

COMPLAINANT INFORMATION

First Name: Diana Last Name: Williams
Address: 131 Calvin Hill Ct City: Balto. State: Md. Zip Code: 21222
Phone Number: 410-868-6013
Email: d_lady_d@verizon.net

Preferred Title and Pronoun:

- Ms.
- Mr.
- Judge
- Dr.
- She/Her
- He/Him
- They/Them
- Other _____

If you are currently incarcerated, please check the box below and provide your Inmate Number:

Inmate ID Number NA

JUDGE INFORMATION

First Name: Audrey Last Name: Carrion

Court:

- Supreme Court of Maryland
- Appellate Court of Maryland
- Circuit Court
- District Court
- Orphans' Court

County/City: Balto. City

CASE INFORMATION

If your complaint is related to a court proceeding, please provide the information requested below. If not, please write NONE and proceed to the next section.

Case Name: _____

Case Number (include all letters and numbers): 24-C-17-004535

Case Type:

- Civil
- Criminal
- Family/Domestic
- Juvenile
- Probate
- Traffic
- Protective/Peace Order
- Sexual Harassment
- Other _____

Date(s) of Hearing(s) or Other Proceeding(s): Waiting on repeated Motions for a hearing on my Motions.

Case Status:

- Pending
- Concluded
- Appealed

Relationship to the case:

- Plaintiff/Petitioner/Appellant
- Defendant/Respondent/Appellee
- Attorney for _____
- Witness for _____
- Relative/Friend of _____
- Other _____

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

If you were represented by an attorney, please provide the information requested below. If not, please proceed to the next section.

Name: NA I'm being represented Pro Se.

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

WITNESS INFORMATION

Please provide the names and contact information for any witnesses to the judge's alleged sanctionable conduct, impairment, and/or disability. You may attach additional pages under "Supporting Materials" as necessary.

Name: _____

Address: NA

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Please provide a detailed summary of your complaint. Please include specific facts, names, dates, locations, and other information that support your allegations that the judge engaged in sanctionable conduct and/or suffers from an impairment and/or disability. You may attach additional pages under "Supporting Materials" as necessary.

See Attachment for additional material facts and evidence,

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Please submit copies of any relevant printed materials that support your complaint. Submitted materials will not be returned to you. Do not submit original documents or any flash drives, CDs, DVDs, or other physical devices used to store data. You do not need to submit copies of transcripts or recordings of court proceedings as the Commission will access such information independently, if necessary.

See evidence that are part of the Attachments and the evidence from copies of the Exhibits from my website, www.dianarwilliams.com that are requested to be submitted as evidence.

I understand that:

- The Commission on Judicial Disabilities does not have authority to change, modify, or reverse a judge's decision in a case;
- The Commission on Judicial Disabilities does not have the authority to remove a judge from a case; and
- Filing this complaint is not an appeal or a substitute for an appeal.

I solemnly affirm under the penalties of perjury that the contents of the foregoing document are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

1-28-25

FAILURE TO SIGN THIS FORM MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF YOUR COMPLAINT.

Printed forms can be mailed to:

Commission on Judicial Disabilities
P.O. Box 340
Linthicum Heights, Maryland 21090

Electronic forms can be submitted at:

www.cjd.state.md.us

Complaints cannot be submitted by telephone, fax, or email.

COMPLAINANT INFORMATION

First Name: Diana Last Name: Williams
Address: 131 Calvin Hill Ct City: Balto. State: Md. Zip Code: 21222
Phone Number: 410-868-2023
Email: dlady-da@verizon.net

Preferred Title and Pronoun:

- Ms.
- Mr.
- Judge
- Dr.
- She/Her
- He/Him
- They/Them
- Other _____

If you are currently incarcerated, please check the box below and provide your Inmate Number:

Inmate ID Number NA

JUDGE INFORMATION

First Name: Melissa Last Name: Phinn

Court:

- Supreme Court of Maryland
- Appellate Court of Maryland
- Circuit Court
- District Court
- Orphans' Court

County/City: Balto. City

CASE INFORMATION

If your complaint is related to a court proceeding, please provide the information requested below. If not, please write NONE and proceed to the next section.

Case Name: _____

Case Number (include all letters and numbers): 24-C-17-004535

Case Type:

- Civil
- Criminal
- Family/Domestic
- Juvenile
- Probate
- Traffic
- Protective/Peace Order
- Sexual Harassment
- Other _____

Date(s) of Hearing(s) or Other Proceeding(s): Waiting on repeated Motion for a hearing on my Motions.

Case Status:

- Pending
- Concluded
- Appealed

Relationship to the case:

- Plaintiff/Petitioner/Appellant
- Defendant/Respondent/Appellee
- Attorney for _____
- Witness for _____
- Relative/Friend of _____
- Other _____

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

If you were represented by an attorney, please provide the information requested below. If not, please proceed to the next section.

Name: NA I'm being represented Pro Se,

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

WITNESS INFORMATION

Please provide the names and contact information for any witnesses to the judge's alleged sanctionable conduct, impairment, and/or disability. You may attach additional pages under "Supporting Materials" as necessary.

Name: _____

Address: NA

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Please provide a detailed summary of your complaint. Please include specific facts, names, dates, locations, and other information that support your allegations that the judge engaged in sanctionable conduct and/or suffers from an impairment and/or disability. You may attach additional pages under "Supporting Materials" as necessary.

See Attachment for additional material facts and evidence.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Please submit copies of any relevant printed materials that support your complaint. Submitted materials will not be returned to you. Do not submit original documents or any flash drives, CDs, DVDs, or other physical devices used to store data. You do not need to submit copies of transcripts or recordings of court proceedings as the Commission will access such information independently, if necessary.

See evidence that are part of the Attachments and the evidence from copies of the Exhibits from my website, www.dianarwilliams.com that are requested to be submitted as evidence,

I understand that:

- The Commission on Judicial Disabilities does not have authority to change, modify, or reverse a judge's decision in a case;
- The Commission on Judicial Disabilities does not have the authority to remove a judge from a case; and
- Filing this complaint is not an appeal or a substitute for an appeal.

I solemnly affirm under the penalties of perjury that the contents of the foregoing document are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

1-28-25

FAILURE TO SIGN THIS FORM MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF YOUR COMPLAINT.

Printed forms can be mailed to:

Commission on Judicial Disabilities
P.O. Box 340
Linthicum Heights, Maryland 21090

Electronic forms can be submitted at:

www.cjd.state.md.us

Complaints cannot be submitted by telephone, fax, or email.

COMPLAINANT INFORMATION

First Name: Diana Last Name: Williams
Address: 131 Calvin Hill Ct City: Balto. State: Md. Zip Code: 21222
Phone Number: 410-868-2013
Email: d.lady.d@verizon.net

Preferred Title and Pronoun:

- Ms.
- Mr.
- Judge
- Dr.
- She/Her
- He/Him
- They/Them
- Other _____

If you are currently incarcerated, please check the box below and provide your Inmate Number:

Inmate ID Number NA

JUDGE INFORMATION

First Name: Julie Last Name: Rubin

Court:

- Supreme Court of Maryland
- Appellate Court of Maryland
- Circuit Court
- District Court
- Orphans' Court

County/City: Balto. City

CASE INFORMATION

If your complaint is related to a court proceeding, please provide the information requested below. If not, please write NONE and proceed to the next section.

Case Name: _____

Case Number (include all letters and numbers): 24-C-17-004535

Case Type:

- Civil
- Criminal
- Family/Domestic
- Juvenile
- Probate
- Traffic
- Protective/Peace Order
- Sexual Harassment
- Other _____

Date(s) of Hearing(s) or Other Proceeding(s): Waiting on repeated Motions for a hearing on my Motion's

Case Status:

- Pending
- Concluded
- Appealed

Relationship to the case:

- Plaintiff/~~Retitioner~~/Appellant
- Defendant/Respondent/Appellee
- Attorney for _____
- Witness for _____
- Relative/Friend of _____
- Other _____

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

If you were represented by an attorney, please provide the information requested below. If not, please proceed to the next section.

Name: NA I'm being represented Pro Se.

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

WITNESS INFORMATION

Please provide the names and contact information for any witnesses to the judge's alleged sanctionable conduct, impairment, and/or disability. You may attach additional pages under "Supporting Materials" as necessary.

Name: NA

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Please provide a detailed summary of your complaint. Please include specific facts, names, dates, locations, and other information that support your allegations that the judge engaged in sanctionable conduct and/or suffers from an impairment and/or disability. You may attach additional pages under "Supporting Materials" as necessary.

See Attachment for additional material facts and evidence,

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Please submit copies of any relevant printed materials that support your complaint. Submitted materials will not be returned to you. Do not submit original documents or any flash drives, CDs, DVDs, or other physical devices used to store data. You do not need to submit copies of transcripts or recordings of court proceedings as the Commission will access such information independently, if necessary.

See evidence that are part of the Attachments and the evidence from copies of the Exhibits from my website, www.dianarwilliams.com that are requested to be submitted as evidence.

I understand that:

- The Commission on Judicial Disabilities does not have authority to change, modify, or reverse a judge's decision in a case;
- The Commission on Judicial Disabilities does not have the authority to remove a judge from a case; and
- Filing this complaint is not an appeal or a substitute for an appeal.

I solemnly affirm under the penalties of perjury that the contents of the foregoing document are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

1-28-25

FAILURE TO SIGN THIS FORM MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF YOUR COMPLAINT.

Printed forms can be mailed to:

Electronic forms can be submitted at:

Commission on Judicial Disabilities
P.O. Box 340
Linthicum Heights, Maryland 21090

www.cjd.state.md.us

Complaints cannot be submitted by telephone, fax, or email.

