

To: Hon. President Trump, Hon. Attorney General Barr of the DOJ, Director of FBI, Mr. Christopher Wray, Senator Graham, Hon. Gov. Hogan of Maryland, and other government officials

From: Diana R. Williams, Whistleblower

Re: 1.) Addendum to 2-18-20 Official Letter of Complaint Against the panel of In Banc judges for the Baltimore City Circuit Court, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin because of new allegations of new federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. 2.) Addendum to my 925<sup>th</sup> Addendum and counting to my 5-6-16 Official Complaint against the Supreme Court (excluding Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh), Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen, other Officers of the Court, the former Gov. of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, Martin O'Malley, and against other government officials, namely, the new allegations of federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 against these Officers of the Court and other federal officials. 3.) Since the offices of the DOJ and FBI are the Experts in federal criminal acts, I'm pleading that whatever other federal crimes that the DOJ and FBI glean from the material facts as supported by evidence in the record of this Court, the evidence on my website, [www.diana-williams.com](http://www.diana-williams.com) in the Baltimore City Circuit Court from my past Civil Complaints, in the Court of Appeals of Maryland, in the Court of Special Appeals of Maryland, in my Documentary which is in the record in Baltimore City Circuit Court, in the records of the Department of Justice (DOJ), in my 5-6-16 Official Complaint, and/or my 925 emailed Addendums and counting to my Official Complaint be included in addition to the alleged federal crimes I've cited. 4.) Hon. President Trump, Hon. Congress, Hon. Attorney Barr and/or Mr. Wray inform Hon. Hogan in writing of his obligation to remove the panel of In Banc judges, Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland (hereinafter "Chief Judge Barbera") whom may preside over my Writ to the Court of Appeals of Maryland that I may have to file, due to their being alleged to have committed federal crimes and that a request for an investigation into the allegations of federal crimes against these Officers of the Court is being conducted by the DOJ and FBI to determine if indictments need to take place.

Date: 4-3-20

As asserted in my 2-18-20 Official Letter of Complaint against the panel of In Banc judges which is Exhibit 78 on my website and which was mailed on this day to Hon. Attorney General Barr from the DOJ and the Director of the FBI, Mr. Christopher Wray, I'm certain that the material facts as supported by the evidence and cited in my Memorandum in Support of my Petition for an In Banc Review (hereinafter "Memorandum") filed on 1-14-20, along with the material facts as asserted in my Motions filed on 1-29-20, which includes a Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges, in my 2-13-20 Motions (Exhibits 71, 74, and 77, respectively, on my website), which include a Motion for Reconsiderations of their Orders dated 2-6-20, will substantiate the alleged federal crimes against the panel of In Banc namely, the allegations of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the repeated and intentional alleged federal crimes of breaching

the my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons under 18 USC 242, tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Chapter 73 & 1512, and the alleged federal crimes of concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071. Moreover, the evidence of the material facts cited in my Motions dated 2-19-20 Motions (Exhibit 80 on my website), which includes another Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges, will further provided additional material facts that support the allegations of these federal crimes against these Officers of the Court. Still too, the material facts as supported by the evidence and cited in my Memorandum, in my Motions cited above and presided over by the panel of In Banc judges, and cited in all of my Motions presided over by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman substantiate the allegations that all of these Officers of the Court deliberately and egregiously committed these federal crimes, and I've requested in my Official Letters of Complaints and Addendums against Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman for committing the alleged federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the repeated and intentional alleged federal crimes of breaching the my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons under 18 USC 242, tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1512, and the alleged federal crimes of concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071. All of these Officers of the Court knowingly and willingly acted corruptly and obstructed justice by: **1.)** committing the prejudicial error of perjury. **2.)** misstating the relevant material facts as asserts in my Memorandum and/or Motions. **3.)** misrepresenting the material facts asserted in my Memorandum and/or Motions. **4.)** concealing, covering up, and/or tampering with the evidence of my material facts as declared in my Memorandum and/or Motions. **5.)** and/or failed to disclose, consider, and resolve a single material fact as supported by the evidence and asserted in my Memorandum and/or Motions.

Further, the evidence of the facts cited in the two 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges, as well as the evidence of the facts cited in all of the Findings and Decisions and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibits 70, 66, 63, 59, 57, 52, 50, 49, 47, and 46 on my website) and the voluminous material facts in all of my Memorandum, Motions and/or my responses to the Defendant's Motions from which these Officers of the Court rendered their facts and orders (Exhibits 67, 64, 60, 58, 42, 41, 40, 39, 38, 36, 35, 34, and 33) substantiate that not only the panel of In Banc judges but, also, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman deliberately and repeatedly acted corruptly and obstructed justice and knowingly, willingly, repeatedly, and egregiously abused their power and displayed total contempt and deliberately and repeatedly committed these same alleged federal crimes. Moreover, the evidence of the facts cited in all of the Findings and Decisions and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman and all of the material facts as supported by the evidence and cited in all of my Motions from which these Officers of the Court rendered their Findings and Decisions and Orders substantiate the allegations that these Officers of the Court repeatedly, intentionally, and egregiously abused their power and displayed total contempt for the Rule

