

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

1.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR.'S

ORDER DOCKETED ON 11-6-25, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 12TH MOTION FOR A HEARING AS
PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE EVIDENCE

SUBSTANTIATE THAT: A.) AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF ASSIGNING
A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. HAS REPEATEDLY
AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTED LAW FARE DUE TO REPETITIOUSLY AND WILLINGLY VIOLATING THE
DEFENDENT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT
UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY INVADING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a)

AND COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND, THUS, DEEMING ALL OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON
JR.'S ORDERS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT BECAUSE HE FAILS,
FOR THE 12TH TIME, TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE
BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR
BIASED SINCE HE WAS APPOINTED TO HIS ELITE ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS IN 2016 BY LARRY
HOGAN AND IN 2023 BY WES MOORE, BOTH OF WHOM, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY AND
FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS TO HAVE
BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO

AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO VIOLATE FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (CRIMES AGAINST
HUMANITY), COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMINAL
ACTS, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S PLEADS TO OUR 45TH – 47TH HON.
PRESIDENT TRUMP. B.) JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. HAS COMMITTED LAW FARE DUE TO

REDUNTANTLY AND KNOWINGLY INFRINGING UPON THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT,
HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AS A
RESULT OF BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND
MARYLAND RULE 2-311 AND, THEN, ERRING BY FAILING CITE A SINGLE LEGAL OR FACTUAL BASIS
IN HIS FINDINGS AND ORDERS FOR THE DENIALS AND RE-EXPUGEMENT OF THE CASE. 2.) 12TH
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

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 Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Order Docketed On 11-6-25, which is The Defendant's 12th Motion For A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That: A.) As The Presiding Judge And As The Judge-In-Charge Of Assigning A Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motions, Judge D. Robinson Has Repeatedly And Deliberately Committed Law Fare Due To Repetitiously And Willingly Violating The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Invading Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming All Of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because He Fails, For The 12th Time, To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge Because There Is An Appearance That Judge D. Robinson Jr. Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since He Was Appointed To His Elite Administrative Positions In 2016 By Larry Hogan And In 2023 By Wes, Both Of Whom, Along With Martin O'Malley and Former Chief Judge Barbera, Are Being Alleged In The Defendant's Motions To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S Code, U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Criminal Acts, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's Pleads To Our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump. B.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has Committed Law Fare Due To Repeatedly And Deliberately Violating The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland Rule 2-311 And Then Erring In His Failure To Cite In His Findings And Order A Single Legal Or Factual Basis For The Denials And Re-Expungement Of The Case . 2.) 12th Motion To Stay The Execution Of The 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 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: 1.) For the 12th time, the Defendant is motioning for a hearing as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and at this time, a Motion For Reconsideration of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 11-6-25, which include the Defendant's 12th Motion for Disqualification of Judge D. Robinson Jr. because, for the 12th time in these instant Motions, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has engaged in Law fare by infringing upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Maryland Rule Maryland Rule

18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) 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 distinguished Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions 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. b.) There is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson Jr. would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions since Judge D. Robinson Jr. was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2016 by Larry Hogan, and was appointed to his distinguished Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's 9-22-25, 8-26-25, and 7-15-25 Motions and/or in other Motions to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. c.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-22-25 to have invaded upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) For the 12th time, the evidence of the fact stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 11-6-25 and/or in his 11 other Findings and orders substantiates that Judge D. Robinson asserts no factual or legal basis, for his denials of the Defendant's eleven Motions, all of whom are assigned as Exhibits numbers on the Defendants website. The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's approximate 10-page Motions docketed on 9-22-25, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his 11-6-25 Findings and Order, substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. for the 12th time, has deliberately engaged in Law fare by violating 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 due to failing to: a.) consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 9-22-25 Motions substantiate sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's being granted her “Reliefs” pleaded for in her 9-22 Motions, with the ultimate “Relief” being the Defendant having the presiding Judge to grant the Defendant's her right under 2nd Amendment, namely, that being able to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunition because the evidence substantiate the material facts that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant's has successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey, the presiding Judge over her criminal case. b.) consider, disclose, and resolve if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-22-25 support the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of the Criminal Division, has redundantly and intentionally violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to his refusal to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order if 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 her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were repeatedly and/or deliberately violated by present and all of the former presiding Judges as alleged in her 9-22-25, 8-26-

25, and in her 7-15-25 Motions and in other Motions. 3.) For the 12th time and since the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson Jr., has yet to assign a Judge to preside over the Defendant's Motions mailed on 6-13-25, which include the Defendants 11th Motion for Stay, the Defendant is motioning, for the 12th time, 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. 4.) For 9th 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 Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, or the U.S. Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes, to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities mailed on 12-16-24 and stated, again, in her "Pleads", namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the assertions 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 due to committing "Fraud Upon the Court" by infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and due to breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and 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, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11, "And the LORD spake into Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend", and Moses informed the judges in Israel of GOD'S law and employed the judges over the various tribes in Israel in Judges 6:16-17, saying, "And, I charged your judges at that time, saying. Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD'S: and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it."

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. In her letter that was sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 to 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 Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, or the U.S. Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. 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, www.dia.gov) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 "Pleads" namely, that of determining whether the evidence 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 15th amendments because the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and all of the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Lawfare 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, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 2-311, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, which prevent the Defendant from being granted her relief requested. Also, for the 12th time, since filing her 11th Motion for Disqualification against Judge D. Robinson, Jr., which was docketed on 10-13-25 and which include the Defendant's 11th plead on of the breaching of her 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, this material fact, (Exhibit 272 on the Defendant's website), Judge D. Robinson Jr., has denied the Defendant's Motions, including her Motion for a hearing on the Motions. The evidence of facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in Judge D. Robinson's Findings and Orders docketed on 11-6-25 (Exhibit 277 on the Defendant's website) and in his other Findings and Orders (Exhibits 192, 219, 220, 223, 224, 240, 252, 257, 261, and 267, 269, and 271, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and the evidence in the material facts and legal arguments proclaimed in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 10-13-25 (Exhibit 272 on the Defendant's website), from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to, and in her other Motions (Exhibits 193, 193, 220, 221, 223, 224, 238, 239, 250, 253, 256, 258, 260, 262, 268, and 270, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate that, for the 12th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has, deliberately invaded upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because: 1.) Judge D. Robinson Jr., has denied the Defendant's 10-13-25 Motions, including her Motion for a hearing on the Motions and justifies his denials of the Defendant's Motions by simply stating at the top of the Defendant's Motions "Denied because there is not a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested; and ordered that the case be re-expunged" and denies the Defendant's 11 other Motions by declaring the usual statement of "Denied because there is not a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested", again without citing a single sufficient legal or factual basis for his denials. 2.) The evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 11-6-25, where his only justification for denying the Defendant's Motions is the simply to declare "Denied because there is not a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested; and ordered that the case be re-expunged" and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's approximate 10-page Motions docketed on 9-22-25, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his 11-6-25 Findings and Order, indisputably, substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. continues to deliberately engage in Lawfare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right, her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to failing to: a.) consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's approximately 10-page Motions substantiate sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's being granted her "Relief Requested" as afforded her under the 2nd Amendment, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her right to

repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunition because the evidence substantiate the material facts that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant's has successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey. b.) consider, disclose, and resolve if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-22-25, 8-26-25, and on 7-15-25 and/or in other Motions support the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as he presiding Judges and as the Judge-in-Charge of the Criminal Division, has redundantly and intentionally violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to his refusal to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order if 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 repeatedly and/or deliberately violated by the previous presiding Judges. c.) consider, disclose, and resolve if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 9-22-25, 8-26-25, and on 7-15-25 and/or in other Motions that the Defendant has continuously pleaded for a hearing on her Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, which would include a hearing on the Defendant's 13th 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 as the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson is cognizant of the fact that if the Defendant's criminal case is expunged, then he would not have to respond to the Defendant's Motions because her criminal case would no longer exist. 3.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. has repetitiously and knowingly engaged in Law Fare as a result of not once allowing the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. 4.) As the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge Of Presiding over assigning a Judge to preside over the Defendant's Motions, Judge D. Robinson Jr, has willfully committed Law Fare due to repetitiously and knowingly violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by not only invading upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 but, also, Federal Statute 28 U.S. C., & 455 (a) and committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming all of his Orders void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge D. Robinson Jr., for the 12th time, fails to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson Jr. would be impartial and/or biased 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 distinguished Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-22-25, 8-26-25, and in other Motions 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, and Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has access the Defendant's website where these Motions are documented as “Exhibits”. b.) There is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson Jr. would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions since Judge D. Robinson Jr. was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2016 by Larry Hogan, and was appointed to his distinguished Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-22-25, 8-26-25, and 7-15-25 Motions and/or in other Motions to have committed Crimes against Humanity. c.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the Judge who is being alleged in

