

RECEIVED FOR RECORD
 CIRCUIT COURT FOR
 BALTIMORE CITY
 2020 SEP 19 AM 11:25

IN THE

THE PETITION OF

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

v.

FOR

Hameedullah Virk, et al.

Defendants

BALTIMORE CITY

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

MOTION TO DISMISS DEFENDANTS' "MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR IN BANC

REVIEW AS BEING UNTIMELY FILED" AS BEING UNTIMELY FILED AND FOR DELIBERATE

PREJUDICIAL ERRORS OF PERJURY, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATIONS,

AND REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Pursuant to Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, which under Md. Rule 2-551 governs in banc review, I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's Motion To Dismiss Defendants' "Motion To Dismiss Plaintiff's Request For In Banc Review as Being Untimely Filed" as being untimely filed And For Deliberate Prejudicial Errors of Perjury, Motion For Reconsideration, And Request For A Hearing (hereinafter "1st Motions") and grant these Motions based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

1. 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 Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Petitioner whose being represented Pro Se and making the application which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner is that the evidence supports the fact that the Defendants knowingly and willingly committed the prejudicial errors of perjury in the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss "Plaintiff's Request" For In Banc Review as Being Untimely Filed".

Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, which governs in banc review. The Court of Appeals set out the details of in banc practice in rule 2-551 of the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure. Maryland is perhaps the only state in the country that gives litigants a constitutional right to have their cases reviewed by a panel of trial judges. In banc review of a circuit court's judgment or determination is governed by the provisions of Md. Rule 2-551. The responding parties, the Defendants, had 15 days to file memorandum if they disputed the statement of questions or facts. The evidence supports the fact that the Defendants knowingly and willingly committed the prejudicial errors of perjury on all 4 of their causes in support of the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for In Banc Review. The Defendants' first intentional prejudicial error of perjury is in erroneously and deliberately citing that "Plaintiff's Notice for In Banc Review was filed with this Court on January 11, 2020." As evidenced by the Petitioner's 5 copies and 1 original copy of which along with 3 copies are filed with the Court, the Petitioner's Petition for In Banc Review and her Memorandum in Support of her Petition for In Banc Review were filed on 1-14-20; the Defendant received 1 copy, the Court received 3 copies and the original, and the Petitioner has her stamped 1-14-20 copy of both documents.

Secondly, the Petitioner is alleging that the evidence substantiate that the Defendants deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in asserting that "The underlying lawsuit was dismissed by this Court by Order entered on December 26, 2017 (Docket Entry #5/1)". As evidenced by his 1-2-20 Findings and Decisions and Order relevant to the Petitioner's Civil Case, # 24-C-17-004535 of which the Defendants and the Petitioner were issued a copy, Judge Michel Pierson dismissed the Petitioner's last Motions and Civil Case on 1-2-20. The Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions is the Petitioner's last Motions from which Judge Michel Pierson rendered his last Findings and Decision and Order which is dated 1-2-20, and the Defendants were mailed copies of each of the Petitioner's timely stamped and filed Motions and her timely stamped and filed 1-14-20 Petition for an In Banc Review and Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, both of which were mailed to the Defendants on 1-14-20. Moreover, the Defendants received copies of each of the Petitioner's timely stamped and filed Motions, beginning with the first Petitioner's Motions which included pleadings to the Court in various Motions, which provided new and relevant evidence to substantiate that the material fact that the Defendants' Motion for dismissal of the Petitioner's 2017 Complaint should have been denied and, furthermore, that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen repeatedly, deliberately, and egregiously acted corruptly and committed federal crimes under : A.) 18 U.S.C. & 1621. B.) U.S.C. & 1001. C.) U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. D.) 18 U.S.C. & 242. E.) U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512. F.) 18 U.S. Code § 2071. G.) the Petitioner's 6th, 7th, and/or 14th Amendment Rights. H.) and/or other federal statutes and laws. In her over 10 Motions filed in a timely manner to this Court, beginning from 11-27-18 through 8-22-19 these Motions, the Petitioner cited the material facts as supported by the evidence to substantiate that these Officers of the Court committed the alleged federal crimes which constituted violating these federal statutes and laws in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motion for dismissal of the Petitioner's Civil Complaint in order to conceal the material fact that the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland (hereinafter "Chief Judge Barbera") is a very critical and material fact in deciding the Motions and in being successful in substantiating the grounds for not

dismissing her Civil Complaint. Also, as evidenced by the more than 10 Motions in the record, each time Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman issued their Findings Decisions and Orders responding to the Petitioner's Motions, the Petitioner was able to discover new material facts that were relevant and essential and timely filed these new and relevant material facts in Motions to further support, amongst other things, not only the material fact that the facts in the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint were unsubstantiated and unlawful reasons for dismissal of the Petitioner's Civil Complaint, but that these Officers of the Court, beginning with Judge Karen Friedman, the first presiding Judge, and then Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Michel Pierson, repeatedly, and egregiously acted corruptly and obstructed justice and breached these federal states and laws in order to: a.) unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint because the material facts asserted in the Petitioner's Civil Complaint and repeated Motions, that are substantiated with new evidence each time, support the material fact that the facts cited in the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint were unfounded and unlawful and substantiated with evidence, beginning with her first Motions dated 11-27-18 and up to the Petitioner's last Motions dated 8-22-19. b.) conceal and/or cover up the material fact that the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera in 2015 is a very relevant material fact in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint. c.) conceal and cover the material fact that evidence of the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions which can be read in less than 5 minutes substantiate, indisputably, that Chief Judge Barbera intentionally committed the prejudicial error of perjury and that, as the Officer of the Court, Judge Michel Pierson was obligated to determine if these 5 Exhibits prove, undeniably, that Chief Judge deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury because such material fact of the alleged intentional perjury by Chief Judge Barbera was a critical material fact in determining whether the Petitioner's Motions from 11-27-18 through 8-22-19 Motions should be granted, which includes the repeated Motions to dismiss the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint and for Disqualification and Substitution of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman due to, amongst other things, repeatedly, repeatedly and intentionally committing the federal crimes under: A.) 18 U.S.C. & 1621. B.) U.S.C. & 1001. C.) U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. D.) 18 U.S.C. & 242. E.) U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512. F.) 18 U.S. Code § 2071. G.) the Petitioner's 6th, 7th, and/or 14th Amendment Rights. H.) and/or other federal states and laws. d.) conceal and cover up the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson (who was the Administrator over Judge Fletcher-Hill, who designated Judge Fletcher-Hill to preside over the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint, who assigned the In Banc panel to preside over the Petitioner's 2014, and who, as the Administrator over the Baltimore City Circuit Court, has the record of the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint in this Court accessible to him, which has the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland and the her 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court) is cognizant of the material fact that the Petitioner's 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland and her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court contained the evidence of the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions to Judge Michel and which takes only minutes to read substantiate, indisputably, that Chief Judge intentionally committed the prejudicial error of perjury which, again, is a very critical and material fact in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint and, thus, Judge Michel Pierson was obligated to determine if the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions

prove that, beyond a shadow of a doubt, Chief Judge Barbera did deliberately commit the prejudicial error of perjury, although Chief Judge Barbera in 2013 appointed Judge Michel Pierson to the elite position of Administrator of the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City. As asserted in the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions and other documents in the record, because the Supreme Court denied the Petitioner's 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court and her 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. And, since the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera was due to her intentionally refusing to correct her 2015 Order which cited that the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to this Court was denied because it was filed late, the Petitioner was denied her right to have the actual issues raised in her appeal to this Court to yet be disclosed, considered, and resolved by this appellant court which includes, amongst other things, the Petitioner's 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 Petitioner's 14th 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 or superior is Judge Michel Pierson, also, Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed by former Gov. Martin O'Malley who is alleged in the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint and in her present Civil Complaint to have intentionally committed misconduct and potential crimes and will be called as a witness and) deliberately violated the Petitioner'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' 2014 Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 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 and with whom 5 of the Defendants in the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Case O'Malley exercised executive authority over as the Governor of Maryland, has committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities.

The evidence support the fact that, out of approximately 300 to 400 pages of documents in the record of this Court, only about 15% of the documents come from both the Defendants and the Court, and, in most instances, the Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman only cite in their Findings Decisions and Orders one or two or unsubstantiated facts with no supporting evidence and laws that would support their facts and justify their lawfully denying and/or striking the Petitioners Motions. The Defendants has only responded briefly in two or three Motions that contains about 3 or 4 pages of reading. In fact, most of the Findings and Decisions and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen contain only about two statements of their facts which are not supported by any of the materials facts compared to the approximately 350 pages of documents, citing material facts as supported by the evidence in the record which, indisputably, substantiate the alleged federal crimes against Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman under : A.) 18 U.S.C. & 1621. B.) U.S.C. & 1001. C.) U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. D.) 18 U.S.C. & 242. E.) U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 &

1512. F.) 18 U.S. Code § 2071. G.) the Petitioner's 6th, 7th, and/or 14th Amendment Rights. H.) and/or other federal statutes and laws. For example, as asserted in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and/or in her 1-29-20 Motions, which include a Motion for Disqualification and Substitution of the panel of In Banc Judges, as well as asserted in the 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges as their justification of changing the granting of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review to dismissal of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review, the only facts cited in Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order for justifying dismissal of the Petitioner's 28 page 8-22-19 Motions and Civil Complaint are that "Plaintiff has filed a motion entitled 'Motions for 'Substitution'....'" (Paper No. 31). Plaintiff continues to file repetitive and/or frivolous pleadings because prior rulings are not to her liking. According, it is this 2nd day of January, 2020. ORDERED that the motion be and it hereby is DENIED, and further ORDERED that the Clerk shall not accept any further filings in this action other than an Order of Appeal accompanied by the filing fee, and further ORDERED the Clerk shall close this case."

However, as asserted in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc and/or in her 1-29-20 Motion for Disqualification and Substitution of the panel of In Banc Judges from presiding over the Petitioner's In Banc hearing, the evidence of the material facts asserted in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 from which Judge Pierson rendered his 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order, substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson failed in his obligation to cite in his 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order: a.) a single material fact in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions which has 28 pages of relevant and material facts to support her legal arguments for granting her Motions and an Exhibit which contain 3 pages of relevant and material facts. b.) a single legal argument from the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions or a single material fact as supported by the evidence, statute, or law which even refute the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Motions to support her legal arguments for granting her 6-22-19 Motions. c.) suppresses, alters, tamper with and/or conceal the material facts, laws, and statutes as supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments in her 8-22-19 Motions for granting the Petitioner's Motions and refute Judge Pierson's findings in his 1-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order that the legal arguments in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions are "frivolous". d.) disclose, consider, and resolve a single legal argument in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions that would substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her 8-22-19 Motions. e.) any law/s, statutes, or material facts as supported by the evidence in the record that justify Judge Michel Pierson lawfully "DENYING" the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions. e.) repeatedly and without any explanation refuse to recuse himself as the presiding judge although the Petitioner repeatedly motioned and provided just causes for his being disqualified from presiding over her Motions and Civil Complaint, and refused to grant the Petitioner a hearing as repeatedly pleaded in her 12-17-18, 2-15-19, and 8-22-19 Motions, which are the Petitioner's response to Judge Michel Pierson's 12-7-18, 2-6-19, and 8-19 Findings and Decisions and Orders, respectively.

As evidenced by the facts and/or lack thereof in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders, the panel of In Banc Judges did not cite any relevant and material facts as supported by the evidence that would substantiate their justifying changing their Orders from granting the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review on 1-24-20 to dismissing the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review on 2-6-20, nor did the panel of In Banc Judges cited any relevant and material facts as supported by the evidence that

would substantiate their determining that Judge Michel Pierson lawfully dismissed the Petitioner's 8-22-19. This panel of In Banc judges only regurgitated Judge Michel Pierson's unsubstantiated facts to lawfully justify the panel of In Banc judges changing the granting of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review to dismissing her Petition for an In Banc Review, namely, that Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions were "repetitive and/or frivolous pleadings because prior rulings are not to her liking. According, it is this 2nd day of January, 2020. ORDERED that the motion be and it hereby is DENIED, and further ORDERED that the Clerk shall not accept any further filings in this action other than an Order of Appeal accompanied by the filing fee, and further ORDERED the Clerk shall close this case." Thus, in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order, the panel of In Banc judges, also and similar to Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order, namely: **a.)** failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review to cite a single material fact in the Petitioner's 27-page Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review dated 1-14-20, which has very relevant and material facts to support her legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review. **b.)** failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review cite a single legal argument from the Petitioner's 7-page Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review dated 1-14-20 or a single material fact as supported by the evidence, statute, or law which even refute the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Motions to support her legal arguments for granting her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review. **c.)** suppresses, alters, tamper with and/or conceal the material facts, laws, and statutes as supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments in her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review to grant her Petition for an In Banc Review and refute the panel of In Banc judges 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order and Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order that the legal arguments in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 and in her 8-22-19 Motions are "frivolous". **d.)** failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review to disclose, consider, and resolve a single Question Presented for Review in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review as Officers of the Court and granting her Petition for an In Banc Review. **e.)** failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review to cite any law/s, statutes, or material facts as supported by the evidence in the record that justify Judge Michel Pierson lawfully "DENYING" the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions. **f.)** repeatedly and without any explanation refuse to themselves recuse as the presiding panel of In Banc judges, although the Petitioner in her 1-29-20 Motions, which includes a Motion for Disqualification and Substitution of the panel of In Banc judges as the presiding judges over the Petitioner's In Banc hearing provided just causes for their being disqualified from presiding over her In Banc hearing. **g.)** in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges misstate, suppress, altering, tamper with, remove and/or misrepresent the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review that justify her being granted her Petition for an In Banc Review. **h.)** in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges failed to disclose, address, and resolve the legal arguments as supported by the evidence and federal statutes, laws, and Canons as cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review. **i.)** in the facts

and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges failed to substantiate with material facts as supported by the evidence in the record to refute the material facts asserted in the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review. j.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges failed to give any material facts and law in their 2-6-20 your Findings and Decision and Order to support their lawfully initially granting the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review on 1-24-20 and then dismissing the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review on 2-6-20. k.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting in your Findings and Decision and Order to conceal, alter, and/or remove the material facts as supported by the evidence in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to grant her Motions. m.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges failed were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Motions and supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments to attempt to uphold their duty as the Officers of the Court to state a single material fact, legal ground or authority in their Findings and Decisions and Orders for lawfully "DENYING" the Petitioner's Motions. n.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or remove the evidence to support the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed to uphold their duty as the Officers of the Court to state a single material fact, legal ground or authority in their Findings and Decisions and Orders for lawfully "DENYING" the Petitioner's Motions and that, indisputably, support the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed to uphold their legal requirement and responsibility as the Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve the legal arguments and all of the substantiated material facts to support the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Motions. o.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in her Exhibits that accompanied her Motions, and/or in her Civil Complaint and supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review and Motions and that, indisputably, support the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed to uphold their legal requirement and responsibility as the Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve the legal arguments and all of the substantiated material facts to support the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Motions. p.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review filed 1-14-20, in her 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, 9-17-18 Motions, in her other Motions, in her Exhibits that accompanied her Motions, and/or in her Civil Complaint and supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review and Motions and that, indisputably, support the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed to uphold their legal requirement and responsibility as the Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve the legal arguments and all of the substantiated material facts to support the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Motions. q.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in her Exhibits that accompanied her Motions, and/or in her Civil Complaint and supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review and Motions and that, indisputably, support the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed to uphold their legal requirement and responsibility as the Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve the legal arguments and all of the substantiated material facts to support the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Motions. r.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in her Exhibits that accompanied her Motions, and/or in her Civil Complaint and supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review and Motions and that, indisputably, support the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed to perform their duty and legal requirement as an Officers of the Court to enforce to further substantiate the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed to perform their duty and legal requirement as an Officers 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 the Petitioner's 7th and 14th Amendment Rights and states as obligated as an Officer of the Court. p.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and in her Motions and supported by the evidence that substantiate the material fact that Judge Michel her Petition for an In Banc Review and Motion and states as the Officers of the Court. r.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and are supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments and substantiate the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman can't justify their lack of providing legal and lawful grounds and authorities in their Findings and Decisions and Orders. s.) in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, and/or tamper with, and/or remove the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Motions and supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Motion and Motion and states as the Officers of the Court. t.) and/or in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, the panel of In Banc judges were attempting to conceal, alter, tamper with, and/or remove the material facts as cited the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, in her 1-29-20 Motions to the panel of In Banc judges, in her 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, 9-17-18 Motions to Judge Michel Pierson, in her other Motions, in her Exhibits that accompanied her Motions, and/or in her Civil Complaint, amongst other material facts, that, in all the Petitioner's Motions pleading for Substitution and Disqualification of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, although the Petitioner cites her legal arguments for motioning Substitution and Disqualification of these Officers of the Court presiding over her Motions

and Civil Case. And, one of the most significant legal arguments is that, amongst other things, the evidence in the record substantiates the material facts which support the Petitioner's legal arguments asserted in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, in her 1-29-20 Motions to the panel of In Banc Judges, in her 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, 9-17-18 Motions to Judge Michel Pierson, in her other Motions, and/or in her Exhibits that accompanied her Motions, namely, that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman deliberately, repeatedly, and egregiously: 1.) acted corruptly in failing to recuse themselves from presiding over the Petitioner's Motions and Civil Case because the Petitioner provided the evidence in her Motions to substantiate the federal laws, statutes, and Canons to give the Petitioner's grounds for motioning Substitution and Disqualification of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, including the legal argument that the Petitioner questions the integrity and impartiality of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman presiding over her Motions and/or Civil Case because, amongst other things, all three of these Officers of the Court were appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera. 2.) acted corruptly in failing to recuse themselves from presiding over the Petitioner Motions and Civil Case because the Petitioner provided the evidence in her Motions to substantiate the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Motions and/or Civil Case, namely, that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman were cognizant of the material fact that the Petitioner alleges in her Motions for Substitutions and Disqualifications, as well as in her Civil Complaint and exhibits that accompanied her Motions that, due to Supreme Court denying the Petitioner's 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court and her 2016 Petition for a Rehearing, the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals in Maryland, has yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved; and, since the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera has yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, the Petitioner right to have the issues raised in her 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have been denied and, thus, the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, namely, the allegations that, because of the alleged deliberate prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera which has nothing to do with the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to this court, the real issues raised in the Petitioner's appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, namely, that, in 2014, the In Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court intentionally committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supreme Clause from the Baltimore City Circuit Court deliberately violated the Petitioner'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 the Petitioner's 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 and with whom 5 of the Defendants in the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Case O'Malley exercised executive authority over as the Governor of Maryland, has committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities possibly criminal activities, which includes: a.) deliberately exposing our children to lead poisoning in Maryland schools since at least 1993 as substantiated in the record of the Supreme Court, in other courts, and in my Documentary

entitled Thanks, Praise, Honor, and Glory to the TRINITE GOD for Lead and Guidance in Documenting Lead Poisoning in the Schools and the Obstructions of Justice in Order to Conceal the Indisputable Truths. b.) being responsible for the health and safety of our children in public schools and as Mayor of Baltimore City, one of the owners of the lead-hazardous schools in Baltimore City documented in my Documentary and substantiated in the records of the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals of Maryland, and in Baltimore City Circuit Court, but have yet to fulfill his duty as one of the owners of these lead hazardous schools to test all of our children that may have been exposed to lead poisoning using the special X-Ray machine to determine the cumulative amount of lead in the bones because the blood lead testing will not reveal the lead in the blood after about 45 days, but lead stays in the bones for nearly 30 years. c.) failing in his duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of the children that were exposed to such possibly deadly poison. The Petitioner's Documentary and her other documents that support the material facts cited in these Motions relevant to the Petitioner's 2015 and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court and her 2014 and 2015 Petitions to the Court of Appeals of Maryland and Motions for Reconsiderations are part of the record in this Court as Civil Case No. 24-C-13-001927AA and Civil Case No. 24-C-114-000558.

Thirdly, the Petitioner is alleging that the evidence substantiate that the Defendants deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in asserting that "Maryland Rule 20551(g)(1) (g)(1)] states, inter alia, (a) Generally The panel...on motion of any party, shall dismiss an in ban review if...the notice for in ban was ...not timely filed..." Contrary to the Defendants erroneously declaring that "Maryland Rule 20551(g)(1) cites that "inter alia, (a) Generally The panel...on motion of any party, shall dismiss an in ban review if...the notice for in ban was ...not timely filed..." Still too, Petitioner is alleging that the evidence substantiate that the Defendants deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in asserting that "Despite the ongoing barrage of Motions, Plaintiff in essence is requesting the In Banc Panel in Review the dismissal of her complaint. As such, Plaintiff should have filed Notice for In Banc Review within ten (10) days of the 26, 2017 dismissal not more than two (2) years after her Complaint was dismissed". As evidenced by the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review filed 1-14-20 and in her Motions for Substitution and Disqualification of the In Banc panel of judges filed 1-29-20, both of which the Defendants received copies of, and, also, as evidenced in paraphrasing these same issues in her 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, 9-17-18 Motions, in her other Motions, in her Exhibits that accompanied her Motions, and/or in her Civil Complaint, the Petitioner is requesting for the second time and "in essence" that the In Banc Panel of judges thoroughly examine the colossal material facts as supported by the over 300 pages of tremendous evidence in the record from the Petitioner's Motions, Responses, and Exhibits substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman not only, irrefutably, repeatedly, intentionally, and egregiously obstructed justice and committed the federal crimes by breaching the federal laws cited above in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint, but another underlying claim alleged by the Petitioner in these documents is that the evidence, unequivocally, substantiate the material fact that Judge Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman knowingly and willingly obstructed justice,

committed federal crimes by infringing upon these same federal laws under, 18 U.S.C. & 1621, U.S.C. & 1001, U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, 18 U.S.C. & 242, U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, 18 U.S. Code § 2071, the Petitioner's 6th, 7th, and/or 14th Amendment Rights, and/or other federal statutes and laws in order to conceal and cover up the material fact that the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions which, amongst other things, prove that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury, a federal crime which constitutes, also, violating the federal laws under A.) 18 U.S.C. & 1621, B.) U.S.C. & 1001, C.) U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, D.) 18 U.S.C. & 242, E.) U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, F.) 18 U.S. Code § 2071, G.) and/or under the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right.

Finally, the Petitioner is alleging that the evidence substantiate that the Defendants deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in asserting that the "Plaintiff's filing for In Banc is thus untimely filed and the Court and Panel should dismiss Plaintiff's Request for In Banc Review." As evidenced by the 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order from Judge Michel Pierson and by the stamped filed date of 1-14-20 on the copies of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review and her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review that were, again, mailed to the Defendants on 1-14-20, the Defendants, who certainly knows that the Petitioner has 10 days to respond to the Judge's Order and 3 days for mailing, with the first day beginning once the Judge's Order was docketed in the record of Court on 1-6-20, deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in motioning for the dismissal of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review. And, again, the evidence of the filing date of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review and her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review substantiate that the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Petitioner's "Request" for an In Banc Review is untimely filed and, thus, must be dismissed in accordance with Maryland Rule.

2. 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 Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Petitioner whose being represented Pro Se and making the application which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner is that the assigned panel of In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Melissa Phinn, as substantiated by the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders, as evidenced by material facts cited in the procedures in Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution which governs in banc reviews, and as evidenced by the material facts declared in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 timely filed Petition for an In Banc Review and/or in her 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review. Petition for an In Banc Review, deliberately and egregiously acted corruptly and obstructed justice and, therefore, intentionally and egregiously committed federal crimes which constitute a violating federal laws and federal crimes under: A.) 18 U.S.C. & 1621, B.) U.S.C. & 1001, C.) U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, D.) 18 U.S.C. & 242, E.) U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, F.) 18 U.S. Code § 2071, G.) the Petitioner's 6th, 7th, and/or 14th Amendment Rights. H.) and/or other federal statutes and laws.

As substantiated by evidence of the facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and

Decisions and Orders and the voluminous material facts as supported by the evidence in the record to support the Petitioner's timely filed 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review from which the panel of In Banc judges rendered their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders, and as substantiated by the evidence in the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions, which includes a Motion for

Disqualification and Substitution of the panel of In Banc judges from presiding over the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review hearing, the Petitioner cites in these documents that the evidence of the material facts cited in the publicly published documents and reiterated as material facts in the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motion for Disqualification and Substitution of the panel of In Banc judges

and a shared elite position among the panel of In Banc judges and Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman in being privileged to such an unique appointment as Administrators to the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City by Chief Judge Barbera and/or by former Gov. Martin O'Malley, both of whom are alleged in the documents of the Petitioner to have repeatedly and intentionally committed federal crimes and/or intentional misconduct and that Gov. O'Malley will be called to testify at the Petitioner's Civil hearing. Consequently, in these same documents, the

Petitioner pleads to the In Banc panel of judges to reveal the evidence in the voluminous record that substantiate the material facts asserted in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and/or in her 1-29-20 Motions and which substantiate the Petitioner's just causes for questioning the panel of In Banc judges' impartiality and ability to be unbiased in disclosing

considering, and resolving whether the material facts asserted below are essential in determining whether the Petitioner's Petition for Review, her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and/or her 1-29-20 Motions should be granted, namely, whether: a.) the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions to Judge Michel Pierson determine that Judge Barbera deliberately

commit the prejudicial error of perjury . b.) in their Findings and Decisions and Orders, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman unlawfully granted the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint because the material facts asserted in the Petitioner's Civil Complaint and repeated Motions substantiated with new evidence each time support the material

fact that the facts cited in the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint were unfounded and unlawful, beginning with her first Motions dated 11-27-18 and even up to the Petitioner's last Motions dated 8-22-19. c.) in their Findings and Decisions and Orders, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman concealed and/or covered up the material fact

that the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera in 2015 is a very relevant material fact in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint. d.) as repeatedly asserted in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, in her 1-29-20 Motions, in her 8-22-19 Motions, and in her 12-15-19, and in her 12-17-18 Motions, that Judge Michel Pierson had a

responsibility as the presiding Officer of the Court to determine in his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, and in his 2-6-19 Findings and Decisions and Orders responding to the issues raised in the Petitioner's 8-22-19, 2-15-19, and 12-17-18 Motions, including whether the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's 12-17-18


Motions, indisputably, prove that Chief Judge Barbera intentionally committed the prejudicial error of perjury because this fact is a very significant material fact in determining whether the Petitioner's Motions from 11-27-18 through 8-22-19 Motions should be granted, which includes the Motion to

banc is permitted by the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner may have a judgment or determination of any point or question reviewed by a court in banc by filing a notice for in banc review. Issues are reserved for in banc review by making an objection in the manner set forth in Rules 2-517 and 2-520. Again, the Court of Appeals set out the details of in banc practice in rule 2-551 of the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure. A "hearing," as opposed to an argument, is automatically scheduled, but may be waived by consent of all parties. Since the Petitioner did not waive her right to a hearing, the consent by all parties to waive the hearing was not given. Moreover, Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution requires the banc panel to file a brief statement of the reasons for the decision. Thus, according to Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner has a right to a hearing before the In Banc panel once she was granted her Petition for Review on 1-24-20 by the panel of judges and then the panel of judges may decide after the hearing on the 9 Questions Presented for Review in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and the opposing party have an opportunity to present their facts as supported by the evidence in the record, the panel of In Banc judges are required to render a decision and write a statement of relevant and material facts and laws to justify their decision and Order. The Petitioner has yet to have a hearing before the panel of In Banc judges as required by Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, however, the panel of In Banc judges deciding on 2-6-20 to unlawfully dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review without permitting the Petitioner her right to have a hearing before the panel of In Banc judges. Furthermore, as evidenced in facts cited in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order the panel of In Banc judges, these presiding Officers of the Court have failed to disclose, consider, and resolve the 9 Questions Presented for Review in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review dated and filed on 1-14-20. The evidence of the facts and/or lack thereof in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order of the panel of In Banc judges which are the panel of In Banc judges' response to the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review reveal that Judge Carrion, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge Julie R. Rubin were deliberately negligent in their responsibility as Officers of the Court, to uphold their responsibility as Officers of the Court, have intentionally acted corruptly and deliberately committed federal crimes under: A.) 18 U.S.C. & 1621. B.) U.S.C. & 1001. C.) U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. D.) 18 U.S.C. & 242. E.) U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512. F.) 18 U.S. Code § 2071. G.) the Petitioner's 6th, 7th, and/or 14th Amendment Rights. H.) and/or other federal statutes and laws by: a.) failing in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review to cite a single material fact in the Petitioner's 27-page Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review dated 1-14-20, which has very relevant and material facts to support her legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review. b.) failing in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review to cite a single legal argument from the Petitioner's 27-page Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review dated 1-14-20 or a single material fact as supported by the evidence, statute, or law which even refute the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Motions to support her legal arguments for granting her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review. c.) in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders, failing to cite a single one of the Petitioner's material facts as supported by the evidence that substantiate the necessity and fairness and justification for the granting of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review, and thus, deliberately and egregiously suppressed, altered, tampered with and/or concealed the material facts, laws, and statutes as supported by the

evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments in her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review to grant her Petition for an In Banc Review and refute the panel of In Banc Judges 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order and Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order that the legal arguments in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc and in her 8-22-19 Motions are "frivolous". d.) failing in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review to cite any law/s, statutes, or material facts as supported by the evidence in the record that justify Judge Michel Pierson lawfully "DENYING" the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions or cite any material fact as supported by the evidence and laws to substantiate their initially granting the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review to dismissing the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review, but simply justified their dismissal of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review by stating, verbatim, the two or three unsubstantiated sentences cited in Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order, namely, that the "Plaintiff has filed a motion entitled "Motions for 'Substitution'...." (Paper No. 31). Plaintiff continues to file repetitive and/or frivolous pleadings because prior rulings are not to her liking. According, it is this 2nd day of January, 2020. ORDERED that the motion be and it hereby is DENIED, and further ORDERED that the Clerk shall not accept any further filings in this action other than an Order of Appeal accompanied by the filing fee, and further ORDERED the Clerk shall close this case. f.) refuse to recuse themselves as the presiding panel of In Banc Judges and without any explanation, although the Petitioner in her 1-29-20 Motions, which includes a Motion for Disqualification and Substitution of the panel of In Banc Judges as the presiding judges over the Petitioner's In Banc hearing provided just causes for their being disqualified from presiding over her In Banc hearing. g.) committing the prejudicial error of perjury in insinuating in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders that the Petitioner has no merit to her 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review which they, without any evidence or law to support their claim that the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review is frivolous and that the Petitioner filed her Petition for an In Banc Review because she resented the "liking" as asserted in the 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order by Judge Michel Pierson, as paraphrased in his other Findings and Decisions and Order, well as in the Findings and Decisions and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. Again, the evidence of the panel of In Banc Judges' Findings and Decisions and Orders, as well as the Findings and Decisions and Orders of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman are, indisputably, unsubstantiated and their justification for dismissing, denying, and/or striking the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review, her 1-29-20 Motions, and all of her more than 10 other Motions are totally unlawful. The Petitioner asserts that in the TRIUNE GOD'S timing, justice will be served because the Petitioner rests her belief and peace during such tremendous adversity that she's been enduring for over 20 years in exposing the evil and criminal actions of government officials on the WORD OF GOD which asserts in Proverbs 12:19 that "The lip of truth shall be established forever, but a lying tongue but for a moment."

Thus, in conclusion, the Petitioner is requesting that this Honorable panel of In Banc Review Judges to grant the Petitioner's Motions.

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court


Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 13th day of February 2020, a copy of the foregoing Motion To Dismiss Defendants' "Motion To Dismiss Plaintiff's Request For In Banc Review as Being Untimely Filed" as being untimely filed And For Deliberate Prejudicial Errors of Perjury, Motions For Reconsideration, And Request For A Hearing was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 402 Long Trail Terrace, Rockville, Maryland 20850.

Cc: Hon. Hon. President Trump, Hon. Gov. Hogan, and other government agencies



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Petitioner is requesting a hearing on her Motions.