of Law by repetitiously and deliberately committing the alleged federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 by conspiring to intentionally and repeatedly obstructing justice in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motion to dismiss my Civil Complaint as a means of deliberately, repeatedly, egregiously, and unlawfully attempting to conceal and cover up, amongst other things, the material facts declared in my 1-14-20 Memorandum, in my 1-29-20, 2-13-20, and 2-19-20 Motions presided over by the panel of in Banc judges and asserted in all of my Motions presided over by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, namely: 1.) the issue of the alleged 2015 intentional and repeated prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera as being one of the critical material facts in deciding my Civil Complaint, any of my Motions, and in deciding my Petition for an In Banc Review. 2.) the issue that the 5 Exhibits that accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions, which are the first 5 Exhibits than can be read in less than 5 minutes and are cited as evidence in my Civil Complaint, in my Memorandum, in all of my Motions presided over by the panel of in Banc judges, and in my Motions presided over by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or Judge Karen Friedman prove, indisputably, that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately and repeatedly committed the prejudicial error of perjury. 3.) the issue that, because the Supreme Court (excluding Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh who had not been appointed as Justices during this time) denied my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court and my 2016 Petition for a Rehearing, the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury against Chief Judge Barbera has yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved which, again, is a very vital material fact in my Civil Complaint, Motions, and Memorandum. 4.) the issue of that, since the 5 Exhibits prove, indisputably, the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera was due to her intentionally refusing to correct her 2015 prejudicial error of perjury, even after I filed my 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to this Court, which referenced these same 5 Exhibits that were in the record before this Court, a reasonable mind would conclude that Chief Judge Barbera intentionally and repeatedly committed the alleged federal crime of deliberately and repeatedly committing the prejudicial error of perjury, which caused the issues raised in my 2015 Writ to this Court to, also, have yet be disclosed, considered, and resolve, including the allegations that the evidence in the record substantiate that, in 2014, the in Banc judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court (who were assigned as the panel of in Banc judges in 2014 by Judge Michel Pierson who was appointed as the Administrator for the Eighth Circuit of Baltimore City Circuit Court by Chief Judge Barbera) intentionally and repeatedly committed federal crimes by deliberately committing perjury, breaching my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and infringing 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 Judge Fletcher-Hill from the Baltimore City Circuit Court, whose Administrator in 2013 was Judge Michel Pierson, deliberately 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' 2014 Motions to dismiss my 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley, who as the Gov. of Maryland at this time and appointed Judge Barbera to be the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland in 2013, who appointed Judge Fletcher-Hill to the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City, and who as Governor of Maryland, exercised executive authority over 5 of the Defendants in my 2014 Civil Case which was presided over by Judge Fletcher-Hill, is alleged in my 2017 and 2014 Civil Complaints to have repeatedly and deliberately

committed misconduct and potential crimes and will be called as a witness during my hearing relevant to my 2017 Civil Complaint.

Still too, due to the close working relationship between Chair Judge Carrion and Judge Michel Pierson as cited in my Memorandum and Motions and acknowledged publicly in January of 2020 by Chair Judge Carrion and due to the material fact that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman being appointed by Chief Judge Barbera and former Gov. Martin O'Malley as Administrators for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City, a reasonable mind would presume that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman further collaborated and decided to obstruct justice in the same manner by failing in their obligation as Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve in all of their Findings and Decisions and Orders the same all material facts asserted in my Memorandum and/or Motions which include: **A.)** the issue of that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman all just happen to fail in their obligation as Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings Decisions and Orders a single material fact to support my legal arguments disclose, consider, and resolve a single material fact as supported by the evidence, statute, or law which even refute the material facts cited in my Motions to support my legal arguments for granting my Petition for an In Banc Review (hereinafter "Petition") and my Motions as asserted in my 27-page Memorandum dated 1-14-20 and in my 1-29-20 Motions and also in my 2-13-20 Motions presided over by the panel of In Banc judges and/or in my other Motions presided over by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. **B.)** the issue of that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman all just happen to fail in their obligation as Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve, in any of their Findings and Decisions and Orders the material facts as supported by the evidence and asserted in my Memorandum, in all of my Motions, and/or Responses to the Defendants' Motions that prove, indisputably, that my Petition and all of my Motions ( including my Motion to dismiss the Defendants' Motion to dismiss my Civil Complaint, my repeated Motions for Substitution and Disqualification of these Officers of the Court, and my repeated Motions for a hearing on each one of the Findings and Decisions and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges and Judge Michel Pierson) should have been granted. **C.)** the issue of that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman all just happen to fail in their obligation as Officers of the Court deliberately and repeatedly obstruct justice in the same exact manner by deliberately, repeatedly, and egregiously suppressing, altering, tampering with and/or concealing the SAME material facts, laws, and statutes in my Memorandum and/or in my many Motions that substantiate my legal arguments in my Memorandum, in all of my Motions pleaded before the panel of In Banc judges, in all of my Motions pleaded before Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, and which refute the facts asserted in the panel of In Banc judges two 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders, as well as refute all of the facts declared in the Findings and Decisions and Orders from Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. **D.)** the issue of that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman all just happen to fail in their obligation as Officers of the Court to deliberately and/or strikingly obstruct justice in the same exact manner, that is, by unlawfully dismissing denying and/or striking my Petition and/or Motions, including my Motion to dismiss the Defendants' Motion to dismiss my Civil

Complaint using the same paraphrased and unsubstantiated facts and, thus, the same unlawful justifications for ordering the dismissal, denial, and/or striking my Petition and/or Motions. E.) the issue of the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman all just happen to fail in their obligation as Officers of the Court to deliberately and repeatedly obstruct justice in the same exact manner, that is, by refusing to recuse themselves from presiding over my proceedings as repeatedly motioned in my Motions for Substitution and Disqualification of these Officers of the Court without disclosing, considering, and resolving the numerous material facts as supported by the evidence and asserted in my Memorandum and Motions which substantiate, indisputably that every one of these Officers of the Court should have granted my Motions for Substitution and Disqualification as the presiding judges, which includes the material fact that I had just causes to question the integrity and impartiality of the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman are in such a close relationship as a result of being appointed to the elite position of Administrators for the Eight Circuit of Baltimore City who by Chief Judge Barbera and/or by former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, both of whom are being alleged in my Motions to have deliberately and repeatedly committed federal crimes and/or misconduct, and that Martin O'Malley will be called to testify during my Civil proceedings. F.) the issue that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman all just happen to fail in their obligation as Officers of the Court to deliberately and repeatedly obstructing justice in the same exact manner, namely, by intentionally and repeatedly committing perjury in failing to disclose, consider, and resolve the material facts as supported by the colossal evidence and cited in my Memorandum, in all of my Motions presided over by these Officers of the Court that prove, undeniably, that my Petition all of my Motions should be granted and that my Civil Complaint should not be dismissed. G.) the issue that the panel of In Banc judges used the same two or three unsubstantiated facts cited in all of Judge Michel Pierson's Findings and Decisions and Orders to justify dismissing my Petition and although panel of In Banc judges knowing that the material facts as supported by the evidence in my 26-page Memorandum dated 1-14-20 and in my 19-page Motions dated 1-29-20, in my 16-page Motions dated 2-13-20, and/or in my 19-page Motions dated 2-19-20 Motions presided over by the panel of In Banc judges, as well, as the material facts asserted in all of my Motions presided over by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman prove, indisputably, that the two or three unsubstantiated facts cited in both of the panel of In Banc judges' two 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders are cited almost verbatim in Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order, which are the same two or three unsubstantiated facts slightly paraphrased in his 8-8-19 Finding and Decision and Order, which are the same two or three unsubstantiated facts slightly paraphrased in his 2-6-19 Finding and Decision and Order, which are the same two or three unsubstantiated facts slightly paraphrased in his 12-7-18 Finding and Decision and Order, which are the same two or three unsubstantiated facts which asserts almost verbatim the same two or three unsubstantiated facts cited in all of Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Decisions and Orders, which are the same two or three unsubstantiated facts slightly paraphrased in all of Judge Karen Friedman's Findings and Decisions and Orders are not justifiable causes for denying, dismissing, or striking my Motions and Petition and/or ordering that my Civil Case. Moreover, the material facts as supported by the evidence and cited in my Memorandum and Motions presided over by the panel of In Banc judges and/or in my other approximately 10 other

Motions in the record prove, indisputably, that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen intentionally and repeatedly denied, dismissed, and/or had stricken from the record my Petition and Motions in order to repeatedly and deliberately unlawfully grant the Defendants Motion to dismiss my Civil Complaint in order to deliberately and repeatedly conceal and cover up the material facts, namely, issues 1 thru 4 cited above.

Consequently, I must give praise, honor, glory, and thanks to the TRIUNE GOD for revealing clearly to me on the evening of 2-18-20 as I was resting in HIM the fact that these same material facts as supported by the evidence and cited in these same documents will substantiate, undeniably, that Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin, also, deliberately and repeatedly committed the alleged federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001, as well as Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. Again, since the DOJ and FBI are the EXPERTS in man's law, I'm pleading that any other obstruction of justice under other federal crimes that you determine through your thorough investigation be included in any necessary indictments.

Thus, I give praise, honor, glory, and thanks to the TRIUNE GOD for giving me the wisdom, understanding, and knowledge to be able to say with 100% certainty that the voluminous material facts asserted in all of my Motions and the facts cited in all of the Findings and Decisions and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher, and Judge Karen Friedman, all of which are on my website and in the record of the Court will, indisputably, substantiate that these Officers of the Court deliberately, repeatedly, and egregiously obstructed justice and not only committed the alleged federal crimes under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, the alleged federal crimes of breaching the my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights, under 18 USC 242, under U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1512, under 18 U.S. Code & 2071 but, also, repeatedly and deliberately committed the new alleged federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 by conspiring to intentionally and repeatedly obstruct justice.

Daily, I send "Reminders to the Whitehouse, Hon. Gov. Hogan, Congress, and other government officials, namely, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum dated 3-5-19 to my 12-20-18 Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson, my 1-4-19<sup>1st</sup> Addendum dated 1-4-19 to my 12-20-18 Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson, my 12-20-18 Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson, along with my 8-6-18 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Barbera, and other Officers of the Court, and my 4 emailed Addendums to this Complaint (Exhibits 65, 62, 61, 43, 44, 45, 54, 55, and 37, respectively, on my website. Still too, on 3-9-18, I mailed my Official Complaint against of federal crimes against Judge Karen Friedman, another Officer of the Court who presided over my present Civil Case (Exhibit 37 on my website). Most of these complaints and addendums include, amongst other things, the material fact that the 2015 alleged prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera and the material fact that alleged 2014 federal crimes against Judge Fletcher-Hill must be disclosed, addressed, and resolved and is essential in determining whether my 4-6-18, 4-27-18, 8-6-18, 9-17-18, 12-17-18, and 2-15-19 Motions in my present Civil Case should be granted. And, although Ms. Pamela Ortiz, the Director, Access To Justice Department For The Administrative Office Of The Courts emailed me on 2-2-19 with an apparent threat in insisting that I cease and cease from sending my emails, at the top of each email that is sent daily, I invite her to respond to my emails so that I can discontinue sending her these emails and thus my

