

To: Hon. President Trump, Hon. Gov. Hogan, Senator Chuck Grassely, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator Bob Goodlatte, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Jeff Session, Attorney General, Rod Rosenstein, Deputy Attorney General, Chrs Wray, Director of the FBI, Michael Harwich, Inspector General, Marilyn Mosby, State's Attorney for Baltimore, Maryland, Emmet C. Davitt, State Prosecutor of Md., Pamela Ortiz, Director for the Access to Justice Department, Ms. Pamela Harris, Administrator for Md. Courts

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams, Complainant

Re: 1.) OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF ALLEGATIONS OF FEDERAL CRIMES AGAINST JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT FOR BALTIMORE CITY CIRCUIT COURT, NAMELY, OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER U.S CODE TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND OF DEPRIVING MS. WILLIAMS, THE COMPLAINANT, OF HER 7TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND BY BREACHING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS 1, 2, AND 3 UNDER 18 USC 242. 2.) OFFICIAL REQUESTS THAT: a.) A STATE PROSECUTOR BE ASSIGNED BY HON. GOV. HOGAN AND A FEDERAL PROSECUTOR BE ASSIGNED BY HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP AND CONGRESS TO INVESTIGATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON OBSTRUCTED JUSTICE BY VIOLATING THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER U.S CODE TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND VIOLATING FEDERAL CRIMES OF DEPRIVING MS. WILLIAMS, THE COMPLAINANT, OF HER 7TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND OF BREACHING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS 1, 2, AND 3 UNDER 18 USC 242. b.) HON. GOV. HOGAN IMMEDIATELY ASSIGN A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER MS.WILLIAMS' MOTIONS AND/OR CIVIL CASE, NOT A JUDGE ASSIGNED BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON OR A JUDGE THAT WAS APPOINTED BY JUDGE BARBERA, CHIEF JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND,OR A JUDGE APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY . c.) EACH OF THE GOV. OFFICIALS CITED ABOVE ATTEND AND/OR SEND A REPRESENTATIVE TO ATTEND THE MOTION HEARING REQUESTED BY MS. WILLIAMS, IF THE COURT GRANTS HER MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE 12-7-18 DECISION AND ORDERS BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON.

Date: 12-20-18

NOTE: STARTING 12-26-18, A DAILY REMINDER EMAIL OF THIS OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF ALLEGATIONS AND REQUESTS WILL BE EMAILED TO YOUR OFFICES UNTIL I RECEIVE A RESPONSE

To begin, I like to state that, presently, I'm enduring dire financial hardship and can't afford to make copies of all of the documents that are essential in substantiating the allegations of federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson, but through the grace of the TRUNE GOD, I'm able to maintain the costs of my website, *www.dianaorwilliams.com*, because of the financial support of my loving family. Thus, all of my Motions to relevant to my present civil case, the Decision and Orders of the Court relating to my Motions, and other pertinent documents are given an Exhibit Number and are readily accessible and available for copying by the Hon. President Trump, Hon. Gov. Hogan, the Court, the Defendants, and the

public. As asserted in my 8-6-18 official statement of federal criminal allegations against Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen Fletcher from the Circuit Court of Baltimore City ((hereinafter "8-6-18 official complaint and requests and is Exhibit 43 on my website), as a Mathematics teacher who has been blessed to positively impact the lives of our leaders of tomorrow since 1981, I'm humbly grateful and honored. And although since 1996, I've been exposing lead poisoning in the public schools in Baltimore City and in Baltimore County and have suffered immense persecutions, including losing my home and livelihood and have apparently been blacklisted, if I had to do it all over again and knowing the horrific injustices and afflictions I'm currently enduring, I would it all over again just to save one of our precious child from being exposed to lead poisoning. Also, as can be substantiated in the record of the Maryland Department of the Environment, since 1997, I've been blessed to be an accredited Lead Inspector, Clearance Examiner, Lead Abatement Contractor and, thus, under the Code of Maryland Regulation (COMAR), namely, COMAR 26.16.01.18(B)(1)(e), a Lead Expert.

