control human behavior** by enacting laws or signing treaties without changing the physical conditions responsible for aberrant behavior. When Earth’s resources are seen as the common heritage of all people, **irrelevant laws** and social contracts will vanish.

In a resource-based economy, social responsibility would not be a function of artificial laws or force. Safeguards against abuse could be designed into the environment. An example of this is the proposed design of cities where people have free access to resources without debt. This would eliminate theft. Such measures are not a matter of passing and enforcing laws to prevent and punish abuse. Rather, they are a means of designing the flaws out of any social venture, thus eliminating the need for many laws.

We are proposing doing away with the systems that cause corruption and human suffering in the first place. In a city with safe, clean, mass transportation, we do not need police to monitor drivers’ speed, behavior at stop signs, or proper papers.

¹⁰ *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.”

Other examples are the air and the water. Although both are necessary to our well-being and survival, there are no laws regulating how many breaths are taken per hour because we have such abundance at this time. No one monitors a gushing spring to see how much water is taken from it, although fresh water is absolutely necessary for the support of life. If it is abundant, no one monitors it.

I must emphasize that this approach to global governance has nothing in common with the present aims of an elite few to form a world government with themselves at the helm, and with the vast majority subservient to them. This newer vision of globalization empowers every person on the planet to be all they can be, without living in abject subjugation to a corporate governing body.

A society with human concern “designs out” laws and proclamations by making all things available to all people, regardless of race, color, or creed. When governments make laws, we are led to believe that these laws are made to enhance people’s lives. In truth, laws are byproducts of insufficiency.

The question is, “can we grow beyond thinking that “someone” has to make decisions for us?”

A better understanding of natural law involves human’s relationship to the environment, which supports all life. All of nature is subservient to natural law. Natural law cannot be violated without serious consequences to individuals or societies. Natural laws dominate all living systems. For example, without water, sun, or nutrients, plants and animals die.

An environment of scarcity, hunger, and poverty is a threat to everyone.”

28. The lobbyist’s proposal of eliminating laws will have the affect of tyrannical reign by those who control the technology and other resources, unrestrained from oppressing, harming, killing or destroying those who do not bend to their will by the just rule of law. This creates oppression and injustice, not freedom or the common good.

29. Look at how bad the world is. People are proposing killing people through death with dignity acts under the lie of good to allegedly put the sick out of their misery by killing them. In reality killing sick, old people who cost a lot in convenience and saving of costs by those who value material gain more than people. This is not protecting life, but sacrificing it to gain the world. Look at people saying the problem is there are too many people for the world to sustain, when the people are the treasure not to be sacrificed to gain the world.

29. On the matter of injustice, I listened to an old video of Justice Kavanaugh on youtube concerning the fact there are many regulations as opposed to merely statutes. It appears he changed my mind on deregulations. It clicked in my hard head that it was unelected bureaucrats, above a check to their law-making authorities in terms of the vote that drafted regulations. I believe congress must sit in their seats to draft rules and laws not unelected partial bureaucrats above one constitutional check to their power, the vote.

30. Deregulation is not lawlessness, Congress's refusal to draft statutes and rules without delegating their power to others creates lawlessness based on lusts, partial desires.

31. I am humbled as I learn. While I disagree with Justice Kavanaugh's book, "A Republic, if you can keep it," because I believe the courts give us a democracy in our democratic-republic, not a republic, I thank him or using his words to make me a little less dumb. That diverse sharing of criticism helps us learn. People should be free to share bad ideas too. How can they learn their ideas need improvement if they cannot share them.

32. I believe each one of our freedoms will be slowly eliminated if the courts do not safeguard freedom. I hope the court safeguards my freedoms in order to safeguard the freedom of all.

Thank you for allowing me to file this 14th affidavit update.

Dated: March 20, 2023,

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly

Meghan Kelly, Esquire

34012 Shawnee Drive

Dagsboro, DE 19939

meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

(302) 493-6693 INACTIVE 4968 Not acting as an attorney

Appendix N

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,	§	APPEALS COURT
Respondent.	§	CASE NUMBER: 22:37372
	§	DISTRICT COURT
	§	Misc. No. 22-45
v.	§	DISTRICT COURT
United States District Court,	§	JUDGE: The Honorable Paul D.
Eastern District of Pennsylvania	§	Paul S. Diamond, Judge

Petitioner Meghan Kelly’s Motion for reconsideration or rehearing on the papers on the June 30, 2023 Order Denying my motion for an extension of time to file her Brief on appeal

I Meghan Kelly, Esq., pursuant to FRAP 2, 27, 40, my 5th Amendment right to a fair trial to defend and preserve my private exercise of 1st Amendment rights to petition, speech, religious belief, exercise, and association, objection to compelled servitude invoking the 13th or other applicable law in the interest of justice move for good cause for reconsideration or rehearing on the papers on the Order denying my Motion for an extension of time to file to appeal the decision of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to place my attorney’s license to practice law as disbarred due to retirement in order not to have 6 new law suits against me due to inability to effectively argue on appeal at this time with a guaranteed new one by the US Supreme Court under Supreme Court Rule 8, to prevent irreparable injury in terms of harm to health, loss of property interests, 6 new law suit, loss of licenses, and the right to exercise fundamental rights. I incorporate the entire District Court Docket below and the Third Circuit Court Record by reference to the document or Docket Item, and any exhibits hereto as if fully incorporated herein, and aver”

1. The Panel abused its discretion committing clear error of law, clear error of fact creating manifest injustice against me by denying my motion for an extension of time in the amount of 120 days.