most recent "Note" at the top of each of my most recent emails cites "DAY 262 REMINDER THAT ON 1-8-19, I RECEIVED A REPLY FROM MY "84<sup>TH</sup> REMINDER OF MY 8-27-18 3<sup>RD</sup> EMAILED ADDENDUM" FROM MS. PAMELA ORTIZ, THE DIRECTOR, ACCESS TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS, CITING "Please cease and desist from sending a large number of emails to this address. I will review the emails sent earlier and respond, if appropriate." HOWEVER IN RESPONSE TO HER REPLY, ON 1-8-19, I ASSERTED THAT "I LOOK FORWARD TO THE DAY WHEN HON. GOV. HOGAN, THE MD. COURTS AND ALL OF THE OTHER GOV. AGENCIES CITED ABOVE WHO HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO RESPOND TO THESE EMAILS WILL DO SO. SINCE THIS IS MY 84TH REMINDER EMAIL AND I'VE YET TO HEAR FROM HON. GOV. HOGAN, THE MD. COURTS, AND/OR OTHER GOV. AGENCIES IN RESPONSE TO THE URGENT ISSUES RAISED IN THE EMAILS, I WILL CONTINUE TO SEND REMINDER EMAILS AND I HOPE THAT ALL WILL SOON RESPOND." FURTHERMORE, SINCE IT IS CERTAINLY MOST "APPROPRIATE" FOR THE DIRECTOR, ACCESS TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS, TO RESPOND TO MY SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS OF FEDERAL CRIMES AGAINST JUDGES IN MARYLAND COURTS AND OTHER OFFICERS OF THE COURT, I LOOK FORWARD TO MS. PAMELA ORTIZ, THE DIRECTOR, ACCESS TO JUSTICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS, IMMEDIATE RESPONSE. THEREFORE, MY DAILY REMINDERS, I PRAY, WILL HELP MS. ORTIZ AND THE OTHER GOV. OFFICIALS CITED BELOW TO EXPEDITE THEIR WRITTEN RESPONSES." Moreover, I have even called Gov. Hogan's office and talked with his staff for constituent services who confirmed to me that Hon. Gov. Hogan has received these documents. Also, in a conversation with another of Hon. Gov. Hogan's assistant on 2-2-19, I referred her to my website and spent less than five minutes in proving to her that the 2015 alleged intentional prejudicial error of perjury against Judge Barbera was true and I pleaded with her to plead with Hon. Gov. Hogan to spend 5 minutes so that she could show him this evidence. I, too, pleaded that she would inform Hon. Gov. Hogan that I'm waiting for his response to my Official Complaints and emailed Addendums. I believe that Hon. Gov. Hogan, Ms. Pamela Ortiz, and the other government officials in Maryland who receive my daily "Emailed Reminders" know that, in order to determine whether Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman have committed the alleged federal crimes, they would be coerced to do something they don't want to do, namely, determine if due to the alleged 2015 deliberate prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved, namely, that 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 fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill from the Baltimore City Circuit Court 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, former Governor of Maryland who appointed Judge Barbera in 2013 as the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, and one of the 2016 Democratic Candidates for the President of the U.S, and other government officials intentionally committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities.

Since I've been waiting since 2016 for a response from Hon. Gov. Hogan, I don't believe that he or any of the other state government official will ever respond unless they are coerced by you, Hon. President Trump, Hon. Attorney General Barr of the DOJ, Director Wray of the FBI, and/or Congress coerce him to uphold his duty to immediately order that my present Civil Case be presided over by a new panel of In Banc Judges not appointed by Chief Judge Barbera and Martin O'Malley, that all of my Motions be reconsidered by a new Judge, since on 2-18-20, I filed an Official Letter of Complaint alleging federal crimes against the presiding panel of In Banc Judges, and on this day, 4-3-20, I've filed an Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Letter of Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges alleging these new federal crimes of not only deliberately and repeatedly acting corruptly, obstructing justice, and knowingly, willingly, repeatedly, and egregiously abusing their power and displayed total contempt for the Rule of Law by repeatedly and intentionally committing the alleged federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, depriving me of my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded under the Constitution of the U.S, allegedly violating other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242, allegedly breaching of federal crimes by tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, by concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code § 2071, but also, intentionally and repetitiously committed the allegations of fraud, deceit, perjury, concealment, and misrepresenting the material facts which constitute intentionally and repeatedly committing the alleged federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. Moreover, Hon. Gov. Hogan must be coerced to uphold his obligation to determine whether he needs to assign a Special State Prosecutor to determine whether indictments need to be placed against the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, former Gov. Martin O'Malley and/or other the government officials cited in my 920<sup>th</sup> Addendum to my 5-6-16 Official Letter of Complaint. In fact, in my 920<sup>th</sup> Addendum to my 5-6-16 Official Letter of Complaint, I alleged that Gov. Hogan has repeatedly and apparently deliberately failed to even respond to a single one of my Official Letters of Complaint and/or Addendums against any of the Officers of the Court who were appointed by the Governor or any of my request that I would be immediately assigned new Officer of the Court to determine if all of my Motions should be granted so that I can proceed with my Constitutional right to have my Civil Complaint heard before a jury of my peers.

Before filing my 2016 Petitions to the Justices of the Supreme Court germane to, amongst other things, the 2015 alleged prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera from the Court of Appeals of Maryland, I filed a Complaint to Attorney General Eric Holder and/or Loretta Lynch of the DOJ, in regard to the material fact that the 5 Exhibits which accompanied my Complaint to the DOJ (Exhibit 31 on my website) substantiate that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the 2015 alleged prejudicial error of perjury which changed the whole outcome of my 2014 appeal. Prior to mailing this Complaint relevant to the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera, I mailed these two Attorney General's other Complaints and Addendums with the supporting evidence to substantiate the allegations of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance against Judge Fletcher-Hill, the In Banc Judges from the Baltimore City Circuit Court who presided over my first appeal of Judge Fletcher-Hill's decision, as well as Complaints of these same alleged federal crimes against other Judges in the Baltimore City Circuit Court (Exhibits 19-30 on my website). Moreover, as substantiated by my



letters of Complaint and Addendums to the DOJ, I repeatedly requested the Attorney Generals, Eric Holder and/or Loretta Lynch, to assign FBI investigators to investigate my substantiated allegations of federal crimes against Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the In Banc Judges for Baltimore City Circuit Court, and against other Officers of the Court in Baltimore City Court. Former Attorney Generals Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch knew that they were obligated to defend my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment right and investigate the allegations in my Complaints and/or Addendums, allegations which I now understand thoroughly constitute deliberately committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, maffesance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and intentionally committing the federal crimes of depriving me of my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under US 18 242 , as well as the new additional alleged federal crimes of intentionally and repeatedly committing Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001.