Also, as cited in my 8-6-18 official complaint and requests, when I first began exposing lead poisoning in the public schools in Baltimore City in 1996, Martin O'Malley (hereinafter "O'Malley") was a member of the City Council and, thus, one of the owners of the lead hazardous schools in the city of Baltimore. In my present civil case, as well as in all of my Administrative and/or Judicial proceedings and appeals which ultimately led to the filing of my 2006, 2015, and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court, one of the major issues is that evidence support the fact that O'Malley and other government officials have intentionally exposed our children to lead poisoning since at least 1993, have yet to test all the children that have been exposed to this potentially fatal hazard, and have not compensated the children for their potentially life-long injuries. My Documentary footnotes the evidence in the records of the Supreme Court, the Courts of Appeals, and the lower courts to substantiate the fact that, included in my whistleblowing, was the evidence to support the fact that three public schools in Baltimore City exposed children to lead-based paint hazards, and one school had lead-tainted drinking water. The title of my Documentary alone gives the reader the essence of what's the Documentary is about, namely tracing the journey of my whistleblowing regarding lead hazards in schools since 1996, the obstructions of justice in my Administrative and Judicial proceedings, the afflictions that accompanied my exposing lead poisoning in the schools, and unmerited grace in the being victorious by the TRIUNE GOD. My Documentary is entitled Thanks, Praise, Honor, and Glory to the TRIUNE GOD for Lead and Guidance in Documenting Lead Poisoning in the Schools and the Obstructions of Justice in Order to Conceal the Indisputable Truths.

Although I recognized in writing my Documentary that the Officers of the Court had obstructed justice in the same manner in all of my Administrative and/or Judicial Proceedings and appeals that led up to my 2006, 2015, and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court, I did not know until having to obtain tremendous legal knowledge as a result of going through the afflictions in this present civil case that such alleged corrupt acts when supported with substantial evidence constitute breaching two federal crimes which are punishable by jail time, namely, the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of breaching my 7th And 14th Amendment Rights and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons under 18 USC 242.

As declared in my 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on website) , stamped and dated 12-17-18 as being filed in the Baltimore City Circuit Court (Exhibit 59 on my website), although I filed at least Motions to have Judge Fletcher-Hill disqualified from presiding over my Motions and civil case, I did not know that my

Under the definition of U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 § 1505, a judge obstructs justice when he/she acts corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication influences, obstructs, or impedes or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which any pending proceeding is being had before any department or agency of the United States. Obstruction can include crimes committed by judges, prosecutors, attorney generals, and elected officials in general. Such obstruction by judges and other government officials are cited as misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance in the conduct of the office. Furthermore, under Section 242 of Title 18, it's a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and the U.S Supreme Court says it is a crime for any person acting on behalf of the government as an agent to willfully deprive or conspire to deprive a person of any law that is protected by the U.S Constitution.

I, Diana R. Williams, the Complainant, would like for this letter to serve as my Official Statement Of Allegations of Federal Crimes Against Judge Michel Pierson, namely, the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of breaching the my 7th And 14th Amendment Rights and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons Under 18 USC 242. Also, my official requests are that: 1.) a state prosecutor be assigned by Hon. Gov. Hogan and a federal prosecutor be assigned by Hon. President Trump and Congress to investigate the allegations that Judge Michel Pierson obstructed justice by violating the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and federal crimes of depriving Ms. Williams, the Complainant, of her 7th and 14th Amendment Rights and by breaching other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242. 2.) Hon. Gov. Hogan immediately assigns a judge to preside over Ms. Williams' Motions and/or civil case, not a judge assigned by Judge Michel Pierson or a judge that was appointed by Judge Barbera, Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, or a judge appointed by O'Malley. 3.) each of the Gov. Officials cited above attend and/or send a representative to attend the Motion Hearing, if the Court grants Ms. Williams' Motion for a Hearing on the 12-7-18 Decision and Order by Judge Michel Pierson.

SUBSTANTIATED FACTS TO SUPPORT THE ALLEGATIONS, AND MY REQUESTS

OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF ALLEGATIONS OF FEDERAL CRIMES AGAINST JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON.

Consequently, below is my official statement of allegations of these two federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson and the substantiated material facts to support the serious criminal allegations.

