

IN THE MATTER  
THE PETITION OF  
DIANA R. WILLIAMS

\* IN THE  
\*  
\* CIRCUIT COURT  
\*  
\* FOR  
\*  
\* BALTIMORE CITY  
\* Case No. 24-C-17-004535

23 FEB 27 11:03:33  
CIVIL DIVISION  
BALTIMORE COURT

\*\*\*\*\*

- 1.) MOTION FOR THE COURT TO STAY THE OTHER MOTIONS CITED BELOW UNTIL GOV. MOORE RESPONDS TO THE PETITIONER'S 2-17-23 CERTIFIED LETTER, WHICH PLEADS THAT GOV. MOORE EXERCISES HIS EXECUTIVE POWER AND ORDER AN IMMEDIATE STAY ON JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL BEING THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND ORDER AN IMMEDIATE RECUSAL OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO HIS BREACHING FOR THE EIGHTH TIME FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND FOR THE FOURTH TIME VIOLATING MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (C) . 2.) 8<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, FOR THE EIGHTH TIME, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REPETITIOUSLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11. 3.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AND, THUS, FOR THE FOURTH TIME, COMMITTING" FRAUD UPON THE COURT" AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY CONTINUOUSLY INFRINGING UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 4.) 3<sup>RD</sup> 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, AND TO SELECT JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - GENOCIDE. 5.) 5<sup>TH</sup> 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 STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11. 6.) 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED

**UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311**

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: **1.)** Motion For The Court To Stay The Other Motions Cited Below Until Gov. Moore Responds To The Petitioner's 2-17-23 Certified Letter, Which Pleads That Gov. Moore Exercises His Executive Power And Order An Immediate Stay On Judge Fletcher-Hill Being the Presiding Judge And Order An Immediate Recusal Of Judge Fletcher-Hill As The Presiding Judge Due to His Breaching For The Eighth Time Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And For The Fourth Time Violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). **2.)** 8<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Fletcher-Hill For Violations Of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And, Thus, For The Eighth Time, Committing Fraud Upon The Court", Treason Against The Constitution, Interference With Interstate Commerce, And Breaching The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Repetitiously Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11. **3.)** 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Fletcher-Hill For Violations of Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) And, Thus, For The Fourth Time, Committing "Fraud Upon The Court" And Breaching The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Continuously Infringing Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c). **4.)** 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 And To Select Judges Who Were Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley And/or by Chief Judge Barbera, Both Of Whom Are Being Alleged To Have Breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- And/Or Have Attempted And/Or Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - Genocide. **5.)** 5<sup>th</sup> 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. **6.)** 3<sup>rd</sup> Motion For Reconsideration. **7.)** 7<sup>th</sup> Motion for A Hearing on the Motions as Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

**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 8<sup>th</sup> time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has intentionally breached Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11 and, thus, for the 8<sup>th</sup> time, has committed "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce, violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and breached the Rule of Law by repetitiously infringing upon Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11. For the 4<sup>th</sup> time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has knowingly and willingly breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) and infringed upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution and, thereby, for the fourth time, has committed "Fraud Upon the Court", violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and breached the Rule of Law by repeatedly infringing upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) and upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. And, for the 6<sup>th</sup> time, the Petitioner has been denied her Motion for**

hearing on her Motions as stipulated in Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) and, thus, for the sixth time, the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and the Rule of Law have been infringed upon by the continuous breaching of Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) by Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other Officers of the Court who previously presided over the Petitioner's civil litigation. Moreover, along with Judge Fletcher-Hill, who was one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, the former presiding In Banc Judges over the Petitioner's appeal in the Review of her initial civil litigation, namely, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, and Judge R. Rubin, and the other two former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson and Judge Karen Friedman, have, too, repeatedly and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18-102.11, and the Rule of Law, and, therefore, have on several occasions, committed "Fraud upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and infringed upon the Rule of Law by their continuously violating Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11. Also, Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other presiding Judges have, too, repetitiously and deliberately infringed upon Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) and, thereby, have, again, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and violated the Rule of Law by their continuous infringing upon Maryland Rule 2-311 (f).

## INTRODUCTION

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, saith the LORD. Behold the days come saith the LORD that I will punish all them which are circumcised with the uncircumcised." 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." Still too, in the HOLY SCRIPTURES, namely, Psalm 34:19 declares "Many are the afflictions of the righteous, but the

LORD delivereth him out of them all." Further, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, Isaiah 48:22 cites that "There is no peace saith the LORD unto the wicked." Moreover, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, Ezekiel 19: 21-23 asserts that "But, if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all MY statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him: in his righteousness that he had done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the LORD GOD: and not that he should return from his ways and live?"

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 as afforded in our great Constitution, 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 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 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14<sup>th</sup> protects them from actions by state and local government. The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, [www.dianarwilliams.com](http://www.dianarwilliams.com), the Exhibits accompanying these Motions, and/or the material facts cited in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that: **1.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill, the presently presiding Judge over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, has for the eighth time deliberately breached Federal Statute 455(a) and, thus, has violated the Due Process Clause of the U.S Constitution and infringed upon the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and violated the Rule of Law for the eighth time. **2.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill's office was forwarded a copy through regular mail on 1-12-23 of the Petitioner's first certified letter to the Governor of Maryland, Gov. Moore, which is dated 1-10-23 and which, amongst other things, pleads that Gov. Moore exercises his Executive Power and Order an immediate STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions and Order an immediate recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge because the evidence substantiates the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill has deliberately and repeatedly not only infringed upon Federal Statute 455(a), but, also, has infringed upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Maryland Rule

18.102.11 5 (c) and, thus, has intentionally and repetitiously breached the Due Process Clause of the U.S Constitution in violating the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and infringing upon the Rule of Law by violating Federal Statute 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). **3.)** The Petitioner asserts in her second certified letter to Gov. Moore dated 2-17-23 that Judge Fletcher-Hill continues to intentionally and unlawfully preside over her Motions. Amongst other things, in the Petitioner's 2-17-23 certified letter to Gov. Moore, she continues to plea that Gov. Moore exercises his Executive Power and Order an immediate STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over the Petitioner's "new " Motions" (which are the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions filed on this day, namely, 2-27-23) and Order the immediate recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge because the evidence substantiates the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill has deliberately: "...a.) committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the eighth time, and has, therefore, violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 for the eighth time in breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102. b.) infringed upon the Rule of Law for the eighth time and has, therefore, violated by 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 under the Rule of Law for the eighth time. c.) violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and Maryland Rule 2-311 for the fourth time and has, thus, breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5( c), under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and under Maryland Rule 2-311 for the fourth time. d.) continues to infringe upon other federal and state laws, and, thus, continues breaching my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 under these other federal and state laws. My previous Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, my Addendums to my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or my other Official Complaints in which Judge Fletcher-Hill's alleged violation of federal and state laws are on my website as Exhibits, namely, Exhibits 16, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 71, 72, 77, 81,94, 96, 98, and/or Exhibit 100. e.) continues to cite in his Findings and Order that my Motions are frivolous and lacking merit, yet Judge Fletcher-Hill continues to refuse to grant my right to a "Hearing on my Motions" as required by Maryland Rule 2-311 so that I can prove that the material facts and legal arguments in my previous Motions and my new Motions are, indisputably, not frivolous and not lacking merit as he continuously state in his unsubstantiated Findings and Order." .... **4.)** In both of her urgent certified letters sent to Gov. Moore on 1-10-23 and 2-17-23, the Petitioner alleges that the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials have allowed our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at least 1993 and that Officers of the Court, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, the former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation, and/or some of the other Officers of the Court and/or other the governmental officials declared in the "Re:" section of the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint ("Re;" section is given in the "STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND"), have intentionally and repeatedly breached Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), and/or other federal and state laws, including violating the Petitioner's my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, in an attempt to conceal the material fact that the

Petitioner is alleging that the owners of the public schools, Officers of the Court, which, again, include Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other previous presiding Judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation, and/or other governmental officials have intentionally and repetitiously infringed Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091. Thus, in her second certified missive sent to Gov. Moore, the Petitioner, also, proclaims ...

