


IN THE MATTER OF
STATE OF MARYLAND

VS.

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

* IN THE
*
* CIRCUIT COURT
*
* FOR
*
* BALTIMORE COUNTY
*
* Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995



Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for
Baltimore County, MD
March 26, 2025

CC:SAO; DEF

- 1.) 1ST MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-27-24, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 8TH MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY, OTHERWISE, THE PRESIDING JUDGE, JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. IS ENGAGING IN LAW FARE BY BREACHING, FOR THE 3RD TIME, THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND THE DEFENDANT'S CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S 1-21-25 PLEADS TO OUR 45TH- 47TH HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP AGAINST JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. 2.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 3RD MOTION TO JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS

PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant's: 1.) 1ST Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed on 8-27-24, Which Is The Defendant's 8th Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And To Continue The Stay On The Expungement Of Judge Glass' Order Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, The Presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Is Engaging In Law Fare By Breaching, For The 3rd Time, The Defendant's 14th Amendment right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And The Defendant's Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleads To Our Hon. 45th- 47th President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motions, Which Is the Defendant's 3rd Motion To Judge D. Robinson, Jr. For A Hearing On The Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below.

CR59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Defendant, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Defendant, is that: for the first time: 1.) For first time, the Defendant is informing Judge D. Robinson Jr. that, on 1-21-25, she sent by certified mail her "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, which, amongst other things, request that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland, to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's Official Complaint to the Commission mailed on 12-16-24 ("12-16-24 Official Complaint") and stated, again, in her "Pleads", namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or deliberately breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. Moreover, our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, have access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges. 2.) For the 8th time, the Defendant is motioning a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Order issued on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this Criminal Case is resolved in its entirety, with the legal and factual basis being that, without the Stay on the expungement, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist as cited by the presiding Judge, Judge Glass, during the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's 5-23-23 Motions, which are Motions to expunge the Defendant's record and to grant the Defendant her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and 15 ammunitions. 3.) For the 3rd time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to grant the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

INTRODUCTION

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Defendant believes that our great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their ruling, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in 2nd Chronicles 19: 6-7, king Jehoshaphat, one of the kings of Judah, pronounces to judges why they should not be impartial and/or biased in their judgment, "*And said to the Judges, Take heed what ye do: for ye judge not for man, but for the LORD, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of*

the LORD be upon you; take heed and do it; for there is no iniquity with the LORD our GOD, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts."

STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND

According to online research, Law fare includes an attempt to damage or delegitimize an opponent, or to deter an individual's usage of his/her legal rights. The evidence of the Defendant's numerous Motions and the Findings and Orders of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and of the former presiding Judges, which is in the record and on the Defendant's website, www.dianarwilliams.com, support the material facts that the instant Motions include the Defendant's 3rd Motion to the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., for a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, her 8th Motion to continue the Stay on the expungement Of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024, and her 3rd Motion to Judge to Judge D. Robinson, Jr to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Order docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until the Defendant's criminal case is resolved in its entirety. As evidenced in the record, Judge Glass granted the Defendant's Motion for Expungement but informed the Defendant and the Attorney representing the State of Maryland that, if there is no stay on the execution of the Defendant's expungement, then the Defendant would no longer have a criminal case existing and, thus, could not have her Motion for repossession of her firearm and 15 ammunitions to be consider, disclosed, and resolved by Judge S. Bailey or any other presiding Judge because the case would no longer exist.

The Defendant alleges that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning judges to criminal cases, should know that, by denying the Defendant's repeated Motions for a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Orders for expungement of the Defendant's criminal case, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist and, therefore, Judge D. Robinson would not have to consider, disclose, and resolve if the evidence substantiate that: **1.)** The original Finder of Fact who presided over the Defendant's criminal proceedings on 5-20-21 and who signed the Defendant's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order on 5-20-21, namely, Judge S. Bailey, erred in her Findings and Order, which are docketed on 6-25-24 at the top of the first page of the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website) due to infringing upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to adhere to her 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21. **2.)** The presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr, and all of the former presiding Judges erred in failing to determine if the evidence support the material facts that the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or intentionally violated by Judge D. Robinson and all of the former presiding Judges due to their failure to disclose, consider, and resolve if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 due to breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to adhere to her 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21. **3.)** For the 3rd time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has denied the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to determine if the Defendant has a legal and

factual basis for her relief requested, namely, to Stay Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of the expungement of the Defendants until it's determined if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 and cited at the top of the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23, especially in light of the material facts that all of the other presiding Judges have denied the Defendant's her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to have a hearing on her Motions.

The Defendant is asserting that the evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and all of the other former presiding Judges have engaged in Law fare (and in the case of Judge. D. Robinson, Jr. and Judge Cahill have repetitiously engaged in Law fare) by redundantly and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242. The Defendant asserts that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning judges to criminal cases, should know that by, denying the Defendant's repeated Motions for a Stay on the execution of her Defendant's expungement, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist and, therefore, the issue of determining if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 at the top of the first page of the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website) due to infringing upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to adhere to her 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 would never have to be consider, disclosed, and resolved because the presiding Judge could claim that the criminal case do not exist. Moreover, since the evidence in the record substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning judges to criminal cases, has repeatedly and deliberately engaged in Law fare, as well as all of the former presiding Judges, in her letter that was sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads, amongst other things, that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed DOJ, Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 "Pleads" namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the assertions that the Defendant is being redundantly and/or deliberately denied her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions because Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to determine if the Defendant has a legal and factual basis for her relief requested, namely, to Stay Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of the expungement of the Defendants until it's determined if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24.

The Defendant is asserting that the evidence of Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 which is Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's Motions and is Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website, the evidence in the record and on the Defendant's website of the material facts in the Defendant's Motions which substantiate the Defendant's successful compliance to Judge S. Bailey Probation/Supervision on Order, and the evidence of Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Order docketed on

6-25-24 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website), substantiate that Judge S. Bailey failed to adhere to her own Order, and which further substantiates that Judge S. Bailey violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242. Further, the evidence of Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order substantiate that Judge S. Bailey didn't cite in her Order that, after the Defendant has successfully complied with all of the requirements in the Order, she would not be granted her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions. Our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, has access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and all of the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges.

As evidenced in the record, the instant Motions are the 1st of the Defendant's 2 separate Motions which respond the Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s 2 sets of Findings and Orders. As evidenced by the citing at the top of the first page of the Defendant's Motions, which include the Motion for a Stay on Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record, the date, the signature, and the Findings and Order of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. are cited (Exhibits 223 and 224, respectively, on the Defendant's website). As evidenced by the citing at the top of the first page of the Defendant's Motions, which include a Motion for Disqualification of Judge D. Robinson, Jr., the date, signature, and Findings and Order of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. are stated (Exhibit 225 on the Defendant's website). The evidence substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. response to the Defendant's Motions, which include a Motion for his disqualification on 3-3-25 was 2 days before he responded to the Defendant's Motions, which include the Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record, which was on 3-5-25.

For the 3rd time, the Defendant is motioning to Judge D. Robinson, Jr. for a hearing on these Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

ARGUMENT

As the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning judges to criminal cases, Judge D. Robinson knows and/or should know that he should not have presided over the the Defendant's Motions, which include a Motion for his disqualification 2 days before he presided over the Defendant's Motions, which include a the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record. Judge D. Robinson, also, is cognizant of the material fact that, if he denied the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record, then there would be an automatic denial of the Defendant's Motion for his disqualification. Moreover, as the Judge-in-Charge of assigning judges to preside over criminal cases and as the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. should be cognizant of the material facts, not one of the 4 former presiding Judges granted the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions, although the Defendant has repeatedly motioned for a hearing on her Motions and for a Stay on the 8-27 Order by Judge Glass by all of the other presiding Judges until the resolution of issue of determining if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 by infringing upon

the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to adhere to her 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21.

CONCLUSION

The Defendant pleads that her Motions be granted.

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 21st day of March 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1.) 1ST Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed on 8-27-24, Which Is The Defendant's 8th Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And To Continue The Stay On The Expungement Of Judge Glass' Order Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, The Presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Is Engaging In Law Fare By Breaching, For The 3rd Time, The Defendant's 14th Amendment right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And The Defendant's Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleads To Our Hon. 45th– 47th President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motions, Which Is the Defendant's 3rd Motion To Judge D. Robinson, Jr. For A Hearing On The Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Baltimore County State Attorney, 401 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland, 21204.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Cc: 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the newly FBI, Mr. K Patel, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland

Adrian Williams
131 Calver Hall Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Retail



21285

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LETTER
DUNDALK, MD 21222
MAR 21, 2025


\$1.29

R2305E125687-24

RDC 99

Circuit Court for Balto. County
County Courts Building
P.O. Box 6754
Pawson, Md. 21285-6754

Attention: Supervisory Clerk: Mrs. Kira



**CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY,
MARYLAND**

401 Bosley Avenue, P.O. Box 6754
Towson, MD 21285-6754

Main: 410-887-2601

To: DIANA RENA WILLIAMS
131 CALVIN HILL CT
DUNDALK, MD 21222-0000

Case Number:
Tracking Number:
Related Case Number:

C-03-CR-20-002995
180001854535

STATE OF MARYLAND VS. DIANA RENA WILLIAMS

Date: 3/26/2025