To: 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump, Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, and the State of Maryland Commission on Judicial Disabilities ("Commission"), and the Clerk of the Court for Baltimore City, Mr. Xavier Conaway

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams, Whistleblower, whose present appeal is in the Baltimore City Circuit Court and whose Civil Case Number is 24-C-17-004535

Re: 1.) Plea that our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland to conduct its own investigation into the allegations cited in my Official Complaint to the Commission completed on 12-23-24 but mailed on 12-26-24 ("12-23-24 Official Complaint") and the additional material facts and evidence in this instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS" forms to the Commission, which further to substantiate the same allegations, proclaimed in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint against the 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Audrey Carrion, Judge Mellissa Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin, namely, that of breaching my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311, especially since there are allegations of these Officers of the Court violating the federal crimes Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091. 2.) Plea that you, Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland to be in charge of overseeing the Commission to ensure the granting of my plea to the Commission to immediately assign another Investigative Counsel to preside over my 12-23-24 Official Complaint, that is, an Investigative Counsel who does not work under the Commission, to preside over a thorough investigation of the material facts and evidence, especially since it is being alleged by me that the Commission and the Director/Investigative Counsel, Tanya Bernstein ("Tanya Bernstein") are violating my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as the presiding Officers of the Court because there is an appearance that the Commission and Tanya Bernstein would be biased and/or impartial due to Tanya Bernstein being employed by the Commission and the Commission being appointed by the Governor, which means either being appointed by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore ("Wes Moore") and/or being appointed by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan or Martin O'Malley, all of whom, along with former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland ("former Chief Judge Barbera"), the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, the Judges, and/or other governmental are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or the attempt to and/or the conspiracy to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities.

Date: 1-28-25

As stated in Rule 18-421, the Commission shall refer all complaints and other written allegations of disability, impairment, or misconduct against a judge to an Investigative Counsel. Allegations must provide proof of misconduct in order to be deemed "Sanctionable Conduct". Moreover, if the Investigative Counsel concludes that the allegations presented, even if proved, would fail to constitute a cognizable basis for a complaint, as defined in Rule 18-402(h), then the Investigative Counsel shall notify the complainant and the Commission, in writing, that the allegations presented were considered and found not to constitute a meritorious complaint that should be pursued and the reasons for that conclusion. Further, Section (b) of this Rule does allow the Investigative Counsel to communicate with the complainant or make an inquiry under section (f) of this Rule in order to clarify general or ambiguous allegations that may suggest a disability, impairment, or sanctionable conduct. After permitting the complainant to give additional evidence to substantiate her allegations, then the Investigative Counsel may conclude under this section that the allegations presented were considered and found not to constitute a meritorious complaint that should be pursued and the reasons for his/her conclusion.

According to Rule 18-402(h) "Sanctionable conduct" includes a judge demonstrating misconduct, persistently failing to perform the duties of the judge's office, or conduct prejudicial to the proper administration of justice. Still too, "Sanctionable conduct" can mean that a judge has breached any of the provisions of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct promulgated by Title 18, Chapter 100.

As stated in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint (Exhibits 196 on my website), because of my financial hardship at this time, I'm unable to afford the cost of printing copies of all of my numerous and lengthy Motions, Official Complaints, and other material evidence on my website, *www.dianarwilliams.com* that need to be submitted into the record of the Commission as evidence to further substantiate the allegations in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint, namely, that my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or intentionally violated by the 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Audrey Carrion, Judge Mellissa Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin. My loved ones help to maintain the cost of my website. Thus, it is my request that, since I give the Exhibit Number on my website to each of my signed and dated Motions, my Official Complaints, and other documents when citing the document, copies of these Exhibits be made and that all of these documents be submitted as more evidence into the record of the Commission.

Below are the additional material facts as supported by the evidence and, as permitted under Rule 2-241, that substantiate the allegations as asserted in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint, namely, that my 14th Amendment Right, my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or intentionally violated by the 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Audrey Carrion, Judge Mellissa Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin.

A.) STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS AND EVIDENCE TO SUBSTANTIATE

ALLEGATIONS CITED ABOVE

AND MY PLEA that our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland to conduct its own investigation into the allegations cited in my Official Complaint to the Commission completed on 12-23-24 but mailed on 12-26-24 ("12-23-24 Official Complaint") and the additional material facts and evidence in this instant **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS"** forms to the Commission, which further to substantiate the same allegations, proclaimed in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint against the **3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, and Judge J. Rubin,** namely, the allegations of breaching my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311, especially since there are allegations of these Officers of the Court violating the federal crimes Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091.

Since the **3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge . Rubin** functioned as one panel and are alleged to have committed the same obstructions of justice, this **"Attachment"** will be used for each In Banc Judge, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, and Judge J. Rubin.