**“Furthermore, as declared in my previous Motions and my new Motions, the evidence in the record of the court, on my website, and/or that will be admitted into evidence during Discovery and/or during my requested jury trial will substantiate the allegations that the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O’Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott and every member of the City Council of Baltimore from 1993 to the present, Chief Judge Barbera, other Officers of the Court , former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan and Martin O’Malley, and/or other governmental officials have: 1.) allowed our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at least 1993 and are, thereby, being alleged to have since 1993 intentionally 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, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws. 2.) for almost 3 decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempt and conspiracy to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, commit misconduct in office, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. 3.) refused for over a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials whose being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 3 decades. 4.) and/or accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been 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 other criminal acts.**

Governor Moore, your response to this 2<sup>nd</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE MEMO” which was sent by certified mail to you on 2-17-23 and was sent by regular mail on this same day is critical. I was informed by the clerk that after about 21 days, my file which contains my new Motions will be sent to Judge Fletcher-Hill’s office, where Judge Fletcher-Hill will be able to and for the ninth time to unlawfully preside over my Motions. Thus, again, I’m pleading for you, Gov. Moore, to utilize your Executive powers to ORDER an IMMEDIATE STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding on my new Motions that will be filed before the deadline, which is no later than 2-28-23, to ORDER removal of Judge Fletcher-Hill from unlawfully presiding over my new Motions as a result of his repeatedly and intentionally infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ) and, thus, repetitiously and intentionally violating my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, ORDER an appointment a panel of 3 judges to preside over my In Banc Review as required by Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, and to appoint 3 judges who were not appointed by Martin O’Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over my new Motions. Sincerely, Cc: Hon. President, Military Tribunal,

**Judge Fletcher-Hill, Pubic” 4.)** The panel of judges who formerly presided over the Petitioner’s In Banc Review and the former judges who presided over her initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have, also, repeatedly and intentionally violated Federal Statute 455(a) and has, thus, deliberately and repetitiously infringed upon the Due Process Clause of the U.S Constitution in breaching the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and violated the Rule of Law as a result of their infringing upon Federal Statute 455(a).

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 suggest 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. The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence that will be submitted into the record during Discovery and during the actual jury trial, the evidence on the Petitioner’s website, the Exhibits accompanying these Motions, and/or the material facts proclaimed in the section below and entitled **“STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND”** will substantiate the allegations that: **1.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill has engaged in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce for the eighth time. **2.)** the panel of In Banc Judges who formerly presided over the Petitioner’s In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin, and the former presiding Judges over her initial civil litigation, which, again, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, along with Judge Michel Pierson and Judge Karen Friedman, have, also, repeatedly engaged in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce.

The Appellant Courts have, also, 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. Sciuto, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir. 1996).

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. 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. The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner’s website, the Exhibits that accompany these Motions, and/or the material facts stated in the section below and entitled **“STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND”** will substantiate the allegations that: **1.)** Judge Fletcher, the presently presiding Judge over the Petitioner’s appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, the panel of In Banc Judges who formerly presided over the Petitioner’s In Banc Review, and the former presiding Judges over her initial

civil litigation, which, again, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, continuously and deliberately breached Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), although these Officers of the Court are knowledgeable of the material facts that the Petitioner has repeatedly cited in her Motions for Disqualifications against Judge Fletcher-Hill and against the other presiding Judges that these Officers of the Court intentionally and repeatedly violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and stated the causes for which the judges' impartiality might reasonably be questioned. 2.) Exhibits 1 and 2 which accompany these Motions and are, also, cited as Exhibits 103 and 109, respectively, on the Petitioner's website, substantiate that, on 1-10-23 and on 2-17-23, the Petitioner sent certified letters to Gov. Moore, and in both of these certified letters, the Petitioner pleads that, amongst other things, Gov. Moore exercises his Executive power and Order an immediate STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over her Motions and Order an immediate recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions due to his continuous and intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), and, thereby, repeatedly and deliberately violating the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and breaching the Rule of Law. 3.) A Copy of the Petitioner's 1-10-23 certified missive to Gov. Moore was forwarded by regular mail to Judge Fletcher-Hill on 1-12-23 and a certified copy was sent to Judge Fletcher on 1-13-23. 4.) Judge Fletcher-Hill still presided over the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions and denied her Motions, although Judge Fletcher-Hill's office has a copy of the first certified letter which was sent to Gov. Moore. and, therefore, should have known that, in the urgent certified letter sent to Gov. Moore on 1-10-23, the Petitioner pleads, amongst other things, that Gov. Moore exercises his Executive power and Order an immediate STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions and Order an immediate recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions due to his repetitive and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) and, therefore, repeatedly and deliberately violating the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and breaching the Rule of Law. 5.) The Petitioner received on 2-16-23 a returned receipt from the postal service of her certified letter sent to Judge Fletcher-Hill on 1-13-23, which indicated that the letter sent to Judge Fletcher-Hill by certified mail on 1-13-23 had been returned to the postal service, who, in turn, returned the certified letter by regular mail to the Petitioner. The Petitioner asserts that she has yet to receive a "returned" mail of the same letter that was sent by regular mail to Judge Fletcher-Hill on 1-12-23, which, also, contains a copy of the certified letter sent to Gov. Moore on 1-10-23.

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 disqualified 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. The Petitioner alleges that the evidence that will be submitted during Discovery and during her requested jury trial, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, the Exhibits accompanying these Motions, and/or the material facts stated in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that the Petitioner continues to undergo financial loss, loss of property, and tremendous emotional distress due to, amongst other things: **1.)** the continuous refusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill to disqualify and recuse himself as mandated by Federal Statute 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11 as a result of there being an appearance of his being biased and/or impartial due to his special appointment in 2009 as an Administrative Judge by the former Mayor of Baltimore City and former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's present Civil litigation to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities. **2.)** the continuous refusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill to disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation as mandated under Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 (c) due to the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the judges who formerly presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation. **3.)** the former presiding Judges' refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as the presiding Judges as a result of there being an appearance of their being biased and/or impartial due to their privileged appointments as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, both of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's present civil litigation to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities.

The Appellant Courts have, also, 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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 Liljeberg 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. Balistreri, 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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.

The 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals has, too, 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 (10<sup>th</sup> 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 influence is attempted 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.

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 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. 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 a decision that is dispositive of a claim or defense without a hearing if one was requested as provided in this section." The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on her website, the Exhibits accompanying these Motions, and/or the material facts asserted in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that: **1.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill continues to deliberately violate Maryland Rule 18-102.11, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 ( c), and Maryland Rule 2-311. **2.)** the former presiding Judges, which again, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have, also, repetitiously and deliberately violated Maryland Rule 18-102.11 and Maryland Rule 2-311. **3.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, and Judge Michel Pierson have never granted the Petitioner's repeated Motions for a hearing on her Motions as mandated by Maryland Rule 2-311.

According to our written Maryland Constitution, that is, 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 rendering their

decision. The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on her website, the Exhibits accompanying these Motions, and/or the material facts declared in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill has deliberately infringed upon Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution for the fourth time and has, thus, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and violated the Rule of Law for the fourth time.

### **STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

In 2018, Judge Fletcher-Hill became the presiding judge over the Petitioner's 2017 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. 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 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 includes a Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge as mandated by Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11 due to the appearance of there being a bias as a result of Judge Fletcher-Hill's appointment in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions, Civil Complaint, in the Petitioner's Official Complaints and/or in the Addendums to her Official Complaints against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against the previously presiding Judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other governmental officials, to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities.

As stated in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in the Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher Hill and in the Findings and Orders of the other former presiding Judges which respond to the Petitioner's material facts and legal arguments declared in her repeated Motions for Disqualification against these judges substantiate the material facts that these Officers of the Court have knowingly, willingly, and repeatedly breached Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11.

