

THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS

MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES' 2-6-20 ORDER TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR AN IMMEDIATE "SUBSTITUTION" AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, MOTION FOR "SUBSTITUTION" IN BANC PANEL OF JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE HEARING BECAUSE THE PRESIDING IN BANC PANEL OF JUDGES ARE ONE OF THE JUDGES IN THE PETITIONER'S 2-17-20 OFFICIAL COMPLAINT TO THE FBI, HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP, HON. GOV. HOGAN, CONGRESS, AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WHO ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INTENTIONALLY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512, HAVE CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071, AND, IN DECIDING THE PETITIONER'S 1-14-20 PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW, HER 1-14-20 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AN IN BANC REVIEW, AND IN HER 1-29-20 MOTIONS, WHICH INCLUDES THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, TO HAVE REPEATEDLY, DELIBERATELY, EXCESSIVELY, AND EGREGIOUSLY: 1.) ABUSED THEIR POWER. 2.) DISPLAYED TOTAL CONTEMPT FOR THE RULE OF LAW. 3.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE IN THE CONDUCT OF THE OFFICE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505. 4.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF DEPRIVING THE PETITIONER OF HER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENTS RIGHTS, AND BY VIOLATING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242. 5.) TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512. 6.) CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071. MOTION TO HAVE THE "SUBSTITUTION" PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES APPOINTED BY HON. GOV. HOGAN TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS, AND MOTION TO HAVE THE "SUBSTITUTION" PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO RECONSIDER THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW AND ALL OF

\*\*\*\*\*

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

BALTIMORE CITY

FOR

CIRCUIT COURT

IN THE

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

THE PETITION OF

IN THE MATTER

\* \* \* \* \*

RECEIVED FOR RECORD  
CIRCUIT COURT FOR  
BALTIMORE CITY

2020 FEB 19 AM 5:57

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 Plaintiff'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, for the panel of In Banc judges, namely, Chair Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin have repeatedly, deliberately, excessively, and egregiously abused their power and displayed total contempt for the Rule of Law by repetitiously and intentionally: 1.) committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. 2.) committing the federal crimes of depriving the Petitioner of her 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded under the Constitution of the U.S, and violating other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242, a federal statute that makes it a crime to deprive any person of their rights "under color of law the Color of Law". 3.) committing the federal crimes of tampering with evidence under U.S.

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's Motion For A Hearing On The Panel Of In Banc Judges' 2-6-20 Order To Deny The Petitioner's Motion For An Immediate "Substitution" And Disqualification Of The Panel Of In Banc Judges, Motion For "Substitution" In Banc Panel Of Judges To Preside Over The Hearing Because The Presiding IN Banc Panel Of Judges Are One Of The Judges In The Petitioner's 2-17-20 Official Complaint To The FBI, Hon. President Trump, Hon. Gov. Hogan, Congress, And Other Government Agencies Who Are Being Alleged To Have Intentionally And Repeatedly Committed The Federal Crimes Of Misfeasance, Malfeasance, And, Nonfeasance Under US Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, To Have Deliberately and Repeatedly Committed The Federal Crimes Of Breaching The Petitioner's 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, And 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights And Other Federal Statutes, Laws, And Canons Under 18 USC 242, To Have Deliberately and Repeatedly Tampered With Evidence Under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, Have Concealed, Removed, And/or Mutilated Evidence Under 18 U.S. Code § 2071, And, In Deciding The Petitioner's 1-14-20 Petition For An In Banc Review, Her 1-14-20 Memorandum In Support Of An In Banc Review, And In Her 1-29-20 Motions, Which Includes The Petitioner's Motion For Substitution And Disqualification Of The Panel Of In Banc Judges, To Have Repeatedly, Deliberately, Excessively, And Egregiously: 1.) Abused Their Power. 2.) Displayed Total Contempt for the Rule Of Law. 3.) Committed The Federal Crimes Of Misfeasance, Malfeasance, and Nonfeasance In The Conduct Of The Office Under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. 4.) Committed The Federal Crimes Of Depriving The Petitioner Of Her 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, And 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights And By Violating Other Federal Statutes, Laws, And Canons. 5.) Tampered With Evidence Under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512. 6.) Concealed, Removed, And/or Mutilated Evidence Under 18 U.S. Code § 2071. Motion To Have The "Substitution" Panel Of In Banc Judges Appointed By Hon. Gov. Hogan To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions, And Motion To Have The "Substitution" Panel Of In Banc Judges To Reconsider The Petitioner's Petition For An In Banc Review And All Of The Petitioner's Motions (hereinafter 1<sup>st</sup> Motions") based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

**Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512. 4.) committing the federal crimes of concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code Chapter 1 § 2071.**

Under the definition of U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 § 1505, a judge obstructs justice when he/she acts corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication influences, obstructs, or impedes or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which any pending proceeding is being had before any department or agency of the United States. Obstruction can include crimes committed by judges, prosecutors, attorney generals, and elected officials in general. Such obstruction by judges and other government officials are cited as misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance in the conduct of the office. Congress approved Title 18 USC 242 -- a statute making it a crime to deprive any person of their rights "under color of law." Acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by federal, state, or local officials within their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prisons guards and other law enforcement officials, as well as judges, care providers in public health facilities, and others who are acting as public officials. "Color of law" refers to an appearance of legal power to act, but such an act is a violation of law. Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and the U.S. Supreme Court says it is a crime for any person acting on behalf of the government as an agent to willfully deprive or conspire to deprive a person of any law that is protected by the U.S. Constitution. Federal statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, popularly known as "Section 1983," is a federal law that allows lawsuits for violations of constitutional rights. Moreover, attempting to tamper with the evidence and/or remove the evidence are acts to alter, conceal, falsify, and/or destroy the evidence interfere with justice, are corrupt, obstruct justice, and, therefore, constitute criminal offenses under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512 and under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 1 & 2071.

Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution 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 Maryland Constitution cites that, upon the decision or determination of any point, or question, by the Court, it shall be competent to the party, against whom the ruling or decision is made, upon motion, to have the point, or question reserved for the consideration of the three Judges of the Circuit, who shall constitute a court in banc for such purpose. Moreover, when review by a court in 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.

First of all, the evidence in the record supports the material facts that within 10 days after the 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order of Judge Michel Pierson was post for the Court's record on 1-6-20, the Petitioner timely filed her Notice of In Banc on 1-14-20 and filed her Memorandum in Support for the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review on 1-14-20 also (hereinafter "1-14-20 Memorandum"), which substantiates the material fact that the Petitioner Notice of In Banc Review and 1-14-20 Memorandum were filed in a timely manner and that the Petitioner did not waive her right to a hearing, but was waiting for a date for her In Banc hearing before the panel of In Banc judges. Moreover, the same documents substantiate the material fact that the consent by all parties to waive the hearing was not given as mandated by Md. Rule 2-551 of the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure. Moreover, 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. Further, the panel of In Banc judges did not give the Petitioner a hearing before deciding to change their decision to dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review, although the panel of In Banc judges had before them the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum which contains voluminous material facts as supported by the tremendous evidence in the record to substantiate, indisputably, that the Petitioner should be granted her Petition for Review and that the panel of Banc judges have no lawful justification to dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review. Also, the evidence of the facts and/or lack of thereof cited in their 1-24-20 Finding and Decision and Order which orders dismissal of the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review substantiate that the panel of In Banc judges decided to change their decision to grant the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review without disclosing, considering, and resolving the many material facts supported by the evidence in the Petitioner's Memorandum or a single one of the 9 "Questions Presented for Review" in the Petitioner's Memorandum. The evidence of facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 1-24-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders and the material facts as supported by the evidence in the Petitioner's 27-page Memorandum and her 20-page Motions filed on 1-29-20 from which the panel of In Banc judges rendered their 1-24-20 and two 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders, respectively, substantiate that the panel of In Banc judges decided the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review and all of the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions, including the Petitioner's Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges as the presiding judges without disclosing, considering, and resolving a single material fact as supported by the evidence in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum or in her 1-29-20 Motions, including the material facts asserted to substantiate why the Petitioner had relevant and just causes for motioning Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges as presiding judges over her In Banc Review hearing and 1-29-20 Motions, as well as the Petitioner's 2-13-20 Motions, which include a Motion for a hearing on all of the 1-24-20 and the two 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders of the panel of In Banc judges and a Motion for Reconsideration. Moreover, the evidence of the facts and/or lack thereof declared in all of their Findings substantiate that the panel of In Banc judges, also, failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court to render a decision and write a statement of relevant and material facts and laws to justify their decision and Order and write a brief statement of the reasons for their decision as the procedures in Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution mandates for Officers of the Court in an In Banc Review. Just as importantly, the Petitioners asserts that along with the evidence of the material facts cited above, the other relevant and material facts asserted in the Petitioner's Memorandum and 1-29-20 Motions and the facts and/or lack thereof cited in the 1-24-20 and two 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions

and Orders substantiates that the panel of In Banc judges deliberately and repeatedly obstructed justice and have intentionally acted corruptly and deliberately committed 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 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and/or 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights. H.) and/or other federal statutes and laws by knowingly, willingly, repeatedly, and egregiously: 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 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 Memorandum and 1-29 20 Motions which includes the Petitioner's Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges as the presiding judges as supported by the evidence, or law which even refute the material facts cited in the Petitioner's Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges as the presiding judges and which substantiate her legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review and Motions. c.) in their 1-24-20 and two 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 Motions, thus, deliberately and egregiously suppressed, altered, tampered with and/or concealed the material facts, laws, and statutes as supported by the evidence in the Petitioner's Memorandum and Motions that substantiate granting the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review and Motions and which, also, refute the facts and/or lack thereof of the panel of In Banc judges 1-24-20 and two 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders and Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order that the legal arguments in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions are "trivious". d.) failing 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 (similar material facts are reiterated in the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions and/or in her 2-13-20 Motions that would substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review. e.) 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 and then decide to dismiss 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 motioned 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 without citing as part of their material facts in their 1-24-20 Finding and Decision and Order that, in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum (similar material facts are reiterated in the Petitioner's 1-29-20