Motions were granted until I discovered from viewing the Court's website on 12-8-18 that Judge Michel Pierson rendered his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders on my 9-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 58 on my website), which I finally received on 12-17-18, the same day that I filed my 12-17-18 Motions. As evidenced in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders, Judge Michel Pierson cites one phrase to substantiate his decision to strike my 9-17-18 Motions, namely, "The Motion is without merit and is part of a pattern of such filings by the Plaintiff." Yes, that's all Judge Michel Pierson stated as a means of justifying why he decided to strike my 9-17-18 Motions from the record. Thus, in my 12-17-18 Motions, I methodically proved that Judge Michel Pierson's one independent clause for substantiating striking my 9-17-18 Motions was not only absurd, unreasonable, erroneous, groundless, but was, also, unsupported by the evidence and shows a lack of integrity and total disregard for his responsibility as an Officer of the Court to explain or justify his Decision and Orders with relevant material facts, grounds, and laws that support his decision and orders. After taking almost two and a half months to decide my 9-17-18 Motions, Judge Michel Pierson justified his decision for striking my 9-17-18 Motions and closing my civil case by citing just one phrase in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders. Contrary to this one independent sentence stated in his 12-7-18 Decisions and Orders, the evidence of the material facts declared in my highly substantiated 9-17-18 Motions prove that, in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders, Judge Michel Pierson deliberately committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in the conduct of the office, under U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and committed the federal crimes under 18 USC 242 by depriving the Plaintiff of her 7th and 14th Amendment Rights and by breaching other federal statute, statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 by 1.) committing 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. 2.) failing 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. 3.) failing 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. 4.) failing to uphold his legal requirement and responsibility as the Officer of the Court to disclose, address, and resolve the two legal arguments and all of the substantiated material facts to support my legal arguments as asserted in my 9-17-18 Motions. 5.) failing to perform his duty and legal requirement as an Officer of the Court to enforce to enforce Canon 1, 2, and 3, 28 U.S.C & 455 and Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363, and to uphold and defend my 7th and 14th 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 7th and 14th 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.

Again, antithetical to Judge Michel Pierson indicating in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders that my 9-17-18 Motions have no grounds of basis, in my 9-17-18 Motions, I pleaded that the Court and Hon. Gov. Hogan would immediately disqualify Judge Fletcher-Hill from presiding over my Motions and/or Civil Case and that Judge Fletcher-Hill be impeached, disbarred, and charged criminally because Judge Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges in my 8-6-18 Official Letter and Request and/or emailed addendums

(Exhibits 41, 54, 55, and 56) to Hon. Gov. Hogan, Hon. President Trump, Congress, and other government agencies that is alleged to have repeatedly and intentionally committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Chapter 73 & 1505 and have repeatedly and deliberately committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under 18 USC 242 by depriving me of my 7th And 14th Amendment Rights and by violating other federal statutes, laws, and Canons. Moreover, despite Judge Michel Pierson implicating in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders that my 9-17-18 Motions be stricken because my Motions have no merit because there is no legal argument, again, insinuating no legal grounds or authorities for filing my 9-17-18 Motions, the verbatim quote of the legal arguments asserted in my 9-17-18 Motions are cited in my 12-17-18 Motions as follows, namely, "CR 59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have reasonably discovered and produced earlier are grounds for granting the Plaintiff's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Plaintiff, whose being represented Pro Se and making the application which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Plaintiff is that, for the third time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has repeatedly, deliberately, excessively, and egregiously abused his power and displayed total contempt for the Rule of Law by repetitiously and intentionally committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. 2.) committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under the Constitution of the U.S, and violating other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242, a federal statute that makes it a crime to deprive any person of their rights "under color of law the Color of Law". Still too, another newly discovered evidence, material for the Plaintiff, whose being represented Pro Se and making the application which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Plaintiff is complaint to Hon. Gov. Hogan, Hon. President Trump, Congress, and other government officials pleading that state and federal prosecutors be assigned immediately to investigate the Plaintiff's allegation that Judge Fletcher-Hill and other Officers of the Court repetitiously and deliberately committed judicial misconduct as defined under Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363, as well as the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and have repeatedly and intentionally committed the federal crimes of violating the Plaintiff's 7th And 14th Amendment Rights and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons under 18 USC 242. Still too, newly discovered evidence, material for the Plaintiff, whose being represented Pro Se and making the application which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Plaintiff is that the Plaintiff has pleaded in her official letter and emails addendums that Hon.Gov. Hogan immediately assigns a judge appointed by him to preside over the Plaintiff's Motions and civil case since Judge Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges with whom the state and federal prosecutors are being request to investigate the allegations of federal corruptions against. Moreover, another newly

discovered evidence, material for the Plaintiff, whose being represented Pro Se, and making the application which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Plaintiff is and that the Plaintiff has motioned the Court to Stay any decision and order on her present Motions until Hon. Gov. Hogan And/or Hon. President Trump respond to the Plaintiff's Motions because the Plaintiff continues to question the impartiality of Judge Fletcher Hill presiding over any of her Motions and/or civil case and, also, questions Judge Fletcher-Hill's impartiality as the Chief Judge of the Baltimore City Circuit Court in assigning another judge to preside over her Motions and/or civil case."