the Defendant's Motions to have invaded upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. 5.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings the Defendant's allegations in her Motions that the former presiding Judges have redundantly and/or intentionally violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to their refusing to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings if the evidence substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully been in compliance with all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year, 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21 and, therefore, the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets must be granted. 6.)

Judge D. Robinson has failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order any of the material facts in the Defendant's Motions (Exhibits 193, 193', 220, 221, 223, 224, 238, 239, 250, 253, 256, 258, 262, 268, 270, 272, and 280, respectively, on the Defendant's website), which include the evidence which support the material facts that the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 were breached due to Judge S. Bailey violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 because of Judge S. Bailey's refusal to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets, since the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions, starting with her Motions docketed on 7-10-23 (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant's website), in her 2nd separate Motions mailed on 11-14-25 which respond to Judge D. Robinson Jr 2nd Findings and Order docketed on 11-6-25, and in other Motions, substantiate that: a.) Judge S. Bailey has breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in her Findings and Orders docketed on 7-14-25 any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-28-25, which include the allegations that Judge S. Bailey has repeatedly erred in failing to adhere to own Probation/Supervision Order and which further substantiate there is no legal or factual basis for Judge S. Bailey's 7-14-25 not granting the Defendant's Motion to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition since the evidence substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully completed all of the mandates in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order. b.) Judge S. Bailey is being alleged to have engaged in Law fare, for the 4th time, in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by: i.) failing to grant the Defendant her right, as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, to a hearing on her 4th Motion to Stay the execution of Expungement in Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety. ii.) failing to grant the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate that Judge S. Bailey has, for the 4th time, erred in her Findings and Orders by failing to adhere to her own 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 because the evidence in the record and on the Defendant's website substantiate that, before filling her Motions in 2023, which included a Motion to


grant the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 bullets, the Defendant had completely and successfully complied to Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order. *iii.*) failing to grant the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate that Judge S. Bailey has, for the 4th time, erred in her Findings and Orders and justifies her denial of the Defendant's Motions by simply citing "Once Again, these motions are respectfully DENIED, thereby, not asserting one shred of evidence or material fact to substantiate her Order. *iv.*) erring in her Findings and Orders by failing give sufficient legal and factual basis for not adhering to her own 2-year, 4-page Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 because the material facts in the Defendant's instant Motion sand in her Motions mailed and/or docketed 7-30-25 4-28-25, 4-1-25, 7-11-24, and/or on 6-1-23, unequivocally, substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully complied with *all* of the requirements in Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order. *v.*) According to the Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 by Judge Bailey, the Defendant was ordered Probation before Judgment (Criminal Procedure Article & 6-220) for two years, with no supervision, to have no contact with the victim, Amy Penn, to surrender firearms, and could not own or possess a firearm during her probationary period. *7.)* After researching the background of Judge Glass, it was discovered that she was appointed to her superlative Administrative by Martin O'Malley. On 12-13-24, after researching the background of Judge S. Bailey, the Defendant discovered that she was, also, appointed to an elite position as a Circuit Court Judge for Baltimore County in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. On 12-14-24, after going on line to research the background of Judge Alexander, it was discovered that Judge Alexander was, too, appointed in 2010 by Martin O'Malley, and Judge Glass was appointed in 2014 by Martin O'Malley, who, along with Wes Moore and Larry Hogan, is being alleged in the Defendant's present civil litigation to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes. *8.)* The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's colossal Motions docketed since 7-10-24 Motions substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and *all* of the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge R. Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, had access to the Defendant's website because the Defendant cited her website address in *all* of these Motions to substantiate other material facts and evidence asserted in her Motions from other documents on the Defendant's website. Since Judge D. Robinson and each of the former presiding Judges have had the opportunity to read the Defendant's Motions and the Findings and Orders by the Judges in her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court in Baltimore City and to recognize that that the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore (herein Wes Moore), two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Martin O'Malley and Larry Hogan, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged by the Defendant to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to impinge upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 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 (*Liteky 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. The revised section of Federal Statute 28 U.S. Code & 455(a), which occurred in 1974 under Public Law 93-512, is made applicable to all justices and judges of the United States, and, therefore, under 28 U.S. Code § 455, any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the U.S. shall disqualify himself/herself in any proceeding in which his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Also, the revised section of Federal Statute 28 U.S. Code & 455(a) cites that, if it known by the judge to have an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding, then the judge must voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself/herself from the proceedings. 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 suggest 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. Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court has already established that the violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) constitutes disqualification of the judge and a judge who fails to disqualify himself/herself is committing "Fraud upon the Court" which 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 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.

CONCLUSION

The Defendant pleads that her Motions be granted.

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013


Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 14th day of November 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1.)

Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Order Docketed On 11-6-25, Which Is The Defendant's 12th Motion For A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That: A.) As The Presiding Judge And As The Judge-In-Charge Of Assigning A Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motions, Judge D. Robinson Has Repeatedly And Deliberately Committed Law Fare Due To Repetitiously And Willingly Violating The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Invading Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming All Of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because He Fails, For The 10th Time, To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge Because There Is An Appearance That Judge D. Robinson Jr. Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since He Was Appointed To His Elite Administrative Positions In 2016 By Larry Hogan And In 2023 By Wes, Both Of Whom, Along With Martin O'Malley and Former Chief Judge Barbera, Are Being Alleged In The Defendant's Motions To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Criminal Acts, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's Pleads To Our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump. B.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has Committed Law Fare Due To Repeatedly And Deliberately Violating The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland Rule 2-311 And Then Erring In His Failure To Cite In His Findings And Order A Single Legal Or Factual Basis For The Denials And Re-Expungement Of The Case. 2.) 12th Motion To Stay The Execution Of The 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

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: Our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ,

Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, and U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes

Anne Williams
131 Calver Hall Ct
Balto. Md. 21212

Circuit Court for Balto. County
County Courts Building
P.O. Box 6754
Towson, Md. 21285-6754
William Williams & Son, Inc. P.O. Box 6754



DUNDALK SPARROWS POINT
44 SHIPPING PL
DUNDALK, MD 21222-9998

www.usps.com

11/14/2025

09:46 AM

Product	Qty	Unit	Price
---------	-----	------	-------

First-Class Mail®	1		\$2.72
Large Envelope			
Towson, MD 21204			
Weight: 0 lb 4.10 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Mon 11/17/2025			

First-Class Mail®	1		\$2.72
Large Envelope			
Towson, MD 21285			
Weight: 0 lb 4.10 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Mon 11/17/2025			

Grand Total: \$5.44

Cash \$20.00
Change -\$14.56

TO REPORT AN ISSUE

Visit <https://email.usps.com>

All hazardous labels/markings on reused

boxes MUST be completely

removed/obliterated if they no longer

match the contents.

PREVIEW YOUR MAIL AND PACKAGES

Sign up for FREE at

<https://informedelivery.usps.com>

All sales final on stamps and postage.

Refunds for guaranteed services only.

Thank you for your business.

Customer Service

1-800-ASK-USPS

(1-800-275-8777)

Agents do not have any additional


information other than what is provided on

USPS.com.

Tell us about your experience.

Go to: <https://postalexperience.com/Pos>

or scan this code with your mobile device.



or call 1-800-410-7420.

UFN: 230405-0013

Receipt #: 840-52100100-1-5778082-2

Clerk: 24