Motions and/or in her 2-13-20 Motions), the Petitioner referenced the evidence of the material facts cited in her 8-22-19 Motions from which Judge Michel Pierson rendered his 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order to substantiate that the facts and/or lack thereof cited in Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order to support his facts and lawfully denying the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions because Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order : 1.) failed to state 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. 2.) failed to state a single legal argument in 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 that do support her legal arguments for granting the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions. 3.) suppresses, alters, tampers with, and/or conceal the material facts, laws, and statutes in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions as supported by the evidence that substantiate her legal arguments in her 8-22-19 Motions for granting the Petitioner's Motions and refute Judge Michel Pierson's findings in his 1-2-20 Findings and Decision and Order that the legal arguments in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions are frivolous. 4.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve a single legal argument in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions that would substantiate her legal arguments for granting the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions and why "DENYING" her 8-22-19 Motions is unlawful. 5.) failed to grant the Petitioner a hearing germane to any of his Findings and Decisions and Orders, although the Petitioner repeatedly pleaded in her 12-17-18, 2-15-19, and 8-22-19 Motions for a hearing each time Judge Michel Pierson denied her Motions and had the Petitioner's Motions stricken from the record, which are the Petitioner's responses to Judge Michel Pierson's 12-7-18, 2-6-19, and 8-8-19 Findings and Decisions and Orders, respectively. 6.) erred 4 times, namely, in his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, and 12-7-18 Findings and Decisions and Orders, as an unlawful procedure and as a matter of law in failing to recuse himself as presiding over the Petitioner's 8-22-19, 2-15-19, and 12-17-18 Motions because, in these Motions, the Petitioner pleads for Substitution and Disqualification of Judge Michel Pierson as the presiding judge because the Petitioner substantiated the evidence that she had just causes to question the integrity and impartiality of Judge Michel Pierson, including the material fact that Judge Michel Pierson is the Administrator for the Eight Circuit of Baltimore City who was appointed in 2013 by Chief Judge Barbera from the Court of Appeals of Maryland and, thus, appears to have a relationship with Chief Judge Barbera, who is, also, alleged in the Petitioner's 8-22-19, 2-15-19, and 12-17-18 Motions and Civil Case to have deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in intentionally and erroneously stating in her 2015 Order that, as a result of my 2015 Appeal being filed late, it was denied, which in turn caused my right to have the issues raised in her 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland to yet 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 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 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 to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill from the Baltimore City Circuit Court deliberately violated my 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and Defendants' motions to dismiss my 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley is alleged in the Petitioner's present Motions and Civil Case to have committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities and who, also, 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. 7.) erred 4 times, namely, in his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, and 12-7-18 Findings and Orders, as an unlawful procedure and as asserted in the Petitioner's 8-22-19 and 2-15-19, and 12-17-18 Motions, in failing to uphold his responsibility as an Officer of the Court, to determine if the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions and which takes only about 5 minutes to read, unequivocally, is a material fact in the Petitioner's Motions and Civil Complaint and, indisputably, substantiates one of her legal arguments in her Motions, namely, that the evidence of the 5 Exhibits substantiates, undeniably, that Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland knowingly and willingly in her Orders in 2015 committed the prejudicial error of perjury in deliberately and erroneously stating in her 2015 Order that the Petitioner's 2015 Appeal was filed late and, thus, denied, which, again, caused her right to have the issues raised in her 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland to yet be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which includes, the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court intentionally committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 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 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' 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, appointed Judge Barbera to be the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland in 2013 and who is, too, being alleged in the Petitioner's present Motions and Civil Case to have committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities. 8.) erred 4 times, namely, in his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, and 12-17-18 Findings and Orders, as an unlawful procedure and as a matter of law in failing to determine as cited in this Memorandum in Support of In Banc Review, in my 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, and 9-17-18 Motions that, in these Motions, the Petitioner substantiated, indisputably, that her repeated pleas for a hearing on Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, 12-7-18 Findings and Orders are relevant and essential because the evidence and the material facts cited in the Petitioner's 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, and 9-17-18 Motions, from which Judge Michel Pierson rendered his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, 12-7-18 Findings and Orders, respectively, undeniably, substantiate that the facts asserted in all of the Findings and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson are not only unsubstantiated but that his justification for "DENYING" and/or "STRIKING" the Petitioner's Motions and ordering the dismissal of her Civil Complaint is, undeniably, unlawful, and further substantiate the material fact that, in Judge Michel Pierson 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, and 12-7-18 Findings and Orders and Order, he repeatedly and deliberately acted corruptly in intentionally committing perjury, misstating the material facts as cited in the Petitioner's Motions, failed to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the legal arguments in her Motions which are substantiated with evidence, statutes, and laws and to support her legal arguments, suppressed, altered, tampered with and/or concealed the material facts that would substantiate that the Petitioner's Motions should have been granted, and thereby, have for the fourth time, as alleged by the Petitioner to have repeatedly, deliberately, and egregiously abused his power by: a.) committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. b.) committing the federal crimes of depriving me of the Petitioner's 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded under

the Constitution of the U.S. and violating other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242, a federal statute that makes it a crime to deprive any person of their rights "under color of law the Color of Law". c.) committing the federal crimes of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512. 4.) committing the federal crimes of concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code § 2071. 9.) erred 4 times, namely, in his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, and 12-7-18 Findings and Decisions and Orders, as an unlawful procedure and as a matter of law in failing to determine as cited in the Petitioner's 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, and 9-17-18 Motions that, in these Motions, the Petitioner substantiated, indisputably, her cause to question the integrity and impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over her Motions and Civil Case, which includes: a.) Judge Fletcher-Hill having a special relationship with former Gov. Martin O'Malley who appointed Judge Fletcher to the Eight Circuit for Baltimore City and who is alleged in the Petitioner's Motions and Civil complaint to have committed misconduct and possible criminal activities and will be called as a witness. b.) the fact that, because of the 2015 alleged prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera in Appeal was filed late, it was denied, the Petitioner's right to have the issues raised in her 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland has yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, namely, that, in 2014, the Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court intentionally committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 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 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' 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, appointed Judge Barbera to be the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland in 2013 and who is, too, being alleged in my present Motions and Civil Case to have committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities. 10.) erred 4 times, namely, in his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, and 12-7-18 Findings and Decisions and Orders, as an unlawful procedure and as a matter of law in failing to determine in his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, and 12-7-18 Findings and Decisions and Orders, from which he rendered his findings and orders of my 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, and 9-17-18 Motions, respectively, whether another legal argument in the Petitioner's Motions, namely, that the evidence, federal statutes and laws as asserted in her Motions substantiate that the Petitioner, too, questioned the integrity and impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over her 8-5-18 Motions and her other Motions because the evidence and the material facts cited in the Petitioner's 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, and 9-17-18 Motions, from which Judge Michel Pierson rendered his 1-2-20, 8-8-19, 2-6-19, 12-7-18 Findings and Decisions and Orders, respectively, undeniably, substantiate that, the facts in all of Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Decisions and Orders substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill repeatedly and deliberately acted corruptly in intentionally committing perjury, misstating the material facts as cited in the Petitioner's Motions, failed to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the legal arguments in my Motions which are substantiated with evidence, statutes, and laws and to support her legal arguments, suppressed and concealed the material facts that would substantiate that the Petitioner's legal arguments in her Motions and, thus, acted corruptly by: a.) committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. b.)



committing the federal crimes of depriving the Petitioner of her 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded under the Constitution of the U.S, and violating other federal states, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242, a federal statute that makes it a crime to deprive any person of their rights "under color of law". c.) committing the federal crimes of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512. d.) committing the federal crimes of concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code § 2071. 10.) refuse to recuse themselves as the presiding panel of In Banc judges and without any explanation as evidenced in their deciding the Petitioner's 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 and failed to cite a lawful justification for denying the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions.

As evidenced in the facts and/or lack thereof cited in the panel of In Banc judges' 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order and the material facts as supported by the evidence in the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions, which includes amongst other Motions, a Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges as presiding over the Petitioner's Motions, from which these Officers of the Court rendered one of their 2-6-20 Order, by the evidence of the facts and/or lack thereof cited in the panel of In Banc judges' 1-24-20 and the material facts as supported by the evidence in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of her Petition for an In Banc Review from which the panel of In Banc judges rendered another of their 1-24-20 Order, and/or by the evidence of a public publishing Judge Carrion, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge Julie R. Rubin, as well as Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman were appointed by Chief Judge and/or by Martin O'Malley to the special and elite position as Administrative Judges for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City. Chief Judge Mary Barbera named Judge Audrey J. S. Carrion as the Administrative Judge of the Eighth Judicial Circuit, Baltimore City which became effective on Jan. 12, 2020. Judge Carrion succeeds Judge W. Michel Pierson as the Administrative Judge because Judge Michel Pierson whose current term as Administrative Judge expired in 2019 and who retired in January 2020. However, Judge Michel Pierson still exercised his "expired" authority and rendered his Findings and Decision and Order on 1-2-20 to the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions, which, amongst other things, includes material facts to substantiate why the Petitioner had just caused in pleading for the 3<sup>rd</sup> time for Substitution and Disqualification of Judge Michel Pierson as well as a hearing on his Findings and Decisions and Order, but Judge Michel chose not to recuse himself as the presiding judge and even denied the Petitioner a hearing on his Findings and Decisions and Orders each time the Petitioner motioned for such.

As evidenced by public comments of adoration and a close relationship, Chief Judge Barbera cited publicly in glowing commendations regarding Judge Carrion which further reveal their special relationship, namely, asserting publicly that "Judge Carrion is eminently qualified to lead the court to meet the mandate of equal justice under law. She brings a wealth of experience as a jurist and a capable, dynamic manager. I look forward to working with her to meet the challenges the future will bring." And, in response to such splendor comments by Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Carrion asserts that "I am honored to have Chief Judge Barbera's trust and support in this new chapter of service. Moreover, Chief Judge Barbera, apparently during the same public occasion, asserted glowing

acknowledgments of Judge Michel Pierson in stating publicly that "Judge Pierson has been a committed and exceptional leader of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. He has provided exemplary service to the judiciary, the residents of Baltimore, and the people of Maryland". Still too, and, apparently on the same public festivity, Judge Carrion declared to Judge Michel Pierson that "It has been a privilege to work with Judge Pierson, and I intend to build upon his wonderful example of thoughtful leadership. I look forward to this opportunity to serve my community and the courts in a new role."