Again, although I did not know that Judge Michel Pierson was going to be the judge to decide my 9-17-18 Motions until I discovered from viewing the Court's website on 12-8-18 that Judge Michel Pierson was the judge who decided my 9-17-18 Motions on 12-7-18, in my 3-9-18 Complaint of Judicial Misconduct and Obstruction of Justice to Hon. Gov. Hogan, Hon. President Trump, Congress, and others, (Exhibit 37), amongst other things, I state my causes as to why I question for impartiality of Judge Karen Friedman or Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over my Motions and/or civil case. Furthermore, in this complaint I mentioned that Judge Fletcher-Hill, along with Judge Michel Pierson, and other judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court are named in my emailed addendums to Hon. Present Trump, Congress, Hon. Gov. Hogan, and others (Exhibit 16 on my website) with whom I've alleged to have committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and have repetitiously and deliberately committed the federal crimes of breaching my 7th And 14th Amendment Rights and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons under 18 USC 242; thus, in my 3-9-18 complaint, I cite the following:.... " Moreover, Ms. Williams is requesting that, since Judge Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges from the Circuit Court with whom she is requesting the President and Congress to investigate relative to allegations of judicial misconduct and obstruction and, thus, Judge Fletcher-Hill may be impartial to presiding over the allegations of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice by Judge Friedman, the Circuit Court have the Hon. Judge Alfred Nance to oversee the Circuit Court's investigation of her assertion of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice by Judge Friedman. Along with questioning the impartiality of Judge Fletcher Hill presiding over any aspect of her civil case, Ms. Williams is asserting that she questions the impartiality of the following other Circuit Court judges presiding over her 2017 Civil Complaint, because of the alleged judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice against them as asserted in Ms. Williams' 5-6-16 official complaint of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice and/or email addendums to the President and Congress, namely, Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Edward Hargadon, Judge Videtta Brown, Judge Lawrence Fletcher-Hill, Judge Yolanda Tanner, Judge Shannon Avery, and Judge Sylvester Cox,".... Once more and as I declared in my 9-17-18 Motions and in my 648 emailed addendum and counting (Exhibit 16 on my website), now, I fully understand that such allegations of deliberate judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice by these Officers of the Court constitute intentionally committing federal crimes of violating U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 due to these Officers of the Court committing misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in the conduct of the office and the federal crimes of intentionally breaching my 7th and 14th Amendment rights and other federal laws and statutes under US 18 242. Moreover, I further questions the impartiality and conflict of interest of Michel Pierson presiding over my 9-27-18 Motions and Civil Case, as well as being allowed to assign another judge to preside over my Motions and/or Civil Case because, as declared in my 12-17-18

Motions, I discovered after filing my 9-17-18 Motions that Judge Michel Pierson was appointed around September of 2013 as the Administrator to the Eighth Circuit by Judge Barbera, the Chief Judge for the Court of Appeals of Maryland. As substantiated by the material facts cited in my 12-17-18 Motions, which have already being cited in my present Civil Complaint, in my 9-17-18, 8-6-18, and 4-27-18 Motions (Exhibit 58, 41, and 42, respectively, on my website), in my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court, and/or in my 5-16-16 complaint and/or emailed addendums to my complaint to Hon. President Trump, Congress, Hon. Gov. Hogan, and others government officials, in my 3-9-18 Official complaint and requests, in my 8-6-18 Official Complaint and requests and/or emailed addendums (Exhibits 7, 6, 16, 37, 43, 44, 45, 54, and 55 respectively, on my website) , the first 5 Exhibits on my website and which accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions support the allegation that Judge Barbera committed the deliberate prejudicial error of perjury. Further, in my 12-17-18 Motions, I cite that one of the responsibilities or duties of Judge Michel Pierson, as the Officer of the Court who presided over my 9-17-18 Motions, was to determine if there was any validity in one of the causes that I had cited for disqualifying Judge Fletcher-Hill from presiding over my Motions and/or civil case, namely, because I questioned the integrity of Judge Fletcher-Hill due to my alleging that the 5 Exhibits that accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions substantiate that Judge Barbera intentionally committed the prejudicial error of perjury in 2015 which caused my right to have my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland (Exhibit 11 on my website) yet to be considered, addressed, and resolve by this court, which includes the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached my 14th 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 fact that in 2014 Judge Fletcher-Hill violated my 14th 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 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, possibly crimes. Thus, in my 12-17-18 Motions, I cite the following: "...Because the alleged prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera centered on her lying in stating in her September 2015 Order that the Plaintiff's 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland was denied because the Plaintiff was late in filing her appeal and then refusing to correct her prejudicial error of perjury after the Plaintiff's substantiated her perjury in the Plaintiff's 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, the issues raised in the Plaintiff's appeal has yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved which includes the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill Judge violated the Plaintiff's 14th 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 Mayor of Baltimore City, is, also, alleged in the Plaintiff's 2014 Civil Case to have intentionally committed misconduct and possibly criminal activities. And, although Judge Pierson demonstrated his response to being appointed to such a privileged position by Judge Barbera and to express his appreciation and/or loyalty, in cited 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 is still obligated to determine whether Judge Barbera committed the deliberate prejudicial