Although I'm just sending this Addendum today, and as I asserted above, on the evening of 2-18-20, the TRINE GOD revealed to me that the evidence on my website, in the Courts, in my Documentary, in the records of the Department of Justice (DOJ), and/or elsewhere will substantiate my 925 emailed Addendums and counting to my Official Complaint (Exhibits 6 and 16, respectively, on my website) my allegations against the Justices of the Supreme Court (excluding Justices Gorsuch and Kavanaugh), Chief Judge Barbera from the Court of Appeals of Maryland, the panel of In Banc Judges, Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, the other Officers of the Court cited in my 925<sup>th</sup> Addendum to my 5-6-16 Official Letter of Complaint, the Court of Special Appeals, the Lower Court, former Attorney Generals Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch from the DOJ, former Gov. Martin O'Malley, and other government officials of not only deliberately and repeatedly committing the alleged federal crimes of misfeasance, maffesance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 committed federal crimes and of repetitiously and intentionally committing the alleged federal crimes of depriving me of my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments Rights and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under US 18 242, the alleged federal crimes of depriving me of my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded me under the Constitution of the U.S, the alleged federal crimes under 18 USC 242, under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, under 18 U.S. Code § 2071 but, also, the new additional alleged federal crimes of intentionally and repeatedly committing Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. As with the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, in essence, all of these Officers of the Court and/or government officials, also, repeatedly and deliberately acted corrupted and obstructed justice by: **1.)** committing the prejudicial error of perjury. **2.)** misstating the relevant material facts as asserts in my Memorandum and/or Motions. **3.)** misrepresenting the material facts asserted in my Memorandum and/or Motions. **4.)** concealing, covering up, and/or tampering with the evidence of my material facts as declared in my Memorandum and/or Motions. **5.)** and/or failed to disclose, consider, and resolve a single material fact as supported by the evidence and asserted in my Civil Complaints, Appeals, Memorandum and/or Motions. In fact, prior to filing Motions in my present Civil Case, I did not know that, amongst other things, the alleged 2006, 2015, and 2016 deliberate judicial misconduct by the Supreme Court, the 2015 alleged intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera from the Court of Appeals of Maryland as cited in my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court and 2016 Petition for a

Rehearing to the Supreme Court (Exhibits 7 and 9, respectively, on my website), the alleged repeated and deliberate obstruction of justice against Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, the other Officers of the Court, and the 2014 and 2015 alleged judicial misconduct by former Attorney Generals Eric Holder and Loretta, the other Officers of the Court, and the other government officials as asserted in my Official 5-6-16 Official Letter of Complaint and/or emailed Addendums constitute intentional corruption and obstruction of justice and, thereby, the alleged federal crimes under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, the alleged federal crimes of depriving me of my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded me under the Constitution of the U.S, the alleged federal crimes under 18 USC 242, under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, under 18 U.S. Code § 2071 and the new allegations of federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. But, in my 5-6-16 Official Complaint and/or 925<sup>th</sup> emailed Addendums and counting, I did assert, amongst other things, such alleged judicial misconduct by any Officer of the Court and/or other government officials obstructs justice and that .... "Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363, assigns judicial misconduct when judges act in ways that are considered unethical or otherwise violate the judges' obligation of impartial conduct and establishes means in which the complainant can have her complaint investigated and resolved. Thus, I, Diana R. Williams, would like for this letter to serve as an Official Complaint of Judicial Misconduct against the Supreme Court of the United States ("Supreme Court") due to the accompanying exhibits which substantiate that the Supreme Court abused their discretion in failing to conclude that the evidence accompanying my Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court ("Petition") supports the allegation that the Court of Appeals of Maryland ("Court of Appeals") intentionally committed the prejudicial error of perjury and such substantiated allegation is a compelling reason to have had my Petition granted. Also, the evidence that accompanies my Petition substantiates the fact that the egregious deliberate prejudicial error of perjury by the Court of Appeals is such a departure from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, thereby, it was essential that the Supreme Court exercise its supervisory power. Furthermore, the evidence that accompanies my Petition substantiates the fact that it was vital for the Supreme Court to exercise their supervisory power because the egregious intentional prejudicial error of perjury by the Court of Appeals caused the Court of Appeals, a United States court of appeals, to sanction a departure by the panel of in Banc judges from the Circuit Court of Baltimore City ("lower court") from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings that, again, make it mandatory that the Supreme Court exercise their supervisory power. Moreover, since the evidence overwhelmingly supports the fact that the Court of Appeals knowingly and willingly committed the egregious prejudicial error of perjury, the Supreme Court should have concluded that such intentional behavior was indicative of judicial misconduct, and thereby, was a compelling reason to find that the Court of Appeals violated the Code of Judicial Conduct for United States Judges because their deliberate egregious prejudicial error of perjury breached the following Canons of the Code of Judicial Conduct for United States Judges, namely, 1.) Canon 1- failing to uphold the integrity and independence of the judiciary. 2.) Canon 2 – failing to avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety in all activities. 3.) Canon 3 – failing to perform their duties of the office fairly, impartially, and diligently. Consequently, as a result of the Supreme Court's failure to determine that the substantiated allegation of the intentional prejudicial error of perjury by the Court of Appeals was a compelling reason to grant my Petition because such judicial misconduct infringes upon Canons 1, 2,

and 3, of the Codes of Conduct for the U.S. judges, I'm asserting that the Supreme Court, also, violated Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Codes of Conduct for the U.S. judges because such a substantiated allegation of the deliberate prejudicial error or perjury by the Court of Appeals not only effects public trust in our judiciary system, but damages the credibility of our Government, challenges the integrity and independence of the judiciary, and gives the appearance of impropriety by the Supreme Court for failing to find that such a highly substantiated allegation of the intentional prejudicial error of perjury by the Court of Appeals is not a compelling reason to grant a Petition. Still too, the failure of the Supreme Court to determine that the deliberate prejudicial error by the Court of Appeal is not a compelling reason to grant a Petition is indicative that the Supreme Court can't perform their duties in office unfairly, impartially, and with diligence when it comes to addressing judicial misconduct against another branch of the Government... Still too, I'm requesting that the investigation be expanded to include an investigation of any deliberate misconduct by the former Attorney Generals of the U.S., namely, Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch, whose failure to uphold and defend the Constitution have negatively impacted any one of my Administrative and/or Judicial proceedings that led up to my 2015 and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court. Attorneys Holder and Lynch did not take any corrective against the lower courts, the Courts of Appeals, and/or the Supreme Court although I forwarded to their office my complaint and/or addendums in 2014 and 2015 which were accompanied by a voluminous amount of evidence used to substantiate the allegations of intentional obstructions of justice by these judicial branches of government (Exhibits 19-31 on my website). " ....