Another of the panel of in Banc judges is Judge Melissa Marie Phinn who is an associate judge on the 8<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit for Baltimore in Maryland. She was appointed to the court by former Governor Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012, assumed office on January 18, 2013, and re-elected to the 8<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit in 2014, therefore, winning a new term that expires on December 31, 2029. And, the last of the panel of in Banc judges that are assigned to preside over the Petitioner's in Banc hearing is Judge Julie Rebecca Rubin, who is an associate judge on the 8th Judicial Circuit for Baltimore City in Maryland, was appointed to the court by former Governor Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012, assumed this elite office on January 9, 2013, was re-elected to the 8<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit in 2014, and, thus, also, won a new term that expires on December 31, 2029. Furthermore, Judge Rubin is one of the judges cited in the Petitioner's Memorandum, in her Motions, Exhibits, in her Official Complaint and/or Addendums to Hon. President Trump, Hon. Congress, Hon. Attorney General Barr, and other government officials (part of the evidence in the record and is Exhibit 16 on the Petitioner's website, which is presently being financed by her family due to the Petitioner's temporary financial hardship) of federal crimes and request for an FBI investigation to determine if any indictment should be brought against the Supreme Court Justices (excluding Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh) Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Rubin, as well as the other Officers of the Court named in these documents for deliberately, repeatedly, and egregiously breached upon federal laws 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 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and/or 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights. H.) and/or other federal statutes and laws.

Moreover, according to article published on September 18, 2019, which includes relating the close relationship and glowing acknowledgements, commendations, and the elite appointments of the same shared and privileged position between Judge Carrion and Judge Pierson due to both of these Officers of the Court being appointed by Chief Judge Barbera who, again, is being alleged in the Petitioner's Memorandum, 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 to have deliberately and repeatedly infringed upon federal laws and committed federal crimes under the federal statutes cited above, the writer, Mr. Steve Lash declares that "Baltimore City Circuit Judge Audrey J.S. Carrion will become chief administrator of the trial court on Jan. 12, 2020, the Maryland judiciary announced Wednesday. Carrion will succeed Judge W. Michel Pierson, who has served as the circuit's administrative judge since December 2013. Pierson will retire from the bench in January.

Maryland Court of Appeals Chief Judge Mary Ellen Barbera, who appointed Pierson and Carrion to the administrative post, praised both jurists.

"Judge Pierson has been a committed and exceptional leader of the Circuit Court of Baltimore City," Barbera said in a statement accompanying the announcement.

"He has provided exemplary service to the judiciary, the residents of Baltimore, and the people of Maryland," Barbera added. "Judge Carrion is eminently qualified to lead the court to meet the mandate of equal justice under law. She brings a wealth of experience as a jurist and a capable, dynamic manager."

As administrative judge, Carrion will be responsible for the Baltimore court's budget and procurement and will manage trial calendars "to ensure the expeditious resolution of cases," the judiciary said in the announcement.

Carrion said in a statement that she is "honored to have Chief Judge Barbera's trust and support in this new chapter of service."

Carrion added that "it has been a privilege to work with Judge Pierson, and I intend to build upon his wonderful example of thoughtful leadership. I look forward to this opportunity to serve my community and the courts in a new role."

Pierson, in an accompanying statement, praised his successor.

"I have had the honor of working with Judge Carrion since I came to the bench and know her as an astute judge and dynamic leader," Pierson said. "I am grateful to have been of service to Baltimore and the people of Maryland as a judge and leader of the Eighth Judicial Circuit. It is reassuring to leave the management of the court in such capable hands."

Still too, as a result of the In Banc judges, as well as Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman being appointed to the elite positions of Administrator Judges by Chief Judge Barbera and/or Martin O'Malley and publicly acknowledging the close relationship among Chief Judge Barbera, the In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill and/or Judge Karen Friedman and as a result of the above statement depicting such close relationship and public acknowledgement of their relationship through such verbal expressions by Judge Carrion of her close working relationship with Judge Michel Pierson, the Petitioner questions whether Judge Carrion, Judge Melissa Phinn, and Judge R. Rubin can be impartial and unbiased in presiding over her In Banc hearing and/or Motions where the irrefutable material facts asserted in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum, in her 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, 9-17-18, 8-6-18, 4-27-18, 3-9-18, 2-15-18, 2-1-18, 1-3-18, and/or 11-27-17 Motions for granting her Petition and Motions and as supported by the evidence in the record prove, undeniably, the Petitioner's allegations that Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman deliberately, repeatedly, and egregiously breached upon federal laws and committed federal crimes under: **A.)** 18 U.S.C. & 1621. **B.)** U.S.C. & 1001. **C.)** U.S. Code Title 18,

As asserted as material facts in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum, in her 1-29-20 Motions, which include her Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges, as declared in the Petitioner's 2-13-20 Motions, which includes Motions for Reconsideration and a hearing on the 1-24-20 and two 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges. Amongst other vital material facts asserted in the Petitioner's documents cited above is that she questions the impartiality and ability of the panel of In Banc judges to be unbiased because of the close relationship and glowing acknowledgements, commendations, and the elite appointments of the same shared and privileged position between Judge Carrion and Judge Pierson due to both of these Officers of the Court being appointed by Chief Judge Barbera who, again, is being alleged in the Petitioner's Memorandum, 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 to have deliberately and repeatedly infringed upon the same federal laws cited above and committed federal crimes cited above, also. Moreover, as repeatedly asserted in these same Petitioner's documents cited above the evidence of the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's 12-17-Motions being presided over by Judge Michel Pierson prove, indisputably that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera deliberately and repeatedly committed the prejudicial error of perjury, and the Petitioner alleges that such deliberate and repeated prejudicial error of perjury, is indicative of deliberately and repeatedly obstructing justice and violating several federal laws. In these same documents, the Petitioner, also, repeatedly cited that the issue of the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury against Chief Judge Barbera is a very critical material fact in her present Civil Complaint which is being presided over by the panel of In Banc judges, and is a very significant material fact in the Petitioner's 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland and in her 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court. As evidenced in these same documents, the Petitioner cites that, the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman were appointed to the elite position of the Eighth Circuit of Baltimore City by Chief Judge Barbera and/or Martin O'Malley, both of whom are being alleged in my Civil Complaint, in the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint, in her 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, and/or in her 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court to have intentionally and repeatedly violated federal crimes and/or intentional misconduct and that Martin O'Malley will be called to testify at the Civil hearing. Although the evidence in the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions, which includes a Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges, substantiate that the Petitioner pleaded with several Justices of the panel of In Banc judges to recuse themselves as the presiding panel of In Banc judges, the panel refused to recuse themselves and provided no explanation for

lawfully justifying denial of the Petitioner's Motion for recusal and for dismissal of her other Motions cited within my 1-29-20 Motions. As substantiated in the Petitioner's 2-13-20 Motions, amongst these Motions is the Motion for a hearing on the panel of in Banc judges' 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders. The first 5 Exhibits which accompany the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions to Judge Michel Pierson and of which the material facts cited in this Motion and the accompanying 5 Exhibits were reiterated in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of in Banc Review, in her 1-29-20 Motions which included her Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of in Banc judges, and in the Petitioner's 2-13-20 Motions substantiate that the panel of in Banc panel judges knew that the alleged 2015 intentional and repeated prejudicial error of perjury was a very vital material fact in all of the Petitioner's documents cited above, in all of her Motions to the panel of in Banc judges, in determining whether to lawfully grant the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint, in all of her other Motions presided over by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, and is absolutely a very important material in the Petitioner's Civil Complaint. Moreover, the evidence of the facts and/or lack thereof in the 1-24-20 and 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders by the panel of in Banc judges, as well as the evidence of the facts and/or lack thereof cited in all of the Findings and Decisions and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, which are their responses to the voluminous material facts in the Petitioner's Motions and/or her responses to the Defendants' Motions substantiate that all of these Officers of the Court deliberately and repeatedly acted corruptly and obstructed justice and knowingly, willingly, repeatedly, and egregiously abused their power and displayed total contempt for the Rule of Law by repetitiously and intentionally committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, depriving the Petitioner of her 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights as afforded under the Constitution of the U.S, and violating other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242, a federal statute that makes it a crime to deprive any person of their rights "under color of law the Color of Law", of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, of concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code § 2071 in order to unlawfully grant the Defendant's Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint in order deliberately and repeatedly conceal and cover up the material facts that the evidence in the record, indisputably, substantiate: A.) that the issue of the alleged 2015 intentional and repeated prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera is a material fact in the Petitioner's Civil Complaint and in all of her Motions presided over by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. B.) that the issue of the alleged 2015 intentional and repeated prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera is a material fact in the Petitioner's Memorandum in Support of her Petition for an in Banc Review and in all of her Motions before the panel of in Banc judges. C.) that the 5 Exhibits that accompanied the Petitioner's my 12-17-19 Motions and that the Petitioner cited in her Civil Complaint and Motions are the first 5 Exhibits on the Petitioner's website which can be read in less than 5 minutes prove, indisputably, that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately and repeatedly committed the prejudicial error of perjury. D.) that 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. E.) 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 the Petitioner filed her 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 federal crime of deliberately and repeatedly committing the prejudicial error of perjury which caused the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to this Court to also, 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 the Petitioner's 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 the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Case which was presided over by Judge Fletcher-Hill, is alleged in her 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 the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint. F.) that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court to cite in Orders a single material fact to support my legal arguments or 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 Petition for an In Banc Review and her Motions as asserted in the Petitioner's 27-page Memorandum in Support of her Petition for an In Banc Review dated 1-14-20 and in her 1-29-20 Motions and also in her 2-13-20 Motions presided over by the panel of In Banc judges and/or in the Petitioner's other Motions presided over by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. G.) that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court to cite in any of their Findings and Orders the material facts as supported by the evidence that substantiate, indisputably, from the material facts cited in my Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, in all of the Petitioner's Motions, and/or Responses to the Defendant's Motions the necessity and fairness of granting my Petition for an In Banc Review, her other Motions, including the Petitioner's Motion to dismiss the Defendants' Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint, her repeated Motions for Substitution and Disqualification of these Officers of the Court, and her repeated Motions for a hearing on each one of the Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges and Judge Michel Pierson, but these Officers of the Court failed to cite any of the material facts cited in the Petitioner documents cited above in their Findings and Orders which constitute deliberately and repeatedly obstructing justice by deliberately, repeatedly, and egregiously suppressing,

As evidenced by Exhibit 1 that accompany the Petitioner's instant Motions, on 2-18-20, the Petitioner mailed an Official Letter of Complaint against the panel of In Banc judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Rubin, and Judge Phinn; but because of her financial hardship in affording printing cost at this time, the Petitioner has only page 1 of her 10-page Official Letter Complaint against the panel of In Banc accompanying her instant Motions. However, as repeatedly cited in the Petitioner's other Motions, the Petitioner has a website, that is presently being totally financed by her family and, thus, has the entire 2-18-20 Official Letter of Complaint against the panel of In Banc judges listed as Exhibit 78 on her website. Also, on 2-18-20, the Petitioner informed the FBI agent in her record conversation which the FBI agent affirmed was being recorded, the Petitioner, amongst other things, informed the FBI agent who, also, gave the Petitioner her ID number at the Petitioner's request, the new evidence of her Official Letter of Complaint against the panel of In Banc judges as being Exhibit 79 on her website and that was mailed to Hon. Attorney Barr and Mr. Wray on 2-18-20 as evidenced by the receipt from the postal service, and will be emailed to some of the other government officials daily starting 2-

2. Still too, another 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 Petitioner has mailed her 2-18-20 Official Letter of Complaint against Chair Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin to the Hon. Attorney Barr, Attorney General for the DOJ, Mr. Christopher Wray, Director for FBI, Hon. President Trump, Congress, and other government officials, pleading that state and federal FBI agents be assigned immediately to investigate the Petitioner's allegations of federal crimes against this panel of In Banc judges to determine if indictments need to be brought against these Officers of the Court for deliberately and repeatedly obstructing justice and repetitiously and deliberately committing federal crimes as defined under Federal law, 28 U.S.C. & 363, as well as the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, federal crimes of violating the Plaintiff's 7<sup>th</sup> And 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights and other federal states, laws, and Canons under 18 USC 242, federal crimes of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18 Part 1 Chapter 73 & 1512, and federal crimes of concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code § 2071.

Memorandum in Support of her Petition for an In Banc Review and/or concealing the material facts, laws, and statutes in the Petitioner's supported by the evidence that substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments in her Memorandum in Support of her Petition for an In Banc Review, in all of her Motions pleaded before the panel of In Banc Judges, in all of her Motions pleaded before Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, and which, also, refute the panel of In Banc judges 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order dated 8-22-19, again, from which Judge Michel Pierson rendered "frivolous" in his 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order, as well as any of the other Findings and Decisions and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman

19-20. As substantiated by the material facts cited in her Letter of Official Complaint, the Petitioner asserts, amongst other things, that.... "1, Diana R. Williams, the Complainant, would like for this letter to serve as my Official Letter of Complaint Of Allegations of Federal Crimes Against the panel of In Banc judges from the Baltimore City Circuit Court, namely, Judge Audrey J.S. Carrion, Chair (hereinafter "Judge Carrion) Judge Julie Rubin (hereinafter "Judge Rubin"), and Judge Melissa Phinn (hereinafter "Judge Phinn"), namely, the alleged federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of breaching the my 6<sup>th</sup>, 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/or the federal crime of concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071. Also, my official requests are that: 1.) under the Department of Justice's Attorney General, Hon. Attorney Barr, and under the Director of the FBI, Mr. Christopher Wray, assign investigators to investigate the allegations that these Officers of the Court deliberately and repeatedly obstructed justice by intentionally and repeatedly violating the Federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and violating the Federal crimes of depriving Ms. Williams, the Complainant, of her 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights and of breaching other Federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242. 2.).... " On 2-13-20 and 2-14-20, I called the FBI and spoke with a male FBI agent on the first day and a female FBI agent on the second day, both of whom gave me their identification number. I informed the agents from the FBI during my recorded verbal complaint and request that I was calling to expose intentional and repeatedly corruption and breaching of federal criminal statutes in our government and request for an investigation be undertaken to determine if indictment need to brought against the Justices of the Supreme Court (excluding Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh), Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals Of Maryland (hereinafter "Chief Judge Barbera"), Judge Michael Pierson, the panel of In Banc judges presenting presiding over my In Banc Review, namely, Chair Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin, other Officers of the Court, and government officials for alleged federal crimes. In my recorded verbal testimony, I informed the FBI agent that, because of the federal criminal laws that I learned about as a result of being coerced to be represented, again, Pro Se, I'm very much aware now that the alleged intentional and repeated obstruction of justice by the panel of In Banc judges in my present Civil Complaint can be easily determined by their facts and/or lack thereof cited in their 1-24-20 and in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders (Exhibit 73 and 75, respectively, on my website) which are there responses to my 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and to my 1-29-20 Motions (Exhibits 71 and 74, respectively, on my website) which includes my Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges from presiding over my In Banc Review,"..... " during our recorded interview on or about, I gave the FBI agent my website and asked him to go to the website while I was talking with him, and he can determine in less than 5 minutes that the evidence of the 5 Exhibits prove, indisputably that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera deliberately and repeatedly committed the prejudicial error of perjury, and I alleged that such deliberate and repeated prejudicial error of perjury, is indicative of deliberately and repeatedly obstructing justice and violating several federal





Support of an In Banc Review and in all of the my Motions before the panel of In Banc judges. C.) that the 5 Exhibits that accompanied my 12-17-19 Motions and that I state in my Civil Complaint and Motions are the first 5 Exhibits on her website which can be read in less than 5 minutes prove, indisputably, that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately and repeatedly committed the prejudicial error of perjury. D.) that because the Supreme Court denied my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court and my 2016 Petition for a Rehearing (Exhibits 7 and 9, respectively, on website), the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury against Chief Judge Barbera has yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved. E.) 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 a Motion for Reconsideration 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 federal crime of deliberately and repeatedly committing the prejudicial error of perjury which caused the issues raised in my Writ to also, 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. F.) that the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court to cite in their Findings Decisions and Orders a single material fact to support my legal arguments or 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 and my Motions, asserted in my 27-page Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review 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." ....

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 19<sup>th</sup> day of February 2020, a copy of the foregoing 1<sup>st</sup> Motions 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.

Exhibit 1

To: Hon. President Trump, Hon. Attorney General Barr of the DOJ, Director of FBI, Mr. Christopher Wray, Hon. Gov. Hogan, Senator Chuck Graham, and other government officials  
From: Ms. Diana R. Williams, Complainant and whistleblower

Re: 1.) OFFICIAL COMPLAINT OF ALLEGATIONS OF FEDERAL CRIMES AGAINST THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES IN BALTIMORE CITY CIRCUIT COURT, NAMELY, CHAIR JUDGE CARRION, JUDGE PHINN, AND JUDGE RUBIN, NAMELY, THE ALLEGED FEDERAL CRIMES OF: A.) MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505. B.) DEPRIVING MS. WILLIAMS, THE COMPLAINANT, OF HER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND BREACHING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS 1, 2, AND 3 UNDER 18 USC 242. C.) TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1512. D.) CONCEALMENT, REMOVAL, OR MUTILATION UNDER 18 U.S. CODE & 2071. 2.) OFFICIAL REQUESTS THAT: a.) UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ATTORNEY BARR, AND UNDER THE DIRECTOR OF THE FBI, MR. CHRISTOPHER WRAY, ASSIGN INVESTIGATORS TO INVESTIGATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT THESE OFFICERS OF THE COURT DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY OBSTRUCTED JUSTICE BY INTENTIONALLY AND REPEATEDLY VIOLATING THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND VIOLATING THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF DEPRIVING MS. WILLIAMS, THE COMPLAINANT, OF HER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND OF BREACHING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS 1, 2, AND 3 UNDER 18 USC 242. b.) BECAUSE THE ALLEGATIONS OF SUCH SERIOUS FEDERAL CRIMES AGAINST THESE OFFICERS OF THE COURT WHO WERE APPOINTED BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND AND/OR BY FORMER GOV. OF MARYLAND, MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO ARE, ALSO, BEING ALLEGED IN THIS OFFICIAL LETTER OF COMPLAINT, OTHER RELATED OFFICIAL LETTERS OF COMPLAINT, AND/OR ADDENDUMS TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THESE SAME FEDERAL CRIMES AND/OR DELIBERATE AND REPEATED MISCONDUCT, THE COMPLAINANT PLEADS THAT HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP, CONGRESS, HON. ATTORNEY BARR, AND/OR MR. WRAY SEND A LETTER ENCOURAGING HON. GOV. HOGAN TO ASSIGN ANOTHER PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER MS. WILLIAMS' IN BANC REVIEW AND/OR CIVIL CASE AND THAT THESE NEWLY ASSIGNED OFFICERS OF THE COURT ARE NOT JUDGES WHO WERE APPOINTED BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND OR A JUDGE APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY. c.) EACH OF THE GOV. OFFICIALS CITED ABOVE ATTEND AND/OR SEND A REPRESENTATIVE TO ATTEND THE MOTION HEARING, IF THE COURT GRANTS MS. WILLIAMS' MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE 2-6-20 FINDINGS AND DECISIONS AND ORDERS BY JUDGE CARRION, JUDGE RUBIN, AND JUDGE PHINN.

Date: 2-18-20

NOTE: STARTING 2-19-20, A DAILY REMINDER EMAIL OF THIS OFFICIAL COMPLAINT OF ALLEGATIONS AND REQUESTS WILL BE EMAILED TO YOUR OFFICES UNTIL I RECEIVE A RESPONSE