error of perjury which caused the issues raised in the Plaintiff's appeal to this court relevant to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 2014 alleged federal crimes by the Plaintiff has yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved. The fact of the matter is that, in her 9-17-18 and 4-27-18 Motions, the Plaintiff cites two legal arguments, one of which exposes the deliberate perjury by Judge Barbera as a major factor in the legal argument as to why Judge Fletcher-Hill should be disqualified from presiding over the Plaintiff's Motions and civil case, namely, that 1.) because of the 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the issues raised in her appeal to this court has yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved, which includes the allegations that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill committed federal crimes of violating U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 due to his committing misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in the conduct of the office and intentionally breaching US 18 242 by infringing upon the Plaintiff's 14th Amendment right and other federal statutes and laws as a result of violating the Plaintiff's 14th Amendment Right, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss the Plaintiff's 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the alleged misconduct and potential crimes by Martin O'Malley. 2.) because the material facts cited in the Plaintiff's 9-17-18, 8-6-18, and 4-27-18 Motions and/or in the other documents in the record prove that Fletcher-Hill obstructed justice under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 § 1505 by committing misfeasance in office due to his improperly and unlawfully executing the Plaintiff's 3 separate Motions for his Disqualification, by improperly and unlawfully executing the Plaintiff's right for Substitution, by improperly and unlawfully executing Federal law, 28 U.S.C. & 363, Canons 1, 2, and 3, by improperly and unlawfully executing the Plaintiff's 7th and 14th Amendment rights as stipulated in the Constitution, and by failing to clarify what laws or grounds he premised his denial of the Plaintiff's Motions.

Germane to the alleged deliberate prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the Plaintiff cites in her 9-17-18, 8-6-18, and 4-27-18 Motions and in her complaints to Hon. President Trump, Congress, Hon. Gov. Hogan, and other government officials, that the attached Exhibits, namely, Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, which are the first 5 Exhibits on the Plaintiff's website, will prove in less than 5 minutes, that Judge Barbera, unequivocally and intentionally, committed the prejudicial error of perjury which caused the issues raised in the Plaintiff's appeal to this court to yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved, which includes the allegations that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill committed federal crimes of violating U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 due to his committing misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in the conduct of the office and intentionally breaching US 18 242 by infringing upon the Plaintiff's 14th Amendment right and other federal statutes and laws as a result of violating the Plaintiff's 14th Amendment Right, 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 the Plaintiff's 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the alleged misconduct and potential crimes by Martin O'Malley. Consequently, relevant to Judge Barbera's 2015 misconduct and potential crimes by Martin O'Malley. Consequently, relevant to Judge Barbera's 2015 deliberate prejudicial error of perjury, and how Judge Barbera's alleged intentional perjury caused the Plaintiff's allegation of federal crimes against Judge Fletcher-Hill in the Plaintiff's 2015 appeal to Judge Barbera and the other members of the Court of Appeals to still remain undisclosed, unaddressed, and unresolved, and why the Plaintiff questions the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill

presiding over her present Motions and/or civil case" ... Moreover, in order to be able to determine that the attached Exhibits to my 12-17-18 Motions substantiate that Judge Barbera knowingly and willingly committed the prejudicial error of perjury and the negative impact of her intentional prejudicial error of perjury on my appeal to this court as cited above, in my 12-17-18 Motions, I assert, verbatim, from the material facts that relevant to determining the validity of the alleged prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera and the negative outcomes resulting from Judge Barbera's deliberate perjury; thus, I cite the following material facts as stated verbatim in my 9-17-18 Motions in my 12-17-18 Motions, namely, "In these documents, the Plaintiff cites that, in order to comprehend how the Court of Appeals of Maryland committed deliberate perjury in 2015 which caused the issues raised in the Plaintiff's 2015 appeal of the 2015 Decision and Order of the In Banc Judges to have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved by any appellant court, it's essential to know that Maryland Rule 7-104 allows 30 days to file an appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, with the first day starting on the day that the last judgment of the Baltimore City Circuit Court is filed in the record by the clerk. The first exhibit (Exhibit 1 on Plaintiff's 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 the Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration and a New Trial. The second exhibit (Exhibit 2 on Plaintiff's website) is a copy of the docket receipt from the clerk of the Court of Appeals of Maryland which gives the date that the Plaintiff's 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 Plaintiff's website) is a copy of the 9-21-15 Order of the Court of Appeals of Maryland which declares that the Plaintiff's Writ was denied because it was filed late to the Court of Appeals of Maryland. The fourth exhibit (Exhibit 4 on Plaintiff's website) is a copy of the Plaintiff's 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 the Plaintiff's website, support the fact that the Plaintiff's Writ was filed in the Court of Appeals of Maryland prior to the 30-day expiration. The fifth exhibit (Exhibit 5 on Plaintiff's website) is the second denial of the Plaintiff's 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 the Plaintiff's 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 Plaintiff's Writ was filed on time. In the Plaintiff's 2016 Writ to the Supreme Court (Exhibit 7 on Plaintiff's website), these first 5 Exhibits accompanied the her Petition 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 the Plaintiff's appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland never to be disclosed, considered and resolved by the Court of Appeals or any appellant court. 4.) Moreover, along with being cited in her 2017 Civil Complaint, in her 8-6-18 Motions, in her 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 the Plaintiff's 3rd Emailed Addendum, in her "9-10-18 Reminder of her 4th Emailed Addendum, in the material facts cited in her 581st emailed addendum and counting to Hon. President Trump, Congress and other government officials, in her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court, and/or in her 2016 Petition for a

Rehearing to the Supreme Court (Exhibit 9 on Plaintiff's website), the Plaintiff declares that the Supreme Court of the U.S. is obligated to uphold and defend the Plaintiff's 7th and 14th Amendment Rights and grant her 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 and have the issues raised in her 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 Plaintiff's 7th and 14th 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 14th 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, as the Officer of the Court had a duty to uphold my 7th and 14th Amendment Rights. Since I repeatedly motioned for Judge Fletcher-Hill to be disqualified from presiding over my Motions and civil complaint due my asserting that his federal crimes were covered up and temporarily hidden due to the intentional perjury by Judge Barbera, Judge Michel Pierson was obligated to determine if my allegation that Judge Barbera's 2015 deliberate prejudicial error of perjury was and how Judge Barbera's alleged intentional perjury caused my appeal to this court yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved, which includes the allegation of federal crimes against Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other Officers of the Court. The material facts cited verbatim from my 9-27-18 Motions and Judge Michel Pierson one sentence statement in his 12-7-18 Decision and Order substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson failed to fulfill his legal obligation and requirement as the Officer of the Court to disclose, address, and resolve this material fact, and, in fact, fail to disclose, address, and resolve any of the material facts which substantiate this allegations and all of the other legal arguments in my Motions. As an attorney who practiced criminal and civil law, but more importantly, as the Officer of the Court, Judge Michel Pierson knew that he had a duty to determine if the evidence substantiate that, in 2015, Judge Barbera intentionally committed the prejudicial error or perjury which caused the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland to yet be disclosed, addressed, and resolved, which includes my allegations that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill committed federal crimes of violating U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 due to his committing misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in the conduct of the office and intentionally breaching US 18 242 by infringing upon my 14th Amendment right and other federal states and laws as a result of violating my 14th Amendment Right, 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 alleged misconduct and potential crimes by Martin O'Malley. Again, the evidence of the one and only complete thought in justifying his striking my 9-17-18 Motions from the record and closing my civil case in Judge Michel Pierson's 12-7-18 Decision and Order, namely, that "The Motion is without merit and is part of a pattern of such filings by the Plaintiff" substantiates that Judge Michel Pierson failed to perform his duty as the Officer of the Court who decided to "Address" my Motions to disclose, address, and resolve the two legal arguments in my 9-17-18 Motions. The evidence of the

material facts stated in my 12-17-18 and 9-17-18 Motions substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson has no grounds or legal authorities for striking my 9-17-18 Motions and closing my civil case, but the evidence certainly substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson has not justified his decision for striking my 9-17-18 Motions and closing my civil case by citing just one phrase in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders, namely, that "The Motion is without merit and is part of a pattern of such filings by the Plaintiff."

