

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's 6th Motion For Disqualification For "Fraud Upon The Court" Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Under Maryland Rule 18-102.11, And, Under The Rule Of Law Against Judge Fletcher-Hill And 2nd Motion For Disqualification For "Fraud Upon The Court" Under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) Against Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion To Have A Panel Of In Banc Judges To Continue To Preside Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, 3rd

HEARING ON THE MOTIONS

RECONSIDERATION, AND 5TH MOTION FOR A

UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR

MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND

PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A

FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL

THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, 3rd MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE

THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF

MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER

COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL,

JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND 2ND MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE

U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST

6TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28

* Case No. 24-C-17-004535

* BALTIMORE CITY

* FOR

* CIRCUIT COURT

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

THE PETITION OF

* IN THE

IN THE MATTER

RECEIVED FOR
CIRCUIT COURT FOR
BALTIMORE CITY
22 AUG 11 PM 11:10
CIVIL DIVISION

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Petitioner believes that our great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their ruling, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11, "And the LORD spake into Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend", and Moses informed the judges in Israel of GOD'S law and employed the judges over the various tribes in Israel in Judges 6:16-17, saying, "And, I charged your judges at that time, saying. Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD'S: and the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it." Moreover, also, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Jeremiah 9:23-25, the Scripture states "Thus, saith the LORD, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: But, let him that glorieth, glory in this. That he understandeth and knoweth ME, that I am the LORD which exercises loving-kindness, judgement, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight,

STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND

CR 59 (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 the 6th time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has intentionally committed "Fraud Upon the Court" by breaching Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11, for the 6th time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has deliberately violated the "Rule of Law", for the 2nd time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has knowingly and willingly committed "Fraud Upon the Court" by breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), and for the 2nd time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has infringed upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution by not allowing the Petitioner's Motions from her in Banc Review to continue to be presided over by a panel of 3 judges as mandated in Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. Moreover, along with Judge Fletcher-Hill, who was one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial Civil litigation, the previously presiding judges over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review, namely, the Panel Of In Banc Judges (Judge Carrion, Judge Melissa Phinn, and Judge R. Rubin) and the two other former presiding judges over the Petitioner's initial Civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson and Judge Karen Friedman, have, too, repeatedly and intentionally violating Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18-102.11, and the Rule of Law, and, therefore, have on several occasions, also, committed "Fraud upon the Court."

Motion for All Orders By Judge Fletcher-Hill, By The Panel Of In Banc Judges, By Judge Michel Pierson, and By Judge Karen Friedman Be Deemed Void As A Matter Of Law Under Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) And Under Maryland Rule 18-102.11, Motion For Reconsideration, And 5th Motion For A Hearing On The Motions based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

said with the LORD. Behold the days come saith the LORD that I will punish all them which are circumcised with the uncircumcised."

In the Oxford English Dictionary, the Rule of Law is defined as "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." The Rule of Law implies that government authority may only be exercised in accordance with written Statutes, Laws, Regulations, Rules, etc., which were adopted through an established procedure. The principle is intended to be a safeguard against arbitrary rulings in individual cases. Moreover, the Rule of Law limits the arbitrary power of those in authority, prevents the arbitrary use of power, applies all laws equally to all citizens of the country, protects against private power, keeps public authorities honest, and protects fundamental rights, including the security of persons and contract, property, and human rights. No one, including the government and judges, is above the Rule of Law.

The written Statute, Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), cites that any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself/herself in any proceeding in which his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a), which is applicable for all judges in all states, holds that, if there is even an appearance in impartiality, then the judges must recuse themselves voluntarily, and a party does not have to file a Motion for Disqualification because the judges are required by this federal law to recuse themselves in any proceeding in which their impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Judges do not have discretion not to disqualify themselves, and by law, judges are bound to follow the law. Recusals are based on the MAXIM that judges are charged with a duty of impartiality in administering justice. Further, the written Statute, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), declares that, if proper grounds for recusal exist and the judge is aware of the grounds but still refuse to recuse himself/herself, then there may be penalties levied against the judge for not recusing himself/herself. Moreover, the written Rule, 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. Still too, the written Rule, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 (c), states that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge previously presided as a judge over the matter in another court. Further, according to our written Maryland Constitution, Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, a panel of three judges are mandated to preside over an In Banc Review, and the Petitioner has a right to an oral hearing before the 3-panel member of the Banc Review prior to the panel of three judges rendering their decision.

