

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 13TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN ORDER DETERMINE IF THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT: A.) FOR THE OR 13TH TIME, 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 REPETIOUSLY 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 13TH 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. B.) FOR THE 3RD TIME, SINCE PRESIDING OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY PRESIDED OVER BY JUDGE S. BAILEY, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. HAS COMMITTED LAW FARE 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 AS A RESULT OF REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY: I.) BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND MARYLAND RULE 2-311. II.) ERRING IN FAILING TO CONSIDER, DISCLOSE, AND RESOLVE IN HIS

11-6-25, 10-1-25, OR 8-25-25 FINDINGS AND ORDERS ANY OF THE MATERIAL FACTS OR LEGAL ARGUMENTS IN THE DEFENDANT'S CORRESPONDING 10-13-25, 9-8-25 OR 7-30-25 MOTIONS, WHICH, ALSO, INCLUDE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT THE ORIGINAL FINDER OF FACT, JUDGE S. BAILEY, REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT CIVIL UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) 7TH 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 IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY

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 13TH 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 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 13TH 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. B.) For The 3RD Time, Since Presiding Over The Defendant's Motions Which Were Previously Presided Over By Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has Committed Law Fare 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 As A Result Of Repeatedly And Deliberately: i.) Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland 2-311. ii.) Erring In Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In His 11-6-25, 10-1-25, Or 8-25-25 Findings And Orders ANY Of The Material Facts Or Legal Arguments In The Defendant's Corresponding 10-13-25, 9-8-25, Or 7-30-25 Motions, Which, Also, Include The Allegations That The Original Finder Of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, Repeatedly And Deliberately 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 Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) 7TH Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And/OR Continue The Stay On The

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 13th time, the Defendant is pleading for a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, which include the Defendant's instant Motion for Reconsideration of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 11-6-25 because the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 10-13-25 substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr., since the filing of her 10-13-25 Motions, has, for the 13th time, engaged in Law fare by infringing 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 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 positions by Larry Hogan, and by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged in the Defendant Motions docketed on 10-13-25, on 7-30-25, and/or in her 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 10-13-25 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 3rd time, 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, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's 10-13-25 Motions, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to, substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. deliberately engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under 18 U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions substantiate: a.) sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's being granted her "Relief Requested" as afforded her under Maryland Rule 2-311 and under the 2nd Amendment, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her right to have a hearing on her Motions in order to determine if the former

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.

STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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 unto 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."

INTRODUCTION

Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety.

Judge Glass' Order docketed on 8-27-24 and/or continue the Stay on the expungement in Judge Glass' expunged. 3.) For the 7th time, the Defendant is motioning to Stay the execution of expungement in and Order for denying the Defendant's Motions or for ordering that the Defendant's case be re-18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. c.) Judge D. Robinson cites no factual Or Legal Basis in his Findings Judge D. Robinson Jr, namely, that of violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule violating the same Federal and State laws as being alleged in all of the Defendant's Motions against Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 252 due to Defendant's Motions to have repeatedly and intentionally impeded upon the Defendant's 14th and/or deliberately violated by the previous presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, who, alleged in the Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were repeatedly docketed on 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and 7-30-25, if the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd in his 11-6-25, 10-1-25, or 8-25-25 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Defendant's Motions and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to his refusal to consider, disclose, and resolve Division, has intentionally violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of the Criminal with all of the requirements in the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey. b.) the evidence substantiate the material facts that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant's has successfully complied the Defendant her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions because the presiding Judge, namely, Judge S. Bailey, erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 7-14-25 in denying

