

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 Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner is that: 1.) For the 1<sup>st</sup> time, the Petitioner has filed a Motion for Default Judgment against the Defendant because the evidence overwhelmingly substantiate the material facts that the Defendant, since filing his Motion on 2-4-20, has remained acquiescence in relation to responding to the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, as well as having remained acquiescence germane to responding to any of the Petitioner's colossal Motions filed since her 2-13-20 Motions. A copy of the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions was mailed to the Defendant on 11-1-23, but, as of the date of the filing of these instant Motions, the Defendant has not responded to the Petitioner's most recent Motions. Along with the evidence of the Defendant having remained acquiescence since filing his Motion on 2-4-20 and has failed to file a single Motion which would dispute any material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions filed since 2-13-20 substantiate that the Petitioner's allegations that the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23 and in all of her other Motions filed since 2-13-20 are indisputable. 2.) For the first time, the Petitioner is asserting that the evidence substantiate the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court: a.) has not once ORDERED

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> Motions For Default Judgment And A Hearing On The Motion As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

**MARYLAND RULE 2-311**

**1<sup>ST</sup> MOTIONS FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT AND A HEARING ON THE MOTION AS PERMITTED UNDER**

\*\*\*\*\*

IN THE MATTER  
 THE PETITION OF  
 DIANA R. WILLIAMS  
 CIRCUIT COURT  
 FOR  
 BALTIMORE CITY  
 Case No. 24-C-17-004535  
 RECEIVED  
 2024 OCT 15 PM 12: 23  
 CIVIL DIVISION

the Defendant to respond to the any of the Petitioner's numerous Motions filed in the Circuit Court since the Petitioner filed her 2-13-20 Motions. b.) has not ORDERED the Defendant to respond to the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions. c.) has not ORDERED the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schrieber II to respond to the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions, nor has Judge Fletcher assigned another presiding Judge to respond to the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions, and the heading in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions is entitled "1.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. 2.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE 10-20-23 JUDGMENT OF JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II DUE TO HIS VIOLATIONS OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF HIS: A) VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 IN FAILING TO DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS A PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF HIM BEING IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED BECAUSE OF HIS APPOINTMENT BY THE FORMER GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, LARRY HOGAN, WHO IS, ALSO, BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE . B.) VIOLATING ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPEATEDLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE JOHN GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, REPEATEDLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPEATEDLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND/OR INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. E.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY INTENTIONALLY INFRINGED UPON BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL DUE TO HIS REPEATED AND DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ASSIGN A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY WES MOORE, LARRY HOGAN,



proper.

for good cause shown may defer entry of the order of dismissal for the period and on the terms it deems

“Deferal of Dismissal”. On motion filed at any time before 30 days after service of the notice, the court

after the expiration of 30 days unless a motion is filed under section (e) of this Rule which is entitled

Section (d) of Maryland Rule 2-507 is entitled “Notification of Contemplated Dismissal” and is entered

dispositive of a claim or defense without a hearing if one was requested as provided in this section.”

determine in each case whether a hearing will be held, but the court may not render a decision that is

state that a hearing is requested. Except when a rule expressly provides for a hearing, the court shall

motion or response under the heading “Request for Hearing. The title of the motion or response shall

other than a motion filed pursuant to Rule 2-532, 2-533, or 2-534, shall request the hearing in the

Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) Hearing--Other Motions states that “A party desiring a hearing on a motion,

the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it.”

the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD’S: and,

brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear

time, saying. Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his

judges over the various tribes in Israel in Judges 6:16-17, saying, “And, I charged your judges at that

speaketh unto his friend”, and Moses informed the judges in Israel of GOD’S law and employed the

ruling, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11, “And the LORD spake into Moses face to face as a man

the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their

great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Defendant believes that our

**INTRODUCTION**

Petitioner is motioning for a Hearing on these Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

COURT’S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER’S MOTIONS VERBATIM”. 2.) For the 1<sup>st</sup> time, the

IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ORDER THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT

JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE 3-21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 8.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-

JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF

2-311. 6.) 7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF

455(A). 5.) 11<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE

DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C &

BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND/OR BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND

M. SCHREIBER II, JUDGE J. GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN

GENOCIDE IN THE PETITIONER’S 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 4.) 9<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE

ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 –

ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE

MARTIN O’MALLEY, CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, OR BY ANY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO ARE BEING

**STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS**

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying for maintenance of her website, *www.dianarwilliams.com*, so that the Petitioner can continue to post Motions, Findings and Orders from the presiding Judges, and other relevant Exhibits that are and/or will be included during Discovery in the Petitioner present civil litigation. Although on a fixed income, the Petitioner is now able to make her own payments, but she is unable to afford, at this time, making copies of all of the pages of all of the Exhibits that will be included in the record.

As evidenced in the record of this proceeding, for the first time, the Petitioner is filing a Motion for Default Judgment against the Defendant because, since filing his Motion on 2-4-20 (Exhibit 76 on the Petitioner's website), the Defendant has not filed a single Motion, disputing any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 1-1-23 (Exhibits 155 and 156, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), nor has the Defendant filed a single Motion disputing any of the material facts and legal arguments in the other voluminous Motions filed in the Court from the Petitioner. The Defendant has remained acquiescent in relation to responding in a Motion to any of material facts or legal arguments in the Petitioner's colossal Motions filed since 2-13-20. Further, the evidence in the record and on the Petitioner's website substantiates that the Petitioner has filed a Certificate of Service to the Court, which verifies that the Petitioner mailed a copy of each of her Motions to the Defendant. The evidence in the record and the evidence of the Defendant's remaining acquiescence in regard to refuting in a Motion any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 1-1-23 or any of the Petitioner's Motions filed since 2-13-23 substantiate the allegation that the material facts and legal arguments undisputable.

As evidenced in the record, although the Defendant did not respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions (Exhibits 147 and 148, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), Judge M. Schreiber II, the presiding Judge, still denied the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions in his Findings and Order entered on 10-20-23 on the Court's website (Exhibit 154 on the Petitioner's website). As evidenced by the record, the Petitioner responded to the Findings and Order of Judge Schreiber II in her Motions filed on 11-1-23. The evidence substantiate the material fact that, as of the filing of these instant Motions, Judge M. Schreiber II, has yet to respond to the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions.

The evidence substantiates the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, has not once ORDERED the Defendant to respond to the any of the Petitioner's numerous Motions filed in the Circuit Court since 2-13-20, which includes responding to the Petitioner's most recent Motions dated 1-1-23. Still too, as evidenced in the record, Judge Fletcher-Hill has not ORDERED the presiding Judge to respond to the Petitioner's most recent Motions although the Judge Schreiber II has, as of the filing of these Motions, not responded to the Petitioner's most recent Motions. Further, Judge Fletcher-Hill, as the presiding Judge who responsibility includes assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, has not assigned another Judge to preside over the Petitioner's most recent Motions although the Petitioner has been waiting over 10 months for a response to her 1-1-23 Motions from a presiding Judge.



The Petitioner is motioning for a Hearing on these Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to further substantiate that the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions are not frivolous and without merit.

**CONCLUSION**

Therefore, the Petitioner is pleading that 1<sup>st</sup> Motion For Default Judgment be grant, otherwise there be a hearing on the Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

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 15<sup>th</sup> day of October 2024, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> Motion For Default Judgment And A Hearing On The Motion As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd, Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

**REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

CC: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Public