2. On 6/2/23, I filed a Motion for my more time under prejudice, given the Clerk of Court Ordered that I may not exceed three pages despite good cause and requirement for more time under my unique situations. I was compelled not to include legal arguments and facts under the threat of this Court forcing me to violate in violating my religious beliefs against Jesus Christ, the right to petition given the threat of malicious bad faith fines.

3. I called my case manager more than a week before the due date 6/13/23. She, Pamela Batts, assured me I would be granted more time. I think I called her again on 6/13/23 because I was panicking.

4. I had no reason to believe this court would deny my reasonable, necessary request for a stay or time to preserve my fundamental rights and the use of eliminating my licenses but for my exercise of fundamental rights of 1st Amendment right to petition, speech, associate believe, 6th Amendment right to self-representation, right to Equal Protection and a fair and meaningful opportunity to be heard under the 5th and 14th Amendments and Delaware claims.

5. I also filed a Motion for a stay as I require time in order to effectively argue the Order below must be overturned under the threat of 6 new additional law suits against me should I fall short, including one by the US Supreme Court. This Court denied a stay too. (Exhibit A)

6. On 7/11/23, I filed a Motion for reconsideration/rehearing of this Court's denial of a stay I incorporate herein by reference.

7. Despite the Court's assurance time would be granted, though my case manager said it would not likely the amount I requested, near closing time on Friday before the 4th of July holiday weekend this Court entered 7 orders against me, in this matter and the Kelly v Swartz a Civil rights case 21-3198 (hereinafter referred to as "civil-rights"-case or "21-3198" for 3rd Cir.

and “21-1490” for DE District Court). The denial of a stay, and a denial of more time caused the Clerk to file an Order dismissing the case immediately for failure to prosecute. (Exhibits A, B).

6. Should this Court grant a stay or time I respectfully request the dismissal order be vacated. I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety the motion I filed 7/10/23 to reopen this case, and the Motion for reconsideration/reargument on this court’s denial of a stay.

7. I was not afforded fair or reasonable notice pursuant to US Amend V under the circumstances where my motions for time and a stay were denied simultaneously as the dismissal order where the Court through its agent assured me time would be granted, effectively vitiating my US Amend I opportunity to be heard.

8. I require a fair opportunity in the form of time or more importantly a stay to defend my license effectively on appeal in this case and to assert my claims in the civil rights case in order to prevent the permanent loss of the exercise of fundamental rights including my private 1st Amendment right to petition, speech, religious belief, exercise of religious belief, 6th Amendment right to self-represent in state Court, 13th Amendment right against involuntary servitude, harm to health, loss of property interests, 6 new law suit needless law suits with a certain one before the US Supreme Court, loss of licenses, and other injuries caused by denial of a stay.

9. A denial vitiates my ability to effectively exercise my 1st Amendment right to petition in the civil rights case on appeal and remand effectively vitiating my 1st Amendment right to religious belief, exercise of belief, speech, association, and other claims since my focus would be to prevent a law suit from the US Supreme Court. So this Court would compel me

against my will to lose my First Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus, exercise of belief and other claims forever in DE as the Delaware Courts and its arms will continue to consider me below the protection of the Constitutional law as they have deemed me unworthy for almost 20 years. (See Third Circuit Docket Item (hereinafter (3DI-56). Time is required to prevent irreparable injury to me in terms of the loss of my freedom to exercise private 1st Amendment right to religious belief in Jesus Christ in DE, petition, speech, association, 6th Amendment right to self-defense, and licenses under the threat of not being able to buy and sell but for my religious beliefs the state finds repugnant.

10. Court agents attacked me in private during Kelly v Trump. I received 3 threatening letters from two different arms of the Court. It was not normal for Judge Clark to misbehave at BJs store demeaning my claims and religious beliefs in Kelly v Trump in an attempt to cause me to forgo my case while the case was pending or not even yet appealed before the DE Supreme Court in order to cause me to forgo my claims.

11. “[I]nterference with or deprivation of the [right of access to the courts is actionable under Section 1983... ‘To be actionable, the claim need not allege a total or complete denial of access to the courts. Rather, plaintiffs need only claim that “the interference with and potential prejudice to the right of access to redress in state court rises to the level of a constitutional deprivation.” In re Cincinnati Radiation Litigation, 874 F. Supp. 796, 823 (S.D. Ohio 1995)(Internal Citation omitted)

12. The USSC noted in Richards v. Jefferson County, 517 U.S. 793, 798 n.4 (1996), “The opportunity to be heard is an essential requisite of due process of law in judicial proceedings. *Windsor v. McVeigh*, [93 U.S. 274, 277](#); *Louisville Nashville R. R. Co. v. Schmidt*, [177 U.S. 230, 236](#); *Simon v. Craft*, [182 U.S. 427, 436](#). And as a State may not, consistently with the Fourteenth Amendment, enforce a judgment against a party

named in the proceedings without a hearing or an opportunity to be heard (*Pennoyer v. Neff*, [95 U.S. 714, 733](#); *Scott v. McNeal*, [154 U.S. 34, 46](#); *Coe v. Armour Fertilizer Works*, [237 U.S. 413, 423](#)), so it cannot, without disregarding the requirement of due process, give a conclusive effect to a prior judgment against one who is neither a party nor in privity with a party therein." [247 U.S., at 476.](#)"

13. In the FRCP 52(b0, 59(e), 60(b)(1)(2)6) in 21-1490, attached at 3DI56-1, page 1, footnote 1, filed Jan 19, 2023, dated Jan 18, 2022 I averred, "I respectfully request to include nominal damages should the Court allow amendments to the Complaint. See, *Freedom from Religion Found. Inc. v. New Kensington Arnold Sch. Dist.*, 832 F.3d 469, 473 (3d Cir. 2016)...Also see, *Molina v. Pa. Soc. Serv. Union*, 392 F. Supp. 3d 469, 476 n.5 (M.D. Pa. 2019)

14. I assert my right to meaningful opportunity to appeal 21-3198, and if successful to argue my claims in *Kelly v Swartz* in order to prevent the vitiation of my rights by this court's unreasonable denial of a stay and for time. I do not live in a bubble. This court's actions and omission affects my rights beyond this case and may vitiate my rights should this Court fail to grant a stay or time. My religious beliefs contained in the speech in the petitions in *Kelly v Trump* were the State's asserted reasons for placing my license to practice law on disability. The Order caused this reciprocal suit to arise.

15. The opinion of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals dated November 18, 2022, disbarred me as retired which may cause 6 additional law suits should I not overturn the Order. This is a new order.

16. I require adequate time to meaningfully petition this Court to prevent 6 additional law suits, and to prevent deprivations of my liberties and licenses based on clear error of law, of fact creating manifest injustice. I respectfully request an extension in the amount of 120 days to appeal the lower court's order placing my license on disbarred as retired but for my religious beliefs, religious political beliefs, and religious political speech contained in my petitions.

17. A Delaware Order placed my license on inactive/disabled, but for my religious-political beliefs, poverty and exercise of First Amendment rights and my right to due process, without disparate treatment.

18. The Delaware Order placing my license on disability inactive has caused additional courts to place my license on inactive disabled, causing multiple law suits. I have been fighting reciprocating courts. I require additional time to plead in other cases to prevent irreparable injury to me in the form of loss of First Amendment rights, not limited to the right to petition, and my property interest in my license.

19. On Tuesday, May 30, 2023, I timely filed an appeal of a PA reciprocal order, and expect PA ODC to bury me in paper to prejudice my other cases as he did in the state court proceeding. Per the attached affidavit in 21-1490, DI-157, labeled 48th Affidavit I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety, I timely appeal a PA-ODC reciprocal case which accepted for consideration. Therein, I note my concern that US Supreme Court justices participate in politicking. I also noted my concerns in my Motions to recuse Phipps and Scirica at 3DI-54-1, in a Second Caveat to recuse Phipps for consideration drafting laws to prevent judges from speaking engagements on behalf of political think tanks such as the lobbyists at the Federalist Society. I believe the temptation to serve those who support the legal theories of justices, such as think tanks or schools, will be used to eliminate people judges by automation by the innate bias.

20. Lobbyists are talking about eliminating the profession of lawyers and judges at the World Economic Forum and the World Government Summit, including Sebastian Thrun. Other lobbyists are talking about eliminating the rule of law altogether to prevent constraint on

those who control the resources from oppressing, enslaving, killing, stealing or destroying human life under the lie of saving the world or the common good.

21. The Courts are in trouble. That means we are all in trouble with no one able to protect our free will to use our own brains to believe by the dictates of our conscience. I believe we must each use our own brain to escape the default hell to lay down our desires to overcome lusts to love, which is God's desire.

22. The new economic digital slavery system using debt and credit substantially burdens free will by desire for basic needs to survive by bending our will to those who control the digital currency, making mammon God. I believe this violates of Jesus's teachings in Matthew 6:24, misleading many to oppression and damnation in the fires of hell.

23. Upon information and belief, the new economy is a mere transition to allow Central banks to recoup resources before the elimination of the rule of law and the governments after 2050. This is not based on speculation, and it is not because I am smart. I am the ugliest and dumbest one in my family, but I love God and people, and do not want them to be sacrificed for a few to gain the world. Lobbyists write books.

24. I require time to ask this Court to save the world, just not now. I need to fight for my faith in Jesus b appealing the civil rights case in 21-3198 before I forever lose my freedom to buy and sell but for my religious belief. Rev. 13:17.

25. In the attached 53rd Affidavit, I incorporate herein in its entirety, I averred:

“I believe the courts are in danger and allowing consideration of my motions by an impartial panel by a majority of the judges would at least apprise the judges they are in danger, and a way to prevent harm to the judiciary by limiting the scope of judicial correction within cases and controversies even if they disagree with my concerns at this time. 10. I also noted that Courts must allow correction by attorneys to improve the

administration of justice, and noted the important consideration as to whether I am below the law and judges are above the law with regards to punishing attorneys for their exercise of fundamental rights including my religious belief in Jesu as God, not money as God. Here are some other important considerations I noted in the attached documents.”

26. In the attached 48th, 51st, affidavit I incorporate herein by reference I indicate my beliefs about the new economy and for the need for judges to judge professionals, experts’ standards, service and products not defer to them essentially allowing them to harm people or sell products that oppress, kill, steal or destroy for mere convenience or profit, which is selling other people’s free will and souls to the forced will of the government backed professionals.

