

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@aol.com

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: Charles Last Name: Dorsey

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 my repeated Motions for a hearing on my Motions.

- 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 the 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.

To: 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump, Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland, 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 **Judge Dorsey, Charles, III**, 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, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI 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.dianarw.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 Judge Dorsey, Charles, III. 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 Judge Dorsey, Charles, III.

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 **Judge Dorsey, Charles, III**, 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.

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 cited in my 11-1-23 Motions (Exhibit 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 **Judge Dorsey, Charles, III**: **1.)** Although I checked the Court’s website around 9-27-24 to find out whether Judge Fletcher-Hill had assigned a Judge to preside over my Motions filed on 11-1-23, I noticed that an Order of a “Notice Of Contemplated Dismissal (Lack Of Prosecution)” was docketed on 9-25-24 from the Clerk of the Court for Baltimore City, Mr. Xavier Conaway (“Mr. Conaway”) (Exhibit 184 on my website), after recognizing that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of assigning a Judge to preside over civil cases, had not assigned a Judge to preside over my Motions filed over a year ago, namely, on 11-1-23. **2.)** In terms of the material facts and legal arguments, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in my Motions filed on 11-1-23, which respond to the Findings and Order of the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, II, as evidenced by the Findings and Order of Judge M. Schreiber (Exhibit 154 on my website), which respond my Motions filed on 9-8-23 ((Exhibits 147 and 148, respectively, on my website), and/or Judge M. Schreiber, II failed to consider, disclose, and resolve whether the evidence substantiate the allegations that **all** of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, repeatedly and/or intentionally breached my 14th Amendment Right my Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to violating 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 2-3 11. **3.)** In responding to the “Notice Of Contemplated Dismissal (Lack Of Prosecution)” from Mr. Conaway , I filed **3** separate Motions on 10-15-24 (Exhibits 180, 181, 182 and 183, respectively, on my website)), which include filing my 1st Motion **for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to my civil litigation** , which include the material fact that I had been waiting on the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over civil cases assign a Judge to preside over my Motions filed on 11-1-23. I believe that

the SPIRIT OF GOD led me to understand, although I had filed 8 Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill as one of the presiding Judges over my initial civil litigation and as one of the presiding Judges over my appeal in the In Banc Review, I needed to file this Motion for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to my civil litigation (Exhibits 182 and 183, respectively, on my website). I had copies of my 3 separate 10-15-24 Motions, which were in a sealed envelope, hand delivered to Mr. Conaway's office. **4.)** In these same Motion for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, I, too, substantiate the material facts of allegations of obstructions of justice and misconduct in office due to repetitiously and/or intentionally infringing 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 by Judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over my civil litigation and as one of the presiding Judges over 8 of my Motions in my civil litigation, as well as by the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, and by all of the other former presiding Judges who Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned to preside over my civil litigation, namely, Judge Karen Friedman and Judge Michel Pierson in my initial civil litigation and Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, Judge J. Nugent, and Judge Geller in my appeal in the In Banc Review. **5.)** As evidenced by his Order (Exhibit 209 on my website), a new presiding Judge by the name of Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, presided over my 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24 and, also, presided over my Motions filed on 11-14-24 Motions, in which, he, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, is being alleged to have infringed 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 because under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), he should disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge since there is an appearance that Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, would be impartial and/or biased due to his appointment to the elite position in 2016 as an Administrative Judge by Larry Hogan, who, along with Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbra, and Wes Moore, is being alleged in my Motions and/or in this 2nd Addendum to our Hon. President to have transgressed Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct, and/or other crimes. **6.)** As declared in my most recent 3 separate Motions filed 12-26-24 (208, 208', and 208'', respectively, on my website) , in my 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24 Motions (Exhibits 180, 181, 182, and 183, respectively, on my website), and/or these instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS" , I've alleged that the evidence support the fact 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, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been breached by the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division, Judge Fletcher-Hill , by the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey and Judge M. Schreiber II, and by all of the other presiding Judges who Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned to preside over my Civil litigation, namely, Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Michel Pierson from my initial civil litigation and Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge J. Nugent, and Judge Geller from my appeal in the In Banc Review. **7.)** When I checked the Circuit Court's website on and/or about 9-28-24 to see if Judge Fletcher-Hill had assigned a Judge to preside over my 11-1-23 Motions, I discovered