As a result of having to be coerced to endure, again, my present Civil Case Pro Se, I've learned, amongst other things, that such alleged deliberate federal corruption as detailed in my 5-6-16 Official Complaint and my emailed Addendum against the Justices of the Supreme Court, Chief Judge Barbera, the DOJ, and/or other government officials obstructs justice, also, constitute violating the alleged federal crimes and, thus, in my 925<sup>th</sup> emailed Addendum and counting to the Whitehouse, Congress, and other government officials, I assert, amongst other things, that.... "THE VOLUMINOUS EVIDENCE IN RECORD OF THE COURTS, IN THE RECORD OF THE DOJ, IN MY DOCUMENTARY, AND ON MY WEBSITE, , WILL PROVE MY ALLEGATIONS THAT, EXCLUDING JUSTICE GORSUCH AND JUSTICE KAVANAUGH, THE SUPREME COURT OF THE U.S, CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND, OTHER JUDGES FROM THIS APPELLANT COURT, JUDGES FROM THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS OF MARYLAND AND FROM THE 4<sup>TH</sup> CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, JUDGE CARRION, JUDGE PHINN, JUDGE RUBIN, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN, AND OTHER JUDGES FROM THIS LOWER COURT HAVE REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES UNDER U.S CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND UNDER USC 18 242, Under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512, AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, AND UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 1001 .... " The alleged judicial conduct by the 7 Justices of the Supreme Court which resulted in these justices breaching the two federal laws in 2006 and 2015 require more time to investigate, but it will take about 5 minutes to read the first 5 Exhibits on my website in order to see that the Court of Appeals of Maryland committed intentional perjury in 2015, which caused my appeal to the Court of

Appeals of Maryland of the decision of the In Banc judges from the lower court to be dismissed premised on the deliberate perjury by the Court of Appeals of Maryland. Therefore, the Justices of the Supreme Court breached U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and USC 18 242, and, also, obstructed justice by deliberately and repeatedly concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code § 2071, by intentionally and repetitiously committing the fraud, deceit, perjury, concealment, and misrepresenting the material facts which constitute federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 because they were obligated to uphold and defend my constitutional right and to exercise their supervisory power by taking corrective actions against the intentional prejudicial error of perjury by the Court of Appeals of Maryland. .... "Therefore, I'm requesting that the investigation into such serious allegations of deliberate judicial misconduct resulting in their committing these two federal crimes include the 7 Justices of the Supreme Court and the over 35 other Officers of the Court, who presided over one or more of my Administrative and/or judicial proceedings which culminated in my filing Petitions to the Supreme Court in 2006, 2015, and in 2016. The approximate 35 Officers of Court include the judges from the Courts of Appeals and judges from the Circuit Court, 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. Still too, I'm requesting that the investigation be expanded to include an investigation of any deliberate misconduct by the former Attorney Generals of the U.S., namely, Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch, whose failure to uphold and defend the Constitution have negatively impacted any one of my Administrative and/or judicial proceedings that led up to my 2015 and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court. Attorneys Holder and Lynch did not take any corrective against the lower courts, the Courts of Appeals, and/or the Supreme Court although I forwarded to their office my complaint and/or addendums in 2014 and 2015 which were accompanied by a voluminous amount of evidence used to substantiate the allegations of intentional obstructions of justice by these judicial branches of government (Exhibits 19-31 on my website). The substantiated assertions of obstructions of justice and, thus, committing of federal crimes under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and USC 18 242, as well as obstructing justice by deliberately and repeatedly concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code § 2071, by intentionally and repetitiously committing the fraud, deceit, perjury, concealment, and misrepresenting the material facts which constitute intentionally and repeatedly committing the alleged federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 by these Officers of the Court include intentional perjury, conspiracy, infringing upon my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, covering up for other government agencies' deliberate perjury, colluding with other government agencies, and/or breaching other Federal states and laws. Furthermore, I'm requesting that the investigation of intentional misconduct include the government officials in Maryland who were in a position of power and had motives for directly and/or indirectly influencing negatively my Administrative and/or judicial proceedings which ultimately led to my 2006, 2015, and 2016 Petitions before the Supreme Court and the unlawful dismissal of my 2015 civil case," .....

I realize that, excluding the investigation into the alleged 2015 repeated and intentional federal crimes against Judge Barbera and the investigation into the alleged deliberated and repeated federal crimes

against the panel of in Banc judges, Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, it may take a few years to thoroughly investigate the allegations against the Justices of the Supreme Court (excluding Justices Gorsuch and Kavanaugh), Chief Judge Barbera from the Court of Appeals of Maryland, the other Officers of the Court cited in my 925<sup>th</sup> Addendum to my 5-6-16 Official Letter of Complaint, the Court of Special Appeals, the Lower Court, former Attorney Generals Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch from the DOJ, former Gov. Martin O'Malley, and other government officials of not only deliberately and repeatedly committing the alleged federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 committed federal crimes and of repetitiously and intentionally committing the alleged federal crimes of depriving me of my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments Rights and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under US 18 242, the alleged federal crimes of depriving me of my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded me under the Constitution of the U.S, the alleged federal crimes under 18 USC 242, under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, under 18 U.S. Code § 2071 but, also, the new additional alleged federal crimes of intentionally and repeatedly committing Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. However, in less than 10 minutes, it can be proven that the 2016 alleged deliberate obstructions by the Justices of the Supreme Court in committing the alleged federal crimes under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, the alleged federal crimes of depriving me of my 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded me under the Constitution of the U.S, the alleged federal crimes under 18 USC 242, under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, under 18 U.S. Code § 2071, the new alleged federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001, as well as their deliberate violation of Rule 10 in the manual of the Supreme Court. To begin with, the evidence of their denying my 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court and the colossal material facts as supported by the evidence and asserted in my 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court and Motions to Supreme Court (Exhibits 7, 8, and 9, respectively, on my website) substantiate my allegations that the Justices of the Supreme Court failed to uphold their responsibility to defend my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and uphold Rule 10 in the manual of the Supreme Court because the Appendix to my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court (Exhibit 7 on my website) included, amongst other things, the first 5 Exhibits on my website, which prove, undeniably, that, in 2015, Judge Barbera, the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, intentionally committed the alleged prejudicial error of perjury. Rule 10 in the Manual of the Supreme Court asserts that, when a United States court of appeals "has so far departed the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power", then the Justices of the Supreme Court must take corrective actions by exercising its supervisory power. As asserted in my 5-6-16 Official Complaint, emailed Addendums and/or in my 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court, the Justices of the Supreme Court were, minimally, obligated to uphold my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and enforce Rule 10 in the manual of the Supreme Court because the 2015 alleged deliberate prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera is not the "accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings" as cited in Rule 10 of the manual of the Supreme Court and every citizen of the U.S has a right to due process as outlined in the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, which includes having the right to appeal the decision of the lower court to the Court of Appeals in whatever state he/she resides in. The first 5 Exhibits on my website substantiate, undeniably, and with less than 5 minutes of reading, my allegation that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera

intentionally committed the prejudicial error of perjury as stated in my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court. The Justices of the Supreme Court were obligated to defend my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and uphold Rule 10 in the manual of the Supreme Court and determine whether the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera because the Justices know that, if the 5 Exhibits indeed substantiate the alleged intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera, then the Justices of the Supreme Court had to take immediate corrective actions against Chief Judge Barbera because not only did her deliberate prejudicial error of perjury is indicative of deliberately obstructing justice but, also, constitute intentionally committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and intentionally committing the federal crimes of depriving me of 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under US 18 242, as well as the new additional alleged federal crimes of intentionally and repeatedly committing Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. Moreover, the Justices of the Supreme Court, as Officers of the Court, was cognizant of the fact that, if the alleged deliberate prejudicial error by Chief Judge Barbera was substantiated, then Chief Judge Barbera would be guilty of perverting justice because her alleged deliberate prejudicial error of perjury changed the whole outcome of my 2015 Appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland (Exhibit 11 on my website), namely, caused my right to have the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland not to be addressed and resolved, namely, the allegations that, 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 fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill from the Baltimore City Circuit Court 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, who as the Gov. of Maryland at this time, appointed Judge Barbera to be the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland in 2013 and with whom 5 of the Defendants in my 2014 Civil Case O'Malley exercised executive authority over as the Governor of Maryland, has committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities. Thus, the Justices of the Supreme Court knew that they were obligated to defend my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment right and determine if the 5 Exhibits that accompanied my 2016 Petition substantiate my allegations that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury and, if the evidence of the 5 Exhibits which accompanied my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court substantiated this allegation, then Chief Judge Barbera would, also, be guilty of intentionally committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and deliberately committing federal crimes of repetitiously and intentionally depriving me of my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under US 18 242, and the new additional alleged federal crimes of intentionally and repeatedly committing Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. But, due to the denial of my 2016 Petitions by the Justices of the Supreme Court which pleaded for the Justices of the Supreme Court to determine if the 5 Exhibits substantiated that Chief Judge Barbera intentionally committed the prejudicial error of perjury in 2015, the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved.

As asserted in my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court, the 2015 alleged deliberate prejudicial error perjury by Chief Judge Barbera has nothing to do with the issues raised in my 2015 Appeal to the Court of Appeals, but is due to Chief Judge Barbera intentionally lying in stating in her 2015 Order that my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland was denied because it was filed late and then refusing to correct her prejudicial error of perjury after being referenced to the two Exhibits in the record as asserted in my 2015 Motion for Reconsideration (Exhibit 4 on my website) which, undeniably, prove her perjury. A third grader can determine in less than 10 minutes that the first 5 Exhibits on my website, the same exhibits that accompanied my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court, substantiates that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury, given the material fact that Md. Rule 7-104 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 on my website is a 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 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 is a copy of the 9-21-15 Order by Chief Judge Barbera 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 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 2015 Writ was filed in the Court of Appeals of Maryland prior to the 30-day expiration. The fifth exhibit on my website is a copy of Chief Judge Barbera's 11-23-15 Order, which still denied my 2015 Writ without any explanation as to why she still denied my Writ and which is further indicative of the fact that Chief Judge Barbera refused to correct her prejudicial error of perjury, even after receiving my Motion for Reconsideration which make references to the fact that Exhibits 1 and 2 are in the record of the Court of Appeals of Maryland and which further substantiate that my 2015 Writ was filed on time. As Officers of the Court, the Justices of the Supreme Court knew that, if no immediate corrective actions were taken by them in exercising their supervisory power, the alleged prejudicial error of deliberate perjury by Chief Judge Barbera would change the whole outcome of my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, namely, that my 2015 Appeal to the Court of Appeals would still remain denied, again, premised only on the alleged prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera and, secondly, the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland would continue to go undisclosed, unaddressed, and unresolved, namely, that 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 fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill from the Baltimore City Circuit Court 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 Mayor of Baltimore City and one of the 2016 Democratic candidates for President who, again, as Governor of Maryland appointed Chief Judge Barbera in 2013 as the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, have intentionally committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities.

