

1ST MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL CASE, WHICH INCLUDE DISQUALIFICATION FROM PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-23, THESE INSTANT MOTIONS, AND THE PETITIONER'S 2 OTHER MOTIONS FILED ON 10-15-24 BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL HAS, SINCE 2018, VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING: a.) FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND HAS COMMITTED "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL LITIGATION AS A RESULT OF THERE BEING AN APPEARANCE THAT HE WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO HIS ELITE APPOINTMENT IN 2009 BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INFRINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. b.) MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (c) IN PRESIDING OVER 4 MOTIONS IN THE PETITIONER'S APPEAL IN THE IN BANC REVIEW ALTHOUGH JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WAS ONE OF THE PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S INITIAL CIVIL LITIGATION. c.) ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW AND TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. d.) FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 IN FAILING TO ASSIGN A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BY LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR BY WES MOORE BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT EACH PRESIDING PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO HIS/HER UNIQUE APPOINTMENT BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, BY FORMER

IN THE MATTER

THE PETITION OF

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE CITY

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

IN THE

RECEIVED

2024 OCT 15 PM 12:23

CIVIL DIVISION

CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BY LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR BY WES MOORE, ALL OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE PETITIONER'S 11-1-23 MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS 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. e.) MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER HER RIGHT TO HAVE A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) MOTION TO HAVE A HEARING ON THE INSTANT MOTIONS AS

PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311

1, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's 1st Motion For Immediate Disqualification Of Judge Fletcher-Hill As The Judge-In-Charge Of Presiding Over Assigning Judges To Preside Over the Petitioner's Civil Case, Which Include Disqualification From Presiding Over Assigning A Judge To Preside Over Her Motions Filed on 11-1-23, These Instant Motions, And The Petitioner's 2nd Other Motions Filed On 10-15-24, These Instant Motions, And The Petitioner's 3rd Other Motions Filed On 10-14-24 Because Judge Fletcher-Hill Has, Since 2018, Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Repetitiously And Intentionally Breaching: a.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Has Committed "Fraud Upon The Court", Treason To The Constitution, And Interference With Interstate Commerce Because Judge Fletcher-Hill Failed To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Judge-In-Charge Of Presiding Over Assigning Presiding Judges Over The Petitioner's Civil Litigation As A Result Of There Being An Appearance That He Would Be Impartial And/OR Biased Due To His Elite Appointment In 2009 By Martin O'Malley, Who Is Being Alleged To Have Infringed Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 –

Genocide And/OR Has Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091- Genocide. b.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) In Presiding Over 4 Motions In The Petitioner's Appeal In The In Banc Review Since Judge Fletcher-Hill Was One Of The Presiding Judges Over The Petitioner's Initial Civil Litigation. c.) Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution In Failing To Have A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions From Her Appeal In The In Banc Review And To Grant The Petitioner An Oral Hearing Before The Panel Decided To Deny The Petitioner's Petition For An In Banc Review. d.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 In Failing To Assign A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside Over the Petitioner's In Banc Review Who Were Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley, By Former Chief Judge Barbera, By Larry Hogan, And/OR By Wes Moore Because There Is An Appearance That Each Presiding Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges Would Be Impartial And/OR Biased Due To His/Her Unique Appointment By Martin O'Malley, By Former Chief Judge Barbera, By Larry Hogan, And/OR By Wes Moore, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In The

Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions And Other Motions 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. e.) Maryland Rule 2-311 In Failing To Grant The Petitioner Her Right To Have A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) Motion To Have A Hearing On The Instant Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

CR59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the 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 for, at least, the 24th time, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Petitioner 24th Motions, thus far, 24 of the Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions the Petitioner's initial civil litigation to her Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review and which include Judge Fletcher-Hill assigning himself twice as the presiding Judge over § of the Petitioner's Motions, has violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he has repeatedly and intentionally infringed upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and has, thereby, for the 24th time have committed "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, and interference with interstate commerce because since 2018, Judge Fletcher-Hill has intentionally and repeatedly failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning presiding Judges over at least 24 of the Petitioner's Motions from her initial civil litigation, which began in 2017, because there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill would be biased and/or impartial as a result of his elite appointment in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, the Commissioner of Social Security Administration, the former Governor of Maryland, and the former Mayor of Baltimore City, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in her most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Honorable President, and/or in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or has attempted to and/or has conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 2.) For the 24th time, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning presiding Judges over the Petitioner's 24th Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill has violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to repetitiously and deliberately breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 as a result of presiding over assigning § other Judges to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation, although all of these presiding Judges were appointed by one of the former Governors of Maryland, Martin O'Malley (hereinafter "Martin O'Malley"), by former Chief Judge Barbera, by another former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan ("hereinafter "Larry Hogan") and/or by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore (hereinafter "Wes Moore") because there is an appearance that each presiding Judge would be impartial and/or biased due to his/her special appointment by Martin O'Malley, by former Chief Judge Barbera, by Larry Hogan, and Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged to in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, 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 have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, Genocide. 3.) For 11th time, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning the presiding Judges over Petitioner's 24 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill has breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to continuously and intentionally: a.) assigning himself and § other Judges to preside over the Petitioner's In Banc Review and, thus, substantiating that Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other § presiding Judges infringed upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under

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."

In the United States Constitutional Law, a Due Process Clause is found in both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Constitution uses the phrase in the 5th and 14th Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5th Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14th protects them from actions by state and local government.

The written Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution require judges to recuse themselves from cases in two situations, namely, where the judge has a financial interest in the case's outcome and where there is otherwise a strong possibility that the judge's decision will be biased. In the United States Constitutional Law, a Due Process Clause is found in both the Fifth and

INTRODUCTION

Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to each of these presiding judges, including Judge Fletcher-Hill, for failing to assign 3 presiding judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review, instead of each one of these Officers of the Court being the only presiding judge as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. b.) allowing himself and 6 other presiding judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Judges prior to the panel of 3 In Banc Judges deciding to Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to himself and each of the judges that presided over the Petitioner's In Banc Review failing to grant the Petitioner's right to have an oral hearing before a panel of 3 In Banc Judges prior to the panel of 3 In Banc Judges deciding to accept or deny the Petitioner's Petition. 4.) For the 16th time, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning judges to preside over the Petitioner's 24 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill, has violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to repeatedly and deliberately allowing himself and all of the other presiding judges, with the exclusion of Judge Karen Friedman (because the Petitioner did not know about Maryland Rule 2-311 during the time Judge Karen Friedman was presiding over her civil litigation), to repeatedly and/or intentionally infringe upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to have a hearing as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. 6.) For the 1st time, the Petitioner is motioning for a Hearing on these instant Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to give the Petitioner

Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Constitution uses the phrase in the 5th and 14th Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5th Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14th Amendment protects them from actions by state and local government.

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.

Germane to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), the Supreme Court has ruled and reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", Levine v. United States, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960), citing Offutt v. United States, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13 (1954). In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held 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 should another judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance of partiality" and has possibly disqualifed himself/herself. Moreover, the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. Wherefore, the U.S. Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio." The Supreme Court has decided that, should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by law.

In regard to the written Maryland Rules in Civil and Criminal proceedings, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 asserts that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) Hearing--Other Motions states that "A party desiring a hearing on a motion, other than a motion filed pursuant to Rule 2-532, 2-533, or 2-534, shall request the hearing in the motion or response under the heading "Request for Hearing. The title of the motion or response shall state that a hearing is requested. Except when a rule expressly provides for a hearing, the court shall determine in each case whether a hearing will be held, but the court may not render

As evidenced in the record of the Circuit Court and on her website, the Petitioner's most recent Motions dated 11-1-23 (Exhibits 155 and 156, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) are Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court, which respond to Judge M. Schreiber II's Findings and Order docketed on 10-20-23 (Exhibit 154 on the Petitioner's website), whose Findings and Order respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-24 Motions (Exhibits 147 and 148, respectively, on the Petitioner's website). In her present civil litigation, whose initial Civil Complaint was filed in 2017, amongst other things, the Petitioner alleges that the Defendant breached the verbal contract between the Defendant and the Petitioner which has caused additional distress to the Petitioner. Also, as evidenced in the Petitioner's Civil Complaint and in her Motions, the Petitioner asserts that prior to filing her Civil Complaint against the Defendant, she and the Defendant had a friendly relationship and was engaged in various conversations during his visits, which included the Petitioner revealing to the Defendant that she was enduring afflictions and had been wrongfully terminated by her former employer, the Baltimore City Public School System (hereinafter "BCPSS")

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying the bill to maintain her website, www.dionawilliams.com, in order to continue posting Motions and Findings and Orders from the presiding Judges in her present civil litigation, as well as to continue posting other relevant Exhibits in the Petitioner's civil litigation, which began in 2017. Although she is on a fixed income, the Petitioner is now able to make her monthly payments, but can't afford to, at this time, make copies of all of the Exhibits that will be included in the record during Discovery of the Petitioner's present civil litigation.

The evidence substantiates the material fact that, since the filing of these instant Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, has not ORDERED the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, to respond to the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, which respond to the Findings and Order entered on the Court's website on 10-20-23 from the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions. Further, Judge Fletcher-Hill, as the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, has not assigned another presiding Judge to respond to the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23.

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

As defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, the Rule of Law is "The authority and influence of law in society, especially when viewed as a constraint on individual and institutional behavior; (hence) the principle whereby all members of a society (including those in government) are considered equally subject to the Rule of Law." Further, under the Rule of Law, government authority may only be exercised as afforded in our great Constitution in accordance with written Statutes, Laws, Regulations, Rules, etc., which were adopted through an established procedure.

a decision that is dispositive of a claim or defense without a hearing if one was requested as provided in this section."

due to the Petitioner exposing lead hazards in 4 schools in Baltimore City. As evidenced by facts cited in the Civil Complaint, the Petitioner declares that, among other things, she informed the Defendant that she was a Whistleblower and that the Findings and Recommendation of the Hearing Examiner (119 on the Petitioner's website), the Findings and Recommendations by the Investigators and Administrator from OSHA (Exhibits 124, 125, 126, 127, and 128 on the Petitioner's website, and the dissenting Opinion from the Hon. Judge from the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals (Exhibit 136 on the Petitioner's website) substantiate that the Petitioner was unlawfully dismissed as a Mathematics teacher in Baltimore City because she continued to expose, publicly, that there is lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards at 4 public schools in Baltimore City. Further, the Petitioner declares that she informed the Defendant that 3 OSHA Officials determined that the voluminous evidence provided by her, the Petitioner, substantiates that the Petitioner suffered adverse actions from her employer due to the Petitioner whistleblowing about lead hazards in some of Baltimore City Public Schools. Moreover, the Petitioner asserts that she told the Defendant, who was often accompanied with a female, whom Defendant asserted was his Assistant, when they came to visit the Petitioner on several occasions that, because of her whistleblowing about these lead hazards, she was terminated as a Mathematics teacher and that she has been fighting in the courts to get justice. Still too, the Petitioner alleges that she informed the Defendant that, in order to support her allegations of lead hazards in the public schools, at her first "Dismissal Hearing" before the original Finder of Fact, the Hearing Examiner, who was hired by the Board of School Commissioners for Baltimore City (hereinafter "School Board") to be the Finder of Fact, she provided the evidence to substantiate her allegations. The Petitioner asserts that she told the Defendant and the female that was with him about a Documentary that she had written, which documents her whistleblowing. The Petitioner's 2011 Documentary is entitled Thanks, Honor, and Glory to the TRINE GOD For Leading and Guidance in Documenting Lead Poisoning in the Public Schools and the Obstructions of Justice in Order to Conceal the Indisputable Truths. Also, the Petitioner declares that after requesting a copy of her Documentary, she signed two copies gave the Defendant and the female that was with him a signed copy of her 2011 Documentary. A copy of the Petitioner's Documentary is part of the record from the Petitioner's 2012 civil litigation in the Circuit Court. The Petitioner's Documentary includes direct quotations from the Hearing Examiner's 11- page Findings and Recommendation dated October 12, 1999.