27. In the attached 54th Affidavit I incorporate herein in its entirety I discuss my belief that the technology to create Privately held Central bank technology for the digital currency was created prior to 9/11. I believe the Patriot’s act opened the door to our devices to allow the private Central banks the means to eventually eliminate the government by ruling over people by credit and debt. Congress delegated their job and Art 1 Section 8 power to the private entity in 1913. The Federal Reserve is not the federal government.

28. Per the 52nd affidavit, attached hereto and incorporated herein, FBI agent Mike Trilio, my baby brother’s friend alerted him back in 2007 or earlier that the back doors to computers could be opening even if they were unplugged and off so long as the battery remained in the device. This allows for the digital transactions to occur even if our devices are off.

29. When I ran for office, the democrats did not care about my ideas to improve laws. They had a preplanned agenda, same as the republicans. They are controlled not free but enslaved by the lobbyists who tempt their collective desires from which they do not depart. Only people are free to lay down interests to do overcome temptations to love.

30. In the 46th affidavit, attached hereto and incorporated herein, I discuss my concerns about Web 3 which will be used in the new economy. I also discussed my concerns about the impartiality of the judiciary without eliminating its independence.

31. “The administration of justice by an impartial judiciary has been basic to our conception of freedom ever since Magna Carta. It is the concern not merely of the immediate litigants. Its assurance is everyone’s concern, and it is protected by the liberty guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.” *Bridges v. California*, 314 U.S. 252, 282 (1941).

32. “The state’s interest [and my interest as a party of one with religious beliefs against favoritism] in ensuring that judges be and appear to be neither antagonistic, nor beholden to any interest, party, or person is entitled to the greatest respect.” *Morial v. Judiciary Comm’n*, 565 F.2d 295, 302 5th Cir. 1977).

33. I averred:

“I feel slimy when I hear about judges speaking at forums, even colleges. I am concerned when I read about judges teaching at colleges because it creates injustice and favoritism. Judges influence and encourage people to believe and argue points favoring what judges teach, chilling diverse viewpoints, instead of allowing litigants to persuade the courts as opposed to students and audiences to the viewpoint of the judges. It is as if judges become the advocates instead of the arbiters of justice, making courts unfair forums for one or both parties. 22. I believe judges’ opinions or dissents should speak for themselves. I think it is wrong to allow judges to act as attorneys to argue their views in interest group forums, including the Federalist Society.”

34. A Code ethics would be used to impeach justices and beholden them to those who regulate them. The only correction that should be permitted to correct any federal judge should be 1. Cases and controversies or 2 impeachment, without required 5th Amendment self-incrimination by judges to judge by rules that will be used to eliminate them.

35. With that said lawyers must be permitted to try judges by contesting their opinions or orders or to correct misfiling’s without threat of reprisal for upholding Constitutional

rights or believed claims. Loyalty is not to people in the government, it is to the impartial rule of law that safeguards me and others from government infringement of 1st Amendment right to religious belief and private speech in private petitions wherein I seek to alleviate a substantial government burden upon my religious exercise.

36. At the inception 21-3198, I noticed the Court I may try DE judges by outlining the questions involved which I include in the 53rd affidavit and incorporate herein b reference in its entirety, also found at 21-3198 DI 6, page 4-11, attached hereto.

37. I have a civil rights case relating to deprivations of Constitutional liberties independent of the disciplinary order, wherein I also seek to overturn the DE order as void or voidable due to due process violations. I require time to exercise the First Amendment right to petition and appeal this case while being able to effectively fight my civil rights case. Should I win on appeal, I will be fighting up to 14 defendants including lawyers and judges, whereas I am poor with limited means to research, and prepare. I am impoverished, and it creates a burden upon my meaningful access to the courts, especially with the price of stamps increasing, and my inability to drive due to unaffordable costs.

38. I cannot risk this Court creating 6 new law suits wherein I would not be able to afford to defend myself on all while appealing the civil rights case to prevent the elimination of my First Amendment rights, and other claims in Delaware forever, albeit some claims may not be barred, I would lose my right to believe in Jesus and to petition to defend my belief.

39. The denial of a stay or time creates a risk too great. US Supreme court Rule provides:

“Whenever a member of the Bar of this Court has been disbarred or suspended from practice in any court of record, or has engaged in conduct unbecoming a member of

the Bar of this Court, the Court will enter an order suspending that member from practice before this Court and affording the member an opportunity to show cause, within 40 days, why a disbarment order should not be entered.”

40. My appeal of this order endangers me given I have 2 appeals to make and an outstanding reciprocal case because the Court I seek relief from will disbar me, the USSC. This is prejudicial to my asserted defense and claims to fundamental rights, even if the court deems me disabled. I should not lose my freedom to religious belief to believe differently by the dictates of my conscience as opposed to the dollars.

41. I noted in the Motion to reopen that Phipps denied two stay motions and granted a motion for time in 21-3198. I incorporate those documents herein b reference. A denial of relief already precluded my ability to appeal the DE Disciplinary order for which this case arises.

42. I note, the staff at the USSC appeared to delay in docketing which also prejudiced my ability to be heard until it was too late and relief could not be granted or guaranteed which effectively vitiated my access to the courts and my First Amendment right to petition. I attach and incorporate a series of affidavits noting my progress of filings of the DE Appeal before the US Supreme Court to preserve the facts to argue against collateral estoppel or claims preclusion under the circumstances.

43. I need time to effectively defend myself before this court. Should I fail due to filing subpar filings under the pressure of asserting and not waiving my rights without adequate time to research proofread or draft documents as I am now, I risk disbarment before the USSC which would destroy my ability to defend my faith in Jesus and eliminate my fundamental rights in DE forever. Please grant me a stay or at least time. Going forward in this case is a risk too late. I am disbarred. The Court has no interest in going forward, nor does the public, but I have

everything to lose, my liberties, my health, livelihood, life, licenses, claims, and possibly even my eternal life.

44. Additional threats of possible law suits create an obstacle so great as to prevent me a fair opportunity to petition in the Civil-rights case until the conclusion of the proceeding given the voluminous amount of Defendants, poverty creating a substantial burden, health issues and other facts of this case. I ask for a fighting reasonable chance for the opportunity to defend my faith in Jesus Christ and other claims without government persecution.

45. “Because this case implicates the [Constitutionally protected] right of access to the courts,” in defense of my First Amendment rights, determining whether removing the substantial burden upon my religious beliefs and access to the courts by granting stay, to prevent needless or unduly burdensome costs, is determined under a strict scrutiny basis test. *Citing, Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004).

46. There is no compelling or necessary interest of the Court in denying my request narrowly tailored to effectuate the interest somehow more important than the loss of access to the courts in other cases causing the loss of my claims in 21-3198 and my 1st Amendment right to religious belief, exercise of belief, petition, association, speech in my hometown and state of DE forever.

Wherefore I pray this Court grants my motion.

Dated July 12, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
DE Bar Number 4968
Inactive license
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com
(3,890 words)

Appendix O

THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

MEGHAN M. KELLY,	§	APPEALS COURT
Respondent.	§	CASE NUMBER: 22-3372
	§	DISTRICT COURT
	§	Misc. No. 22-45
v.	§	DISTRICT COURT
United States District Court,	§	
Eastern District of Pennsylvania	§	Paul S. Diamond, Judge

Appellant Meghan Kelly’s Motion for rehearing on papers/reconsideration of Order dated June 30, 2023 regarding 3 motions to vacate Order dated May 19, 2023 with regards denial of waiver of costs by threatening me with costs, to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, and compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights and compelled violation of my invoked 13th Amendment right against involuntary servitude.

I, Appellant Meghan Kelly pursuant to USCS Fed Rules App Proc R 27(b) and 40 move this Court for rehearing on the papers/reconsideration of its Order dated June 30, 2023 with regards to denial of the Motion to vacate Order dated 5/19/23, Third Circuit Docket Item (hereinafter “3DI”) 3DI-37, Motion to Correct to Vacate at 3DI-38, and Leave for additional words at 3DI-40. I incorporate the entire the entire Third Circuit record, and lower court record and aver.

1. The panel committed clear error of law and fact creating manifest injustice against me by Order dated June 30, 2023 at Third Circuit Docket Item (hereinafter “3DI”) 3DI-47, attached hereto as Exhibit A by denying Motion to vacate Order dated 5/19/23 at 3DI-37, Motion to Correct to Vacate at 3DI-38, which must be considered with the granted Motion for Leave for additional words at 3DI-40 by chilling and substantially burdening my speech contained in my petitions necessary for me to defend my liberty interests, life health, and licenses by allowing the 5/19/23 Order to threaten me to violate of my US Amend I protected religious belief, by compelling me to lose my exercise of the First Amendment right to petition fairly under the 5th

Amendment by limiting my Motion for an extension of time to 3 pages under the threat of taxes which violates my religious beliefs against debt, my invoked right against 13th Amendment involuntary servitude, and in light poverty creating a substantial burden on my access to the courts.

2. This Court erred by requiring I **exchange** the 5th Amendment Constitutional right to fair treatment and opportunity to be heard in exercise of the 1st Amendment right to petition **for my religious belief in Jesus**. US Amend I, V.

3. I believe people go to hell for debt because it tempts them to seek money as savior blinding their eyes from seeing clearly to love one another by love of money damning people to hell. Matthew 6:24.

4. I was compelled by government force, not freely to forgo drafting a motion exceeding 3 pages per the 5/19/23 Order under the threat of sanctions in violations of my asserted religious beliefs despite the fact I faced irreparable injury should the motion for an extension be denied in terms of loss of my fundamental rights and licenses which was disbarred but for the exercise of fundamental rights. I required words and pages to discuss irreparable threat of harm relating to the voluminous amount of materials in reciprocal suits, the voluminous amount of harm, 20 years of religious and place of origin persecution by Delaware Courts and the risk I may lose my life, health, licenses and Constitutional liberties and civil rights claims including but not limited to my private-1st Amendment right to religious belief, exercise of belief, association, petition, 6th Amendment right to self-representation, Equal protections under the 14th and 5th, procedural Due Process under the 5th and 14th, but for the exercise of religious belief in Jesus Christ, and exercise of my 1st Amendment right to petition and 1st Amendment

exercise of the right of speech contained in petitions to defend my religious belief in Jesus as God not money as God.

5. I complied with the order under the threat of government compelled violations of religious belief. On 6/2/23, I filed a Motion for my more time under prejudice, given the Clerk of Court Ordered that I may not exceed three pages despite good cause and requirement for more time under my unique situations. I was compelled not to include legal arguments and facts under the threat of this Court forcing me to violate in violating my religious beliefs against Jesus Christ, the right to petition given the threat of malicious bad faith fines.

6. I called my case manager more than a week before the due date 6/13/23. She, Pamela Batts, assured me I would be granted more time. I had no reason to believe this court would deny my reasonable, necessary request for a stay or time to preserve my fundamental rights and the use of eliminating my licenses but for my exercise of fundamental rights of 1st Amendment right to petition, speech, associate believe, 6th Amendment right to self-representation, right to Equal Protection and a fair and meaningful opportunity to be heard under the 5th and 14th Amendments and Delaware claims.

7. Despite the Court's assurance time would be granted, though my case manager said it would not likely the amount I requested, near closing time on Friday before the 4th of July holiday weekend this Court entered 7 orders against me, in this matter and the *Kelly v Swartz* a Civil rights case 21-3198 (hereinafter referred to as "civil-rights"-case or "21-3198" for 3rd Cir. and "21-1490" for DE District Court), including a denial of a stay, and a denial of more time which caused the Clerk to file an Order dismissing the case immediately for failure to prosecute. (Exhibits A, B). I move the Court to vacate the dismissal Order. The Order compelled me and

continues to compel me to violate my religious beliefs or acquiesce to the Court ordered diminished right of the opportunity to be heard.

8. I was actually prejudiced by the 5/19/23 Order because the Court denied a motion I was not permitted to fully and fairly present.

9. I respectfully argue this Court vacate the Clerk Order 5/19/23 to prevent the threat of choosing between chilling my speech contained in petitions causing me to ineffectively plead or a compelled violations of my religious belief.

10. The Clerk's Order was made in bad faith with knowledge debt violated my religious belief. On 12/23/22, I filed a motion to exempt costs due to foreseeable costs creating a substantial burden upon my access to the courts and forced violation of my religious beliefs by threat of indebtedness, I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety Third Circuit Docket Item Number (hereinafter "3DI-" 3DI-4.

11. I sought and continue to exempt taxes, fees and costs 1. to prevent unaffordable costs from becoming a substantial burden upon my access to the courts, 2. to prevent a government compelled violation of my religious beliefs against indebtedness in order to exercise my right to petition the Court in my defense of the exercise of fundamental rights, and 3. to prevent government compelled involuntary servitude in exchange with access to the courts to defend my licenses and liberties from being taken away for my religious beliefs in Jesus," I incorporate herein by reference in its entirety. (Citing, US Amendments I, V, XIII).

12. Clerk Order dated at DI 16 provides in part:

"The motion to be exempt from costs is denied without prejudice to renewal once the Court has entered a decision on the appeal, which would include a ruling on whether costs would be taxed against a party. It is noted that no hearings were conducted in the

underlying District Court proceedings and, therefore, no transcripts will need to be ordered.”

13. The Clerk erred as a matter of law, and as a matter of fact, creating manifest injustice in denying matters that are not merely procedural until it is too late to assert them. “[O]nce the Court has entered a decision on the appeal.”

14. In my Motion for reargument on the denial of waiver of costs at 3DI-17, I averred I,

“seek to exempt all costs, including but not limited to costs by taxable in the District Court, for the Eastern District of PA.

Pursuant to USCS Fed Rules App Proc R 39 (e)

“The following costs on appeal are taxable in the district court for the benefit of the party entitled to costs under this rule:

- (1) the preparation and transmission of the record;
 - (2) the reporter’s transcript, if needed to determine the appeal;
 - (3) premiums paid for a bond or other security to preserve rights pending appeal;
- and
- (4) the fee for filing the notice of appeal.”

8. It is against my religious belief to go into debt, especially given I am not permitted to work for pay as an attorney in DE. (*See, Bible Romans 13:8*. “Owe nothing to anyone, but to love them”)

9. It is my religious belief people should buy and sell by free choice, not by forced choice by artificially man-made government compulsion to be exploited by government backed private or foreign partners in a fixed not free economy. ¹¹

¹¹ By fixed, I mean lawlessness, making business through entities the standard of care and the letter of the law. This makes businesses above the law and above Court correction. I desire just decrees that prevent businesses from killing, oppressing, and destroying human life, liberty and health for material gain. The fixed system allows businesses to be above the law by making the experts and the business’s standards above government guidance and correction when they destroy and harm other people’s lives and liberty. I desire the Judges to judge, not businesses through experts whose aims are exploiting people for money and material gain. Whereas Courts aim is to protect liberty and lives. US Amend I and preamble. Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution vests the judicial Power of the United States in the United States Supreme Court and the federal Courts. Powers may be waived if not exercised. When this Court relinquishes its powers, it allows the other two branches to lawlessly rule by lusts, including business greed, as opposed to serve people. The other two branches will sacrifice the

10. I argue government compelled debt in my case not only violates the 13th Amendment against involuntary servitude, but violates my private, personal individual religious belief in Jesus, God the father and the holy spirit as guide and God, not money as guide and savior by government compelled force. US Amend I, XIII.”

15. The Clerk had notice that I believe people sin against God by creating artificial debt by fines or credits to enslave a no longer free people to bend the people’s dictates to their will substantially burdening their free will to do God’s will.

16. The clerk filed anew order at 3DI-18, “To the extent Appellant is requesting to be exempt from costs taxed by this Court, the motion is referred to the merits panel that will be assigned to the case **once briefing is complete**, as that is the panel of the Court that will make the decision on the taxation of costs.”

17. Briefing is not complete. On 7/10/23 I sought to reopen the case to assert my 1st Amendment right to petition under FRAP Rule 40 on denied motions. The panel was not aware of my religious belief against debt, but the Clerk was when she imposed the threat of taxes I sought an exemption from which she twice denied by delays.

18. The threat of taxes and costs in violation of my religious belief creates an obstacle by preventing the foreseeable costs upon me from denying me fair access to the courts needed to safeguard my exercise of fundamental rights and to prevent the loss of my license as punishment for the exercise of my rights. The threat of taxes by the clerk made in bad faith with knowledge debt violates my religious belief inhibited my 1st Amendment right to effectively speak persuasively while exercising my 1st Amendment right to petition to defend my license from losses based on my exercise of fundamental rights in DE in my request for more time and other

people, land and resources to private and foreign powers if left unstopped and unrestrained by the rule of Constitutional law. That makes the Courts necessary, at all times. You have the power and authority to prevent war, an economic crash and the dismantling of our government, should someone with standing ask.

requests. The Order continues to chill speech necessary to defend my licenses, liberty, life and eternal life effectively.

19. I lack the capacity to pay any costs. I am impoverished and without an income. I lack the right to work in the profession of my free choice.

20. A lawyer's right, my right to pursue my profession constitutes a property protected by the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, and of which I cannot be deprived for any whimsical, capricious or unreasonable cause, including the government's disagreement with my Constitutionally protected religious-political beliefs. US Amend I, V.

21. I must be afforded fair access to the courts to defend my license to practice law from being placed on inactive disabled but for my faith in Jesus Christ, and exercise of fundamental rights, without compelled denial by requiring I pay costs or plea to waive costs when costs may be incurred. US Amend I, V.

22. I am utterly poor. Threat of taxes create a substantial burden and obstacle to my access to the Courts in contravention to my First Amendment right to access to the Courts applicable to the Federal Courts via the Equal Protection component of the 5th Amendment, for me, a member of class of one due to religious beliefs against incurring debt combined and due to utter poverty.

23. "Because this case implicates the [Constitutionally protected] right of access to the courts, [and First Amendment rights to free speech, religious belief, association and exercise of religious beliefs] the government's disparate treatment towards me, based on poverty, is still unconstitutional under a strict scrutiny basis test." *Citing, Tennessee v. Lane*, 541 U.S. 509, 533 n.20 (2004).

24. I expected to rejoin my old law firm after standing up for something more important than money in *Kelly v Trump*, my free exercise of religion, exercise of religious and political belief, exercise of religious and political speech, and association as a party, attorney, democrat, and Christian without government incited persecution, but for my exercise of fundamental rights.

25. The Delaware Order against me and the reciprocating Order creates a government incited economic substantial burden upon me, and prejudices me by forcing me into a maintained state of poverty by preventing me from seeking to get my former position back at my old law firm as an attorney, or any work as a law firm, and harms my reputation to make me less attractive to employers.

26. While, poverty is not a suspect class, my right to meaningful access to the courts, despite the inherent burden of poverty, and my religious beliefs and strongly held religious exercise relating to my religious belief against indebtedness are protected. In addition, fundamental rights are implicated.

27. So, the Court must have a compelling reason to deny my request for an exemption of taxes to protect my access to the courts to defend the exercise of my fundamental rights including my religious beliefs by its 5/19/23 threat of taxes and compelled religious violations narrowly tailored to meet the important justification.

28. There is no compelling reason to deny my request for an exemption. Any tax applied by the federal courts would be crushing to me compelling me into slavery to sin by involuntary servitude in violation of US Amend XIII, and violations in my beliefs in Jesus, threatening my soul to the fires of hell. What is more important money or Constitutional laws

which protect rights of even people like me whose religious beliefs do not conform with the majority?

29. Is it freedom this court protects or does it sell its subjects souls and liberties to serve businesses to gain money in violation of US Amend XIII, and US Amend I and V as applied to me.

30. I argue people and individual liberty are not for sale and are more valuable than money. The Courts gain the confidence of the public when it upholds the freedoms they all hold dear for all, not merely those who can buy what is no longer free.

31. There is no justification narrowly tailored to meet any compelling reason to allow the 5/19/23 order to stand..

32. The Court erred in not vacating the order by causing an undue burden should this court my motions on reargument, including loss of my First Amendment rights, property interest in my license, loss to my reputation, other damages, loss of employment opportunities and a substantial burden to my access to the courts. FRAP 27 (b).

33. I must be afforded equal access to the courts as a party of one with unique religious beliefs against money as God and guide, without disparate treatment in violation of my First Amendment right to religious belief and right to exercise my religious beliefs, and 5th Amendment Equal Protections component applicable to the Federal courts based on disdain for my unique religious beliefs.

34. I respectfully request the Court vacate the Clerk Order dated 5/19/23.

35. The Clerk's 5/19/23 Order chilled my exercise of the right to petition effectively under the threat of government compelled violations of my religious belief.

36. Conditioning my ability to petition under the threat of government compelled religious violations prejudices me. I must not be compelled to violate my religious belief against debt in order to regain my license. Nor should I be punished for my exercise of the right to access to the courts to defend my religious beliefs because the original disciplinary Court finds my citations to the Bible and religious beliefs contained in my speech in my private petitions illogical. (3DI-3, page 34, and 3DI21-4); *See, Brief of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, the Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission, the International Mission Board, and Dr. R. Albert Mohler, Jr. as amici curiae in Support of Petitions before the US Supreme Court by the Little Sisters of the Poor Home for the aged, Denver Colorado, et.al, Petitioners v. Sylvia Matthews Burwell, Secretary of Health and Human Serviced, et. al*, No.15-105, 2015 WL 5013734 (US).(The Court allowed references to the bible in other RFRA petitions); *See, Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 682. (“Courts have no business addressing whether sincerely held religious beliefs asserted in a RFRA case are reasonable.”) *Also see, Africa v. Pennsylvania*, 662 F.2d 1025, 1025 (3d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 456 U.S. 908 (1982); (“Judges are not oracles of theological verity, and the founders did not intend for them to be declarants of religious orthodoxy.”); *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872, 887, (“Repeatedly and in many different contexts, we have warned that courts must not presume to determine the place of a particular belief in a religion or the plausibility of a religious claim.”); *Cantwell v. State of Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 60 S. Ct. 900, 84 L. Ed. 1213 (1940); *Remmers v. Brewer*, 361 F. Supp. 537, 540 (S.D.Iowa 1973) (court must give "religion" wide latitude to ensure that state approval never becomes prerequisite to practice of faith); *Presbyterian Church in U. S. v. Mary Elizabeth Blue Hull Memorial Presbyterian Church*, 393 U. S. 440, 450, (1969) (holding that “the First Amendment forbids civil courts from” interpreting

“particular church doctrines” and determining “the importance of those doctrines to the religion.”); *Ben-Levi v. Brown*, 136 S. Ct. 930, 934; *See, Holt v. Hobbs*, 574 U.S. 352; *In re Eternal Word Television Network, Inc.*, 818 F.3d 1122, 1140 (11th Cir. 2016) (“The Supreme Court cautioned that “federal courts have no business addressing” such questions of religion and moral philosophy.” (Internal citation omitted)); *Thomas v. Review Board*, 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981), “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit First Amendment protection.”).

37. “To be sure, a state may not condition the grant of a privilege, [a license,] or benefit upon the surrender of a constitutional right.” *Minn. Ass’n, Health Care v. Minn. Dept., P.W.*, 742 F.2d 442, 446 (8th Cir. 1984); *Citing, Western Southern Life Insurance Co. v. State Board of Equalization*, 451 U.S. 648, 657-58, 664-65 (1981); *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404-05, (1963).

38. “The doctrine that a government, state or federal, may not grant a benefit or privilege on conditions requiring the recipient to relinquish his constitutional rights is now well established.” *Citing, Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 34 (1970); *E.g., Cafeteria Workers v. McElroy*, 367 U.S. 886, 894; *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398, 404; *Speiser v. Randall*, 357 U.S. 513, 519-520; *Garrity v. New Jersey*, 385 U.S. 493, 499-500; *Kwong Hai Chew v. Colding*, 344 U.S. 590, 597-598; *Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm’n*, 271 U.S. 583, 593-594; *see Van Alstyne, The Demise of the Right-Privilege Distinction in Constitutional Law*, 81 Harv. L. Rev. 1439, 1445-1454 (1968); *Comment, Another Look at Unconstitutional Conditions*, 117 U. Pa. L. Rev. 144 (1968). As stated in *Homer v. Richmond*, 292 F.2d 719, 722: (“One may not have a constitutional right to go to Baghdad, but the Government may not prohibit one from going there unless by means consonant with due process of law.”)

39. “Neither the state in general, nor the state university in particular, is free to prohibit any kind of expression because it does not like what is being said.” *Jones v. Board of Education*, 397 U.S. 31, 35-36 (1970)

40. The United States Supreme Court in *Kennedy v. Bremerton School Dist.*, No. 21-418, at *15 (June 27, 2022) held, “Where the Free Exercise Clause protects religious exercises, whether communicative or not, the Free Speech Clause provides overlapping protection for expressive religious activities.”

41. In that case, the Court granted a professional coach the right to exercise private religious belief and speech, indicating the state’s punishment violated the Coach’s first Amendment right applicable to the state pursuant to the 14th Amendment, despite his association as a government employee or agent.

42. This case must be extended to me to prevent the state, federal government and additional governments’ including Judge Diamond of the Eastern District Court of PA punishment of me, but for the exercise of my exercise of my religious belief, as outlined in my speech in my petitions, no matter how repugnant or illogical my religious beliefs appear to the state and Federal government.

43. I must be afforded a fair opportunity to be heard in defense of my licenses and liberties without compelled religious violations placed upon me by the Clerk’s Order 5/19/23 substantially chilling my speech causing me to ineffectively plead before this Court to safeguard my religious belief in Jesus and my licenses and other liberties. US Amend I, V.

44. Freedoms are not for sale, in exchange for professional licenses. When the courts make business the law, by making professionals the law, by self-regulating, money, not freedom,

or the people, is protected. Individuals and individual liberty are instead sacrificed under the lie money grants freedom when it creates slavery by how it is coined.

45. Lawyers and judges should be corrected within the purview of Constitutional limits without threats of enslaving them by fines in contravention of the 13th Amendment, as applied to me as a party of one with unique religious beliefs against debt, but also as applied to other professionals.

Wherefore I pray the Court grants my motion.

Dated July 13, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Meghan Kelly
Meghan Kelly, Esquire
Bar Number 4968, INACTIVE, not
acting as an attorney
34012 Shawnee Drive
Dagsboro, DE 19939
(302) 493-6693
(word count 3,842)
meghankellyesq@yahoo.com

Appendix P