

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 6TH, 7TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND BREACHING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS 1, 2, AND 3 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 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 6TH, 7TH, AND 14TH 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

OFFICIAL COMPLAINT OF ALLEGATIONS OF FEDERAL CRIMES AGAINST JUDGE CARRION, JUDGE

PHINN, AND JUDGE RUBIN, SUBSTANTIATED FACTS TO SUPPORT THE ALLEGATIONS,

AND MY REQUESTS

I, 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, and nonfeasance under US Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of breaching the my 6th, 7th, and 14th 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, 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 6th, 7th, and 14th Amendment Rights and of breaching other Federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 under 18 USC 242. 2.) The FBI and a state prosecutor be assigned by Hon. Gov. Hogan and a federal prosecutor be assigned by Hon. Attorney Barr to assign a federal FBI agent to investigate the allegations that Judge Carrion, Judge Rubin, and Judge Phinn deliberately and repeatedly obstructed justice by intentionally and repeatedly violating the federal crimes of misfeasance, mafffeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and federal crimes of depriving Ms. Williams, the Complainant, of her 6th, 7th, and 14th Amendment Rights and by breaching other federal statutes, laws, and Canons 1, 2, and 3 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. 2.) Because of the allegations of such serious federal crimes against these Officers of the Court who were either appointed by Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland and/or former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley who are, also, being because 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, and/or the FBIs send a Letter encouraging Gov. Hogan immediately assigns another panel of In Banc Judges to preside over Ms. Williams' In Banc Review and Civil Complaint. 3.) each of the Gov. Officials cited above attend and/or send a representative to attend the Motion Hearing, if the Court grants Ms. Williams' Motion for a Hearing on the 2-6-20 Finding and Decision and Order by Judge Carrion, Judge Rubin and Judge Phinn.

Under the definition of U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 § 1505, a judge obstructs justice when he/she acts corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication influences, obstructs, or impedes or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which any pending proceeding is being had before any department or agency of the United States. Obstruction can include crimes committed by judges, prosecutors, attorney generals, and elected officials in general. Such obstruction by judges and other government officials are cited as misfeasance, malfeasance, or nonfeasance in the conduct of the office. Furthermore, under Section 242 of Title 18, it's a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and the U.S. Supreme Court says it is a crime for any person acting on behalf of the government as an agent to willfully deprive or conspire to deprive a person of any law that is protected by the U.S. Constitution. Moreover, intentionally tampering with evidence is a federal crime under U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1512, and deliberately concealment, removal, or mutilation of evidence is a federal crime under 18 U.S. Code § 2071.

On 2-13-20 and 2-14-20, I called the FBI office 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 Michel Pierson, the panel of In Banc judges 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 obstructions 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 Orders (Exhibit 73 and 75, respectively, on my website) which are there responses to the material facts as supported by the evidence my 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and in 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. Further, I informed the FBI agent that, presently, I'm enduring dire financial hardship and can't afford to make copies of all of the voluminous documents that are available and essential in substantiating the allegations of intentional and repeated federal crimes, not only against the panel of In Banc judges, but substantiated alleged repeated and deliberate federal crimes against Justice of the Supreme Court (again, excluding Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh), Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Michel Pierson, other Officers of the Court, former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley (hereinafter "Martin O'Malley") and other government officials, but through the grace of the TRUINE GOD, I'm able to maintain the costs of my website, because of the financial support of my loving family. Thus, during our recorded interviews, I gave the FBI agents my website and asked him and her to go to the website while I was talking with him or , and he or she 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 laws. Moreover, in my recorded verbal testimony, I asserted that the issue of the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury against Chief Judge Barbera is a very critical material fact in my present Civil Complaint which is being presided over by the panel of In Banc Judges, and was a very significant material fact in my 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland and in my 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court (Exhibits 4, 7, and 9, respectively, on my website). I informed the FBI agent that, in my present Civil Complaint, the presiding judges have a special relationship with and were appointed to the elite position of the Administrator for 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 my 2014 Civil Complaint, in my 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, and/or in my 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. And, although during my initial recorded verbal testimony I did not recite specifically what federal laws, I did inform the FBI agent that my website has my Motions and complaints which stipulate these alleged deliberate and repeated violations of these federal laws against Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman that are now being alleged to have been committed deliberately and repeated by the panel of In Banc Judges. And, although the evidence in my 1-29-20 Motions (Exhibit 74 on my website) which includes a Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc Judges substantiate that I pleaded with several just causes for 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 my Motion for recusal and for dismissal of my other Motions cited within my 1-29-20 Motions. As substantiated in my 2-13-20 Motions (Exhibit 77 on my website), amongst these Motions is the Motion for a hearing on the panel of In Banc Judges' 2-6-20 Findings and Decisions and Orders. In essence, I informed the FBI agents that the first 5 Exhibits on my website which accompany my 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on my website) to Judge Michel Pierson and of which the material facts cited in this Motion and the accompanying 5 Exhibits were reiterated in my 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of In Banc Review, in my 1-29-20 Motions which included my Motion for Substitution and Disqualification of the panel of In Banc Judges, and in my 2-13-20 Motions (Exhibits 60, 71, 74, 77, respectively, on my website) 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 my documents cited above, in all of my Motions to the panel of In Banc Judges, in determining whether to lawfully grant the Defendants' Motion to dismiss my Civil Complaint, in all of my Responses and Motions to deny the Defendants' Motion to dismiss my Civil Complaint, in all of my other Motions presided over by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, and is absolutely a very important material in my 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 Orders by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibits 70, 66, 63, 59, 57, 52, 50, 49, 47, and 46 on my website), which are their responses to the voluminous material facts in my

Motions and/or my responses to the Defendant's Motions (Exhibits 67, 64, 60, 58, 42, 41, 40, 39, 38, 36, 35, 34, and 33) 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 me of my 6th, 7th, and 14th 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 my Civil Complaint in order 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 my 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 my Memorandum in 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 my 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 my 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to this Court which referenced these same 5 Exhibits that were in the record before this Court, a reasonable mind would conclude that Chief Judge Barbera intentionally and repeatedly committed the federal crime of deliberately and repeatedly committing the prejudicial error of perjury which caused the issues raised in my 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 my 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 in 2013 was Judge Michel Pierson, deliberately violated my 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' 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 and Decisions 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, and/or Responses to the Defendant's Motions the necessity and fairness of granting my Petition for an In Banc Review, my other Motions, including my Motion to dismiss the Defendants' Motion to dismiss my Civil Complaint, my repeated Motions for a hearing on each one of the Findings and Decisions and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges and Judge Michel Pierson, but these Officers of the Court failed to cite any of the material facts cited in my documents in their Findings and Decisions and Orders which constitute deliberately and repeatedly obstructing justice by deliberately, repeatedly, and egregiously suppressing, altering, tampering with and/or concealing the material facts, laws, and statutes in my Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review and/or in my voluminous Motions as supported by the evidence that substantiate my legal arguments in my Memorandum in Support of my Petition for an In Banc Review, in all of my Motions pleaded before the panel of In Banc judges, in all of my Motions pleaded before Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, and which, also, 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 (Exhibit 70 on my website) that the legal arguments in my 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of an In Banc and in my 27 page Motions 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. H.) that the panel of In Banc judges failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve a single Question Presented for Review in my Memorandum in Support of an In Banc that would substantiate my legal arguments for granting my Petition for an In Banc Review. I.) that the panel of In Banc judges failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court to cite in falling 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 in my Memorandum in Support of my Petition for an In Banc Review or in any of my Motions as supported by the evidence in the record that justify Judge Michel Pierson lawfully "DENIED my 8-22-19 Motions or cite any material fact as supported by the evidence and laws to substantiate their initially granting my Petition for an In Banc Review to dismissing my Petition for an In Banc Review, but simply justified their dismissal of my 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 "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" without citing as part of their material facts in their 1-24-20 Finding and Decision and Order (Exhibit 73 on my website) that, in my 1-14-20 Memorandum in support of my Petition for an In Banc Review (and which are asserted again in my 1-29-20 Motions and/or in my 2-13-20 (Exhibits 74 and 77, respectively, on my website) I referenced the evidence of my 8-22-19 Motions (Exhibit 67 on my website) from which Judge Michel Pierson rendered is 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 that his Decision and Order was unlawful and unsubstantiated because in his 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order Judge Michel Pierson: 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 my 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 my legal arguments for granting my 8-22-19 Motions. 3.) suppresses, alters, tampers with, and/or conceal the material facts, laws, and statutes in my 8-22-19 Motions as supported by the evidence that substantiate my legal arguments in my 8-22-19 Motions for granting my Motions and refute Judge Pierson's findings in his 1-2-20 Finding and Decision and Order that the legal arguments in my 8-22-19 Motions are frivolous. 4.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve a single legal argument in my 8-22-19 Motions that would substantiate my legal arguments for granting my 8-22-19 Motions and why "DENYING" my 8-22-19 Motions is unlawful. 5.) failed to grant me a hearing germane to any of his findings and Decisions and Orders, although I repeatedly pleaded in my 1-2-17-18, 2-15-19, and 8-22-19 Motions for a hearing each time Judge Michel Pierson denied my Motions and had my Motions stricken from the record, which are my responses to Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-7-18, 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 my 8-22-19, 2-15-19, and 12-17-18 Motions because, in these Motions, I plead for Substitution and Disqualifications of Judge Michel Pierson as the presiding judge because I substantiated the evidence that I 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 my 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 14th Amendment Right and

infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill from the Baltimore City Circuit Court deliberately violated my 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss my 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley is alleged in my 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 a matter of law and as asserted in my 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 my 12-17-18 Motions and which takes only about 5 minutes to read, unequivocally, is a material fact in my Motions and Civil Complaint and, indisputably, substantiates one of my legal arguments in my 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 my 2015 Appeal was filed late and, thus, denied, which, again, caused my right to have the issues raised in my 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 my 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill from the Baltimore City Circuit Court deliberately violated my 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss my 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley, 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. 8.) 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 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, I substantiated, indisputably, that my repeated pleads 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 my 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" my Motions and ordering the dismissal of my 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 Decisions and Order, he repeatedly and deliberately acted corruptly in intentionally committing perjury, misstating the material facts as cited in my 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, altered, tampered with and/or concealed the material facts that would substantiate that my Motions should have been granted, and thereby, have for the fourth time, as alleged by me 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 my 6th, 7th, and 14th 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 my 8-22-19, 2-15-19, 12-17-18, and 9-17-18 Motions that, in these Motions, I substantiated, indisputably, my cause to question the integrity and impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over my 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 my 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 deliberately and erroneously citing in her 2015 Order that, since my 2015 Appeal was filed late, it was denied, my right to have the issues raised in my 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland has 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 to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill from the Baltimore City Circuit Court deliberately violated my 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supreme 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 my Motions, namely, that the evidence, federal statutes and laws as asserted in my Motions substantiate that I, too, questioned the integrity and impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over her 8-5-18 Motions and my other Motions because the evidence and the material facts cited in my 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, respectively, 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 my 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 Plaintiff of her 6th, 7th, and 14th 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. d.) committing the federal crimes of concealing, removing, and/or mutilating evidence under 18 U.S. Code § 2071.

Although this is my first Official Letter of Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges (Exhibit 78 on my website). since the I alleged that the 5 Exhibits on my website prove, indisputably, that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately and repeatedly committed in 2015 the prejudicial error of perjury, and, excluding Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh, since the Justices of the Supreme Court denied my 2016 Petitions which, amongst other things, raised the issue of the 5 Exhibits which accompanied my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court but the Justice of the Supreme Court still denied my 2016 Petitions, and, also, since I learned since representing myself, again, Pro Se in my 2017 Civil Complaint that such alleged deliberate and repeated obstructions of justice constitute breaching the same federal crimes cited above, I have filed many Letters of Official Complaint and/or Addendums to my Letters of Official Complaint against the Justices of the Supreme Court (again excluding Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh), Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Michel Pierson. The Letters of Official Complaints and the Addendums are listed as Exhibits 6, 13, 14, 16, 30, 31, 37, 43, 44, 45, 54, 56, 58, 61, 62, 65, 68, and 69 on my website. And, as I stated in my recorded verbal testimony to the FBI agent, each time I receive new evidence. Thus, today, 2-18-20, I will call the FBI office and, amongst other things, in my recorded testimony, I informed the FBI agent that I post the new and relevant evidence of this Official Letter of Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges for Baltimore City Circuit Court, namely, Chair Judge Carrion, Judge Rubin, and Judge Phinn today, 2-18-20, on my website.

Sincerely,