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.diana.com). Hayes 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 possess her legally owned firearm and her 15th amendments because Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are 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, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, which prevent the Defendant from being granted her relief requested. After the original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, denied the Defendant's 5-30-23 Motions, which included a Motion to repossess her firearm and 15th bullets without citing a legal or factual basis as noted as substantiated in her 6-25-24 Findings and Order (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website), the Defendant has been basically motioning in all of her Motions filed since 7-10-24 that Defendant has included a Motion for a hearing on her Motions to determine if Judge S. Bailey erred in her 6-25-24 Findings and Order in failing to disclose, consider, and resolve the material facts and legal arguments first cited in the Defendant's 7-10-24 Motions (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant's website), namely, that the evidence in the record substantiate that the Defendant has her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets because as cited in these Motions and in the Defendant's 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and 7-30-25 Motions (Exhibits 272, 268, and 262, respectively, on the Defendant's website), Judge S. Bailey erred in her 6-25-24 Findings and Order because, 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 (Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website). The evidence of Judge S. Bailey's 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order dated 5-20-21 and the evidence of the material facts asserted and legal arguments in the Defendant's 7-30-25, 4-28-25, 3-28-25, 7-11-24 and 6-1-23 Motions substantiate before the original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey that, for the 4th time, she had erred in her Findings and Orders by failing give sufficient legal and factual basis for denying the Defendant's Motions and, further, not adhering to her own 2-year, 4-page Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21.

The Defendant declares that, for the 13th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr., has denied the Defendant's Motions, including her Motion for a hearing on the Motions but simply state at the top of the Defendant's Motions and without any legal or factual basis for his denials, other than the citing the phrase, "Denied because there is not a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested" but in his 11-6-25 Findings and Orders, Judge D. Robinson includes an additional Order and, again, without any factual or legal basis, namely, "and ordered that the case be re-expuned". The evidence of facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in Judge D. Robinson's 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 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.) For the 13th time, 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. 2.) For the 13th time, 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 has not only 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 impeding upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, also, by breaching 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 13th 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 10-13-25, 9-8-25, in her 7-30-25 Motions (Exhibits 272, 270, and 268, respectively, on the Defendant's website), and/or 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 to the Defendant's website where these Motions that are cited 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 positions by Larry Hogan, and by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and in her 7-30-25 Motions, and/or in other Motions to have committed "Crimes against Humanity". The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 12th separate Motions docketed since 7-10-24 Motions (Exhibits 188, 189-193, 219-220, 231-232, 233-234, 235, 250, 253, 256, 258, 260, 262, 268, and 270, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate that Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and all 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 be cognizant of the material facts that as evidenced in my most recent Motions in my present civil and criminal litigations and/or in other Motions on my website, there are allegations of violations of Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. § 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempting to and/or conspiring to defy Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. § 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other criminal acts against Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, and former Chief Judge Barbera as a result of knowingly and willingly: B.1.) allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades. B.2.) having ignored the alleged heinous crimes against the owners of the public schools, (the Mayor and Baltimore City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young and Brandon Schott, against all of the present members of the City Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter "City Council"), and against those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993 to repetitiously and/or intentionally expose our children to lead poisoning through lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint

hazard, thereby, infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to traduce Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other possible criminal acts. B3.) refusing to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials, who are being alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately intruding upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/ other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. B4.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Judges, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged 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. 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.

As evidenced by the material facts stated in the Defendant’s 10-13-25, 9-8-25 and 7-30-25 Motions, prior to Judge D. Robinson Jr. assigning himself to preside over these Motions the Defendant’s 7-30-25 Motions, the original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, was the presiding Judge over the Defendant’s criminal case and is the Judge whose 7-14-25 Findings and Order (Exhibit 259 on the Defendant’s website) the Defendant’s 7-30-25 Motions responds to. A evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the Findings and Orders of Judge D. Robinson docketed on 11-6-25, 10-1-25, and on 8-25-25 (Exhibits 277, 271 and 267, respectively, on the Defendant’s website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Defendant’s Motions docketed on 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and on 7-30-25 (Exhibits 272, 270, and 268, respectively, on the Defendant’s website), from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his Findings and Orders, although Judge D. Robinson Jr. recused the presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, from presiding over the Defendant’s Motions docketed 7-30-25, Judge D. Robinson Jr. fails to consider, disclose, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant’s 7-30-25 Motions, which are, also, declared in the Defendant’s 10-13-25 and 9-8-25 Motions. As evidenced in the Defendant’s 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and 7-30-25 Motions, amongst other pleadings, the Defendant motions the presiding Judge to determine if the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant’s Motions substantiate the allegations that her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were redundantly and intentionally invaded upon by Judge S. Bailey, because the evidence substantiate the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant’s Motions docketed on 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and/or 7-30-25, namely, that: 1.) The Defendant’s 7-30-25 Motions declares, amongst other pleadings, that, for the 4th time, Judge S. Bailey has failed to grant the Defendant’s right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland 2-311, knowing that without hearing on the Defendant’s Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass’ 6-13-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant’s record as pleaded in the Defendant’s Motions docketed on 7-30-25, the Defendant’s criminal case would no longer exist. 2.) As evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the Findings and Order of Judge D. Robinson docketed on 11-6-25, 10-1-25, and on 8-25-25 (Exhibits 277, 271, and

267, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and on 7-30-25 (Exhibits 2278, 272, and 268, respectively, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his Findings and Orders, the presiding Judge fails to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order whether Judge S. Bailey has, for the 4th time, breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a). Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Judge S. Bailey has committed Fraud upon the Court and all of her Orders are deemed void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge S. Bailey has failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding Judge since there is an appearance that S. Bailey, Judge would be impartial and/or biased because: a.) Judge S. Bailey was appointed to her privileged Administrative position in 2009 by the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, who, along with another former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, the present Governor of Maryland, Wes More, and former Chief Judge Barbera, is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25 and/or in her 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, and Judge S. Bailey have had access to the Defendant's website since the Defendant's Motions were docketed on 7-10-24. b.) Being appointed to her distinct position by Martin O'Malley, who is being asserted in these Motions to have committed Crimes against Humanity, it appears that Judge S. Bailey would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the criminal proceeding. c.) Judge S. Bailey is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's 9-8-25 and 7-30-25 Motions and in these instant Motions to have repeatedly and deliberately 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. 3.) As evidenced by the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the evidence of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Orders docketed on 11-6-25, 10-1-25 and on 8-25-25 (Exhibits 277, 271, and 267, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and 7-30-25, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order respond to, Judge D. Robinson has, for the 3rd time, erred in his Findings and Order in failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in his 10-the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and 7-30-25 Motions which substantiate that Judge S. Bailey has repeatedly and deliberately breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, namely, that: a.) For the 4th time as cited in the Defendant's 7-30-25 Motions, Judge S. Bailey failed to consider, disclose, and resolve if the evidence substantiate 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 Honorable 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 denial in her

Order of 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 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 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. iv.) erring in her Findings and Orders by failing to 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 8-6-220) 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. vi.) As an eyewitness during hearing on 5-20-21 germane to her criminal proceedings, Judge S. Bailey was the presiding Judge and the evidence in the record and the Defendant's testimony substantiate that the Complainant, the only witness for the opposing party, the State of Maryland, did not appear. Although the Complainant was a "no show", neither the Attorney representing the State of Maryland or the Defendant's Public Defender motioned to Judge S. Bailey for a dismissal of the charges against the Defendant. vii.) As an eyewitness, the Defendant is proclaiming that, at the beginning of the hearing held on 5-20-21, the Defendant's Public Defender motioned for "Probation before Judgment", which is a disposition where Judge S. Bailey deferred judgment, placed the Defendant on probation, and, thus, the Defendant did not plead guilty to a lesser charge or receiving a lighter sentence in exchange for avoiding trial. viii.) The Defendant is declaring that, after she was granted the Motion for a "Probation before Judgment" by Judge S. Bailey, a few minutes later, the Defendant was given a document, which was the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order signed by Judge S. Bailey (Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website), and was told that it was necessary for the Defendant to read and sign the Probation/Supervision Order. ix.) Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21, 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order, which is "Exhibit 1" that accompanies the

Defendant's 7-10-24 Motions (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant's website), and other Motions, is cited as

Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website.

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.C. 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.C. 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.C. 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 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. 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.

The Defendant is alleging that the 2 Exhibits accompanying her Motions to Judge S. Bailey docketed on 7-11-24 include a copies of the Defendant's emailed Official Complaint to her Public Defender at the time on 11-7-20 and her 11-10-20 (Exhibits 85 and 86 on the Defendant's website), and her Official Complaint and Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge S. Bailey, the present presiding judge, Judge D. Robinson, and against all of the other former presiding judges sent by certified mail to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump and posted on the Defendant's website as Exhibits. Thus, Judge S. Bailey, the present presiding judge, Judge D. Robinson, and all of the other former presiding judges had access to the Defendant's website address stated in the Defendant's 7-10-24 and other Motions. In her Official Complaints and/or Addendums against the State of Maryland, t the Baltimore County Police Department, and against other agencies, the Defendant allege that, amongst other things, the


Defendant was the victim of a brutal verbal assault by the Complainant and fear of a physical assault from her do and was in fear of her life due to the Complainant's dog, who was not on a leash, consistently coming toward the Defendant her and the Complainant refusing to call her dog to get away from the Defendant. In the Defendant's Official Complaints, she alleges that the State of Maryland, the Police Department, and/or other agencies committed fraud, deceit, and tampered with evidence, which include someone moving the Defendant's gun from her gun case, sending the gun case back to the Defendant's residence by a police officer, and having someone place some of the Defendants bullets on the ground after the Defendant was taken to the Police station. The evidence of material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-28-25, from which Judge S. Bailey responds to in her Findings and Order docketed on 7-10-24 and on 7-14-25 Exhibits 188 and 260, respectively, on the Defendant's Website) in her other Motions where Judge D. Dorsey is the presiding Judge, and/or as cited in the Defendant's 1-21-25 "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump include the following: 1.) During the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass, the presiding Judge, where the Defendant was, again, the Defendant, the evidence was presented to substantiate that, by 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully complied to all of requirements of Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order was confirmed during the 6-9-24 hearing before the presiding Judge, Judge Glass. 2.) The transcript of the 6-9-24 hearing will substantiate that the State of Maryland, the opposing party, testified 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. 19.) At the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's Motions, after granting the Defendant's Motion to have her record expunged, Judge Glass informed the Defendant that she has to Order a Stay on the granting of the Defendant's expungement in order to allow the Motion for the granting of the Defendant's legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition to be resolved before Judge S. Bailey, otherwise, without the Stay on her Order for expungement of the Defendant's record, the Defendant would not be able to have a hearing on Motion for repossessing her firearm and 15 ammunition or file any other Motion because an expungement implies that the case no longer exists. Also, during the 6-9-24 hearing, Judge Glass stated that she would put a Stay on her Order so that the issue of repossessing the Defendant's firearm and 15 ammunition could be brought before Judge S. Bailey. 20.) As evidenced by the Defendant's Motions which were docketed on 7-10-24 (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads her 1st Motion to Stay the 30-day Stay on Judge Glass' 6-13-24 Order prior to the expiration of Judge Glass' 30 day Stay on the Defendant's expungement of her record. 21.) 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. 22.) The Defendant's is alleging that, in her Motions docketed on 10-13-25, 9-8-25, 7-30-25 and in Motions docketed on 7-10-24, she gives her website address in her Motions to substantiate material facts and legal arguments that are cited in these documents, which are on her website and, thereby, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge S. Bailey, and the all of other former presiding Judges have had access, not only to these documents but, also, access to the Defendant's Motions relating to the Defendant's civil litigation in Baltimore City, where the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore (herein Wes

Moore), the other former Governor of Maryland, 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 crimes.

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 of 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 13th 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, 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 13th 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. B.) For The 3rd Time, Since Presiding Over The Defendant's Motions Which Were Previously Presided Over By Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has Committed Law Fare 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 As A Result Of Repeatedly And Deliberately: 1.) Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland 2-311. ii.) Erring In Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In His 11-6-25, 10-1-25, Or 8-25-25 Findings And Orders Any Of The

Material Facts Or Legal Arguments In The Defendant's Corresponding 10-13-25, 9-8-25, Or 7-30-25
Motions, Which, Also, Include The Allegations That The Original Finder Of Fact, Judge S. Bailey,
Repeatedly And Deliberately 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 Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. &
455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) 7th Motion To Stay The Execution Of
Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And/Or Continue The Stay On The
Expungement In 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 P. Bondi, the
Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, and U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney M. Hayes