As stated in the Petitioner's Documentary, in her Motions, and/or in her 2017 Civil Complaint, the Hearing Examiner, the original Finder of Fact, used the incriminations in the letter of the Petitioner's suspension without pay and in the Statement of Charges document (Exhibits 117 and 118, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) against the Petitioner by the CEO of BCPSS and summarized the issues of the case in his October 12, 1999 Findings and Recommendation relevant to the allegations declared by the Petitioner of lead-tainted drinking water at Southeast Middle School (hereinafter "SMS") and lead-based paint hazards at Fairmount-Harford High Schools (hereafter "FHHS") and James Mosher Elementary School (hereafter "JMES") and, thereby, declares the issues in the Petitioner's letter of suspension without pay and in the Statement of Charges document are the following:

"1. Did the Respondent [Ms. Williams] commit misconduct in office by circulating erroneous information to parents, students and staff regarding potential health hazards at SMS, FHHS, and JMES? 2. If the information circulated by the Respondent is basically accurate, did the Respondent commit misconduct in office by failing to follow the chain of command by disseminating the information directly to the public and the media? 3. Whether the acts allegedly committed by the Respondent would bear upon the Respondent's fitness to teach such that it would undermine her future classroom performance and overall impact on her students?"¹

In relation to the burden of proof, the Petitioner being trained in the field of lead paint assessment and abatement, and the validity of the statements in her public communications, the original finder of fact begins by citing the following:

"The CEO must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the information contained in the two (2) communications was erroneous. The Hearing Examiner finds that the CEO failed to carry his burden of proof; in fact, based on the substantial documentation presented at the hearing, the Hearing Examiner finds that the information contained in the two (2) communications concerning SMS, FHHS and JMES was basically true.

First, the Hearing Examiner finds that the Respondent [Ms. Williams] has received substantial training in the field of lead paint assessment and abatement and could validly consider herself an expert in the field. See Respondent's Exhibits 8 & 9. Secondly, with regards to the correspondence dated February 24, 1999, to parents SMS students regarding lead in the water, the Respondent present sufficient documentation to support the statements made in the correspondence."²

Next, as evidenced in his 11-page Findings and Recommendation (Exhibit 119 on the Petitioner's website), the Hearing Examiner addressed in more detail the issue of lead in the water at SMS,

¹ In the Matter of Diana Williams before the New Board of School Commissioners for Baltimore City, Case No. 99-17, Findings and Conclusions of Law by the Hearing Examiner (October 12, 1999), p.8.
² Ibid., pp.8-9

which was one of thirty-two schools identified as having lead-blemished drinking water since 1993.

Thus, the Findings undrape the following:

"In 1993, the State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene sampled the water at SMS [CEO Exhibit 15]. The State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene found that there was lead in the water but only one (1) drinking fountain had a lead content in excess of EPA standards. According to Fields, the high lead content found in the one fountain was due to a deteriorating bubbler or spigot. Fields testified that in response to the report received from the State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, the fountain was turned off and the school established four (4) bottle water stations.

The Hearing Examiner finds that, though bottle water was available to the students, the water was not readily accessible due to the locations of the water stations [Transcript p. 391 Line 7 thru p. 394 Line 5]. Except for the water fountains that had been turned off, students still had access to water fountains in the school. The Respondent testified that she took a water sample from a fountain that was still being used by students for testing to a certified laboratory [Respondent's Exhibit 27]. The lab found that the lead content of the water exceeded the standards allowed by EPA.

The CEO relied on the report from the City Health Department dated February 11, 1999 [CEO Exhibits 8 & 9] in determining that the Respondent had issued erroneous information regarding the water at SMS and placing her on suspension. The Hearing Examiner questions how the CEO determined that there was no lead problems with SMS' drinking water because there was no assessment of the lead content of the school's drinking water in the inspection report. Moreover, the actual sampling of the school's water by the City Health Department did not occur until March 9, 1999 [CEO Exhibit 16] and the report was not issued until March 15, 1999; two (2) weeks after the Respondent was suspended.

The report indicates that there is lead in the water at SMS and that at least one (1) fountain that was still in use prior to February 11, 1999 had a lead content in excess of EPA standards for drinking water. Elam testified that SMS was 1 of 32 schools that had been identified with lead in its drinking water [Transcript p. 130, Line 9 et Seq.]

Though the Respondent may not have had her dates correct as to when the fountains were turned off, the fountains were in deed turned off after the Health Department's inspection and the parents of the students were not notified of the situation as stated in the correspondence. It would appear prudent to recommend that students who may have consumed water with a high lead content be tested as a precaution.³

Also, as evidenced by the facts cited in his 11-page Findings and Recommendation, the original Finder of Fact concluded that there was substantial evidence in the record which clearly establish that the school system did not fully unclark to the parents that there was an issue with the lead content of the water at SEMS before I issued my communication and unearths the following:

"The CEO complains that the actions of the Respondent cause panic amongst the parents, students and staff that disrupted the educational process. According to Field's testimony, the primary disruption to school activities was telephone calls from parents inquiring about the accuracy of the information contained in the communication and about the person who disseminated the information. Fields also testified that she had to call an emergency staff meeting to answer concerns raised by the staff regarding the information in the communication.

However, the facts clearly establish that school system did not fully disclose to the parents that there was an issue with the lead content of the water at SMS before the Respondent issued her communication. Additionally, it appears to the Hearing Examiner that the school system,

³ Ibid., pp.9-10.

relying on the February 13th Health Department reports, may have issued misinformation regarding the matter [CEO Exhibit 6]”⁴

Again, the evidence in his Findings and Recommendation in relation to the exposure to lead poisoning at FHHS and JMES, the original Finder of Fact articulates the truth as supported by the evidence in the record as follows:

“The Hearing Examiner also finds that the weight of the evidence supports the Respondent’s claim that FHHS and JMES had been cited for lead paint hazards [CEO Exhibit 10, p. 3]. The school system hired a certified lead abatement contractor to clean FHHS after a sampling reveal lead bearing dust in excess of EPA standards. JMES was cited in a report by MOSH to have a lead base paint problem and was ordered to abate the lead bearing paint through out the facility [Respondent’s Exhibit 29, p. 14]. It is also clear from the evidence that it was the complaints filed by the Respondent that spurred the school system into taking corrective action at the two (2) schools.”

In regard to the Petitioner being alleged to have committed misconduct in office by not following the chain of command when it came to publicly debunking the lead hazards at these schools, the original Finder of Fact affirms the following:

“The Hearing Examiner finds that the Respondent did not follow proper procedure when she disseminated the information regarding the health related issues directly to the public without first providing the school system a fair opportunity to take corrective action. In regard to the situations at FHHS and SMS, the Respondent did raise her concerns to the principals of the schools, respectively. However, the Respondent acknowledges that she did not present her concerns to the area executive officer or officials at North Avenue before filing a complaint with MOSH or going public.

⁴ Ibid, p. 10
⁵ Ibid, p. 10

JMES' principal was not notified of the Respondent's concern regarding lead paint at the school before the Respondent issued her communication to the public.

The Respondent testified that, after her experience at FHS, she did not believe that the school system would take her concerns seriously. The Respondent testified further that, because the health and welfare of the students were at issue, she felt time was of the essence in having the situations investigated.

Though the Hearing Examiner finds that the Respondent did not follow proper procedure in filing a complaint with MOSH or circulating information to the public without following the chain of command, the Hearing Examiner does not find that such actions constitute misconduct in office. Employees have a legal right to file complaints regarding safety and health issues affecting their condition of employment directly to MOSH. The Respondent also has a right as a citizen to file a complaint regarding safety and health issues that generally affect the public to MOSH. Moreover, the concerns raised in the Respondent's complaints were validated by MOSH.