that an Order declaring a “Notice of Contemplated Dismissal (Lack of Prosecution)” was issued on 9-25-24. When I received my copy of this Order (Exhibit 184 on my website) and read it, I noticed that the Order was signed by the Clerk of the Court, Mr. Xavier Conaway. After researching online the term, “Notice of Contemplated Dismissal (Lack of Prosecution)”, getting an understanding of what this Order meant, and discovered that I had 30 days to respond, I worked on filing Motions and on 10-15-24 I filed 3 separate Motions, namely, my: a.) 1st Motions for Deferral of Contemplation of Dismissal, vacate, and Motion for Hearing (Exhibit 180 on my website). b.) 1st Motions for Default judgment and Motion for A Hearing 9 (Exhibit 181 on my website). c.) 1st Motion for Disqualification of judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over my civil litigations (Exhibits 180 and 182, respectively, on my website). 9.) When I checked the Circuit Court’s website on and/or about 11-8-24, I found out that the Court granted my Motion for a deferral without prejudice on 11-5-24 and that this deferral would be effective until 2-5-25. Moreover, when I checked my mailbox the same day, I received a copy of the Order from Mr. Xavier Conaway (Exhibit 185 on my website) and a copy of Order which scheduled a hearing on my Motions on 12-6-24 (Exhibit 186 on my website). The Order which assigned a date for a hearing on my Motions did not give the name of the presiding Judge. 10.) A few days later, I checked the Circuit Court’s website and discovered that the presiding Judge over the hearing on my Motions is Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III. After researching his background, it was revealed to me that Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III was appointed to the superlative Administrative position by Larry Hogan in 2016. 11.) On 11-14-24, I filed my 1st Motions for Disqualification against Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III and a Motion for a hearing on the Motions. 12.) As asserted in my 11-14-24 Motions, if Judge Dorsey, Charles III presides over my Motions for a Hearing on the Motions scheduled for 12-06-24, my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, would be violated because: a.) Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11, committing “Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce, and according to the U.S. Supreme Court, his ORDER would be deemed void as a matter of law because of Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III’s refusal to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge as decreed under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to there being an appearance that Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be impartial and/or biased since he was appointed in 2016 as a Judge in the Baltimore City Circuit Court by Larry Hogan, who is being alleged in my Motions to have impinged upon Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. b.) Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be intruding on Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over my Motions for a Hearing on my Motions filed on 10-15-24, which are Motions from my appeal of my initial civil litigation in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City. Moreover, in these Motions, I proclaim that I look forward to having the hearing on my Motions scheduled for 12-6-24 and with a panel of 3 In Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 13.) Although the Order doesn’t state which of my 5 Motions for a hearing on my Motions will be considered, disclosed, and resolve during the hearing, I believe that the SPIRIT OF TRUTH has led me to understand that the material facts and legal arguments in my Motions filed on 11-14-24 must be disclosed, considered, and resolved before considering disclosing and resolving the other 4 Motions. 14.) Relevant to the hearing on my Motions scheduled for 12-06-24 at 11:00 a.m., at approximately 10:43 a.m., I called the telephone

number given on the Order of the hearing and imputed the information needed to get connected to the hearing that was scheduled for a remote hearing over the computer and/or by using the telephone. It is no doubt in my mind that the SPIRIT OF GOD gave me the strength, discipline, and determination to surrender to HIS leading and guiding me to wait almost a total of 3 hours on the telephone for the hearing that never occurred. Moreover, I was never informed by anyone after waiting on a hearing scheduled for 11:00 a.m. why the AI cited two separate occasions "good bye" and the telephone was disconnected. I only deviated for about a minute and a half from having to wait on the telephone for about 3 hours for the hearing because, after about two hours of waiting on the telephone, the AI said "good bye" and the telephone were disconnected at about 12:43 p.m. Before the first disconnection, I was informed by the AI that I had 7 other participants in front of me. After taking about a minute and a half to call back and go through the protocol for connecting to the hearing again, I was reconnected to the hearing for the second time. The AI told me that I had 2 participants in front of me After, and after waiting on the telephone for about 40 minutes, the AI told me to touch the star button on my telephone to disconnect my mute. The AI came on and stated "good bye" and the telephone was disconnected again. It was around 1:43 p.m. when I checked the time after the telephone was disconnected. Prior to the second disconnection, I heard a good portion of a case where the sister ultimately won her desire to care for her brother, and the Judge, whom I presume was Judge Dorsey, Charles, III gave the reasons and laws for substantiating his Orders. I was so righteously indignant and immediately called the Circuit Court with the intention of letting Clerk of the Court, Mr. Xavier Conway of the facts proclaimed above, including the fact that no one called me to explain why I was not given a hearing on the my Motions and/or to issue an apology for having me to wait on the telephone nearly 3 hours only to have the AI declare "good bye" and the telephone to be disconnected several times. Although I never had the opportunity to speak with Mr. Conway, I did inform 2 two clerks and one individual who informed me that he did not work for Clerk of the Court but the Circuit Court. Further, after putting me on hold for a few minutes and after returning to the telephone, the clerk informed me that she had been told by the clerk who works in Judge Dorsey, Charles, II's chamber that he was informed by the Judge-in-Charge of the Circuit Court, whom the clerk named as Judge John Nugent instead of Judge Fletcher-Hill, to rule on my case. Judge John Nugent is one of the former presiding Judges over my present civil litigations, but who, also, discontinued to preside over my Motions once I filed a Motion for his Disqualification in my Motions dated 6-20-23 (Exhibits 142 and 143, respectively, on my website). Initially, I was so righteously indignant that Judge, Dorsey, Charles, III was ruling on my Motion for hearing on my Motions scheduled for 12-6-24 before giving myself and the Defendant an opportunity to have our oral arguments presented during the hearing on my Motions, of which I had 5 separate Motions which had yet to be presided over by a Judge. However, on the evening of 12-6-24 as I continue to ponder in my heart why was I not given my right to have an oral hearing on my Motions for a hearing before Judge Dorsey, Charles, III rendered his Order, I believe that the SPIRIT OF TRUTH led me to go on line and research when a Judge can rule on a case without having a hearing as Ordered by the Judge. In my research, it was revealed to me that a Judge can rule without a hearing when one or more of the parties does not appear and/or if there is a reason for a postponement. Moreover, I believe that the HOLY GHOST has led me to, also, comprehend during this time I must still file Motions, which must include my 2nd Motion for Disqualification of Judge Dorsey, Charles II because it doesn't matter if Judge Dorsey, Charles, III grants, denies, or order a postponement of the hearing on my Motions, he still would be, for the first time, violating my 14th

Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law by: a.) transgressing Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11, committing "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce if he refuses to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge over my hearing on my Motions' hearing as ordered under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to there being an appearance that Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be impartial and/or biased because of his privileged appointment in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan (hereinafter "Larry Hogan"), who, along with another former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley (hereinafter "Martin O'Malley), former Chief Judge Barbera, and the present Governor Maryland, Wes Moore (hereinafter "Wes Moore), is being alleged to have violated Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to usurp Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. b.) encroaching upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over my Motions for a Hearing since the my Motions for a Hearing are Motions from my appeal of her initial civil litigation in an In Banc Review in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City. Moreover, I believe that the SPIRIT OF TRUTH has led me to understand that the only way that Judge Dorsey can legally rule without having a hearing on my Motions if: a.) the Defendant did not attend the hearing through being on the computer or by telephone and/or did not plea for a postponement. b.) I would not have remained on the telephone for nearly 3 hours, having had evidence of my attendance at the hearing as evidenced by the AI having to tell me "good bye", have my line disconnected on the two separate occasions as cited above, and having reiterated the facts declared above to the 3 individuals working in the Baltimore City Circuit Court to further substantiate the material fact that I did attend the hearing. 15.) In checking the website to determine the status of my 11-1-23 Motions and my 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24, I found out that a hearing on my Motions was scheduled for 12-6-24, and I started preparing for the hearing, hoping that the hearing would be on my 11-1-23 Motions and my 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24. Several days later, I found out that Judge Dorsey would be the presiding Judge during the 12-6-24 hearing on my Motions. I did some online research on Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and discovered that he was appointed to his privileged position Administrative position in 2016 by Larry Hogan. On 11-14-24, I filed a Motion to disqualify Judge Dorsey, Charles III from presiding over my motions on a hearing of my Motions. My 11-14-24 Motions is entitled "**1ST MOTIONS FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES HENRY, III AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR A HEARING SCHEDULED FOR 12-06-24 AND TO ASSIGN A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE, TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS, WHICH ARE MOTIONS FROM THE PETITIONER'S APEAL IN THE IN BANC REVIEW. 2.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON MOTIONS**" As evidenced in body of my Motions filed on 11-14-24, amongst other material facts and/or legal arguments, I declare that" The Petitioner is asserting that, if Judge Dorsey, Charles III presides over her Motions for a Hearing on her Motions scheduled for 12-06-24, her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, would be violated because 1.) Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11, committing "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce as a result of his refusal to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge as decreed under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to there being an appearance that Judge Dorsey,

Charles Henry, III would be impartial and/or biased since he was appointed by Larry Hogan, who, along with Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and Wes Moore, is being alleged to have violated Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 2.) Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be intruding on Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's appellant proceedings in the In Banc Review, which include the Petitioner's Motions for a Hearing on her Motions filed on 10-15-24, Motions from the Petitioner's her appeal of her initial civil litigation in an In Banc Review in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City. The Petitioner asserts that she looks forward to having the hearing on her Motions scheduled for 12-6-24 with a panel of 3 In Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for In Banc proceedings." 16.) As evidenced by his Findings and Orders docketed on 12-16-24, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III presided over my 3 separate 10-15-24 Motions, denied my 3 separate Motions, presided over my 11-14-24 Motions and denied these Motions, cancelled the hearing on my Motions scheduled for 12-06-24 on 12-16-24, and without giving any explanation for a single one of his Orders, Judge Dorsey simply states that "Order denying Plaintiff's Request for a Hearing on a Motion for Default Judgment, Plaintiff's Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill, Plaintiff's Motion for Disqualification of Judge Dorsey and the Motions Hearing scheduled for December 6th 2024 be CANCELLED." (Exhibit 209 on my website). 17.) In response to Judge Dorsey, Charles III's Findings and Orders, I filed 3 separate Motions on 12-23-24 and went to the Courthouse to file them, but the Court was closed and did not reopen until 12-26-24. My Motions were completed on 12-23-24 but was filed in the Circuit Court on 12-26-24 n my 12-26-24 In these Motions, amongst citing other obstructions of justice and misconduct , I continue to assert the redundant and/or willful 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, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 by Judge Fletcher-Hill , the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to my civil case, by the presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, and Judge M. Schreiber II, and by all of the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Michel Pierson in my initial civil litigation and by Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge J. Nugent, and Judge Geller in my appeal in the In Banc Review. As evidenced in one of my 3 separate and most recent Motions filed on 12-26-24 relevant to my present appeal in the In Banc Review in the Baltimore City Circuit Court (Exhibit 208, 208', and 208'', respectively, on my website), which respond to the Findings and Order docketed on the Court's website on 11-11-24 from the presiding Judge, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, and as evidenced in the Findings and Orders of Judge Dorsey, the presiding Judge fail to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material fact or legal arguments my Motions filed on 11-14-24 or from my 3 separate Motions filed on 10-14-24. The Heading in one of my Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibit 208 on my website) is entitled and from which he respond to in his Findings and Orders. The Heading in this Motion is entitled "**1st MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR**

RECONSIDERATION OF THE IMMEDIATE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL CASE, WHICH INCLUDE DISQUALIFICATION FROM PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER HER INSTANT MOTIONS, HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-14-24, HER 3 SEPARATE MOTIONS FILED ON 10-15-24, AND PRESIDING OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-23 DUE TO: A.) THE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III AND HIS 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 BEING DEEMED AS VOID AND OF NO EFFECT AS MANDATED UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNTITL 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR BY WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. B.) THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATING THAT JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL HAS INFRINGED UPON THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 SINCE 2018 DUE TO HIS REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING: i.) FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND HAS COMMITTED "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL LITIGATION AS A RESULT OF THERE BEING AN APPEARANCE THAT HE WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO HIS ELITE APPOINTMENT IN 2009 BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INFRINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. ii.) MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (c) IN PRESIDING OVER 4 MOTIONS IN THE PETITIONER'S APPEAL IN THE IN BANC REVIEW ALTHOUGH JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WAS ONE OF THE PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S INITIAL CIVIL LITIGATION. iii.) ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDING OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW AND TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. iv.) MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER HER RIGHT TO HAVE A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) MOTION TO HAVE HEARING ON THE INSTANT MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311"

The Heading in another of my Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibit 208' on my website), which respond to Judge Dorsey Findings and orders docketed on 12-16-24 is entitled "1ST MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDING OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR

RECONSIDERATION OF DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND THAT HIS 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 BE DEEMED VOID AND OF NO EFFECT UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TTLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR WES MOORE , IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENODICE. 2.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311."

The Heading in my third Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibit 208" on my website) is entitled "1ST MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE IMMEDIATE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL CASE, WHICH INCLUDE DISQUALIFICATION FROM PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER HER INSTANT MOTIONS, HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-14-24, HER 3 SEPARATE MOTIONS FILED ON 10-15-24, AND PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-23 DUE TO: A.) THE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III AND HIS 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 BEING DEEMED AS VOID AND OF NO EFFECT AS MANDATED UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNTITL 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR BY WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. B.) THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATING THAT JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL HAS INFRINGED UPON THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 SINCE 2018 DUE TO HIS REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING: i.) FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND HAS COMMITTED "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL LITIGATION AS A RESULT OF THERE BEING AN APPEARANCE THAT HE WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO HIS ELITE APPOINTMENT IN

2009 BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INFRINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. ii.) MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (c) IN PRESIDING OVER 4 MOTIONS IN THE PETITIONER'S APPEAL IN THE IN BANC REVIEW ALTHOUGH JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WAS ONE OF THE PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S INITIAL CIVIL LITIGATION. iii.) ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW AND TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. iv.) MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER HER RIGHT TO HAVE A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) MOTION TO HAVE HEARING ON THE INSTANT MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311"

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 to the Commission (Exhibit 196 on my website), in my 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24 (Exhibits 180, 181, 182, and 183, respectively, on my website), and/or in my 11-1-23 Motions (Exhibits 155 and 156, respectively, on my website) 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 Official Complaint, 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, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 by Judge Karen Friedman. 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 Official Complaint to the Commission, 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 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 Official Complaint to the Commission 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 Judge Dorsey, Charles, III.

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 against **Judge Dorsey, Charles, III**. 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 for 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 **Judge Dorsey, Charles, III**, 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, 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 for the FBI, the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland