

IN THE MATTER OF
STATE OF MARYLAND
VS.
DIANA R. WILLIAMS
CIRCUIT COURT
BALTIMORE COUNTY
Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995

1.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' 8-27-24 ORDER BY JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR, DOCKETED ON 6-3-25, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 6TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 AND HER 11TH MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND/OR TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY, OTHERWISE, THE PRESIDING JUDGE, JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. IS CONTINUING TO ENGAGE IN LAW FARE AND, FOR THE 6TH TIME, HAS BREACHED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND THE DEFENDANT'S CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY INFRINGING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND DUE TO VIOLATING MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S 1-21-25 PLEADS TO OUR 45TH-47TH HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP AGAINST JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. 2.) 3RD MOTION TO ALLOW THE STATE OF MARYLAND ITS 15 DAYS TO RESPOND TO THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS AND THE 3 DAYS FOR MAILING AS

PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant's: 1.) Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order By Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Docketed On 6-3-25, Which Is The Defendant's 6th Motion For A Hearing On Her Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 And Her 11th Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And/Or To Continue The Stay On The Expungement Of Judge Glass' Order Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, The Presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Is Continuing To Engage In Law Fare And, For The 6th Time, Has Breached The

Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And The Defendant's Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Committing Fraud Upon The Court By Infringing Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Due To Violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleds To Our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion to Allow the State Of Maryland Its 15 Days To Respond To The Defendant's Motions And The 3 Days For Mailing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below.

CR59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Defendant, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Defendant, is that: for the first time: 1.) For the 6th time, the Defendant is motioning for a hearing as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 on her Motions, which include the Defendant's hearing on her instant Motion for a hearing on her Motion For Reconsideration of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Order docketed on 6-3-25, which, also, include the Defendant's 11th Motion to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Order docketed On 8-27-24 and/or to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety. 2.) For the 6th time, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engage in Law Fare and, thereby, has, for the 6th time, breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, And The Defendant's Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to committing Fraud Upon the Court by infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and as a result of violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Maryland Rule 2-311. 3.) For 4th time, the Defendant is informing Judge D. Robinson Jr. that, on 1-21-25, she sent by certified mail her "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, which, amongst other things, request that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S. Attorney for Maryland, to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's Official Complaint to the Commission mailed on 12-16-24 on Judicial Disabilities and stated, again, in her "Pleads", namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or deliberately breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. Moreover, our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes, have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, have access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges. 4.) For the 1st time, the Defendant is motioning a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Order issued on 8-27-24 and/or to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this Criminal Case is resolved in its entirety, with the legal and factual basis being that, without the Stay on the expungement, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist. 5.) For the 6th time, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare by violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to not only breaching

Maryland Rule 2-311 but, also, Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). 6.) For the 3rd time, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has engaged in Law fare in breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by not allowing the State of Maryland its 15 days to respond to the Defendant's Motions and the 3 days for mailing before issuing his Findings and Order as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

INTRODUCTION

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Defendant believes that our great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their ruling, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in 2nd Chronicles 19: 6-7, king Jehoshaphat, one of the kings of Judah, pronounces to judges why they should not be impartial and/or biased in their judgment, "And said to the Judges, Take heed what ye do: for ye judge not for man, but for the LORD, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of the LORD be upon you; take heed and do it; for there is no iniquity with the LORD our GOD, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts."

STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND

According to online research, Law fare includes an attempt to damage or delegitimize an opponent or to deter an individual's usage of his/her legal rights. The evidence of the material facts cited in the Defendant's 8 separate Motions from which Judge D. Robinson presided over, which are cited as Exhibits on the Defendant's website, www.diana-rw.com, and the evidence of the Findings and Orders of Judge D. Robinson, Jr., which are stamped on the first page of the Defendant's Motions substantiate the material facts that the instant Motions include the Defendant's 6th Motion to the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., for a hearing on her Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, which would include a hearing on her Motions For Reconsideration of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Order docketed on 6-3-25 and a hearing on the Defendant's 11th Motion to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Order docketed on 8-27-24 and/or to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety, otherwise, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., is continuing to engage in Law Fare because the evidence in the record substantiate allegations that, for the 6th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to committing Fraud upon the Court by infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and due to violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Maryland Rule 2-311.

As evidenced in the record, during the hearing on 6-9-24, the presiding Judge on, Judge Glass, granted the Defendant's Motion for Expungement of her record in the Defendant's criminal case, but informed the Defendant and the Attorney representing the State of Maryland that, if there is no stay on the execution of the Defendant's expungement, then the Defendant would no longer have a criminal case existing and, thus, could not have her Motion for repossession of her firearm and 15 ammunition to be considered, disclosed, and resolved by Judge S. Bailey, the Judge who presided over the

Defendant's proceedings on 5-20-21, nor would any other Judge preside over her case because the Defendant's case would no longer exist. For the 6th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr., has denied the Defendant's Motions, including her Motion for a hearing on the Motions, but continues to simply state at the top of the Defendant's Motions that "Based on this Court's consideration of this motion, the motion is denied because it does not present a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested", although the evidence in the Defendant's Motions, unequivocally, substantiate that the material fact that Judge D. Robinson provides no sufficient legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's relief requested, namely, that of granting the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition. The Defendant alleges that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to criminal cases, should be knowledgeable of the fact that, if he continues to deny the Defendant's repeated Motions for a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Orders for expungement of the Defendant's criminal case, then he would not have to grant the Defendant's 6th Motion for a hearing on her Motions in order to consider, disclose, and resolve whether the evidence substantiate that he, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has violated, for the 6th time, the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of infringing upon the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and her 15 ammunition because the evidence substantiate the following material facts and legal arguments, which are cited in the Defendant's last 10 separate Motions, from which Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the presiding Judge, are declared in the Defendant's other Motions, and/or are asserted in the "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, namely, that: 1.) The Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 by Judge S. Bailey and there is no statement in her Probation/Supervision Order that declares that the Defendant can't repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition upon successfully completing Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervisor Order. 2.) In all of the Defendant's Motions, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his Findings and Orders, the Defendant states the material facts and legal arguments in her Motions substantiate the allegations that there is no legal or factual basis for Judge S. Bailey, the original Finder of Fact, denying the Defendant's relief requested, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition because: a.) The evidence in the record of the testimony given by the Defendant during the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website) before Judge Glass, the presiding Judge, substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully completed the requirements mandated in the 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey dated 5-20-21 (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 2-28-25 and is Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website). b.) Also, the evidence of the testimony cited during the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass by the State of Maryland, the opposing party, namely, that the State of Maryland would not oppose the Defendant repossessing her firearm and 15 bullets since the Defendant had fulfilled the State of Maryland's requirement of waiting 3 years before being granted an expungement of her records substantiate that the Defendant has successfully completed the requirements mandated in the 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued by Judge S. Bailey on 5-20-21. c.) Moreover, the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified during the hearing before Judge Glass on 6-9-24 that, in the Probation/Supervision Order signed on 5-20-21 by Judge S. Bailey, the Order does not declare that the Defendant could not repossess

her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets after successfully completing the mandates in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order; then, the Attorney representing the State of Maryland, walked over to the Defendant's table to show the Defendant a copy of the Probation/Supervision Order, although she wasn't aware that the Defendant had own her copy of the same document until she saw the Defendant looking at the same Order. **d.)** Although the Defendant continues to forward a copy of all of her Motions to the State of Maryland as evidenced by the Certificate of Service in the Defendant's Motions, the Defendant is aware that the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified at the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass that the State of Maryland would not object to the Defendant having repossession of her firearm and ammunition. **3.)** The Defendant alleges that evidence before Judge D. Robinson, Jr., presiding Judge, and that was before all of the former presiding Judges substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the other presiding Judges erred in failing to determine if the evidence support the material facts that the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or intentionally violated by Judge D. Robinson and all of the former presiding Judges because these Officers of the Court repeatedly and/or deliberately failed to consider, disclose, and resolve if Judge S. Bailey, erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 due to there being no legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's her legally own firearm and 15 bullets; again, the evidence in the record substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the requirements in her Probation/Supervision Order and, therefore, Judge S. Bailey's denial breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242. **4.)** For the 6th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has intentionally denied the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to determine if the Defendant has a legal and factual basis for her relief requested, namely, to Stay Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of the expungement of the Defendants until it's determined if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24, especially in light of the material facts that all of the other presiding Judges have failed to consider, disclose, or resolve this issue and have denied the Defendant's her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to have a hearing on her Motions. Also, Judge D. Robinson is cognizant of the material fact that his 6th denial of the Defendant's Motions, which include the Defendant's 11th Motion for a Stay on the execution of her Defendant's expungement, would mean that Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist and, therefore, he, the presiding Judge, would not have to have a hearing on the Defendant's Motions to determine if he, the presiding Judge, and all of the other presiding Judges, which include Judge S. Bailey, the original Finder of Fact, erred in their Findings and Orders d because the evidence, unequivocally, substantiate that Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 due to infringing upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to adhere to her 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 because the Defendant had, since 5-23-23 successfully completed Judge S. Bailey Probation/Supervision Order would never have to be consider, disclosed, and resolved by Judge D. Robinson Jr. or any other presiding Judge. **5.)** For the 6th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by not only deliberately breaching Maryland Rule 2-311, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, but by, also, failing to uphold Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and voluntarily disqualify

