To: Honorable Attorney General, Eric Holder

From: Diana R. Williams

Re: Request for Reconsideration

Date: 11-14-14

 Although I’m pleased with hearing that Attorney Gardner from the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”) agree with me that the issue of determining whether my termination was legal and did not breach the negotiated contract is not within the jurisdiction of the DOJ, I respectfully disagree with her determining in her response letter to dated 9-29-14 (Exhibit 1) that my complaint dated 7-14-14 to your office is requesting that the DOJ “review both your termination from a mathematics teaching position in the Baltimore County Public Schools and subsequent legal decisions upholding that termination.” As cited in this complaint as well as in the addendums to your office dated7-14-14, 7-22-14, 8-5-14, and 9-23-14, it is my requests that you would have a FBI investigative team to determine if the evidence that accompanied my complaints and addendums support the relevant and material fact that Judge Hill and 13 other Officers of the Court in Maryland have conspired willfully and deliberately in committing obstructions of justice, namely, perjury, fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, misfeasance, and malfeasance against me, which are crimes against justice.

 As cited in her complaint dated 7-14-14, I suspect that the Court of Appeals would deny my petition, and in their Order dated 9-22-14 (Exhibit 2), these Officers of the Court, did deny my petition for the same reason as they did in 2013. Consequently, the enclosed Writ is my petition to the Supreme Court of the United States. As indicated in my Petitioner for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States (Exhibit 3), it is my hope and prayer that this Highest Court in the land would restore the integrity, trust, dignity, and confidence in our judicial system. Thus, since the Supreme Court has jurisdiction to determine since there is a bargained agreement if the evidence support that my dismissal breached Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement and if so, uphold their responsibility to enforce the protocols in the bargained agreement. Consequently, as indicated in my Writ, the **Argument** before the Highest Court in the United States of American cites the following:

“The Honorable Supreme Court of the United States have an opportunity not only to take swift and severe corrective measures against these Officers of the Court for willfully and deliberately committing the substantiated crimes against justice, but to restore the dignity, confidence, and integrity of our judicial system before these same “public employees” who work under bargained agreements and who will be desirous and interested in knowing whether he Highest Court in the United States will not deny the Petitioner’s petition and will not remand this case back to the Lower Courts because the evidence in the Appendices indisputably substantiate that the Petitioner: **1**. worked under a bargained agreement raised the issue of her dismissal breaching Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement. **2.** the indisputable evidence substantiate that the Court of Appeals and the Lower Courts willfully and intentionally omitted disclosing in their Orders and Memorandum that the Petitioner even raised the issue of her termination violating these specific articles and sections of the contractual agreement the substantiated, relevant and material facts unequivocally supports the material fact that the Petitioner’s dismissal breached specific articles and sections of the bargained agreement. **3.** the evidence substantiate that these Officers of the Court willfully and knowingly fail to consider, address, disclose, and resolve the issue of whether the Petitioner’s termination infringed upon these specific articles and sections of the bargained agreement. **4.** the Petitioner has every reason for being righteously indignant with and having no faith in the Court of Appeals and the Lower Courts if this case is remanded to the Lower Courts because the evidence in the record substantiates that these Officers of the Court willfully and deliberately committed fraud, deceit, perjury nonfeasance, misfeasance, and/or malfeasance violate A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct. **5.** the Petitioner has already suffered severe emotional, mental, and financial hardship, including having her 14th Amendment right violated by being denied of her livelihood for over three years, have been without an income for over 3 years because no one will hire her due to her tarnished record, and have had her house foreclosed on July 11, 2014 and, thus, this Honorable Supreme Court should not coerce the Petitioner to have to suffer any longer in a case where the evidence overwhelming supports the fact that the Petitioner should not have been terminated and that this case should have been decided in arbitration.”

 Therefore, in conclusion, I’m requesting that this Honorable Office of the DOJ would grant my request for “Reconsideration” and, in fact, have a FBI investigative team diligently investigate the substantiated allegations of conspiracy, fraud, deceit, perjury, nonfeasance, misfeasance, malfeasance, and violation of my 14th Amendment right by Judge Hill as indicated in my addendum dated 9-23-14 as well as the 13 other Officers of the Court as indicated in my initial complaint and addendums, which includes the Court of Appeals in Maryland, the Special Court of Appeals in Maryland, the panel of In Banc judges, Judge D. Brown, and the Maryland State Board of Education.

 I look forward to your response to this request.

 Sincerely

 Diana R. Williams

Enclosures