To: Honorable Attorney General, Eric Holder

From: Diana R. Williams

Re: Request to Support my Petition to the Supreme Court of the United States

Date: 12-1-14

As substantiated in the letter from the clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States (Exhibit 1), my petition for a writ of certiorari (“Writ”) which I forwarded to your office on 11-14-14 was filed on November 14, 2014 and placed on the docket November 19, 2014 as No. 14-7166. Some of the evidence accompanying my Writ are included in the exhibits that support my complaint to your office, the addendums to my complaint, and corrections dated 7-14-14, 7-22-14, 8-5-14, 9-23-14, 9-24-14, 11-14-14, and a second letter, also, dated 11-14-14. I’m absolutely confident that, in my “Request for Reconsideration” and in my “Corrections and addendum to Request for Reconsideration” ( both dated 11-14-14), I enclosed a copy of my Writ to the Supreme Court and copies of the following Appendices that accompanied my Writ, namely, Appendices A, D, E, H, and P. Also, in my complaint letter dated 7-14-14, I sent you a copy of Appendix F. But, to make sure that you have copies of all the evidence to support the following relevant and material facts cited in my Writ to the Supreme Court and below, I’m enclosing copies of Appendices B, C, G, I, J, K, L, M, and U.

My complaint, addendums, and corrections request that your office assign a FBI investigative team to determine if all the evidence submitted to your office support the fact that the Court of Appeals of Maryland (“Court of Appeals”), the panel of In Banc judges from the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, Judge D. Brown from the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, the Maryland State Board of Education (“MSBE”), the Board of Education of Baltimore County (“School Board”), and the other Officers of the Court named in my complaint, addendums, and corrections willfully and intentionally committed perjury, fraud, deceit, conspiracy, nonfeasance, misfeasance, and/or malfeasance and, thus, violated my 14th Amendment right and cause other legal injures as a result of their willfully and deliberately failing to consider, address, disclose, and resolve the issue of my termination violating Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement and willfully and knowingly omitting relevant and material facts that prove, unequivocally, that my dismissal infringed upon these specific articles and sections of the contractual agreement. Unless it has been determined that my termination infringed upon Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 as I repeatedly alleged in both of my Administrative proceedings and on all of the appeals, it is impossible for your office to decide if these Officers of the Court failed to uphold their responsibility willfully, deliberately, and with the intention to injure my interest, including violating my 14th Amendment right. Therefore, I’m making a second request that your office will join me in petitioning the Supreme Court of the United States to decide if my dismissal breached Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement since the Civil Rights Division of the DOJ needs to know if my termination breached these specific articles and sections of the contractual agreement in order to decide if the evidence support the fact that these Officers of the Court were negligent willfully, intentionally, and with the knowledge that my interest would be injured, especially violation of my 14th Amendment right, since I’ve gone before at least 14 Officers of the Court with the request that they determine if my dismissal violated these specific articles and sections of the contractual agreement and not a single one of them who had jurisdiction to do so upheld their responsibility to determine if my dismissal breached these specific articles and sections of the negotiated contract, and since I’m not convinced that my petition to the Supreme Court will be granted although this Court has jurisdiction.

Even if your office decide not to petition the Supreme Court to hear my appeal, the relevant and materials facts cited below and the supporting exhibits that accompany my complaint, addendums, and corrections substantiate that, the Court of Appeals, the panel of In Banc judges, Judge D. Brown, the MSBE, and the School Board willingly and deliberately obstructed justice by willfully and intentionally committing perjury, fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, misfeasance, and/or malfeasance relative to my dismissal and breaching A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct, thereby, willfully and knowingly cause me to continue to be deprived of my livelihood, cause my 14th Amendment right to continue to be violated, as well as cause me to continue to endure other legal injuries. The evidence support the allegations that the Court of Appeals, the panel of In Banc judges, Judge D. Brown, the MSBE, and the School Board **all “coincidently”, willfully, and intentionally failed to disclose as evidenced in the Orders and/or Memorandum and Orders and/or Opinions the same relevant and material facts asserted below:**

1. I raised the issue of my dismissal breaching Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement called the Master Agreement as evidenced in my Writ to the Court of Appeals, in my Motion for Reconsideration to the In Banc panel of judges, in my written oral argument that was read before the panel of judges, in my Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, in my Motions for Reconsideration and a New Trial before Judge D. Brown, in my written oral argument that was read before Judge D. Brown, and in my 27-page defensive testimony that was in the record before the School Board.
2. These Officers of the Court failed to even mention that I raised the issue of my termination violating these specific articles and sections of the contractual agreement and, thus, was negligent in their responsibility to enforce a bargained agreement by considering, addressing, disclosing, and resolving the issue of whether my dismissal breached the negotiated contract.
3. My recommended termination and ultimate dismissal was due to my not adhering to just one of the **new non-instructional mandates** which I did not know how to do, requested assistance from my Department Chair but did not receive any help. Also, t**he new mandates (new instructional and non-instructional mandates**  were being implemented for the first time at Golden Ring Middle School (“GRMS “)for the 2010-2011 school year, and Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 of the negotiated contract gives specific protocols that must be followed before implementing any new mandates, new policies, or new procedures in a Baltimore County School; Article IV, Section 4.2 of the Master Agreement states that the “**Faculty Council shall also serve as the vehicle by which proposed changes in existing policies and practices, and new policies and practices, for each school may be considered and be subject for discussion at any Faculty-Council-principal meeting.”** (Exhibit 1 which is attached to my Motion for Reconsideration to the panel of In Banc judges).
4. The implementation of the **new** **non-instructional responsibilities**, also, breached the Master Agreement because such **new non-instructional mandates** had not gone through the protocol as cited in Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 of the Master Agreement before implementation; adhering to the **new non-instructional** responsibilities, also, infringed upon Article X, Section 10.14 of the Master Agreement (Exhibit 4 attached to my Motion for Reconsideration to the panel of In Banc judges) which states that **“The Board shall provide instructional assistants and clerical personnel for the purpose of relieving teachers of such duties as duplicating instructional materials, entering and tabulating data, collecting money and materials from students, and supervising students in non-instructional activities.**
5. I wrote a hand-written letter to one of the Faculty Council members at GRMS dated 11-16-10

(Exhibit 2 which is attached to my Motion for Reconsideration to the panel of In Banc judges)

that inquired as to whether the principal had brought the new mandates to the Faculty

Council for discussion prior to implementation**.**

**6.**  Thee-mail response dated 11-18-10 from this Faculty Council member (Exhibit 3 attached my

Motion for Reconsideration to the panel of In Banc judges) declares that the principal never

met with the Faculty Council to discuss the new mandates before their implementation.

1. I provided the evidence to support my assertion that my employer, the School Board, and others wanted to get rid of me by any means necessary because I was a Whistleblower who continually exposed lead in the drinking water in one of Baltimore County Public Schools, consistently took a stance on violations in the contract, and who continuously revealed through my multiple grievance complaints precisely how the unexpected implementation of the new mandates violated Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the contractual agreement and, thus, how my termination for not adhering to all of the sudden new implementation infringed upon the bargained agreement. Consequently, in my substantiated defensive testimony and in my appeals, I allege that, because I was a Whistleblower who appeared to be a thorn in their side, my employer, the School Board, did not appear to care that my recommended dismissal or ultimate termination infringed upon these specific articles and sections of the Master Agreement.

The relevant and materials facts that continue to be cited below and the supporting exhibits that accompany my complaint, addendums, and corrections substantiate that, the Court of Appeals, the panel of In Banc judges, and Judge D. Brown willingly and deliberately obstructed justice by willfully and intentionally committing perjury, fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, misfeasance, and/or malfeasance germane to my dismissal and breaching A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct and, thereby, willfully and knowingly cause me to continue to be deprived of my livelihood, cause my 14th Amendment right to continue to be violated, as well as cause me to continue to endure other legal injuries due **to their “coincidentally”, willfully, and intentionally failing to disclose in their Orders and/or Memorandum and Orders the same relevant and material facts below:**

1. The Opinion of the MSBE support the assertion that the School Board willfully and knowingly committed perjury, deceit, fraud, and, thus, breached Rules 3.3(a) (1) through 3.3(a) (4), 8.4(a) through 8.4(d), and 8.4(f) of the Maryland Lawyers’ Rules of Professional Conduct during the hearing before Judge Brown by falsely affirming that the MSBE considered, addressed, disclosed, and resolved the issue of the Petitioner’s termination infringing upon Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the Master Agreement.
2. The Court of Appeals, the panel of In Banc judges, and Judge D. Brown failed to even mention in their Orders and/or Memorandum and Orders that I raised the issue of the substantiated allegations of these obstructions of justice by the School Board in my Motions for Reconsideration to Judge D. Brown, in my Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review, in my written oral argument that was read before the panel of In Banc judges, in my Motion for Reconsideration before the panel of In Banc judges, and in my Writ to the Court of Appeals.
3. No corrective actions as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct was taken against the School Board for willfully and intentionally causing Judge D. Brown to err egregiously as result of the School Board’s willful and deliberate act of committing such obstructions of justice as substantiated by the Order of the Court of Appeals and/or the Memorandums and Orders of the panel In Banc judges and/or the Order of Judge D. Brown.

The relevant and materials facts that continue to be cited below and the supporting exhibits that accompany my complaint, addendums, and corrections substantiate that, the Court of Appeals and the panel of In Banc judges willingly and deliberately obstructed justice by willfully and intentionally committing perjury, fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, misfeasance, and/or malfeasance germane to my dismissal and breached A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct, thereby, willfully and knowingly cause me to continue to be deprived of my livelihood, cause my 14th Amendment right to continue to be violated, as well as cause me to continue to endure other legal injuries due **to their “coincidently”, willfully, and intentionally failing to disclose in their Orders and/or Memorandum and Orders the same relevant and material facts below:**

1. No corrective action was taken against Judge D. Brown for failing to take any corrective measures as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct was taken against Judge D. Brown for willfully and deliberately failing to take corrective actions as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), and 2.15(c) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct against the School Board as a result of their willfully and intentionally committing perjury, deceit, fraud, and, thus, breaching Rules 3.3(a) (1) through 3.3(a) (4), 8.4(a) through 8.4(d), and 8.4(f) of the Maryland Lawyers’ Rules of Professional Conduct during the hearing before Judge Brown by falsely affirming that the MSBE considered, addressed, disclosed, and resolved the issue of my termination infringing upon Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the Master Agreement.
2. No corrective action was taken against Judge D. Brown as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct as a result of her willfully and deliberately failing to correct her egregious error of basing her decision to affirm my termination on the obstructions of justice by the School Board, even after being referenced in my Motions for Reconsideration and a New Trial to the evidence of the Opinion of the MSBE to substantiate the allegations of perjury, fraud, and deceit by the School Board; thus, Judge D. Brown breached A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct by willfully and knowingly refusing to correct her egregious error as substantiated by her Order dated 11-13-13 and, therefore, causing me to continue to be deprived of my livelihood and a violation of my 14th Amendment right as well as causing a continuation of other legal injuries ;.
3. No corrective measures as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct was taken against Judge D. Brown due to the substantiated allegations of her willfully and intentionally committing fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, misfeasance, malfeasance and, thus, breaching A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct, thus, willfully and knowingly causing me to continue to be deprived of my livelihood and, thereby, causing a violation of my 14th Amendment right and causing a continuation of other legal injuries due to her willful and intentional failure to initiate any corrective measures as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct against the School Board because the evidence supports the allegations of the School Board’s willful and intentional crimes against justice.

The relevant and materials facts that continue to be cited below and the supporting exhibits that accompany my complaint, addendums, and corrections substantiate that, the Court of Appeals willingly and deliberately obstructed justice by willfully and intentionally committing fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, misfeasance, and/or malfeasance relative to my termination and breaching A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct and, thereby, willfully and knowingly cause me to continue to be deprived of my livelihood, cause my 14th Amendment right to continue to be violated, as well as cause me to continue to endure other legal injuries due **to their willfully and intentionally failing to disclose in their Order the relevant and material facts below:**

1. No corrective actions as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct was taken against the panel of judges due to the substantiated allegations of their willfully and intentionally committing fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, and misfeasance, malfeasance and, thus, violating A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct as a result of: **a.** failing to even mention in their Memorandum and Orders that the I 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. **b.** failing to disclose all of the **substantiated, relevant, and material facts** which prevent their statements of fact from being misleading by detailing precisely how the sudden implementation of the new mandates breached Article IV, Section 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement and, thus, how my termination for not adhering to all of the unexpected new implementation infringed upon the contract**. c.** failing to disclose that the evidence of the Opinion of the MSBE supports the allegation that the Respondent willfully and intentionally committed perjury, fraud, and deceit and thereby, infringed upon Rules 3.3(a) (1) through 3.3(a) (4), 8.4(a) through 8.4(d), and 8.4(f) of the Maryland Lawyers’ Rules of Professional Conduct by falsely affirming that the MSBE, the ALJ, the School Board, and the Hearing Examiner considered, addressed, disclosed, and resolved the issue of my dismissal breaching Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement**. d.** and, failing to uphold their responsibility to enforce a bargained agreement which caused legal injures to me, including deprivation of my livelihood and, thus, violation of my 14th Amendment right.
2. No corrective measures was taken against the panel of In Banc judges as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct due to the substantiated allegations of their willfully and deliberately committing perjury, fraud, and deceit nonfeasance, misfeasance, malfeasance and, thus, violating A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct, thus, willfully and knowingly causing me to continue to be deprived of my livelihood and, thereby, causing continued violation of my 14th Amendment right and causing a continuation of other legal injuries as a result of the panel of judges lying on page 6 in their Memorandum and Order dated 4-23-14 in declaring that I did not cite a clause in the contract to substantiate that there was a breach in the bargained agreement, as well as for willfully and deliberately failing to correct their egregious error even after being referenced in my Motion for Reconsideration to the indisputable evidence of my Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review which proves the obstructions of justice.
3. No corrective actions as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct was taken against the panel of judges due to the substantiated allegations of their willfully and intentionally committing fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, and misfeasance, malfeasance and, thus, violating A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct as a result of their failure to take corrective actions against Judge D. Brown for failing to take corrective actions as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct against the School Board as a result of their willfully and intentionally committing perjury, deceit, fraud, and, thus, breaching Rules 3.3(a) (1) through 3.3(a) (4), 8.4(a) through 8.4(d), and 8.4(f) of the Maryland Lawyers’ Rules of Professional Conduct during the hearing before Judge Brown by falsely affirming that the MSBE considered, addressed, disclosed, and resolved the issue of my termination infringing upon Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the Master Agreement.
4. No corrective actions as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct was taken against the panel of judges due to the substantiated allegations of their willfully and intentionally committing fraud, deceit, nonfeasance, and misfeasance, malfeasance and, thus, violating A-104, C-101, C-102, Rules 1.1, 1.2a, 1.2b, and 2.2 of Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct as a result of their failure to take corrective actions as outlined in 2.15(a), 2.15(b), 2.15(c), and 2.15(d) of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct against the School Board because the evidence supports the allegations that the School Board willfully and intentionally committed perjury, deceit, fraud, and, thus, breaching Rules 3.3(a) (1) through 3.3(a) (4), 8.4(a) through 8.4(d), and 8.4(f) of the Maryland Lawyers’ Rules of Professional Conduct during the hearing before Judge Brown by falsely affirming that the MSBE considered, addressed, disclosed, and resolved the issue of my termination infringing upon Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the Master Agreement.

Courts are mandated to enforce bargained agreements, but the Officers of the Court that I appeared before have totally disregarded their responsibility. Furthermore, it’s difficult to believe and conceive that the Court of Appeals, the panel of In Banc judges, Judge D. Brown, and the MSBE would all “coincidentally” leave out the same substantiated, relevant, and material facts in their Orders and/or Memorandum and Orders and/or Opinion. It’s, too, unreasonable to believe and conceive that the Court of Appeals, the panel of In Banc judges, and Judge D. Brown would all independently and coincidentally failed to disclose the same substantiated, relevant, and material facts; still too, it is highly unlikely that the Court of Appeals and the panel of In Banc judges just independently and coincidentally omit the same substantiated, relevant, and material facts. Thus, it appears that conspiracy is a key element in these crimes against justice that I’ve been forced to endure. My prayer is that the highest Court in the United States will do that which is righteous and according to the law and the Department of Justice will write a petition which will urge the Supreme Court to determine if my dismissal breached Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement so that the DOJ can determine if such negligence by these Officers of the Court conspired willfully, deliberately, and with the intent to injure my interest, including breaching of my 14th Amendment right and other legal injures relevant to the allegation of their committing perjury, fraud, deceit, conspiracy, nonfeasance, misfeasance, and/or malfeasance as a result of their willfully and deliberately failing to consider, address, disclose, and resolve the issue of my termination violating Article IV, Sections 4.1 through 4.3.1 and Article X, Section 10.14 of the bargained agreement and willfully and knowingly failing to disclose relevant and material facts that prove, unequivocally, that my dismissal infringed upon these specific articles and sections of the contractual agreement.

I appreciate your responding to my request immediately as I’m still suffering tremendously emotionally, financially, inhumanely, and have had my house foreclosed on. Also, I will be emailing and/or faxing our President of the United States, the Honorable President Barack Obama, the Honorable members in Congress, the media, and the public to assist in petitioning the Supreme Court of the United States of America to grant my petition.

Enclosures Sincerely,