Consequently, the evidence substantiates that, in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders, Judge Michel Pierson deliberately committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in the conduct of the office, under U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and committed the federal crimes under 18 USC 242 by depriving the Plaintiff of her 7th and 14th Amendment Rights and by breaching other federal statute, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 by 1.) committing 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. 2.) failing 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. 3.) failing 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. 4.) failing to uphold his legal requirement and responsibility as the Officer of the Court to disclose, address, and resolve the two legal arguments and all of the substantiated material facts to support my legal arguments as asserted in my 9-17-18 Motions. 5.) failing to perform his duty and legal requirement as an Officer of the Court to enforce 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 7th and 14th 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 7th and 14th 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.

The evidence of the findings in the Decisions and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen Friedman, the two former judges who presided over my Motions and/or civil case, do not justify Judge Michel Pierson's one sentence narrative for justifying striking my 9-17-18 Motions and closing my civil case. Like Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, in his 9-4-18 and 7-23 18 Decisions and Orders, (Exhibits 57 and 52 on my website) states that, in my Motions, I continue the "pattern" of challenging the fairness of any judge who decides any issue against me and, thus, considered my Motions as having no merit in any of my arguments. However, although lengthy, my 8-6-18 and 4-27-18 Motions (Exhibits 41 and 42 on my website) from which Judge Fletcher-Hill rendered his are decisions thoroughly cite the material facts as substantiated by the evidence to prove that Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen Friedman deliberately committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance in the conduct of the office, under U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and committed the federal crimes under 18 USC 242 by depriving the Plaintiff of her 7th and 14th Amendment Rights and by breaching other federal statute, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3. The truth of the matter is that the evidence of her 12-22-17 Decision and Order which denied my 11-27-17 Motion (Exhibits 47 and 39

on my website), of her 1-31-18 Decision and Order which denied my 1-3-18 Motions (Exhibits 48 and 35 on my website), and of her 3-1-18 Decision and Order which denied my 2-1-18 Motions (Exhibit 49 and 33 on my website), substantiate that Judge Karen Friedman simply denied my Motions, without giving a single explanation or even clarification, although I requested in my Motions for Judge Karen Friedman to clarify her Decisions and Orders.

I agree with the part of the statement of these Officers of the Court is statement, in that, Yes, I do have a "pattern" of citing the in my Motions lengthy legal arguments and the material facts as supported by the evidence to prove that my legal arguments, namely, that Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen Friedman deliberately committed the federal crimes of mistfeasance, maffesance, and nonfeasance in the conduct of the office, under U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and committed the federal crimes under 18 USC 242 by depriving the Plaintiff of her 7th and 14th Amendment Rights and by breaching other federal statute, statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3.

As a result of the serious alleged federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson and the overwhelming evidence to support the relevant and material facts necessary to constitute such alleged federal crimes against Judge Michel Pierson cited above, I'm requesting that: 1.) a state prosecutor be assigned by Hon. Gov. Hogan and a federal prosecutor be assigned by Hon. President Trump and Congress to investigate the allegations that Judge Michel Pierson obstructed justice by violating the federal crimes of mistfeasance, maffesance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and federal crimes of depriving Ms. Williams, the Complainant, of her 7th and 14th Amendment Rights and by breaching other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, AND 3 under 18 USC 242. 2.) Hon. Gov. Hogan immediately assigns a judge to preside over Ms. Williams' Motions and/or civil case, not a judge assigned by Judge Michel Pierson or a judge that was appointed by Judge Barbera, Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, or a judge appointed by O'Malley. 3.) each of the Gov. Officials cited above attend and/or send a representative to attend the Motion Hearing, if the Court grants Ms. Williams' Motion for a Hearing on the 12-7-18 Decision and Order by Judge Michel Pierson.

I look forward to your response to these urgent matters

Sincerely,