As proclaimed in my **3** most recent Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibits 208, 208', and 208'', respectively, on my website), as asserted in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission (Exhibit 196 on my website), as declared in my 11-1-23 Motions (Exhibits 155 and 156, respectively, on my website), and/or as stated in these instant **"ATTACHMENTS"**, the following are additional material facts and/or legal arguments to further substantiate the allegations my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or intentionally violated by the **3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, and Judge J. Rubin:**

1.) Since Judge Michel Pierson ordered that the clerk do not accept any more of my Motions, I filed an appeal to the Findings and Order of Michel Pierson entered on the Circuit Court's website on 1-2-20 by filing a Notice For In Banc Review with the Circuit Court (hereinafter "Petition") and my Memorandum on 1-14-20 (Exhibits 72 and 71, respectively, on my website). In my Memorandum, I state "9 Questions for Review", the material facts, and/or legal arguments that I wanted the panel of In Banc judges to disclose, consider, and resolve before deciding to grant or deny my Petition. **2.)** In response to my Petition and Memorandum filed on the same day, namely, 1-14-20, Judge Carrion, the Administrative & Chief Judge" ORDERED on 1-24-20 (Exhibit 73 on my website) that **three** "designated" Judges be assigned to preside over my In Banc Review, which is part of the procedures under Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution for any In Banc Review. Moreover, Article IV §22 of the Maryland Constitution, also, requires that the panel of In Banc Judges automatically schedule an oral hearing before rendering a decision to deny or grant my Petition. **3.)** The panel of In Banc Judges consisted of Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin. In Judge Carrion's Order, there is no disclosure of the filing of my 1-14-20 Memorandum, nor does the Circuit Court's website reveals the material fact that I filed my Memorandum on the same day that I filed my Petition. However, Exhibits 72 and 71 on my

website are copies of my Petition and Memorandum, both of which are stamped by the Circuit Court as being filed on 1-14-20. 4.) My 1-14-20 Memorandum is lengthy due to the necessity of having to trace almost two and a half years of filing Motions alleging intentional and repeated violations of my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by all 3 of the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen due to their repetitious and/or intentional defying numerous federal and state laws, which includes deliberately and/or routinely breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as mandated under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a)), and his/her ORDER be deemed void as a matter of law and ,thus, be of no legal force or effect due to there being an appearance that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman would be impartial and/or biased because of their privileged appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged in my Memorandum, in my Motions, and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have transgressed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to disregard Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. 5.) After filing my Petition and Memorandum on 1-14-20, I began to research the background of the In Banc judges, and, again, through what I believe was DIVINE providence, I was led to more critical material facts, namely, that the 3 In Banc Judges presiding over my Petition was appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera and that there was public acknowledgement in a local newspaper of the close relationship among the 3 In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or Judge Karen Friedman. 6.) On 1-29-20, I filed my first Motions against the 3 In Banc judges (Exhibit 74 on my website), which include my first Motion for Disqualification against the panel of In Banc Judges. In these Motions, I allege, amongst other material facts, that my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., S impinged upon by the 3 In Banc Judges because the evidence support the assertions that, along with trespassing other federal and state laws, the panel of In Banc judges was, also, invading Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges) and his/her ORDER be deemed void as a matter of law and, therefore, be of no legal force or effect due to the material facts that there is an appearance that the 3 In Banc Judges would be impartiality and/or bias because: a.) The panel of In Banc Judges were appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being averred to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to flout Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. Judge Carrion’s appointment by Chief Judge Barbera as an Administrative Judge for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City became effective on January 12, 2020. Judge Mellissa Phinn was appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. Judge Julie Rubin was, also, appointed as an Associate judge on the 8th judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. b.) There was public acknowledgement in a local newspaper of the close relationship among the panel of In Banc judges and the former presiding Judges over my civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. 7.) The Heading in my 1-29-20 Motions is entitled **“MOTIONS FOR IMMEDIATE SUBSTITUTION AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES FROM PRESIDING OVER THE PETITIONER’S IN BANC REVIEW HEARING AND MOTION**

THAT ANY JUDGE APPOINTED BY CHIEF JUDGE BERBARA FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS OF MARYLAND AND/OR BY FORMER GOV. MARTIN O'MALLEY BE DISQUALIFIED FROM PRESIDING OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW HEARING." 8.) The 3 In Banc Judges responded to my Motions filed on 1-29-20 with 2 separate Findings and Orders entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-6-20 (Exhibit 75 on my website). In their first Findings and Order, the panel of In Banc Judges states that "Upon consideration of Diana R. Williams' ("Petitioner") Notice for In Banc Review (docket #00033000), filed January 14, 2020, this Court's January 2, 2020 Order in the which the Honorable W. Michel Pierson found that the "Plaintiff continues to file repetitive and/or frivolous pleadings because prior rulings are not to her liking" and ordered that "Clerk shall not accept any further filings in this actions other than an Order of Appeal accompanied by the filing fee" (docket #00031001), and the contents of the record herein, it is this 6th day of February, 2020, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, hereby ORDERED that the Request for In Banc Review (docket #00033000), be, and the same is, hereby DISMISSED." And, in their 2nd Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-6-20, the panel of In Banc Judges declares that "Upon consideration of Diana R. Williams' ("Petitioner") Motion for Immediate Substitution and Disqualification of the Panel of In Banc Judges and to Disqualify Any Judge Appointed by Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland and/or by Former Govern Martin O'Malley (docket #00034000), filed January 29, 2020, no opposition having been filed, and the contents of the record herein, it is this 6th day of February, 2020, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore, hereby ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion for Immediate Substitution and Disqualification of In Panel of In Banc Judges and to Disqualify Any judge Appointed by Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland and/or by former Governor martin O'Malley (docket #00034000), be, and the same is, hereby DENIED." 9.) As evidenced by the facts stated in their 2 sets of Findings and Orders entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-6-20 (Exhibit 75 on my website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 1-29-20 Motions (Exhibit 74 on my website), from which the panel of In Banc Judges respond to, the 3 In Banc Judges fails to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in my Memorandum, which include the declarations that the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman have consciously and redundantly breached my 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of their violating numerous federal and state laws, including purposely and repetitiously violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by intentionally and continuously failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as ordered under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a)) and his/her ORDER be deemed void as a matter of law and ,thus, be of no legal force or effect due since there is an appearance that these 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, and Judge J. Rubin, would be biased and/or impartial as a result of their being appointed to superlative Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged in my 1-29-20 Motions, in my Memorandum, in other Motions and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have invaded Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. Still too, as evidenced by the facts stated in both of their Findings and Orders entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-6-20, the panel of In Banc Judges disregarded my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18,

U.S.C., Section 242 by dismissing my Petition before allowing me to have an oral hearing before the panel of In Banc Judges as stated in Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 10.) In response to the panel of In Banc Judges Findings and Orders entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-6-20, which denied my 1-29-20 Motions, and in response to the Defendant's Motion filed on 2-4-20, I filed my Motions dated 2-13-20. Again, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in the Findings of the panel of In Banc Judges and the evidence of the material facts and legal declared in my 1-29-20 support the assertions that the panel of In Banc Judges trespassed my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to their impinging upon traducing Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, which decrees not only that a panel of three judges preside over the appeal in the In Banc Review but, also, that an automatic scheduling of an oral hearing must be given before the panel can render a decision to grant or deny any Petition. The evidence of the material facts asserted in my 1-29-20 Motions substantiate that I did not waive my right to have an oral hearing as allowed under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 11.) After reading over the facts proclaimed in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the two sets of Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-6-20, which respond to my 1-29-20 Motions, I believe that the HOLY GHOST led me to understand that I needed to filed an Official Complaint against the 3 In Banc Judges because they, like the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, were intruding upon my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by fracturing numerous federal and state laws, including breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. On 2-18-20, I mailed the original copy my Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges (Exhibit 78 on my website) to you, Hon. President Trump, and sent a copy to another governmental official. Amongst other things, in my Official Complaint, I proclaim that the evidence in the record and/or on my website support the material facts that the panel of In Banc Judges: a.) transgressed Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to failing to voluntarily disqualify and recused themselves as presiding over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation) and his/her ORDER be deemed void as a matter of law and ,thus, be of no legal force or effect because there being an appearance that the panel of In Banc judges might be bias and/or impartial as a result of their appointments to the distinct positions of Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being proclaimed in my 1-29-20 Motions, in other Motions, and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have intruded upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to invade Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. b.) committed misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. c.) deprived me of my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 24 due to impinging upon other federal statutes and laws. d.) tampered with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Part1, Chapter 73 & 1512. e.) and/or the committed the federal crimes of concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071. 12.) A few days after filing my 2-13-20 Motions (Exhibit 77 on my website), I believe that I was led by the SPIRIT OF GOD to read over my 2-13-20 Motions so that I could see that, in these Motions, I did not respond to that part of the panel of In Banc Judges' Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-6-20 which denies my 1-29-20 Motion for Disqualification. Therefore, I filed another set of Motions on 2-19-20 (Exhibit 80 on my website), which includes my 2nd Motion for

Disqualification against the 3 In Banc Judges as the presiding Judges in my In Banc Review. 13.) The Heading in my 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 6TH, 7TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512, HAVE CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071, AND, IN DECIDING THE PETITIONER’S 1-14-20 PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW, HER 1-14-20 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AN IN BANC REVIEW, AND IN HER 1-29-20 MOTIONS, WHICH INCLUDES THE PETITIONER’S MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, TO HAVE REPEATEDLY, DELIBERATELY, EXCESSIVELY, AND EGREGIOUSLY: 1.) ABUSED THEIR POWER. 2.) DISPLAYED TOTAL CONTEMPT FOR THE RULE OF LAW. 3.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE IN THE CONDUCT OF THE OFFICE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505. 4.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF DEPRIVING THE PETITIONER OF HER 6TH, 7TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS RIGHTS, AND BY VIOLATING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242. 5.) TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512. 6.) CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071. MOTION TO HAVE THE “SUBSTITUTION” PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES APPOINTED BY HON. GOV. HOGAN TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER’S MOTIONS, AND MOTION TO HAVE THE “SUBSTITUTION” PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO RECONSIDER THE PETITIONER’S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW AND ALL OF THE PETITIONER’S MOTIONS” . 14.)** While waiting on 3 In Banc Judges to respond to my 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, I believe that the SPIRIT OF TRUTH led me to research federal laws relevant to obstruction of justice in order to understand that the evidence substantiate the proclamations that the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, and other Judges were breaching a number of other federal laws. On 4-3-20, I finished working on completing an Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, and against other Officers of the Court (Exhibit 81 on my website). I mailed the original copy to you, Hon. President Trump. This Addendum has four **“Re”** sections. The section entitled **“Re: 1”** is my 1st Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges, which includes the new allegations of federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. The section entitled **“Re: 2”** is my Addendum to my “925th Addendum and counting to my 5-6-16 Official Complaint” (Exhibit 11 on my website), which includes these same denunciations of federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 against the Justices of the Supreme Court, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Judge

Michel Pierson, against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Karen, against the former Gov. of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, namely, Martin O'Malley, and/or against the other governmental officials declared in my 925th Addendum to my 5-6-16 Official Complaint. 15.) After taking over two years to respond to my 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions (Exhibits 77 and 80, respectively, on my website), the panel of In Banc Judges denies my Motions in their Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 3-30-22 (Exhibit 93 on my website). In responding to my 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, the panel of In Banc Judges asserts in their Findings and Orders entered on the Circuit Court's website on 3-30-22 that "This Court having read and considered Plaintiff, Diana R. Williams' (Plaintiff) Motion to Dismiss Defendants' "Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Request for In Banc Review as Being Untimely Filed" As Being Untimely Filed and for Deliberate Prejudicial Errors of Perjury, Motion for Reconsiderations, and Request for a Hearing (docket #36000) filed February 13, 2020 and Motion to Dismiss Defendant's "Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Request for In Banc of Perjury, Motion for Reconsiderations, and Request for a Hearing (docket #37000) filed February 13, 2020 and Motion for a Hearing on the Panel of In Banc Judges' (docket 38000) filed February 19, 2020, it is this 30th day of March 2022, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 23. ORDERED, that the Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss Defendants' "Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Request for In Banc Review as Being Untimely Filed" As Being Untimely Filed and for Deliberate Prejudicial Errors of Perjury, Motion for Reconsiderations, and Request for a Hearing (docket #36000) filed February 13, 2020 and Motion to Dismiss Defendant's "Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Request for In Banc Review as Being Untimely Filed" As Being Untimely Filed and for Deliberate Prejudicial Errors of Perjury, Motion for Reconsiderations, and Request for a Hearing (docket #37000) filed February 13, 2020 and Motion for a Hearing on the Panel of In Banc Judges' (docket 38000) filed February 19, 2020, be and the same is hereby DENIED." 16.) As evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in their Findings (Exhibit 93 on my website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments cited in my 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions (Exhibits 77 and 80, respectively, on my website), from which the panel of In Banc judges respond to, the panel of In Banc Judges fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments in my two sets of Motions, which substantiate the allegations that my 14th Amendment right and Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were continuously being infringed upon by the 3 In Banc Judges due their disregarding a variety of federal and state laws, which include intentionally and continuously infringing upon: a.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) because there is an appearance that the panel of In Banc Judges would be biased and/or impartial as a result of being appointed to their exclusive Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being averred in my 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, in my Memorandum, in other Motions, and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have impinged upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. b.) Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution as a result of depriving me of my right to have an oral hearing before the panel of In Banc Judges prior to the presiding Judges deciding to deny or grant my Petition. c.) Maryland Rule 2-311 due to failing to allow me to exercise my right to have a hearing on my Motions before deciding my Motions filed on 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions. and other Motions a plea for a hearing on the Motions. d.) my right to have a response to motions filed on by the panel of In Banc Judges within a reasonable time, and, thus, not

having to wait over two years before issuing their response to my 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, but issuing a response to the Defendant's 2-4-20 Motions on 2-13-20. 17.) In response to the panel of Judges' denial of my 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions entered on the Circuit Court's website on 3-30-22, I filed my 4-7-22 Motions (Exhibit 94 on my website), which include the material facts that the evidence substantiate the allegation that the panel of In Banc Judges and the former presiding Judges have routinely and designedly fractured my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to invading numerous federal and state laws, including breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, and Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. Also, my 4-7-22 Motions include my 3rd Motion for Disqualification of the 3 In Banc Judges for "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). 18.) The Heading in my 4-7-22 Motions is entitled "3rd MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AGAINST THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 3RD MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS" 19.) The panel of In Banc Judges did not respond to my 4-7-22 Motions (Exhibit 94 on my website), but Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court and who was, also, one of the presiding Judges in my initial civil litigation, assigned himself as the new presiding Judge over my 4-7-22 Motions, which are Motions from my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation.

STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS AND EVIDENCE TO SUBSTANTIATE

ALLEGATIONS CITED ABOVE

B.) AND MY PLEA that you, Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland to be in charge of overseeing the Commission to ensure the granting of my plea to the Commission to immediately assign another Investigative Counsel to preside over my 12-23-24 Official Complaint, that is, an Investigative Counsel who does not work under the Commission to preside over a thorough investigation of the material facts and evidence, especially since it is being alleged by me that the Commission and the Director/Investigative Counsel, Tanya Bernstein ("Tanya Bernstein") are violating my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as the presiding Officers of the Court because **there is an appearance that the Commission and Tanya Bernstein would be biased and/or impartial** due to Tanya Bernstein being employed by the Commission and the Commission being appointed by the Governor, which means either being appointed by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore ("Wes Moore") and/or being appointed by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan or Martin O'Malley, **all** of whom, along with former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland ("former Chief Judge Barbera"), the owners of the public schools in

Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, the Judges, and/or other governmental are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, (“Crimes against Humanity”), and/or the attempt to and/or the conspiracy to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities

According to the Commission’s organizational structure, Tanya Bernstein is employed as the Director/Investigative Counsel for the Commission. The Commission is appointed by the Governor, which includes either being appointed by Wes Moore and/or by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan, and Martin O’Malley, who, along with former Chief judge Barbera, the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber II, and all of the former presiding Judges in my present appeal in the In Banc Review in my civil litigation in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, and/or other government officials are being alleged in my 3 separate Motions mailed on 12-26-24 (Exhibits 208, 208’, and 208’’, respectively, on my website), in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 196 on my website), in my 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24 (Exhibits 210, 210’, and 210’’, respectively on my website), and/or in my 11-1-23 Motions that are still awaiting for Judge Fletcher-Hill to assign a preside Judge , and/or in other Motions to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, (“Crimes against Humanity”), and/or the attempted to and/or the conspired to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities due to knowingly and willingly: a.) allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades by the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City (the Mayor and Baltimore City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O’Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and the present Mayor, Brandon Schott, 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. b.) having ignored for years the alleged heinous crimes against the Mayor of Baltimore City, owners of the public schools, namely, that of repetitiously and/or intentionally exposing our children to lead poisoning for decades and, thereby, violating Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other possible criminal acts. c.) refusing to prosecute for over a quarter of a century the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/ other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. d.) 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 attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes.

Since allegations are made in my Motions and in other documents that the evidence will support that these Officers of the Court have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, (“Crimes against Humanity”), and/or the attempted to and/or the conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, have invaded upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), have invaded upon my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311, it is my plea that our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland to conduct its own independent investigation in regard to my 12-23-24 and my 12-16-24 Official Complaints to the Commission (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on my website). Moreover, I’m alleging that Tanya Bernstein and the Commission are violating my 14th due to impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C 7 455(a) due to failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Officers of the Court since there is an appearance that Tanya Bernstein and the Commission would be biased and/or impartial as a result of Tanya Bernstein being hired as the Director/Investigative Counsel for the Commission, and the Commission being appointed by the Governor, which could include either being appointed by Wes Moore or by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan, and Martin O’Malley, all of whom, along with former Chief judge Barbera, are being alleged in my 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in other Motions, and/or in 12-23-24 Official Complaint to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, (“Crimes against Humanity”), and/or attempted to and/or the conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091. Thus, it is, too, my plea that, you, Hon. President Trump, whose Inauguration Ceremony as our official Hon. 47th President of the U.S. was on 1-20-25, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland to launch its own investigation into my 2 separate Official Complaints to the Commission, namely, my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission and my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission, and to have supervision in overseeing the Commission to ensure the granting of my plea by the Commission to immediately assign another Investigative Counsel who does not work under the Commission to preside over a thorough investigation of the material facts and evidence, especially since it is being alleged by me that the Commission and the Director/Investigative Counsel, Tanya Bernstein, are violating my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as the presiding Officers of the Court because there is an appearance that the Commission and Tanya Bernstein would be biased and/or impartial due to Tanya Bernstein being employed by the Commission and the Commission being appointed by the Governor, which means either being appointed by the Wes Moore and/or being appointed by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan or Martin O’Malley, all of whom, along with former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland (“former Chief Judge Barbera”), the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, the Judges, and/or other governmental are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, (“Crimes against Humanity”), and/or the attempt to and/or the conspiracy to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities.

In terms of past Findings and Conclusion by Tanya Bernstein, as evidenced by her 2018 letter (Exhibit 199 on my website) which has her Findings and Conclusion that respond to my 2018 Official Complaint to the Commission (Exhibit 200 on my website), Tanya Bernstein was the presiding Investigative Counsel who investigated my 2018 Official Complaint to the Commission against Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen, who are two of the former presiding Judges in my present **civil litigation**, which is currently on appeal in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and whose initial Civil Complaint was filed in 2017.

As evidenced by the lack of facts and supporting evidence declared in Tanya Bernstein's 12-27-24 and 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusions (Exhibit 201 and 201', respectively, on my website), which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-16-24 and 12-23-24 Official Complaints to the Commission (Exhibit 195 and 196, respectively, on my website), I'm alleging that the evidence substantiate the allegations that, like in her 2018 Findings and Conclusion, Tanya Bernstein has failed to disclose, consider, and resolve a single material fact and/or legal argument proclaimed in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission that substantiate the allegations in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission, namely, that the evidence support the allegations of violations of my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 by the **panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, and Judge J. Rubin.** Still too, as evidenced by the facts cited in her 2018, 12-27-24, and 1-3-25 Findings and Orders and the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 2018, in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission, and in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission, from which Tanya Bernstein responds to, other declaring the Rule 18.421, Tanya Bernstein fails to provide a shred of material facts and/or evidence that would disprove the material facts and legal arguments alleged in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission.

In Tanya Bernstein's Findings dated 1-3-25, she states that "Pursuant to Maryland Rule 18-421 (b), the allegations have been considered and found not to constitute a meritorious complaint that should be pursued because they are factually unfounded or even if proved, fail to establish "Sanctionable conduct", impairment, or disability. Please provide an accurate case name, and case number. If you have additional information in support of the allegations, please submit it in writing within the next 30 days either by mail to the address above or by email to commJD@mdcourts.gov."

Moreover, as evidenced in her 2018, 12-27-24, and 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusions, it appears that Tanya Bernstein, simply quoted, almost verbatim, the same reasons for her conclusion in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission as she declared in her 2018 and 12-16-24 Conclusions for denying my 2018 and 12-16-24 Official Complaints to the Commission , namely, that the allegations in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission did not constitute a meritorious complaint. However, as evidenced by her 12-27-24 and Findings and Conclusion and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission, Tanya Bernstein failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings any of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission which substantiate the allegations that my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland

Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been repetitiously and/or deliberately breached by the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, and Judge J. Rubin.

I believe that Tanya Bernstein has damaged her credibility because as evidenced by the lack thereof of facts as supported by the evidence in Tanya Bernstein's 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusions and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission, the evidence substantiate the allegations that Tanya Bernstein fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Conclusion any of the material facts and legal arguments stated in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission which substantiate these allegations. Therefore, I'm requesting that the Commission assigns another Investigative Counsel to preside over the instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS" forms to the Commission and over my 12-23-24 Complaint (Exhibit 196 on my website), which are additional material facts and evidence to further substantiate the allegations stated above and in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission against the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, and Judge J. Rubin. Further, I'm pleading that the Commission assigns an outside, independent Investigative Counsel to preside over this instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATE OF FACTS" forms to the Commission of additional material facts and supporting evidence to further substantiate the allegations in my 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission. I will be sending a copy of my 12-23-24 Complaint (Exhibit 196 on my website) and a copy of this instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATE OF FACTS" to further substantiate the allegations in my 12-23-24 Complaint to our Hon. President Trump, whom I pray will have the Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S Attorney to Maryland to launch its own independent investigation. Moreover, it is my plea that the Commission: **1.)** mandates that the new, independent Investigator substantiates his/her reasons for his/her Findings and Conclusion with, in addition to citing the Rule, the material facts being supported by the evidence. **2.)** orders the a new, independent Investigator to have copies of my Motions which have the presiding Judges' Findings and Orders cited on the first page of my Motions, my Official Complaints, and other documents, which I've given Exhibit numbers on my website and to include these documents as part of the evidence in the record of the Commission.

In Conclusion, I'm alleging that the evidence supporting the material facts and legal arguments cited above, further substantiate the allegations that Tanya Bernstein, and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, and Judge J. Rubin, have used the same pattern of deceit in attempting to conceal the allegations that my 14th Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article Iv & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or deliberately violated by Tanya Bernstein and Judge Karen Friedman, using the pattern of deceit, which includes: **1.)** misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. **2.)** misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se. **3.)** concealing in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court that are contrary to her

Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. 4.) concealing in her Findings the material facts and legal arguments cited in Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se that are contrary to her Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. 5.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as proclaimed in my Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se.. 7.) concealing in their Findings that the evidence in the record support the allegations that Officers of the Court exhibited judicial misconduct and obstructed justice by, amongst other things, committing the prejudicial error of perjury. 8.) and/or concealing in their Findings that the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court, as asserted in my Official Complaints, and/or as declared in my Motions.

Cc: Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General for the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland