

orders the striking of the Plaintiff's 12-17-18 Motions is unlawful and unsubstantiated. Moreover, as evidenced in the Findings in his 8-8-19 Decision and Order which is rendered as a result of responding to the Plaintiff's 2-15-19 Motions, Judge Michel Pierson has, yet, to recuse himself as the presiding judge over the Plaintiff's Motions and Civil Case. In fact, the evidence of the Plaintiff's Motions and the orders in their Decisions and Orders substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman have all refused to recuse themselves from presiding over the Plaintiff's Motions and Civil Case, although, in all of her Motions for Substitutions and Disqualifications of these three Officers of the Court, the Plaintiff cites the evidence in the record and the federal laws, statutes, and Canons that support her legal arguments and her right as supported by federal laws and statutes and Canons for Substitutions and Disqualifications of these Officers of the Court. Further, the evidence support the fact that, in all of the Plaintiff's Motions pleading for Substitution and Disqualification of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, the Plaintiff cites her legal arguments for motioning Substitution and Disqualification of these Officers of the Court presiding over her Motions and Civil Case, which includes, amongst other things, the evidence in the record substantiating the material facts which support the Plaintiff's legal arguments asserted in each of the Motions for Substitution and Disqualification, namely, that these Officers of the Court deliberately, repeatedly, and egregiously: 1.) acted corruptly in failing to recuse themselves from presiding over the Plaintiff's Motions and Civil Case because the Plaintiff provided the evidence in her Motions to substantiate the federal laws, statutes, and Canons to give the Plaintiff's grounds for motioning Substitution and Disqualification of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, including the legal argument that the Plaintiff question the integrity and impartiality of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman presiding over her Motions and/or Civil Case because, amongst other things, all three of these judges were appointed by Martin O'Malley, the former Governor of Maryland, who is being alleged in the Plaintiff's Civil Case to have deliberately committed misconduct in office and potentially federal crimes. 2.) acted corruptly in failing to recuse themselves from presiding over the Plaintiff's Motions and Civil Case because the Plaintiff provided the evidence in her Motions to substantiate the material facts cited in the Plaintiff's Motions and/or Civil Case, namely, that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman were cognizant of the material fact that the Plaintiff alleges in her Motions for Substitutions and Disqualifications, as well as in her Civil Complaint and exhibits that accompanied her Motions that, due to Supreme Court denying the Plaintiff's 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court and her 2016 Petition for a Rehearing, the alleged 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals in Maryland, has yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved; and, since the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera has yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, the Plaintiff's right to have the issues raised in her 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have been denied and, thus, the issues raised in the Plaintiff's appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, namely, the allegations that, because of the alleged deliberate prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera which has nothing to do with the issues raised in the Plaintiff's 2015 appeal to this court, the