In spite of my repeated motions for his disqualification and Substitution and citing causes for such pleadings, Judge Fletcher-Hill still chose to be the presiding over my Motions to my present Civil Case. Judge Fletcher-Hill took it upon himself to be the Officer of the Court to determine whether he should be disqualified from presiding over my Motions and for a Substitution, knowing that these issues as well as the allegation of federal crimes were raised against him in these Motions. Judge Fletcher-Hill denied my 4-6-18, 4-27-18, 8-6-18 Motions without citing any valid justifications, findings, authorities, or laws to substantiate his 4-16-18, 7-23-18, and 9-4-18 Decisions and Orders (Exhibits 46, 52, and 57, respectively, on my website) which are his Findings to my 4-6-18, 4-27-18, and 8-6-18 Motions. Again, as substantiated in the material facts cited in these Motions, amongst other things, I pleaded for disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding judge and motioned for a Substitution due to my questioning Judge Fletcher-Hill's integrity and impartiality as a result of my allegations of federal crimes against Judge Fletcher-Hill in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals in Maryland which has yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved. And, although Judge Michel Pierson, the Administrator for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City Court, granted my 4<sup>th</sup> Motions dated 9-17-18 (Exhibit 58 on my website) which, amongst other things, pleads, again, to disqualify Judge Fletcher-Hill from presiding over my Motions and for substitution and cited these same causes for motioning Judge Fletcher-Hill's disqualification and pleading for Substitution, the Findings cited in Judge Michel Pierson's 12-7-18 Decision and Orders (Exhibit 59 on my website), which are his Findings from reading and considering my 9-17-18 Motions, substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson failed to disclose, consider, and resolve any of my legal arguments raised in my 9-17-18 Motions, including the legal argument that I had just causes for motioning for the disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill and for substitution, as well as valid reasons for questioning the integrity and impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding judge, which includes the material fact cited in my 9-17-18 Motions, namely, that, due to the 2015 alleged prejudicial error of deliberate perjury by Chief Judge Barbera, the issue raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland relevant to the 2014 allegations that, amongst other things, 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 and that such alleged federal crimes against Judge Fletcher-Hill have yet to be considered, addressed, and resolved. I believe with 100% certainty that Judge Michel Pierson, as an Officer of the Court, knows that he had a duty to disclose, address, and resolve the critical legal arguments raised in my Motions in order to lawfully determine whether to grant or deny my Motions, and that he was obligated to include as a part of his Findings in his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders authorities, laws, and material facts to substantiate his finding that there was no merit to my legal arguments and ordering, lawfully, that my 9-17 Motions be "stricken" from the record and that my Civil Case be closed. Although Judge Michel Pierson was appointed to this elite position by Chief Judge Barbera in September of 2013 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 Michel Pierson still had a duty to determine if the 5 Exhibits that accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively, on my website) substantiates the allegation that, because Chief Judge Barbera committed the deliberate prejudicial error of perjury in 2015, the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland relevant to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 2014 alleged federal crimes have yet to be disclosed, addressed, and resolved and, thus, support the fact that I had a just cause in questioning the integrity of Judge Fletcher-Hill as well as



question the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over any of my Motions or Civil Case. In his 12-7-18 Decision and Orders, Judge Michel Pierson needed to have revealed in his Findings my legal arguments, which includes determining whether the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury against Chief Judge Barbera caused the issue raised in my 2015 Appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, which includes the alleged 2015 federal comes by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and which gave me just cause in questioning the integrity of Judge Fletcher-Hill as well as question the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over any of my Motions or Civil Case. Therefore, in the Findings in his 2-6-19 and 12-7-18 Decisions and Orders, Judge Michel Pierson had a duty to determine if Chief Judge Barbera did commit, intentionally, the prejudicial error of perjury by determining if: a.) the first exhibit that accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions 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. b.) the second exhibit that accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions 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. c.) the third exhibit that accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions 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. d.) the fourth exhibit that accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions 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 2015 Writ was filed in the Court of Appeals of Maryland prior to the 30-day expiration. e.) the fifth exhibit that accompanied my 12-17-18 Motions is the second denial of my 2015 Appeal by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, which would be indicative of the fact that Chief Judge Barbera refused to correct her prejudicial error of perjury, even after receiving my Motion for Reconsideration which make references to the fact that Exhibits 1 and 2 are in the record of the Court of Appeals of Maryland and which further substantiate that my 2015 Writ was filed on time.

Although as a whistleblower, I've lost my home, my livelihood, have been blacklisted due to my whistleblowing, and have lost other materialistic things due to my continued whistleblowing, I will never lose my integrity or give up on the truth being revealed here in this earthly realm in the TRIUNE GOD'S perfect timing. Thus, even within all the afflictions I've undergone for over twenty years and continue to endure, as I informed FBI agents whose identification numbers are 9193, 9374, and 59558, I'm blessed beyond measure.

Although my new additional federal allegations in my Addendums to my 2-18-20 Official Letter of Complaint against the panel of In Banc judges and my new additional federal allegations in my 925<sup>th</sup> Addendum and counting to my 5-6-16 Official Complaint against the Supreme Court (excluding Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh), Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen, other Officers of the Court, the former Gov. of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, Martin O'Malley, and against other government was only mailed to Honorable Attorney General Barr and the Director of the FBI, Mr. C. Wray on 4-3-20, a signed copy is posted along with my receipt from the post office on my website as Exhibits 81 and 82, respectively. Also, I will call the FBI agent on this same day and inform him/her that the signed copy on my website.