The Petitioner has repetitiously asserted in her Motions that, because of her financial hardship, she can't afford to make copies of all of the material evidence at this time, but her family has supported her in maintaining her website and, thus, most of the evidence germane to her present civil litigations, which include the Official Complaints and/or the Addendums against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against the former presiding judges, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other governmental officials

are posted on her website. 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 allegations against Judge Fletcher-Hill are in the record and/or can be located on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 16, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 71, 72, 77, 81, 94, 96, 98, 100, and/or Exhibit 112. The Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 50, 51, 52, 67, 95, 97, 99, and 111. The Petitioner's Motions, which include her Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions, her Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc judges and/or other Official Complaints and other Addendums which include allegations against the panel of In Banc Judges are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits on her website, namely, 16, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, and/or Exhibit 94. 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 Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualification and/or Substitution against Judge Karen Friedman, her Official Complaint, and/or the Petitioner's Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman are in the record and/or can be viewed from the Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, namely, 16, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 54, 55, 56, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81. The Findings and Orders of Judge Karen Friedman can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 47, 48, and 49. 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 are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits 16, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81 on her website. The Findings and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 59, 63, 66, and 70. 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.

The evidence of Judge Fletcher-Hill's 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, and 9-4-18 Findings and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, and 8-6-18 Motions, respectively, substantiate the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the presiding Judges in the Petitioner's initial civil proceeding. The evidence of the Petitioner's Motions dated 4-7-22, 6-24-22, and 8-11-22 substantiate the material fact that these are Motions from the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, where Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, and Judge Michel Pierson were the presiding Judges. The evidence of Judge Fletcher-Hill's 6-17-22, 8-4-22, 12-16-22, and 2-16-23 Findings and Orders responding to the Petitioner's 4-7-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, and 12-27-22 Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill substantiate the material fact that, for the 4<sup>th</sup> time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). And, as a result of the alleged deliberate and continuous infringement upon Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18-102.11, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 (c), and/or other federal and state laws by Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Karen Friedman, and other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner has filed two Addendums to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint (Exhibit 78 on the Petitioner's website). The Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint is Exhibit 81 on her website. In the "Re" section of the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint, she asserts "2<sup>nd</sup>

Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint (hereinafter "2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum") which includes the new allegations of violations of Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, "Crimes against humanity" and/or the attempt and/or conspiracy to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 and commit "Crimes against humanity" against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against all of the judges who were appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland (hereinafter "Court of Appeals") and presided over my 2013 and/or 2014 judicial proceedings and/or my appeals in the In Banc Review in the Baltimore City Circuit Court (hereinafter "Circuit Court"), against the judges who were appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera and presided over my 2014 and/or 2015 Writs to the Court of Appeals, against the judges who were appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera and presided over my appellant cases in the Court of Special Appeals of Maryland, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against the ALJ from the District Court in Maryland for Baltimore City (hereinafter "District Court"), against the Administrative Review Board (hereinafter "ARB"), against the majority Fourth Circuit Judges, against the Justices of the Supreme Court, (excluding Justices Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Baret), against the former Attorney Generals, Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch, against the former Mayors of Baltimore City, from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott, against all of the present members of the City Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter "City Council") and against those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993, against the former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan and Martin O'Malley, against the present Gov. of Maryland, Wes Moore, against all of the other Officers of the Court asserted in my 5-6-16 Official Complaint of judicial misconduct, and/or against all of the Officers of the Court cited in my 928 emailed Addendums to my 5-6-16 Official Complaint. 2.) 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum which includes the new allegations of the breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) and, thus, committing treason against the Constitution and/or interference with interstate commerce against some of the Officers of the Court cited in the "RE: 1" of this 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum. 3.) 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum which includes the new allegations of continuously and deliberately violating my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment and my Civil Rights under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241, and /or under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 against the Officers of the Court and/or other governmental officials cited in the "Re: 1" section of this 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum due to my continuously exposing in my present and past civil litigations their repetitiously, intentionally, and since 1993 violating Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or the attempt and/or conspiracy to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, and infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). 4.) Request that, if the Insurrection Act of 1807 empowers you, Hon. President Trump, to deploy our Hon. Military Tribunal, then I pray that our Hon. Military Tribunal will be deployed to launch a thorough investigation and conduct a Military Tribunal hearing to determine if the evidence support the allegations of breaching of Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempt and/or conspiracy to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committing of misconduct in office, and/or other criminal acts by: A.) the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, the Mayors and members of the City Council, which include Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott, and all of

the members of the City Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter "City Council") who were members from 1993 to the present. B.) the Officers of the Court and/or other governmental officials who are responsible for the health and safety of our children because the evidence substantiate the allegations that these Officers of the Court and/or other governmental officials have for almost 3 decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of breaching of Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempt and/or conspiracy to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 against the owners of the public schools. C.) other governmental officials who are, also, Officers of the Court, because the evidence substantiate the allegations that these other Officers of the Court have refused, for over a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 3 decades. D.) and/or by the Officers of the Court and/or governmental officials because the evidence substantiate the allegations that these Officers of the Court and/or governmental officials accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free. 5.) Request that, if the Insurrection Act of 1807 empowers you, Hon. President Trump, to deploy our Hon. Military Tribunal, then I plead that our Hon. Military Tribunal will be deployed to investigate and conduct a Military Tribunal hearing to preside over: A.) the allegations against the Officers of the Court in "Re: 1" of this 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum for their violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 11.102.11, Maryland Rule 11.102.11 5(c), and/or their infringing upon the other federal and state laws as proclaimed in the Motions in my present civil litigation and in my other Official Complaints and/or Addendums to my Official Complaints against some of these Officers cited in the "Re: 1 Section of this 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum. B.) the allegations that the Circuit Court, the Appellant Courts, and/or the Supreme Court of the U.S have repeatedly and intentionally failed in their judicial responsibility to protect my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Rights under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 and /or under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 that were being violated in the alleged breaching of Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempt and/or conspiracy to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 11.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 11.102.11 5(c). C.) all of the other alleged federal and state crimes cited in Motions, Official Complaints, and/or Addendums to my Official Complaints in my present civil litigation and the alleged federal and state crimes stated in my past civil litigations against the Officers of the Court who presided over any of my administrative and/or judicial proceedings which ultimately led up to the filings of my 2006, 2015, and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court and against all of the Officers of the Court who presided over any of my other administrative and/or judicial proceedings, beginning in 1999, which were not petitioned to the Supreme Court. C.) preside over my present civil litigation, which is currently being appealed in an In Banc Review in the Circuit Court. D.) reopen and preside over my 2014 Civil Complaint and my 2010 and 2000 administrative and/or judicial proceedings, which ultimately led up to my 2016, 2015, and 2006 Petitions, respectively, to the Supreme Court."

As declared in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against

Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution mandates that the Petitioner's In Banc Review, which includes her Motions filed during the In Banc Review proceeding, be presided over by a panel of 3 In Banc Judges, not by one judge. The evidence of his Findings and Orders dated 2-16-23, 12-16-22, 8-1-22, and 6-17-22, which respond to the Petitioner's material facts and legal arguments cited in her 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, respectively, which are Motions from the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review, substantiate the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill has not only infringed upon Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 (c) for the 4<sup>th</sup> time but has, also, violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for the 4<sup>th</sup> time. As declared in the Introduction to her Motions, the Petitioner sent certified letters to the Governor of Maryland, Gov. Moore, on 1-10-23 and on 2-17-23 (Exhibits 1 and 2, respectively, which are, also, declared as Exhibits 103 and 109, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), pleading that, amongst other things, he exercises his Executive Power and Order an immediate STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over the Petitioner's Motions and Order an immediate recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge because the evidence substantiates the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill has deliberately and repeatedly not only infringed upon Federal Statute 455(a), but has, also, repetitiously and intentionally violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) and, thus, has knowingly, willingly, and repeatedly breached the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution in violating the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and infringed upon the Rule of Law by repetitiously and intentionally breaching Federal Statute 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). Still too, along with being alleged in the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint, in both of the urgent memos sent to Gov. Moore, the Petitioner, also, alleges that, amongst other things, the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials knowingly and willingly allowed our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at least 1993 and are, thus, being alleged in these Motions as well, to: **1.)** have since 1993 intentionally 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, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws. **2.)** for almost 3 decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempt and conspiracy to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091– Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. **3.)** refused for over a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials whose being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 3 decades. **4.)** and/or accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been 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 other criminal acts.

A copy of the Petitioner's 1-10-23 certified missive to Gov. Moore was forwarded by regular mail to Judge Fletcher-Hill on 1-12-23, and a copy of the same missive was sent certified to Judge Fletcher-Hill on 1-13-23 with a handwritten note at the bottom of the letter which states "Note: Sent this certified

copy on 1-13-22 & sent through regular mail on 1-12-23" ( Exhibit 3 and is, also, cited as Exhibit 104 on the Petitioner's website). As substantiated by a copy of the envelope and the postal receipt of the returned certified mail (Exhibit 4 and is, also, cited as Exhibit 111 on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner asserts that, on 2-16-23, she received from the postal service the certified mail she had sent on 1-13-23 to Judge Fletcher-Hill that was sent back to the postal service, who, in turn, forwarded to me on 2-16-23 by regular mail with a note on the envelope from the post office dated 2-7-23 and citing "Return To Sender Unclaimed Unable To Forward". The Petitioner has yet to receive the copy of the certified letter sent to Gov. Moore and forwarded by regular mail to Judge Fletcher-Hill on 1-12-23, which, again, pleads that, amongst other things, Gov. Moore exercises his Executive power and Order an immediate STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions and Order an immediate recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions (Exhibit 100 on the Petitioner's website). Judge Fletcher-Hill presided over the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions and denied the Petitioner's Motion in his Findings and Order filed by the clerk on 2-16-23 (Exhibit 113 on the Petitioner's website). Exhibit 6 that accompanies the Petitioner's Motions and which is, also, Exhibit 106 on the Petitioner's website, are copies of the certified receipts that the Petitioner received from the postal service after sending the certified letters to Gov. Moore on 1-10-23, to Judge Fletcher-Hill on 1-13-23, and Mr. Xavier Conway, the Clerk of the Court for Baltimore City on 1-14-23.

As cited in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill , against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, Judge Michel Pierson presided over the Petitioner's initial civil proceeding after Judge Fletcher-Hill was recused in 2018 from presiding over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation. 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, on 1-24-20, the panel of In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, and Judge R. Rubin were designated as the presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review.

As stated in the Petitioner's 12-27-22 and 8-11-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, 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, with her first day starting on 3-23-22. 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 Judge Rubin was no longer a judge in the Circuit Court as of 3-23-22. In his 2-16-23, 12-16-22, 8-1-22, or in his 6-17-22 Findings and Orders, which



respond to the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-33, and 4-7-22 Motions, respectively, Judge Fletcher-Hill does not cite the material fact that Judge Rubin was no longer a judge in the Circuit Court as of 3-23-22, and, therefore, Judge Rubin was no longer one of the panel of In Banc Judges presiding over the Petitioner's Motions from the appeal in the In Banc Review.

As proclaimed in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the evidence of the facts declared in and/or the lack thereof of facts proclaimed in Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Orders which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's corresponding Motions, substantiate the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill, like the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman, denies the Petitioner's Motions without disclosing, considering, and resolving all of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Petitioner's Motions. Furthermore, the evidence of the Petitioner's Headings in her 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, as well as the evidence of the Headings in her other Motions, beginning with her 12-17-18 Motions, substantiate the material fact that the Petitioner has repeatedly pleaded for a hearing on her Motions to prove that the material facts and legal arguments cited in her Motions are, indisputably, not "frivolous" or "lacking in merit", which include the material facts that the evidence in the record and/or on the Petitioner's website substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill has intentionally and repetitiously: 1.) committed "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, and violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and infringed upon the Rule of Law by deliberately and repeatedly breaching Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18-102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c). 2.) 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 and, thus, has continuously and intentionally violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and breached the Rule of Law by deliberately and repeatedly infringing upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 3.) denied the Petitioner's right to have a hearing on her Motions for a Hearing as stipulated in "Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), and, thereby, has repeatedly and deliberated violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and breached the Rule of Law by repetitiously and intentionally infringing upon Maryland Rule 2-311 (f). The Petitioner alleges that she believes that Judge Fletcher-Hill is fearful to grant the Petitioner her repeated Motions for a hearing on her Motions because Judge Fletcher-Hill will be coerced to prove with the evidence his repetitive and unsubstantiated assertions that the Petitioner's Motions are "frivolous" and "lacking merit".

As stated in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, 9-17-18 Motions, in other Motions, in her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, in her Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher Hill, in her 1-14-22 Memorandum, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of

Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, Martin O'Malley appointed Judge Fletcher-Hill to the prominent position as an Administrator to the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City in 2009 and appointed Judge Barbera to the elite position as the new Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals in 2013.

As declared in Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the other former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman, were appointed to the privileged position as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera. The Petitioner, also, asserts in these Motions and the other documents cited above the material fact that there is evidence of the public acknowledgement of the close relationship amongst Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, and/or Judge Karen Friedman. Again, under Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman are mandated to disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges since there is an appearance that they would be impartial and/or biased due to their unique appointments as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities.

As asserted in her 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner declares that, in her Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher Hill, she asserts that she questions the impartiality and/or bias of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge because he was appointed by Martin O'Malley, who is alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities, and maybe called as a witness. Also, in these Motions, the Petitioner declares that she questions the impartiality and/or bias of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge due to her believing 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, other significant material facts, namely, that the evidence that accompanied her 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals (Exhibit 11 on her website) and her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court (Exhibit 7 on her website) substantiate the allegations that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 her 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley is being

alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or possibly criminal activities.

As proclaimed in her 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner alleges that she questions the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, or Judge Karen Friedman disclosing, considering, and resolving these critical material facts as well, namely, that the Petitioner alleges in her 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals (Exhibit 4 on her website) and in her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court 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. The Petitioner asserts in her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court the material fact that 5 of the Exhibits that accompanied her Petition, which are the first 5 Exhibits on her website, substantiate, unequivocally, and in less than 5 minutes of reading, the allegation that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in her 2015 Findings and Order. Moreover, the Petitioner alleges that the evidence that accompanied her 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals substantiate the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> 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, in the Petitioner's 2014 civil litigation, Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 critical allegations, namely, that: 1.) Martin O'Malley, who was Mayor of Baltimore City from 1999 to 2007 and, thus, one of the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, along with the other Mayors of Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, which include Kurt Schmoke, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott, and the other owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, every member of the City Council who was a member between 1993 until the present, and/or other governmental officials who are responsible for the health and safety of our children are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities by: a.) having exposed our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based hazards since at least 1993. b.) having 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.) failing in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of the children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison. d.) having for decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal

U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, misconduct in office, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. e.) having refused, for nearly a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for decades. f.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities for close to a quarter of a century. 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.

As stated in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in the 2-16-23, 12-16-22, 8-1-22, and 6-17-22 Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner alleges in her 2-13-20 Motions that the evidence substantiate 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 Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution. In these Motions, the Petitioner cites that her 2-13-20 Motions states 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....." ... Also, the Petitioner alleges in these same Motions that, in her 2-13-20 Motions, she questions the impartiality and/or fairness in the panel of In Banc Judges rendering their Findings and Order to the Defendant's 2-6-20 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. Moreover, the evidence substantiate the material fact that the Defendant has not responded to any of the Petitioner's Motions since responding to her 1-14-20 Petition, nor have Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, or Judge Michel Pierson mandated a response from the Defendants germane to any of the Petitioner's Motions filed since 2-13-20. Further, the Petitioner states that she 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, in her 2-13-20 Motions, the Petitioner states that, 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, which are labeled as Exhibits 71 and 72 on her website. Still too, the Petitioner alleges that the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in panel of In Banc judges 3-30-22 Findings and Order, which, also, respond the Petitioner's 2-19-20 Motions, substantiate the material facts that the panel of In Banc judges fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in their 3-30-22 Findings and Orders the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 2-19-20 Motions. The Petitioner's Heading in her 2-19-20 Motions is 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 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> 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 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> 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 declared in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 12-27-22 and on 8-11-22 and as asserted in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner alleges that she called the Circuit Court on 8-18-22 and informed the clerk and the supervisor that the Heading in her 8-11-22 Motions was not entered on the Circuit Court's website as it is cited in the Heading of her Motions, but was entered on the Circuit Court's website as "**Motion**" and "**Request for Hearing on Selection Motion**". Also, the Petitioner alleges that she read the Heading of her Motions to the supervisor and protested vigorously that the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions should be inserted on the Circuit Court's website exactly as it is stated in the Heading of her Motions. Further, the Petitioner alleges that, after finding out on the morning of 8-22-22 that the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions was still not recorded as declared in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions but was entered on the Circuit Court's website as "**6<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U,S,C, & 455(a)"**" and "**Request for Hearing on Selected Motion**", the Petitioner called the Circuit Court and declared to the clerk ( whose name the Petitioner prefers not reveal in order to protect the innocent) her righteous indignation in regard to the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions not being entered on the Circuit Court as cited in the Heading of her Motions. The Petitioner asserts that the clerk requested that the Petitioner give her a few minutes to speak with her supervisor, and after speaking with the supervisor, the clerk informed the Petitioner that the supervisor declared that there would be no changes made to what was written on the Circuit Court's website. The Petitioner alleges that she asked this clerk if she could speak to Ms. Marilyn Bentley, the Clerk of the Court, and the clerk connected the Petitioner to Ms. Bentley's office. The Petitioner alleges that a female informed her that Ms. Bentley was not available. The Petitioner alleges that she asked the female, "To whom am I speaking with" and was informed by the young lady that she could not give the Petitioner her name, but inquired as to why the Petitioner was calling Ms. Bentley's office. The Petitioner alleges that, after repeating, again, amongst other things, her righteous anger in not having the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions stated on the Circuit Court's website as it is stated in the Heading of her Motions, the female