and recuse himself as the presiding Judge and/or as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Defendant's case and all of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders should be deemed void as a matter of law and, thus, be of no legal force or effect because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would be biased and/or impartial since: a.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, and was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant's Motions from her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, and Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has access to the material facts and legal arguments in these Motions that are cited as "Exhibits" on the Defendant's website, of which Judge D. Robinson has access to. b.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr., the presiding Judge and who is the Judge-in-Charge of assigning himself to be the presiding Judge over the Defendant's 5 separate Motions, is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions to have invaded upon her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 2-18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a). 6.) The Supreme Court has held that, if a Judge wars against the Constitution in breaching the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution or if he/she acts without jurisdiction, then that Judge has engaged in treason to the Constitution, which suggests that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce. Since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no Judge has immunity to engage in such acts. 7.) Relative to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), the Supreme Court has ruled and reaffirmed that disqualification of a Judge is mandatory if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the Judge's impartiality (*Litky v. U.S.*, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). The Court has, too, affirmed that, should a Judge not disqualify himself/herself as required by law, then the Judge has given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which could potentially further disqualify the Judge. Further, the Court have determined that, if a Judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that Judge has acted in the Judge's personal capacity and not in the Judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. Wherefore, the U.S. Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a Judge, cannot be made valid by any Judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio." The Supreme Court has decided that, should a Judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the Judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the Judge is, again, disqualified by law. 8.) For the 6th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by issuing his Findings and Order before allowing the opposing party, the State of Maryland, 15 days to respond to the Defendant's Motions and the 3 days for mailing as ordered under Maryland Rule 2-311. 9.) In the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-3-25, the evidence substantiate the material facts that Judge Robinson Jr. issued his Findings and Order docketed on 5-20-25 and, thereby, violating Maryland Rule 2-311 due to issuing his Findings and Order before the

State of Maryland's 15-day time limit to respond to the Defendant's Motions and the 3 days for mailing had expired. 9.) Since the evidence in the record substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to criminal cases, has repeatedly and deliberately engaged in Law fare, although for the 4th time the Defendant has informed Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and has informed the other presiding Judges that, in her letter which was sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads, amongst other things, that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. Patel, or the U.S. Attorney for Maryland, Attorney Hayes, to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 "Pleads" namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the assertions that the Defendant is being redundantly and/or deliberately denied her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunition because Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to determine if the Defendant has a legal and factual basis for her relief requested, namely, to Stay Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of the expungement of the Defendants until it's determined if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24. 10.) Our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney Hayes, have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, has access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and all of the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges.

ARGUMENT

Judge D. Robinson Jr. should be cognizant of the material fact that, if he denies the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record, then there would be an automatic denial of the Defendant's Motion for a hearing on her other Motions, which include a Motion for Disqualification of Judge D. Robinson Jr. as the presiding Judge and the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the expungement of her records until the Defendant's Stay would implicate the Defendant's case no longer exists and, therefore, the issue of determining if Judge D. Robinson and the 4 other presiding Judges, which include the original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, have repeatedly breached the Defendant's in failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if Judge S. Bailey erred in failing to adhere to her own 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 and has cited no tangible evidence or no legal or factual basis in her Findings and Orders for denying the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition because the evidence in the record, indisputably, substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the conditions in Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order. Just as importantly, the evidence, undeniably, substantiates that, for the 6th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare by violating the

The Defendant pleads that her Motions be granted.

Defendants' 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to not only breaching Maryland Rule 2-311 and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, but, also, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), which mandates that Judge D. Robinson Jr. voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge and/or as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Defendant's case and all of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders be deemed void as a matter of law and, thus, be of no legal force or effect because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would be biased and/or impartial since: 1.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, and was appointed to his privileged position in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant's Motions from her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, and Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has access to the material facts and legal arguments in these Motions that are cited as "Exhibits" on the Defendant's website. 2.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr., the presiding Judge and who is the Judge-in-Charge of assigning himself to be the presiding Judge over the Defendant's 5 separate Motions is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions to have invaded upon her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 2-18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a)

Engage In Law Fare And, For The 6th Time, Has Breached The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And The Defendant's Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Committing Fraud Upon The Court By Infringing Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) And Due To Violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleads To Our Hon. 45th - 47th President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion to Allow the State Of Maryland Its 15 Days To Respond To The Defendant's Motions And The 3 Days For Mailing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Baltimore County State Attorney, 401 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland, 21204.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Cc: 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the newly FBI, Mr. K Patel, and U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes

Aaron Williams
131 Calver Hill Dr
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Attention: Circuit Court for Baltimore County
P.O. Box 6754
Jenison, Md. 21285-6754
Supervising Clerk: Ms. Fina

Mailed on 6-19-25

