

Since in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders, Judge Michel Pierson asserted that he would "address" my 9-17-18 Motions, a reasonable minded person would conclude that, in order to execute judgement and justice relevant to my 9-17-18 Motions, as an Officer of the Court, it was essential that Judge Pierson disclose, address, and resolve, amongst other things, one of main legal arguments raised in 9-17-18 Motions, as well as in my 8-6-18, 4-27-18 and 4-6-18 Motions, namely, my 8-month plea (from April 2018 to December of 2018 3 different Motions) that Judge Fletcher-Hill be disqualified from presiding over my Motions and civil case because, amongst other things, I questioned his impartiality due to my having alleged in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland (Exhibit 11 on website) that the, in 2014, the In Banc judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material facts that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss my 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley, former

As stated in my 12-20-18 Official Statement of Allegations of Federal Crimes Against Judge Michel Pierson, the Administrator for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City Circuit Court, which was mailed to Hon. President Trump and Hon. Gov. Hogan on 12-21-18 (Exhibit 61 on my website, *www.williams.com*), my 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on my website), amongst other things, I've requested that each government official listed above attend the hearing if I'm granted this Motion and/or send a representative.

NOTE: AS OF 1-7-19, ALL EMAILED ADDENDUMS AND DAILY REMINDER EMAILS TO THIS OFFICIAL COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON WILL BE SENT TO YOUR OFFICES BY EMAIL JUST LIKE THE OTHER 4 DAILY REMINDER EMAILED ADDENDUMS TO MY 8-6-18 OFFICIAL COMPLAINT AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL. I CAN BE EMAILED AT [diady\\_d@verizon.net](mailto:diady_d@verizon.net)

Date: 1-4-19

Re: 1<sup>st</sup> EMAILED ADDENDUM TO MY 12-20-18 OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF ALLEGATIONS OF FEDERAL CRIMES AGAINST JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT FOR BALTIMORE CITY CIRCUIT COURT, NAMELY, FEDERAL CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS OF TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512 AND CONCEALMENT, REMOVAL, OR MUTILATION UNDER 18 U.S. Code § 2071

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams, Complainant  
 Administrator for Mid. Courts  
 Prosecutor of Mid., Pamela Ortiz, Director for the Access to Justice Department, Ms. Pamela Harris, Inspector General, Marilyn Mosby, State's Attorney for Baltimore, Maryland, Ermet C. Davit, State General, Rod Rosenstein, Deputy Attorney General, Chris Wray, Director of the FBI, Michael Harwich, Committee, Senator Bob Goodlatte, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Acting Attorney To: Hon. President Trump, Hon. Gov. Hogan, Senator Chuck Grassely, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary

Gov. of Maryland who appointed Judge Barbera as the Chief Judge for the Court of Appeals of Maryland around June of 2013, is being alleged to have intentionally committed misconduct and possibly crimes. Moreover, I further allege that, because Judge Barbera, the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland committed the alleged deliberate prejudicial error of perjury in 2015 in failing to correct her lying in stating in her Order that my appeal was denied because it was filed late to this court, even after I filed my Motion for Reconsideration to this court which referenced the evidence in the record to substantiate that my appeal was filed timely. Therefore, my right to file the appeal and have the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have yet to be considered, addressed, and resolve by this court or by the Supreme Court of the U.S who denied my 2016 Petition to Court and a Petition for a Rehearing (Exhibits 7 and 9, respectively, on website). Further, as cited in my 12-17-18 Motions and 12-20-18 Official Letter of Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson, as the presiding Officer of the Court, Judge Michel Pierson was obligated to determine if my allegation that Judge Barbera's 2015 deliberate prejudicial error of perjury was valid, if the evidence of the first 5 Exhibits on my website which accompanied my Petition to the Supreme Court and my 12-17-18 Motions substantiate that Judge Barbera committed the intentional prejudicial error of perjury, and if Judge Barbera deliberate prejudicial error caused the issues raised in my appeal to this court to yet be disclosed, addressed, and resolved, which includes the allegation of federal crimes against Judge Fletcher-Hill and the in Banc judges from the Baltimore City Circuit Court. And, although Judge Pierson was appointed to the prestigious position of Administrator of the Eighth Circuit by Judge Barbera in September of 2013 and demonstrated his response to being appointed to the privileged position and expressed his appreciation and/or loyalty in citing in a newspaper article around September of 2013 that "I'm thankful for the confidence Chief Judge Barbera has shown in me with this appointment", Judge Pierson still had a duty as the presiding Officer of the Court to determine whether Judge Barbera committed the deliberate prejudicial error of perjury which caused the issues raised in my appeal to this court relevant to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 2014 alleged federal crimes to yet be disclosed, addressed, and resolved and, thus, support the fact that I had a just cause in questioning the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over any of my Motions or civil case. Moreover, and as asserted in my 12-17-18, 9-17-18, 8-6-18, 4-27-18, and 4-6-18 Motions, as well as in my 12-20-18 Official Complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson, in my 8-6-18 Official Complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibit 43 on website), in the emailed addendums (Exhibits 44, 45, 54, and 55 on website), in my 5-16-16 Official Complaint and/or the 643" emailed addendums and counting to Hon. President Trump, Congress, Hon. Gov. Hogan, and other government officials (Exhibits 6, and 16, respectively, on website), it will take less than 5 minutes to determine that the first 5 Exhibits on my website prove, unequivocally, that Judge Barbera intentionally committed the prejudicial error of perjury. In order to determine the alleged intentional prejudicial error of perjury Judge Barbera by refusing to correct her prejudicial error of perjury after being referenced to the evidence before her that proved that she had lied, it's important to know that Maryland rule allows one 30 days to file an appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, with the first day starting once the clerk from the Baltimore City Court post the decision in the record of the court. The first exhibit (Exhibit 1 on website) is copy of the document that gives the date of the in Banc judges' last judgment, which was their denial on July 6, 2015 of my Motion for Reconsideration and a New Trial. The second exhibit (Exhibit 2 on website) is a copy of the docket receipt from the clerk of the Court of Appeals of Maryland which gives the date that my 2015 Petition for a Writ to the Court of Appeals was filed in the record of this court, namely, on August 3, 2015. The third exhibit (Exhibit 3 on website) is a copy of the 9-21-15 Order of the Court of Appeals of Maryland which declares that my Writ was denied because it was filed late to the Court of Appeals of Maryland. The fourth exhibit (Exhibit 4 on website) is a copy of my Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland which asserts that, amongst other things, the evidence in the record of this court, which are Exhibits 1 and 2 on my website, support the fact that my Writ was filed in the Court of

Appeals of Maryland prior to the 30-day expiration. The fifth exhibit (Exhibit 5 on website) is the second denial of my Writ by the Court of Appeals of Maryland. Consequently, the second denial by the Court of Appeals of Maryland is indicative of the fact that this court refused to correct their prejudicial error, even after receiving my Motion for Reconsideration which make references to the fact that Exhibits 1 and 2 were in the record of the Court of Appeals of Maryland and which further substantiate that the plaintiffs Writ was filed on time. Still too, and as stated in my 12-17-18 Motions and the other documents cited above, in my 2016 Writ to the Supreme Court (Exhibit 7 on website), these first 5 Exhibits accompanied my Petition to the Supreme Court to substantiate that the Court of Appeals of Maryland committed intentional perjury in 2015, which would have taken the Justice of the Supreme Court less than 10 minutes to read in order to determine that the Court of Appeals of Maryland deliberately committed perjury which caused the issues raised in my appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland never to be disclosed, considered and resolved by the Court of Appeals or any appellant court. Moreover, along with being cited in my 12-17-18, 9-17-18, 8-6-18, 4-27-18, and/or 4-6-18 Motions, in my 2017 Civil Complaint, in my 8-6-18 official letter of complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Fletcher-Hill and other Officers of the Court to Hon. Gov. Hogan, Hon. President Trump, Congress, and other agencies, in my emailed addendum, in my Reminder emailed addendum, in the material facts cited in my 643<sup>rd</sup> emailed addendum and counting to Hon. President Trump, Congress and other government officials, in my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court, and/or in my 2016 Petition for a Rehearing to the Supreme Court (Exhibit 9 on website), I assert that the Supreme Court of the U.S was obligated to uphold and defend my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights and grant my Petition because the intentional perjury by the Court of Appeals of Maryland caused the denial of due process right of the Plaintiff to appeal her civil case to the Court of Appeals of Maryland to have the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland to be disclosed, considered, and resolve by the Court of Appeals, namely, that the in Banc Judges from the Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached the Plaintiffs 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause and thereby to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss my 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that O'Malley and other government officials intentionally committed misconduct and possibly criminal activities.

Judge Michel Pierson can't justify the necessity of his having to clarify and/or provide legal grounds and/or authorities in his 12-7-18 Decision and Order by claiming that the previous Officers of the Court who presided over my Motions had given a detail clarification in their findings by citing the material facts, grounds and legal authorities supporting their denials of my Motions in their Decisions and Orders. Like Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, in his 9-4-18, 7-23 18, and 4-16-18 Decisions and Orders corresponding to my 8-6-18, 4-27-18, and 4-6-18 Motions (Exhibits 57, 52, 46, 41, 42, and 36, respectively, on website) states that, in my Motions, I continue the "pattern" of challenging the fairness of any judge who decides any issue against me. And, like Judge Michel Pierson, the evidence of the findings in Judge Fletcher-Hill's Decisions and Orders substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill, also, fail to cite any material fact from my Motions or in the record or any legal grounds or basis to substantiate his findings that my Motions have no legal arguments to justify my Motions. However, after reading my Motions that correspond to his Decisions and Orders, namely, the lengthy but relevant material facts as supported by the evidence in my 8-6-18, 4-27-18, and 4-6-18 Motions (Exhibits 41, 42, and 36, respectively, on my website), a person with a reasonable mind will conclude, unequivocally, that Judge Fletcher-Hill, also, egregiously erroneously stated the facts and erred in his Decisions and Orders. Further, the other Officer of the Court who presided over my Motions prior to Judge Fletcher-Hill was



In conclusion, I'm alleging that the substantiated material facts cited in this email addendum, in my 12-20-18 Official complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson, and in my 12-17-18, and 9-17-18 Motions prove that Judge Michel Pierson was attempting to tamper with the evidence and/or remove the evidence of my 9-17-18 Motions, which are acts to alter, conceal, falsify, and/or destroy the evidence of my 9-17-18 Motions with the intent to interfere with my civil proceeding. These acts are corrupt and obstruct justice, and, therefore, constitute the criminal offenses under U.S. Code

During the celebration of CHRISTMAS, JESUS CHRIST'S BIRTHDAY FOR ME AND OTHER CHRISTIANS, it was revealed to me new federal criminal allegations against Judge Michel Pierson as a result of his deciding not to just deny my 9-17-18 Motions but to strike or remove my 9-17-18 Motions from the record and close my civil case without citing any material facts as supported by evidence to substantiate that my legal arguments in my Motions have legal grounds and authorities and, thereby, no merit. By simply stating that there is no merit to my Motions without given a single clarification, substantiated material fact, legal ground or authority that would validate his 12-7-18 Orders, and thereby, and by abusing his power by striking or removing my 9-17-18 Motions and closing my civil case premised on his unsupported and unmerited one-sentence statement, I'm alleging that Judge Michel Pierson knowingly and willingly acted corruptly and was attempting to: 1.) remove my 9-17-18 Motions from the record and, thereby, destroy the evidence which would substantiate the relevant and material fact that his one-independent clause was grossly insufficient to justify striking my 9-17-18 Motions and closing my civil complaint. 2.) conceal the material facts cited in my 9-17-18 Motions and supported by the evidence that substantiate my legal arguments. 3.) conceal the fact that he committed the prejudicial error of perjury by erroneously citing in his 12-7-18 Decision and Order that my 9-17-18 Motions have no merit, insinuating no legal grounds and/or no legal arguments to merit my Motions and, therefore, ordering that my civil case to be closed. 4.) conceal the fact that he failed to execute his responsibility as the Officer of the Court to cite any of the numerous relevant material facts in my 9-17-18 Motions, especially my 2 legal arguments and the material facts as substantiated by the evidence to support the legal arguments and provide merit to my Motions. 5.) conceal the fact that he failed to uphold his duty as the Officer of the Court to state a single material fact, legal ground or authority in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders that refute the material facts cited in my 9-17-18 Motions and substantiate his one-independent clause, namely, that "The Motion is without merit and is part of a pattern of such filings by the Plaintiff." 6.) conceal the fact that he failed to uphold his legal requirement and responsibility as the Officer of the Court to disclose, address, and resolve the legal arguments and all of the substantiated material facts to support my legal arguments as asserted in my 9-17-18 Motions. 7.) conceal the fact that he failed to perform his duty and legal requirement as an Officer of the Court to enforce Canons 1, 2, and 3, 28 U.S.C. & 455 and Federal law, 28 U.S.C. & 363, and to uphold and defend my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights and other federal laws and statutes as obligated as an Officer of the Court. 8.) conceal his exhibiting judicial misconduct and wrong doing by committing perjury, violating my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights, and other federal laws and statutes. 9.) conceal the fact that he failed to lawfully and properly execute federal laws and statutes as the Officer of the Court and that he can't justify his lack of providing legal grounds and authorities in his 12-7-18 Decision and Order and that the two other Officers of the Court who presided over my Motions, also, failed to provide any legal grounds and authorities in their Decisions and Orders for denying my Motions.

Federal law, 28 U.S.C. & 363, and to uphold and defend my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights and other federal laws and statutes as obligated as an Officer of the Court. 6.) exhibiting judicial misconduct and wrong doing by committing perjury, violating the Plaintiff's 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights, and other federal laws and statutes. 7.) failing to lawfully and properly execute federal laws and statutes as the Officer of the Court.

Sincerely,

I look forward to your response. And, I will send daily reminders until I receive a response to my official addendum to my official complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson. Last but not least, I like to thank Mr. Dakota, who works in the constituent service office for Gov. Hogan, for informing me on 1-4-19 during our pleasant telephone conversation that he has received my 3-9-18, 8-6-18, and 12-20-18 Official Complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Michel Pierson (Exhibits 61, 43, and 37, respectively, on website) that he forwarded these documents over to Gov. Hogan's legal counsel who are reviewing them, that he will send an email to Gov. Hogan's legal counsel requesting that they send me a follow up of my complaints, and that I can check with him next week to make sure that he received this addendum to my 12-20-18 Official Complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson. Thus, personally and publicly, I thank Mr. Dakota for his kindness, respectful mannerism, steadfastness in following up on my requests, and his patience in addressing all of my concerns.

Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512 and under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 101 & 2071. Consequently, along with the allegations of the federal crimes cited in my 12-20-18 Official Complaint alleging federal crimes under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and under US 18 242, I'm also, alleging that Judge Michel Pierson's corruption and obstruction of justice constitutes his committing the federal crimes under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512 and under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 101 & 2071. Therefore, I'm requesting that these two additional allegations of federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson be included in my request for an investigation by state and federal prosecutors, namely, federal criminal allegations of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512 and concealment and removal under 18 U.S. Code & 2071. The truth of the matter is that the substantiated material facts asserted in this emailed addendum to my 12-20-18 Official Complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson, as well as the substantiated material facts in my 12-20-18 Official Complaint alleging federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson, in my 12-17-18 Motions, and/or in my 9-17-18 Motions, indisputably, support the fact that any presiding Officer of the Court that makes a decision on my 12-17-18, 9-17-18, 8-6-18, 4-27-18, and/or 4-6-18 Motions, in order avoid acting corruptly and obstructing justice under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, under 18 USC 242, under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, and/or under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 101 & 2071, must determine if I had a justifiable cause for motioning in three different Motions to disqualify Judge Fletcher-Hill from presiding over my Motions and/or civil case because in all of these Motions, amongst other things, I question the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over my Motions as a result of my alleging that, in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Fletcher-Hill committed federal crimes; but, because of the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, my 2015 allegations as yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolve. Therefore, as the Officer of the Court, this judge must, also, determine whether Judge Barbera committed the alleged deliberate prejudicial error of perjury in 2015 which caused the issues raised in my appeal to this court relevant to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 2014 alleged federal crimes to yet be disclosed, addressed, and resolved and, thus, support the fact that I had a just cause in questioning the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over any of my Motions or civil case.