told the Petitioner that she would connect her to "Ms." (whose name the female did mention, but to protect the innocent, the Petitioner will call her "Ms.") who could assist her.

As stated in the Petitioner's 12-27-22 and 8-11-22 Motions and in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner asserts that, when calling the Circuit Court, the recording informs the individual of the likelihood that his/her conversation will be recorded for quality control purposes. Therefore, the Petitioner declares that she knew that it was possible that her conversation was being recorded prior to her speaking to the clerk and the supervisor on 8-18-22, before talking with another clerk on 8-22-22, prior to conversing with the young lady who refuse to give the Petitioner her name on 8-22-22, and/or before having a conversation with "Ms." on 8-22-22. During the various conversations and at difference times, the Petitioner alleges that she informed these individuals of one or more of the material facts, namely, that:

- 1.) The Petitioner's Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions was entered on the Circuit Court's website as **"Motion" and "Request for Hearing on Selection Motion"** when she checked the Circuit Court's website on 8-18-22, and the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions was entered on the Circuit Court's website as **"6th Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" under Federal Statue 28 U,S,C, & 455(a)" and "Request for Hearing on Selected Motion"** when the Petitioner checked the Circuit Court's website just prior to calling the Circuit Court on the morning of 8-22-22.
- 2.) The Petitioner did not file "a Motion", but filed "Motions" and proceeded to read, verbatim, the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions, which is entitled **"6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND 2<sup>ND</sup> 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 STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARINGON THE MOTIONS"**.
- 3.) The Petitioner's Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions should be stated, verbatim, on the Circuit Court's website as it is cited in the Heading of her Motions.
- 4.) The clerk/s should not attempt to hide the material facts in the Heading of the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions from the public's viewing on the Circuit Court's website, namely, that it is being alleged in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the "Judge-in-Charge" over the Civil division in the Circuit Court, has committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the sixth time, has breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5( c) for the second time, that Judge Fletcher-Hill has breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for the second time, that Judge Fletcher-Hill has violated the "Rule of Law" for the sixth time, and that a plea for a hearing on the Petitioner's Motions has been requested for the fifth time.
- 5.) No Officer of the Court, which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill, is above the Rule of Law.
- 6.) Judge Fletcher-Hill should know that Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 require his voluntary disqualification and

**OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311”.**

As proclaimed in the Petitioner’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O’Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner alleges that, on 12-28-22, she checked the Circuit Court’s website and discovered that the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions on the Circuit Court’s website is not declared, verbatim, as in the Heading of her actual 12-27-22 Motions, but is stated as follows: **“7th Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" Under Federal Statue28 U,S,C, & 455(a), Under MD 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 MD 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 MD 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 Statue 28 U.S.C & 455(A) and under MD Rule 18-102.11, Motion for Reconsideration”.** The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence of the Heading in her 12-27-22 Motions substantiates the material facts, namely, that clerk who posted the Petitioner’s Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions, a legal document, on the Circuit Court’s website for public viewing failed to: **1.)** state in its entirety the Petitioner’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion as proclaimed in the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions, which declares **“2<sup>ND</sup> 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, JUDGES NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O’MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES”.** **2.)** include the fact that, within the Heading of the Petitioner’s 12-27-22 Motions is her Motion entitled **“2<sup>nd</sup> Motion for Reconsideration”** not a “Motion for Reconsideration” as cited on the Circuit Court’s website. **3.)** include the Petitioner’s last Motion stated within the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions, which proclaims **“AND 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311”.**

As stated in the Petitioner’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O’Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner alleges that she called the Circuit Court on 12-29-22 and spoke with “Ms. P” (whose name the Petitioner will omit to protect the innocent) germane to having the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions asserted, verbatim, on the Circuit Court’s website as stated in the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions. Also, the Petitioner asserts that she informed “Ms. P” that “Ms.” was the individual who had the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions changed on the Circuit Court’s website to declare what is exactly written in the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions. The Petitioner declares that “Ms. P” assured her that she would get “Ms.” to change the Heading of her



**Cc: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Ms. Adrienne”**

The Petitioner alleges that, on 2-25-23, she received in the mail Exhibit 7, which is, also, Exhibit 114 on the Petitioner’s website, which is a copy of the certified postal card from the post office, indicating that the Office of Gov. Moore has received the Petitioner’s 2nd Urgent missive dated 2-17-23.

## **ARGUMENT**


The Petitioner’s argues that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner’s website, and evidence that will be admitted during Discovery and revealed during the Petitioner’s requested jury trial support the material facts, namely, the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the other judges who formerly presided over her appeal in the In Banc Review of the Petitioner’s initial civil litigation, and the judges who presided over her initial litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have continued to deliberately, unlawfully, deny the Petitioner’s Motions, which include repeated Motions for their Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other formerly presiding Judges for deliberately and repetitiously breaching Federal Statute, Maryland Rule, Maryland Rule 5(c) , and/or other Federal and State laws, and, thus, infringing upon the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and/or breaching the Rule of Law in order to, ultimately, grant the Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Petitioner’s 2017 Civil Complaint in order to attempt to continue to conceal the **critical material facts** which will be revealed during the hearing, which include the allegations that: **1.)** In her 2015 Motion for Consideration to the Court of Appeals and in her 2016 Petition to the Supreme that the first 5 Exhibits on the her website, namely, Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 which can be read in about 5 minutes, prove, indisputably, that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury, which is “Fraud Upon the Court”. **2.)** Due to 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, which includes the material facts that the Petitioner alleges that the evidence that accompanied her 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals, the evidence on her website, and/or the evidence in the record of the Petitioner’s 2014 Civil proceedings in the Circuit Court substantiate the allegations, namely that, in their 2014 the Findings, the In Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to cover up the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> 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, who was Mayor of Baltimore City from 1999 to 2007 and, thus, one of the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, along with the other Mayors of Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott, and the other owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, every member of the City Council who was a member between 1993 until the present, and/or other governmental officials who are responsible for the health and safety of our children are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C

& 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities by: a.) having exposed our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based hazards since at least 1993. b.) having 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.) failing in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of the children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison. d.) having for decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of misconduct in office, crimes against humanity, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. e.) having refused, for nearly a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison. f.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities for several decade.

### **CONCLUSION**

Thus, in conclusion, the Petitioner pleads that another panel of In Banc Judges who were not appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera grants her Motions.