The Hearing Examiner does not find that the acts committed by the Respondent bears upon her fitness to teach such that it would undermine her future classroom performance and overall impact on her students. There was no evidence offered by witnesses for the CEO that any parents, students or other staff members at the three (3) schools complained about the Respondent issuing the two (2) communications. In addition, there was no evidence offered by witnesses for the CEO that the Respondent was not a competent teacher.⁶

As evidenced in his Findings and Recommendations, Hearing Examiner concludes his 11-page Findings and Recommendation by citing the following:

"The CEO relied on Abernathy's [the Southeast Area Superintendent at the time] recommendation in suspending the Respondent without pay and recommending her dismissal. The case for dismissal is based primarily on the premise that the Respondent irresponsibly disseminated erroneous (and unfounded) information to parents and the public. However, even Abernathy stated that if she had determined that there was some validity to the Respondent's allegations, she may have recommended a different disciplinary action.

The Hearing Examiner finds that there was more than some validity to the Respondent's allegations.

RECOMMENDATION

WHEREFORE, the undersigned Hearing Examiner respectfully recommends that the CEO's recommendation to dismiss the Respondent be denied."

As evidenced in the material facts cited in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, Judge Fletcher-Hill, who is the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, has only assigned presiding Judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation whom he knew and/or should have known were appointed to their unique Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley, by former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or by Larry Hogan because Judge Fletcher-Hill knows and/or should have known that, under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, each of these Judges should have been disqualified and recused from presiding over the Petitioner's civil litigation since there is an appearance that each of these presiding Judges would be impartial and/or biased as a result of each one of these Judges being appointed to his/her distinguished Administrative position by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or Larry Hogan, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions, in other Motions, and/or in other documents 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. In her 11-1-23 Motions, the Petitioner declares 76 "material facts" which substantiate that her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 has been repeatedly and/or intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill and/or by all of the other 8 presiding Judges that Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation, along with assigning himself twice to preside over 8 of the Petitioner's Motions, as a result of violating various federal and/or state laws, including the

⁷ Ibid., p.11

repetitious and/or intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the 8 other Judges assigned by Judge Fletcher-Hill to preside over the Petitioner's present civil litigation.

The evidence substantiate the material fact that, since filing his 2-4-20 Motions (Exhibit 76 on the Petitioner's website), the Defendant, has not filed a Motion although he was mailed copies of each of the Petitioner's 24 Motions filed thus far, which include a copy of the Petitioner's most recently filed Motions dated 11-1-23. The evidence substantiate the material fact that the Defendant has remained acquiescence in relation to responding to any of material facts or legal arguments in the Petitioner's colossal Motions filed since filing his 2-4-20 Motions. Further, as evidenced in the record and on the Petitioner's website, 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 for each of her Motions. As evidenced in the record of this proceeding, the Petitioner has filed a Motion for Default Judgment against the Defendant because the evidence of lack of response and, thus acquiescence, from the Defendant in filing a Motion to dispute any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions or in any of the other voluminous Motions filed since the Petitioner's 2-13-20 Motions (Exhibit 77 on the Petitioner's website), substantiate that the materials facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23 and other Motions filed by the Petitioner since 2-4-20 are undisputable material facts.

As asserted in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the Findings and Order of Judge M. Schreiber II docketed on 10-20-23, which responds to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions substantiate that, in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, Judge M. Schreiber II fail to disclose, consider, and resolve whether the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions. In her 11-1-23, the Petitioner declares at least 76 "material facts, which she proclaims are statements of "UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS" and which trace the history of the alleged repetitious and/or intentional violations of the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to, amongst other things, the repeated and/or deliberate breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other 8 presiding Judges whom Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation as a result of their repeated and/or intentional refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves because there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other 8 Judges assigned by him as presiding Judges would be biased and/or impartial because Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other 8 Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation were appointed to their elite Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley, by former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or by Larry Hogan, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's most recent Motion filed on 11-1-23, in these instant Motions, and/or in other Motions to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. The first of the 76 "material facts" asserted in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions to substantiate that the

Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or intentionally being violated by Judge Fletcher-Hill cites that: "1.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division whose responsibilities include assigning judges to civil case, presided over the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, 8-6-18, and 9-17-18 Motions from her initial civil litigation (Exhibits 38, 36, 42, 41, 58, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) as evidenced by his responses in his 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, 9-4-18 Findings and Orders (Exhibits 50, 46, 52, and 57, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), and the evidence of the Petitioner's 4-7-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, and 12-27-22 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review, (Exhibits 94, 96, 98, and 100, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) as evidenced by Judge Fletcher-Hill's responses in his 6-21-22, 8-4-12, 12-16-22, and 2-16-23 Findings and Orders (Exhibits 95, 97, 99, and 112 on the Petitioner's website). Thus, the evidence substantiate the material fact that the Petitioner was coerced to have to file 9 separate Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill for violating her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his repetitiously and intentionally infringing breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding judges because of the appearance of his being impartial and/or biased as a result of being appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions and in her Civil Complaint filed in 2017 to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. Moreover, since the evidence support the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill has unlawfully presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation at least 4 times, Judge Fletcher-Hill has, thereby, repeatedly and intentionally breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), which prohibits a judge from presiding over a party's appeal in a civil litigation after the judge has been a presiding judge in the initial civil litigation. Still too, for the 6th time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has assigned only judges who were appointed by government officials who are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities, which include Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, and/or any government official cited in the Petitioner's 27-23 Motions and/or in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. In fact, attached to the Petitioner's instant Motions as Exhibit 1 is her "6th URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" to the Governor of Maryland, Gov. Moore, which declares in the Heading of the Petitioner's urgent missive "Re: 1.) "6TH URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES, THAT IS, FOR YOU, GOV. MOORE, to exercise your Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland, representing a GOVERNMENT OF WE THE PEOPLE, BY WE THE PEOPLE, AND FOR WE THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND, WHO WILL UPHOLD OUR 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY AND, FOR THE SECOND TIME, ORDERS the JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL to: a.) assign a panel of 3 in Banc judges to preside over my 11-1-23 Motions and to grant my right to an oral Hearing before the panel of 3 Judges deny or grant my Petition as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland

The second of the 76 critical "material facts" proclaimed in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions and which substantiate the allegations that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under 18 U.S.C., Section 242 has been continuously and/or deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-

removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071, Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001." The second of the 76 critical "material facts" proclaimed in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions and which substantiate the allegations that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under 18 U.S.C., Section 242 has been continuously and/or deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-

Constitution for In Banc proceedings. b.) assign only judges who were not appointed by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore, another former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, another former Governor of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, Martin O'Malley, the former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, or any of the government officials that are cited in my 2-27-23 Motions and/or in my 2nd Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint because all of these government officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. 2.) 2nd REQUEST THAT THE U.S ATTORNEY OF MARYLAND, EREK L. BARRON, AND THE STATE ATTORNEY FOR BALTIMORE CITY, IVAN BATES, regardless of whether Gov. Wes Moore issue the ORDERS and Judge Fletcher-Hill adheres to or reject the ORDERS, that both of you will continue your investigation and resolve the allegations that indictments need to be brought against the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, the former presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, the former presiding Judges over my appeal in the In Banc Review, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges who initially presided over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation and all of the other judges who presided over my initial civil litigation, which, also, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, because the evidence substantiate the material facts that these Officers of the Court have repeatedly and/or deliberately violated my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 241, and/or my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by repetitiously and/or intentionally: a.) committed the Federal crimes of violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and the federal crimes of "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with interstate Commerce due to their repetitious and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) in refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and/or to deem each of their Orders as void due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as presiding Judges as a result of being appointed to the elite positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in my 2-27-23 Motions and/or in my 2nd Addendum to 2-18-20 Official Complaint to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. b.) committed the same other federal and/or state crimes alleged in my 3-9-18 Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 37 on my website), the first Judge that presided over my initial civil litigation, which include repetitiously and/or deliberately committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Part1, Chapter 73 & 1512, concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071, Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001."