The Courts have affirmed that Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. "is directed against the appearance of partiality, whether or not the judge is actually biased," and that "Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a) is not intended to protect litigants from actual bias in their judge but rather to promote public confidence in the impartiality of the judicial process." Judges do not have discretion not to disqualify themselves, and by law, judges are bound to follow the law. Taylor v. O'Grady, 888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989. The 7th Circuit Court of Appeals has repeatedly held that positive proof of the partiality of a judge is not a requirement, only the appearance of partiality as in the case of Lilljberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp., 486 U.S. 847, 108 S.Ct. 2194 (1988). Also, this Court has

decided that "what matters is not the reality of bias or prejudice but its appearance" United States v. Ballstrieri, 779 F.2d 1191 (7th Cir. 1985). The 7th Circuit, also, stated that "a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final." Further, the 7th Circuit has determined that "Fraud upon the Court" immediately removes jurisdiction from that Court as well as vitiates (makes ineffective - invalidates) every decision or Order from that point on.

Still too, the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals has determined that, if a judge is disqualified according to Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a) but fail to recuse himself/herself, then that judge is acting in the judge's "personal capacity" and not in the judge's "judicial capacity" and has, thus, committed "Fraud upon the Court". In the case of Bulloch v. United States, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated "Fraud upon the Court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. ... It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influenced or where the judge has not performed his judicial function --- thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted." And, the Circuit Court has determined that, when a judge acts in his/her personal capacity and not in his/her judicial capacity, it causes the court to be directly corrupted and further "embrace that species of fraud which does, or attempts to, defile the court itself, or is a fraud perpetrated by officers of the court so that the judicial machinery cannot perform in the usual manner its impartial task of adjudging cases that are presented for adjudication." Kenner v. C.I.R., 387 F.3d 689 (1968); 7 Moore's Federal Practice, 2d ed., p. 512, 60.23.

Moreover, the Supreme Court has decided that, should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, 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, acting in the judge's personal capacity due to being disqualified and not in the judge's judicial capacity. As stated in the Petitioner's Civil Complaint and other documents, she continues to undergo financial loss, loss of property, and tremendous emotional distress due to these hardships and other afflictions. Still too, 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 Courts 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 disqualified himself/herself. Moreover, the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issue 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 Courts have, too, ruled that, should a judge who has been disqualified by law fail to recuse himself/herself, then the judge is in violation of the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution (United States v. Scuito, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir. 1996). The 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 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. Moreover, the Supreme Court has, also, 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. And, if a judge acts after he has been automatically disqualified by law, then he is acting without jurisdiction, and that suggests that he is then engaging in criminal acts of treason, 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. There is no statute of limitations on fraud. Also, the Courts have repeatedly ruled that judges have no immunity for their criminal acts.

In the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Proverbs 6:16-19, it states that "These six things doth the LORD hate, yea, seven are an abomination to HIM, a proud look, a lying tongue, hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and, he that soweth discord among brethren." In 2018, Judge Fletcher-Hill became the presiding judge over the Petitioner's Civil litigation, and only after the Petitioner had filed several Motions, including Motions for Disqualification against Judge Karen Friedman, the original presiding judge over the Petitioner's present Civil litigation which was filed in 2017. The evidence in the record of the 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, and 9-4-18 Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill has presided over the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, and 8-6-18 Motions, respectively. In her Motions dated 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 8-6-18, and 9-17-18, the Petitioner included a Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding judge and cites the causes. Instead of Judge Fletcher-Hill responding to the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions, Judge Michel Pierson responded and denied the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions; thus, Judge Fletcher-Hill was no longer the presiding judge over the Petitioner's initial Civil litigation.

As evidenced from Judge Fletcher-Hill's 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, and 9-4-18 Findings and Orders and the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, and 8-6-18 Motions, respectively, Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the presiding judges in the Petitioner's initial Civil proceeding. Under Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 (c), Judge Fletcher-Hill should have disqualified and recused himself from presiding over the Petitioner's 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions as evidenced in his Findings and Orders dated 8-4-22 and 6-17-22, respectively, because these Motions are from the In Banc Review, which is an appeal of the decision from the Petitioner's initial Civil proceeding, the Civil proceeding in which Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the previously presiding judges and, therefore, prohibited from presiding over the Petitioner's appeal of the decision from the initial Civil litigation.

According to Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner's In Banc Review, which includes her Motions filed during the In Banc Review proceeding, is to be presided over by a panel of 3

In Banc judges, not by one judge, as in cases of the Petitioner's 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions which were presided over only by Judge Fletcher-Hill, who, again, is one of the judges who previously presided over the Petitioner's initial Civil litigation.

After Judge Fletcher-Hill was recused in 2018 from presiding over the Petitioner's initial Civil litigation, Judge Michel Pierson presided over the Petitioner's initial Civil proceeding. Judge Michel Pierson's last Findings and Order in the Petitioner's initial Civil litigation was rendered on 1-2-20. In response to Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed a Petition for an In Banc Review and her Memorandum in Support of her In Banc Review on 1-14-20; and, around 1-24-20, the panel of In Banc judges, namely, Judge Carrón, Judge Melissa Phinn, and Judge R. Rubin were designated as the presiding judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review.

The panel of In Banc judges' 3-30-22 Findings and Orders respond to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions. When the panel of In Banc judges issued their Findings and Orders on 3-30-22 to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, Judge Rubin had left the Circuit Court and assumed her appointed position to the Biden's Administration as the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. The Petitioner questions the legality of Judge Rubin's signature being on the 3-30-22 Findings and Order by the panel of In Banc judges since, at this time, Judge Rubin was no longer a judge in the Circuit Court. The Chief Judge of the panel of In Banc judges, namely, Judge Carrón, never informed the Petitioner that Judge Rubin was no longer a judge in the Circuit Court, and, therefore, no longer a member of the panel of judges presiding over the Petitioner's In Banc Review. And, in his 8-4-22 or in his 6-17-22 Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill never informed the Petitioner that Judge Rubin was no longer one of the three judges presiding over her In Banc Review.

In his 8-4-22 Findings and Order which respond to the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions. And, in his 6-17-22 Findings and Order which respond to the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve a single material fact and legal argument in the Petitioner's 4-7-22 Motions, which are the Petitioner's response to the 3-30-22 Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges, whose Findings and Orders are based upon responding to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions. Thus, the evidence of the 8-4-22 and 6-17-22 Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill which respond to the Petitioner's 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions, respectively, substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions, which is indicative of the material fact that Judge Fletcher fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions, which respond to the panel of In Banc judges' 3-30-22 Findings and Orders responding to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions (Exhibits 97, 94, 95, 93, 77, and 80, respectively, on the Petitioner's website).

The evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the 8-4-22 and 6-17-22 Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill support the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Petitioner's corresponding 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions which responds to the panel of In Banc judges' 3-30-22

As asserted in her 6-24-22 Motions, in her 4-7-22 Motions, and in the other documents cited above, the Petitioner motioned for disqualification of Judge Fletcher Hill and stated that she questioned the impartiality and/or bias of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding judge not only because he was appointed by Martin O'Malley, who is alleged to have committed misconduct, potentially criminal activities, and maybe called as a witness, but, also, due to the material facts that the Petitioner believes that Judge Fletcher-Hill would be impartial and/or biased because she has alleged in her Civil Complaint, in her other Motions, in her Official Complaint and/or Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill that, in 2014, he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal

office and/or federal crimes.

O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have committed misconduct in they would be impartial and/or biased due to their elite appointment as Administrative Judges by Martin should have disqualified and recused themselves as presiding judges since there is an appearance that

Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11, these Officers of the Court Fletcher-Hill, the panel of in Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, and/or Judge Karen Friedman. Under evidence of the public acknowledgement of the close relationship amongst Chief Judge Barbera, Judge and/or Chief Judge Barbera. Moreover, in these same documents, the Petitioner asserts that there is

Karen Friedman, were appointed to the privileged position as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge

Addendums to her Official Complaint against the panel of in Banc judges, the other former presiding stated in her Official Complaint against the panel of in Banc judges, and/or as cited in the Petitioner's

in 2013. Still too, as declared in the Petitioner's Motions, including her 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions, as 2009 and appointed Judge Barbera to the elite position as the new Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals

Fletcher-Hill to the prominent position as an Administrator to the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City in her Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher Hill, Martin O'Malley appointed Judge

her 4-7-22 Motions, in her Civil Complaint, in her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or in misconduct in office and federal and/or state crimes. As stated in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions, in

of Maryland (hereinafter "Court of Appeals"), both of whom are being alleged to have committed O'Malley (hereinafter "Martin O'Malley"), or appointed by Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals

appointed to the elite position as Administrative Judges by the former Governor of Maryland, Martin to be granted another panel of in Banc judges to preside over her in Banc Review who were not

Official Complaints, she asserts that, in her 3rd Motions, amongst other Motions, the Petitioner pleads Review. In the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions, in her 4-7-22 Motions, in her Civil Complaint, and/or in her

did not know that Judge Rubin was no longer one of the three-panel judges presiding over her in Banc included her 3rd Motions for disqualification of the panel of in Banc judges. At this time, the Petitioner

panel of in Banc judges' 3-30-22 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her 4-7-22 Motions, which Again, as declared in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions and in her 4-7-22 Motions, in response to the

Findings and Order.

are, thus, reiterated in the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions, which responds to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 8-4-22 and 4-7-22 are still very material in responding to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 8-4-22 Findings and Order and Findings and Orders. However, these material facts and legal arguments from the Petitioner's 6-24-22

Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss her 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley is being alleged to have committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities. Also, as declared in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions and as stated in her Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, or Judge Karen Friedman disclosing, considering, and resolving other relevant material facts and legal arguments that are vital material facts in her present Civil litigation, which, also, include the allegations that, due to the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera, the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, namely, that, in 2014, the In Banc judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill, one of the judges which, also, presided over the Petitioner's initial Civil litigation and is presently presiding over her appeal in the In Banc Review, violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley is being alleged to have committed misconduct in office and possibly criminal activities.

Further, as stated in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions, in her Civil Complaint, in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to her Official Complaints against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Chief Judge Barbera, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, and/or against the panel of In Banc judges, the first 5 Exhibits on her website will substantiate, unequivocally, and in less than 5 minutes of reading, the allegation that Chief Judge Barbera committed, deliberately, in 2015 the prejudicial error of perjury. Still too, as cited in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 and 4-7-22 Motions, in her 2-18-20 Official Complaint, and/or in her Addendums to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint, the Petitioner's questions the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, or Judge Karen Friedman in disclosing, considering, and resolving all of the other the material facts and legal arguments which are very material facts in her present Civil litigation, which include the allegations that: 1.) our children who attended Baltimore City Public Schools have been exposed, for decades, to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based hazards by the owners of these public schools, namely, Mayors of Baltimore City since at least 1993, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and the present Mayor of Baltimore City, Brandon Scott; also, the evidence support the material fact that the other owners of the public schools have intentionally and repetitiously exposed our children to lead hazards, namely, every member of the City Council who was a member of the City Council between 1993 until the present. 2.) Kurt Schmoke was the Mayor of Baltimore City and Martin O'Malley was a member of the City Council when the Petitioner initially started whistleblowing about the lead hazards in the schools in 1996. 3.) during the Petitioner's continued whistleblowing, Martin O'Malley became Mayor of Baltimore City in 1999 and held this office for 8 years, and he became Governor of Maryland in 2007 and held this position, also, for 8 years. 4.) Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack

Young, and the present Mayor of Baltimore City, Brandon Scott, as well as all of the members of the City Council who were members between 1993 until the present, and/or other government officials, are being alleged to have: a.) deliberately and repetitiously exposed our children to lead poisoning in Maryland schools since at least 1993 as evidenced in the records of the lower and appellate courts, in the record of the Supreme Court, and/or as evidenced in the Petitioner's highly footnoted Documentary. b.) have yet to fulfill their duty and obligation to test all of our children that may have been exposed to lead poisoning using the special X-Ray machine to determine the cumulative amount of lead in the bones because the blood lead testing will not reveal the lead in the blood after about 45 days. Lead stays in the bones for nearly 30 years. Lead is a poison, and when it becomes hazardous, it can possibly kill you. c.) failed in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of the children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison.

The evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in the 8-4-22 Findings and Order by Judge Fletcher-Hill substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order the material facts that the Petitioner alleges in her 6-24-22 Motions, in her 4-7-22 Motions, and in her 2-13-20 Motions that the panel of In Banc Judges denied her Petition for an In Banc Review before allowing the Petitioner her right to an oral hearing as stipulated in the Maryland Constitution. In her 6-24-22 Motions and in her 4-7-22 Motion, the Petitioner proclaims that, in her 2-13-20 Motions, she asserts that "The Maryland Constitution cites that, upon the decision or determination of any point, or question, by the Court, it shall be competent to the party, against whom the ruling or decision is made, upon motion, to have the point, or question reserved for the consideration of the three Judges of the Circuit, who shall constitute a court in banc for such purpose. Moreover, when review by a court in banc is permitted by the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner may have a judgment or determination of any point or question reviewed by a court in banc by filing a notice for in banc review. Issues are reserved for in banc review by making an objection in the manner set forth in Rules 2-517 and 2-520. Again, the Court of Appeals set out the details of in banc practice in rule 2-551 of the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure. A "hearing," as opposed to an argument, is automatically scheduled, but may be waived by consent of all parties. Since the Petitioner did not waive her right to a hearing, the consent by all parties to waive the hearing was not given. Thus, according Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner had a right to a hearing before the In Banc panel once she was granted her Petition for Review on 1-24-20 before the panel of judges and then the panel of judges may decide at the hearing to dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for In Banc Review and Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review. The Petitioner has yet to have a hearing before the panel of In Banc Judges as required by Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, instead of the panel of In Banc Judges deciding on 2-6-20 to unlawfully dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review. Furthermore, Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution requires the banc panel to file a brief statement of the reasons for the decision or shall dictate the reasons into the record. The evidence of the facts and/or lack thereof in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order of the panel of In Banc Judges which are response to the Petitioner's Questions presented for Review in her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review..... d.) failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review to disclose, consider, and resolve a single Question Presented for Review in the Petitioner's

Memorandum in Support of an In Banc s that would substantiate the Petitioner's legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review....." ...

Moreover, in her 6-24-22 Motions and in her 4-7-22 Motions, the Petitioner questions the impartiality and/or fairness in the panel of In Banc judges rendering their Findings and Order to the Defendants' 2-13-20 Motion on 2-13-20 but issued their Findings and Orders to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 Motions over two years later, namely, on 3-30-22. Further, the Petitioner states in her 6-24-22 Motions and in her 4-7-22 Motions the material fact that, the Petitioner questions the impartiality and/or fairness by the panel of Banc judges in failing to disclose in their 1-24-20 Order or in their 2-6-20 Findings and Orders the material fact that the Petitioner filed her Notice for an In Banc Petition and her Memorandum in Support for An In Banc Review on the same day, namely, on 1-14-20. Still too, on the Circuit Court's website, there is no evidence of a "filed date" or "entry date" of the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum, but the Petitioner does have copies of these two documents which were stamped by the clerk as filed on 1-14-20 (Exhibits 71 and 72 on the Petitioner's website).

In his 8-4-22 Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve the material fact that the Petitioner asserts in her 6-24-22 Motions and in her 4-7-22 Motions that the pleadings in the Heading of her 2-19-20 Motions and the material facts and legal arguments in the body of the her 2-19-20 Motions substantiate that the panel of In Banc judges fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in their 3-30-22 Findings and Orders the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2-19-20 Motions. As asserted in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions and in her 4-7-22 Motions, the Petitioner's 2-19-20 Motions are entitled "MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES' 2-6-20 ORDER TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR AN IMMEDIATE "SUBSTITUTION" AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, MOTION FOR "SUBSTITUTION" IN BANC PANEL OF JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE HEARING BECAUSE THE PRESIDING IN BANC PANEL OF JUDGES ARE ONE OF THE JUDGES IN THE PETITIONER'S 2-17-20 OFFICIAL COMPLAINT TO THE FBI, HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP, HON. GOV. HOGAN, CONGRESS, AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WHO ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INTENTIONALLY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 6TH, 7TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512, HAVE CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071, AND, IN DECIDING THE PETITIONER'S 1-14-20 PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW, HER 1-14-20 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AN IN BANC REVIEW, AND IN HER 1-29-20 MOTIONS, WHICH INCLUDES THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, TO HAVE REPEATEDLY, DELIBERATELY, EXCESSIVELY, AND EGREGIOUSLY: 1.) ABUSED THEIR POWER. 2.) DISPLAYED TOTAL CONTEMPT FOR THE RULE OF LAW. 3.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE IN THE CONDUCT OF THE OFFICE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505. 4.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF DEPRIVING THE PETITIONER OF HER 6TH, 7TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS RIGHTS, AND BY VIOLATING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER

18 USC 242. 5.) TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512. 6.) CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071. MOTION TO HAVE THE "SUBSTITUTION" PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES APPOINTED BY HON. GOV. HOGAN TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS, AND MOTION TO HAVE THE "SUBSTITUTION" PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO RECONSIDER THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW AND ALL OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS."

As cited in her 6-24-22 Motions and in her 4-7-22 Motions, the Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions against Judge Fletcher-Hill, her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or other Official Complaints and other Addendums which include Exhibits 16, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions against Judge Fletcher-Hill, her Official Complaint, and/or the Petitioner's Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman, her Official Complaint, and/or the numbered exhibits on the Petitioner's website, namely, Exhibits 16, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 54, 55, 56, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions against Judge Michel Pierson, her Official Complaint, and/or Addendums to the Petitioner's Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson can be viewed from Exhibits 16, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 77, 81 96, and/or Exhibit 98 on her website. Still too, on the Petitioner's website, her Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions and the Petitioner's Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc other Official Complaints and other Addendums which include allegations against the panel of In Banc Judges can be viewed from Exhibits 16, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, and/or Exhibit 94. The Petitioner's Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, her Addendums to her Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other Official Complaints and/or Addendums to other Official Complaints which include allegations against Chief Judge Barbera can be viewed from Exhibits 6, 16, 43, 45, 54, 56, 77, and/or Exhibit 81 on the Petitioner's website. Moreover, the Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 50, 51, 52, 67, 95 and 97. The Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 73, 75, and 93. The Findings and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 59, 63, 66, and 70. The Findings and Orders of Judge Karen Friedman can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 47, 48, and 49.

CONCLUSION

Thus, in conclusion, the Petitioner is requesting that Judge Fletcher-Hill grant the Petitioner's Motions. Cc: Hon. President Trump, Hon. Military Tribunal, Public

Respectively Submitted

Petitioner is requesting a hearing on her Motions.

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Diana R. Williams, Pro Se



Maryland 20850.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 11th day of August 2022, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's 6th Motion For Disqualification For "Fraud Upon The Court" Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Under Maryland Rule 18-102.11, And, Under The Rule Of Law Against Judge Fletcher-Hill And 2nd Motion For Disqualification For "Fraud Upon The Court" Under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) Against Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion To Have A Panel Of In Banc Judges To Continue To Preside Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, 3rd Motion For All Orders By Judge Fletcher-Hill, By The Panel Of In Banc Judges, By Judge Michel Pierson, and By Judge Karen Friedman Be Deemed Void As A Matter Of Law Under Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) And Under Maryland Rule 18-102.11, Motion For Reconsideration, And 5th Motion For A Hearing On The Motions was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd, Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.

Certificate of Service

410-868-6013

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

131 Calvin Hill Court

Diana R. Williams, Pro Se