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

### **Certificate of Service**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 27 day of February 2023, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's: 1.) Motion For The Court To Stay The Other Motions Cited Below Until Gov. Moore Responds To The

Petitioner's 2-17-23 Certified Letter, Which Pleads That Gov. Moore Exercises His Executive Power And Order An Immediate Stay On Judge Fletcher-Hill Being the Presiding Judge And Order An Immediate Recusal Of Judge Fletcher-Hill As The Presiding Judge Due to His Breaching For The Eighth Time Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And For The Fourth Time Violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). 2.) 8<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Fletcher-Hill For Violations Of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And, Thus, For The Eighth Time, Committing Fraud Upon The Court", Treason Against The Constitution, Interference With Interstate Commerce, And Breaching The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Repetitiously Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 3.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Fletcher-Hill For Violations of Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) And, Thus, For The Fourth Time, Committing "Fraud Upon The Court" And Breaching The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Continuously Infringing Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c). 4.) 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 And To Select Judges Who Were Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley And/Or by Chief Judge Barbera, Both Of Whom Are Being Alleged To Have Breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- And/Or Have Attempted And/Or Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - Genocide. 5.) 5<sup>th</sup> 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. 6.) 3<sup>rd</sup> Motion For Reconsideration. 7.) 7<sup>th</sup> Motion for A Hearing on the Motions as Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd., Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

**REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

Petitioner is requesting a hearing on her Motions.

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

# Exhibit 1

To: Gov. Elect of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams

Re: "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE" PLEADS to executive powers as the "Governor Elect of Maryland" to IMMEDIATELY: A.) GRANT A STAY ON MY 12-27-22 MOTIONS being presided over by Judge Fletcher-Hill. B.) remove Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding judge over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial Civil litigation because he has continuously and deliberately violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right by repeatedly and intentionally breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). C.) as mandated by Article IV in the Maryland Constitution, have 3 judges preside over my 12-27-22 Motions, which are Motions germane to my appeal in the In Banc Review. D.) have judges who were not appointed by former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over my In Banc Review since the evidence substantiate the material facts that both of these individuals are being alleged in my 12-27-22 Motions, along with other Officers of the Court and/or other government officials to have directly and/or indirectly committed misconduct in office, the prejudicial act of perjury, crimes against humanity, and/or other federal crimes

Date: 1-10-23

Please grant the urgent plead, as the new Gov. Elect of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore, to use your executive powers to IMMEDIATELY GRANT A STAY ON MY 12-27-22 MOTIONS being presided over by Judge Fletcher-Hill because Judge Fletcher-Hill, who was appointed as the Administrative judge to the Eighth Circuit in Baltimore City in 2009 by Martin O'Malley and who is the "Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, is being alleged in my 12-27-22 Motions which respond to his 12-16-22 Findings and Order (Exhibit 100 and 99 on my website, , respectively) to have intentionally: a.) committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the seventh time, and has, therefore, violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right as afforded under the Due Process Clause of the U.S Constitution for the seventh time in violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102. b.) breached the Rule of Law for the seventh time and has, therefore, violated by 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right under the Rule of Law for the seventh time. c.) violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and Maryland Rule 2-311 for the third time and has, thus, violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and under Maryland Rule 2-311 for the third time. d.) continues to infringe upon other federal and state laws, and, thus, continues breaching my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right under these other federal and state laws. e.) continues to cite in his Findings and Order that my Motions are frivolous and lacking merit, yet Judge Fletcher-Hill continues to refuse to grant my right to a "Hearing on my Motions" as required by Maryland Rule 2-311 so that I can prove that the material facts and legal arguments my 12-27-22 Motions are, indisputably, not frivolous and do not lack merit.

Furthermore, as declared in my 12-27-22 Motions, the evidence in the record of the court, on my website, and/or that will be admitted into evidence during Discovery and/or during my requested jury trial will substantiate the allegations that the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott and every member of the City Council of Baltimore from 1993 to the present, Chief Judge Barbera, other Officers of the Court, former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan and Martin O'Malley, and/or other governmental officials have: 1.) allowed our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at least 1993. 2.) for almost 3 decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of misconduct in office, crimes against humanity, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. 3.) refused for over a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials whose being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 3 decades. 4.) and/or accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who committed the alleged misconduct in office, crimes against humanity, and/or other criminal acts.

Your response, Gov. Elect of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore, to this missive which was sent by certified mail to you on 1-10-23 is "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE". I was informed by the clerk that after about 21 days, my file which contains my 12-27-22 Motions will be sent to Judge Fletcher-Hill's office, where Judge Fletcher-Hill will be able to and for the eighth time to unlawfully preside over my Motions. Thus, again, I'm pleading for you, Gov. Elect of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore, to utilize your Executive powers to mandate an IMMEDIATE STAY ON MY 12-27-22 MOTIONS, to remove Judge Fletcher-Hill from unlawfully presiding over my 12-27-22 Motions as a result of his violating my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right by repeatedly and intentionally infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ), appoint a panel of 3 judges to preside over my In Banc Review as required by Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, and to appoint 3 judges who were not appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over my 12-27-22 Motions.

Sincerely,

Cc: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Pubic

Note: Sent this certified copy on 1-13-23  
& sent through regular mail on 1-12-23



# Exhibit 2

To: Gov. of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams

Re: "2<sup>ND</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE" PLEADING that you, Gov. Moore, execute your Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland" and IMMEDIATELY: **A.)** Order a STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill being the presiding Judge over my new Motions that will be filed before the deadline (a copy of my new filed and stamped Motions will be posted on my website, . no later than 2-28-23) until you have responded to this urgent memo. **B.)** Order a removal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial Civil litigation because the evidence substantiate that he has deliberately and for the eighth time violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) and, thus, have infringed upon my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 for the 8<sup>th</sup> time. **C.)** Order that, as mandated by Article IV in the Maryland Constitution, 3 judges preside over my new Motions, which are Motions germane to my appeal in the In Banc Review. **D.)** Order to have only judges who were not appointed by former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over my In Banc Review since both of these individuals, along with Judge Fletcher-Hill, other Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged in my Motions, in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint, and/or in other Official Complaints to have breached of 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 and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws.

Date: 2-17-23

Please grant my 2<sup>nd</sup> the urgent plea, as the new Gov. of Maryland, to use your executive powers to ORDER an IMMEDIATE STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over my new Motions that will be filed before the deadline, which is no later than 2-28-23. Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed as the Administrative Judge to the Eighth Circuit in Baltimore City in 2009 by Martin O'Malley and is the "Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, is being alleged in my new Motions which respond to his 2-16-23 Findings and Order ( and in my previous Motions) to be unlawfully presiding over my Motions because he has intentionally: **a.)** committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the eighth time, and has, therefore, violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 for the eighth time in breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102. **b.)** infringed upon the Rule of Law for the eighth time and has, therefore, violated by 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 under the Rule of Law for the eighth time. **c.)** violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and Maryland Rule 2-311 for the fourth time and has, thus, breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5( c), under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and under Maryland Rule 2-311 for the fourth time. **d.)** continues to infringe upon other federal and state laws, and, thus, continues breaching my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 under these other federal and state laws. My previous Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, my Addendums to my

Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or my other Official Complaints in which Judge Fletcher-Hill's alleged violation of federal and state laws are on my website as Exhibits, namely, Exhibits 16, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 71, 72, 77, 81,94, 96, 98, and/or Exhibit 100. e.) continues to cite in his Findings and Order that my Motions are frivolous and lacking merit, yet Judge Fletcher-Hill continues to refuse to grant my right to a "Hearing on my Motions" as required by Maryland Rule 2-311 so that I can prove that the material facts and legal arguments in my previous Motions and my new Motions are, indisputably, not frivolous and not lacking merit as he continuously state in his unsubstantiated Findings and Order.

Furthermore, as declared in my previous Motions and my new Motions, the evidence in the record of the court, on my website, and/or that will be admitted into evidence during Discovery and/or during my requested jury trial will substantiate the allegations that the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott and every member of the City Council of Baltimore from 1993 to the present, Chief Judge Barbera, other Officers of the Court, former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan and Martin O'Malley, and/or other governmental officials have: **1.)** allowed our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at least 1993 and are, thereby, being alleged to have since 1993 intentionally 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, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws. **2.)** for almost 3 decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempt and conspiracy to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, commit misconduct in office, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. **3.)** refused for over a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials whose being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 3 decades. **4.)** and/or accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been 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 other criminal acts.

Governor Moore, your response to this 2<sup>nd</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE MEMO" which was sent by certified mail to you on 2-17-23 and was sent by regular mail on this same day is critical. I was informed by the clerk that after about 21 days, my file which contains my new Motions will be sent to Judge Fletcher-Hill's office, where Judge Fletcher-Hill will be able to and for the ninth time to unlawfully preside over my Motions. Thus, again, I'm pleading for you, Gov. Moore, to utilize your Executive powers to ORDER an IMMEDIATE STAY on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding on my new Motions that will be filed before the deadline, which is no later than 2-28-23, to ORDER removal of Judge Fletcher-Hill from unlawfully presiding over my new Motions as a result of his repeatedly and intentionally infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ) and, thus, repetitiously and intentionally violating my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, ORDER an appointment a panel of 3 judges to preside over my In Banc Review

as required by Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, and to appoint 3 judges who were not appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over my new Motions.

Sincerely,

Cc: Hon. President, Military Tribunal, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Pubic



Exhibit 3

To: Gov. Elect of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams

Re: "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE" PLEADS to executive powers as the "Governor Elect of Maryland" to IMMEDIATELY: A.) GRANT A STAY ON MY 12-27-22 MOTIONS being presided over by Judge Fletcher-Hill. B.) remove Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding judge over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial Civil litigation because he has continuously and deliberately violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right by repeatedly and intentionally breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). C.) as mandated by Article IV in the Maryland Constitution, have 3 judges preside over my 12-27-22 Motions, which are Motions germane to my appeal in the In Banc Review. D.) have judges who were not appointed by former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over my In Banc Review since the evidence substantiate the material facts that both of these individuals are being alleged in my 12-27-22 Motions, along with other Officers of the Court and/or other government officials to have directly and/or indirectly committed misconduct in office, the prejudicial act of perjury, crimes against humanity, and/or other federal crimes

Date: 1-10-23

Please grant the urgent plead, as the new Gov. Elect of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore, to use your executive powers to IMMEDIATELY GRANT A STAY ON MY 12-27-22 MOTIONS being presided over by Judge Fletcher-Hill because Judge Fletcher-Hill, who was appointed as the Administrative judge to the Eighth Circuit in Baltimore City in 2009 by Martin O'Malley and who is the "Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, is being alleged in my 12-27-22 Motions which respond to his 12-16-22 Findings and Order (Exhibit 100 and 99 on my website, , respectively) to have intentionally: a.) committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the seventh time, and has, therefore, violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right as afforded under the Due Process Clause of the U.S Constitution for the seventh time in violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102. b.) breached the Rule of Law for the seventh time and has, therefore, violated by 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right under the Rule of Law for the seventh time. c.) violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5( c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and Maryland Rule 2-311 for the third time and has, thus, violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5( c), under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and under Maryland Rule 2-311 for the third time. d.) continues to infringe upon other federal and state laws, and, thus, continues breaching my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right under these other federal and state laws. e.) continues to cite in his Findings and Order that my Motions are frivolous and lacking merit, yet Judge Fletcher-Hill continues to refuse to grant my right to a "Hearing on my Motions" as required by Maryland Rule 2-311 so that I can prove that the material facts and legal arguments my 12-27-22 Motions are, indisputably, not frivolous and do not lack merit.

Furthermore, as declared in my 12-27-22 Motions, the evidence in the record of the court, on my website, and/or that will be admitted into evidence during Discovery and/or during my requested jury trial will substantiate the allegations that the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott and every member of the City Council of Baltimore from 1993 to the present, Chief Judge Barbera, other Officers of the Court, former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan and Martin O'Malley, and/or other governmental officials have: 1.) allowed our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at least 1993. 2.) for almost 3 decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of misconduct in office, crimes against humanity, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. 3.) refused for over a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials whose being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 3 decades. 4.) and/or accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who committed the alleged misconduct in office, crimes against humanity, and/or other criminal acts.

Your response, Gov. Elect of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore, to this missive which was sent by certified mail to you on 1-10-23 is "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE". I was informed by the clerk that after about 21 days, my file which contains my 12-27-22 Motions will be sent to Judge Fletcher-Hill's office, where Judge Fletcher-Hill will be able to and for the eighth time to unlawfully preside over my Motions. Thus, again, I'm pleading for you, Gov. Elect of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore, to utilize your Executive powers to mandate an IMMEDIATE STAY ON MY 12-27-22 MOTIONS, to remove Judge Fletcher-Hill from unlawfully presiding over my 12-27-22 Motions as a result of his violating my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right by repeatedly and intentionally infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ), appoint a panel of 3 judges to preside over my In Banc Review as required by Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, and to appoint 3 judges who were not appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over my 12-27-22 Motions.


Sincerely,

Cc: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Pubic

Note Sent this certified copy on 1-13-23  
it sent through regular mail on 1-12-23

Exhibit 4

U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
COMM. LETTER  
DUNEDALK, MD  
21222  
JAN 13, 23  
AMOUNT  
**\$7.85**  
R2303S103704-16



21202



RDC 99



2E4E TOT9 0000 0T40 2202

Wm  
131 Calvert Blvd Ct  
Baltimore, Md 21222

Judge Fletcher Blvd  
131 Calvert St. Suite 208  
Baltimore, MD 21202

2/11/23

0102/07/23

212 212 1

SIX

RETURN TO SENDER  
UNCLAIMED  
UNABLE TO FORWARD

7022 0410 0000 6101 3432

Article Number (Transfer from service label)

7022 0410 0000 6101 3432

Domestic Return Receipt

3. Service Type
- Adult Signature
  - Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
  - Certified Mail®
  - Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
  - Collect on Delivery
  - Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
  - Priority Mail Express®
  - Registered Mail™
  - Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
  - Signature Confirmation™
  - Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery

9590 9402 6989 1225 8856 78



Judge Fletcher Hill  
111 N. Calvert St. Suite  
208  
Baltimore, Md. 21202

1. Article Addressed to:  
Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.  
Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

X  
 Agent  
 Addressee

B. Received by (Printed Name)

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1?  Yes  
If YES, enter delivery address below:  No

Exhibit 5

To: Mr. Xavier Conaway, Clerk of the Court for Baltimore City

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams

Re: Plead to follow the protocol for recording the Heading of a legal document on the Circuit Court's website for public viewing

If a clerk fails to state on the Circuit Court's website the Heading in a party's 12-27-22 Motions, a legal document, as clearly delineated in the Heading of the Motions, which is viewed by the public, then that clerk could be guilty of committing Fraud, which is a crime. One of the main responsibilities of the Clerk of the Court is to record land deeds, mortgages, plats, conveyances and other precious documents. I do not want the Clerk of the Court to be in danger of being alleged to have committed Fraud in altering the Heading of an official legal document, thus deceiving and misrepresenting on the Circuit Court's website, which is opened to the public for viewing, the actual Heading in a legal document, namely, in the Heading of my 12-27-22 Motions. Further, I don't want the Clerk of the Court to be accused of intentionally committing Fraud as a result of repetitiously refusing to change the Circuit Court's posting of the altered Heading of an official legal document to the verbatim quoting as stated in the Heading of the official legal document, even after being warned of the material facts that I, the Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se in this Civil litigation, am alleging that, if the Clerk of the Court do not mandate that the clerk declare, verbatim, the Heading in the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions, then Clerk of the Court should hold some responsibility in the allegation of Fraud in altering the Heading in a legal document on the Circuit Court's website that it used for public viewing.

Sincerely,

Cc: Hon. President

Hon. Military Tribunal

Ms. Adrienne

Note: 1-14-23

To: Mr. Xavier Conaway

From: Ms. Diana Williams

Re: 3<sup>rd</sup> time sending this message but certified this time.

On 1-7-23, I completed and mailed this letter. On 1-11-23, I sent a copy of this letter again, indicating that the date was mistakenly left off on the initial sending. And, again, on this day, namely, 1-14-23, I'm sending a copy of the original letter, this time, a certified copy. I ~~sent~~ certified

cc: Ms. Adrienne Sincerely

7022 0410 0000 6101 3401

U.S. Postal Service  
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT  
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com.  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
0013  
01

Certified Mail Fee \$4.00 \$3.25

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)

Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$0.00

Return Receipt (electronic) \$0.00

Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Adult Signature Required \$0.00

Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Postage \$0.60

Total Postage and Fees \$5.85

Postmark Here: DUNDALK STATION 01/10/2023

Sent to: Elected in James Moore  
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.: 110  
City, State, ZIP+4: Annapolis MD 21401

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-907 See Reverse for Instructions



DUNDALK SPARROWS POINT  
44 SHIPPING PL  
DUNDALK, MD 21222-9998  
(800) 275-8777

01/10/2023 11:12 AM  
Product Qty Unit Price  
Letter 1 \$0.60

First-Class Mail® 1 \$0.60

Annapolis, MD 21401  
Weight: 0 lb 0.40 oz  
Estimated Delivery Date  
Thu 01/12/2023

Certified Mail® \$4.00  
Tracking #: 70220410000061013401  
Return Receipt \$3.25  
Tracking #: 9590 9402 6989 1225 8857 08  
Total \$7.85

Grand Total: \$7.85

Exhibit 6

7022 0410 0000 6102 4674

U.S. Postal Service™  
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT  
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com.  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
0013  
24

Certified Mail Fee \$4.00 \$3.75

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)

Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$0.00

Return Receipt (electronic) \$0.00

Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Adult Signature Required \$0.00

Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Postage \$0.60

Total Postage and Fees \$7.55

Postmark Here: BALTIMORE STATION 01/14/2023

Sent to: Xavier Conway  
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.: 111 N. Colmar St Rm 412  
City, State, ZIP+4: Baltimore, Md 21202

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-907 See Reverse for Instructions



DUNDALK SPARROWS POINT  
44 SHIPPING PL  
DUNDALK, MD 21222-9998  
(800) 275-8777

01/14/2023 09:13 AM  
Product Qty Unit Price  
Letter 1 \$0.60

First-Class Mail® 1 \$0.60

Baltimore, MD 21202  
Weight: 0 lb 0.80 oz  
Estimated Delivery Date  
Tue 01/17/2023

Certified Mail® \$4.00  
Tracking #: 70220410000061024674  
Return Receipt \$3.25  
Tracking #: 9590 9402 6989 1225 8858 90  
Total \$7.85

Grand Total: \$7.85

7022 0410 0000 6101 3432

U.S. Postal Service™  
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT  
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com.  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
0013  
24

Certified Mail Fee \$4.00 \$3.25

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee if applicable)

Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$0.00

Return Receipt (electronic) \$0.00

Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Adult Signature Required \$0.00

Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$0.00

Postage \$0.60

Total Postage and Fees \$7.85

Postmark Here: BALTIMORE STATION 01/13/2023

Sent to: Judge Fletcher Hill  
Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No.: 111 N. Colmar St Suite 2  
City, State, ZIP+4: Baltimore, Md 21202

PS Form 3800, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-907 See Reverse for Instructions



DUNDALK SPARROWS POINT  
44 SHIPPING PL  
DUNDALK, MD 21222-9998  
(800) 275-8777

01/13/2023  
Product Qty Unit Price  
Letter 1 \$0.60

First-Class Mail® 1 \$0.60

Baltimore, MD 21202  
Weight: 0 lb 0.60 oz  
Estimated Delivery Date  
Tue 01/17/2023


Certified Mail® \$4.00  
Tracking #: 70220410000061013432  
Return Receipt \$3.25  
Tracking #: 9590 9402 6989 1225 8858 90  
Total \$7.85

Grand Total: \$7.85

Exhibit 7

I received this document on  
2-25-23



SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION		COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
<p>1. Article Addressed to:</p> <p>Gov. of Md. Mr. Wes Moore 100 State Circle Annapolis, Md. 21401</p>  <p>9590 9402 6989 1225 8851 42</p>		<p>A. Signature <input type="checkbox"/> Agent</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>OFFICE OF THE</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Addressee</p> <p>Received by (Printed Name) <b>WES MOORE</b> C. Date of Delivery <b>2/25/23</b></p> <p>D. Is delivery address different from item 1? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If YES, enter delivery address below: <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	
<p>2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)</p> <p>7022 0410 0000 6096 1130</p>		<p>3. Service Type</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Priority Mail Express®</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Registered Mail™</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Restricted Delivery</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail®</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail Restricted Delivery</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Collect on Delivery</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Registered Mail™</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Registered Mail Restricted Delivery</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Signature Confirmation™</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery</p>	

Domestic Return Receipt

PS Form 3811, July 2020 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

told the Petitioner that she would connect her to "Ms." (whose name the female did mention, but to protect the innocent, the Petitioner will call her "Ms.") who could assist her.

As stated in the Petitioner's 12-27-22 and 8-11-22 Motions and in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner asserts that, when calling the Circuit Court, the recording informs the individual of the likelihood that his/her conversation will be recorded for quality control purposes. Therefore, the Petitioner declares that she knew that it was possible that her conversation was being recorded prior to her speaking to the clerk and the supervisor on 8-18-22, before talking with another clerk on 8-22-22, prior to conversing with the young lady who refuse to give the Petitioner her name on 8-22-22, and/or before having a conversation with "Ms." on 8-22-22. During the various conversations and at difference times, the Petitioner alleges that she informed these individuals of one or more of the material facts, namely, that:

- 1.) The Petitioner's Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions was entered on the Circuit Court's website as "Motion" and "Request for Hearing on Selection Motion" when she checked the Circuit Court's website on 8-18-22, and the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions was entered on the Circuit Court's website as "6th Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" under Federal Statue 28 U,S,C, & 455(a)" and "Request for Hearing on Selected Motion" when the Petitioner checked the Circuit Court's website just prior to calling the Circuit Court on the morning of 8-22-22.
- 2.) The Petitioner did not file "a Motion", but filed "Motions" and proceeded to read, verbatim, the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions, which is entitled "6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND 2<sup>ND</sup> 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 STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARINGON THE MOTIONS".
- 3.) The Petitioner's Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions should be stated, verbatim, on the Circuit Court's website as it is cited in the Heading of her Motions.
- 4.) The clerk/s should not attempt to hide the material facts in the Heading of the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions from the public's viewing on the Circuit Court's website, namely, that it is being alleged in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the "Judge-in-Charge" over the Civil division in the Circuit Court, has committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the sixth time, has breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5( c) for the second time, that Judge Fletcher-Hill has breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for the second time, that Judge Fletcher-Hill has violated the "Rule of Law" for the sixth time, and that a plea for a hearing on the Petitioner's Motions has been requested for the fifth time.
- 5.) No Officer of the Court, which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill, is above the Rule of Law.
- 6.) Judge Fletcher-Hill should know that Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 require his voluntary disqualification and

recusal since there is an appearance of his being bias and/or impartial as a result of Judge Fletcher-Hill being appointed as an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions to have committed misconduct in office and/or federal crimes. 7.) According to Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Judge Fletcher-Hill should not have presided over the Petitioner's 4-7-22 and 6-24-22 Motions, should not preside over her 8-11-22 Motions, nor should Judge Fletcher-Hill preside over any other Motions originating from the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation since Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation.

As declared in the Petitioner's 12-27-22 and 8-11-22 Motions and in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner alleges that, during their one-on-one telephone conversation, "Ms." frequently expressed her agreement with the some of the facts stated above and with some of the Petitioner's other concerns. Furthermore, the Petitioner alleges that "Ms." assured her on the morning of 8-22-22 that she would retrieve the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions, and by the end of the work day, the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions would be entered on the Circuit Court's website exactly as it is declared in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions. Moreover, the Petitioner alleges that, when she checked the website, again, prior to 5:00 p.m. on 8-22-22, the Heading of her Motions filed on 8-11-22 was entered on the Circuit Court's website precisely as stated in the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions.

As cited in the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, and/or against other Officers of the Court, the Petitioner alleges that, after returning home from filing her 12-27-22 Motions in the Circuit Court, she called the Circuit Court and spoke with "Ms.", whom the Petitioner asserts that she had a conversation with on 8-22-22 and who had the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions cited on the Circuit Court's website as clearly delineated in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions. The Petitioner declares that she pleaded with "Ms." to make sure that the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions was stated on the Circuit Court's website exactly as it is proclaimed in the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions. The Petitioner declares that "Ms." assured her that she would make an effort to do so. The Petitioner's Heading in her 12-27-22 Motions is entitled **"7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND VIOLATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 2<sup>ND</sup> 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, JUDGES NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES, 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL**