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: dlady_d@verizon.net

Preferred Title and Pronoun:

- [x] 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 _____

JUDGE INFORMATION

First Name: Lawrence Last Name: Fletcher-Hill

Court:

- [ ] Supreme Court of Maryland
- [ ] Appellate Court of Maryland
- [x] 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:

- [x] 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:

- [x] Pending
- [ ] Concluded
- [ ] Appealed

Relationship to the case:

- [x] 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: 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 Allachment for the 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:

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, 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 Fletcher-Hill** as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over my civil litigation, whose initial Complaint was filed in 2017, and as one of the former presiding Judges over my civil litigation, and against the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey and Judge M. Schreiber, II, and against Judge Geller, Judge Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman, 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, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), 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 Statute28 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 to the Commission, 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, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or intentionally violated by Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Dorsey, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and by Judge Karen Friedman. 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 to the Commission,

namely, that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd 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 intentionally violated **by Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Dorsey, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and by Judge Karen Friedman.**

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 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 Fletcher-Hill** as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over my civil litigation whose initial Complaint was filed in 2017 and as one of the former presiding Judges over my civil litigation, and against the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey and Judge M. Schrieber, II, and against Judge Geller, Judge Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman, 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, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), 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 declared in my 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24 (Exhibits 180, 181, 182, and183, 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 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 Fletcher-Hill, Judge Dorsey, Judge M. Schrieber, II, Judge Geller, Judge Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman: **1.)** As of the filing date of this instant Attachments, namely, 1-29-25, and prior to receiving the "Notice Of Contemplated Dismissal (Lack Of Prosecution)" from the Clerk of the Court for Baltimore City, Mr. Conaway, I was waiting on Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of

assigning judges to preside over civil cases, to assign a Judge to preside over my 11-1-23 Motions (Exhibit 155 and 156, respectively, on my website. **2.)** 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, and 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), Judge M. Schreiber, II fails to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order whether my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were infringed upon because the evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill, as one of the presiding Judges over my civil litigation, and **all** of the other former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman 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 filed 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 preside over my civil litigation** . Also, in the body of these Motions, amongst other things, I assert that, under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), **there is an appearance that Judge-Fletcher-Hill would be biased and/or impartial as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over my civil litigation** because of his unique appointment as an Administrative judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who, along with Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials, is being alleged to have violated 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. Moreover, I did proclaim in these Motions that the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over civil litigations have yet to preside over assigning a Judge to preside over my recent Motions filed on 11-1-23, which are Motions from my appeal in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City of my civil litigation and that I had been waiting over a year for Judge Fletcher-Hill to assign a Judge to preside over my 11-1-23 Motions. I had copies of my **3** separate 10-15-24 Motions hand-delivered to Mr. Conaway's office on 10-15-24. **4.)** In one of my **3** separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibit 208" on my website), I filed a Motion for Reconsideration of Judge Dorsey, Charles, III's 12-14-24 Order, which denied my 1st Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill ,filed on 10-15-24, as the **Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over my civil litigation** . Amongst other things, I assert the material facts and/or legal arguments cited in my 11-1-23 Motions as evidence to substantiate my Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill as one of the presiding Judges over my civil litigation under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), and I alleged the material facts and/or legal arguments to substantiate my Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to my civil litigation under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a). **5.)** In my 11-1-23 Motions, beginning with Judge M. Schreiber III, the presiding Judge over my present appeal in the In Banc Review and ending with Judge Karen Friedman, the first presiding Judge over my initial civil litigation, I cite the 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 each of these presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill as one of the presiding Judges in my initial civil litigation and as one of the presiding Judges in my present appeal in the In Banc Review. **6.)** In my 12-26-24, 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, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 are being alleged against the newest of the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey , and against the other presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, as well as against Judge Geller, Judge Nugent, Judge A. Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, **Judge Fletcher-Hill**, and Judge Karen Friedman. **7.)** In my 11-1-23 Motions, beginning with the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, I state that .... **"The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, , the Exhibits accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts cited in the section below and entitled "STATEMENTS OF UNDISPUTED FACTS" will substantiate the allegations that, for the first time, Judge M. Schreiber II, has violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law by: 1.) breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11 and have, also, committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the appearance of Judge M. Schreiber II being impartial and/or biased because of his appointment by Larry Hogan, who, along with Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials, 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.) failing to set aside his judgment filed on 10-20-23 and to deem his Order as void as a matter law due to his infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 3.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated 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 In Banc Review, instead of having himself as the only presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions from her In Banc Review. 4.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's 10th Motion for her right to an oral Hearing because the previous presiding Judges, namely, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge fletcher-Hill, and the 3 panel of In Banc Judges repeatedly denied the Petitioner's right to an oral Hearing as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 5.) failing disclose, consider, and resolve the Petitioner's Motion to set aside the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, due to the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature, which indicate what Judge wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the 8 Motions cited in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which include Motions alleging repeated and/or deliberate violations of the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, breaching the Rule of Law, by Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher, and by all of the other judges who presided**

over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation from her Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation (Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin) due to these Officers' of the Court repetitious and/or intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11), Maryland Rule18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws. 7.) failing disclose, consider, and resolve the 9-8-23 Petitioner's Motion to set aside the judgements of the previous presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the judgments of the other former presiding Judges and to deem all of their Orders void as a matter of law due to their continuous and deliberate breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by not voluntarily disqualifying and recusing themselves due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as a result of their appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are, also, 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. 8.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order whether and, for the 6th time, the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division of the Circuit Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill, breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his failure, as the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, who represents the Court, to grant the Petitioner's Motion to assign judges to preside over her civil litigation who were not appointed by government officials are 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, which include Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials. 9.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order if the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, along with Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because these Judges repeatedly and/or deliberately violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to have an oral Hearing before deciding to deny the Petitioner's Petition. 10.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill due to his repeated and deliberate violations of Maryland 18.102.11 5(c). 11.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, Judge J.

Geller, and by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and/or intentional failure to grant the Petitioner Petitioner's 7TH Motion For Reconsideration. 12.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, and by John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and/or intentional failure to grant the Petitioner's 11th Motion for a Hearing on the Motions as mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311.

Moreover, the Petitioner alleges that the evidence that will be submitted during Discovery and revealed during her requested jury trial, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, Exhibit 1 that accompanies her instant Motions, and/or the material facts stated in the section below and entitled "STATEMENTS OF UNDISPUTED FACTS" will substantiate the allegations that: 1.) The Petitioner continues to undergo more financial loss, more loss of property, and more tremendous emotional distress as a result of repetitiously and/or deliberately having her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 violated and, thus, the Rule of Law, due to the repeated and/or intentional infringements of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge M. Schreiber II, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges due to their failure to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, as well as set aside all of their judgments and deem all of their Orders void as mandated under Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S. as a result of there being an appearance that all of these Officers of the Court could be biased and/or impartial as a result of their special appointments by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged to have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities. 2.) The facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the 10-20-23 Findings and Order by Judge M. Schreiber II, from which his 10-20-23 Findings and Order respond to, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions support the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber II violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, Section 242 because Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were intentionally breached due Judge M. Schreiber II violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which further resulted in his engagements in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce. 3.) The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions support the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber II violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, Section 242 because Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and/or intentionally breached by Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, and Judge Fletcher-Hill due to their repeated and/or intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which further resulted in their repetitiously and/or deliberately engaging in the acts of treason

to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce. 4.) The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions support the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber II violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, Section 242 because Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and/or intentionally violated by the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, who initially presided over the Petitioner's appeal in her In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation because all of these Officers of the Court repetitiously and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which further resulted in their repeatedly and deliberately engaging in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce."... 8.) Further, in my 11-1-23 Motions, which responds to the Findings and Orders docketed on 10-20-23 of Judge Schreiber II, the presiding Judge, whose responds to my 9-8-23 Motions, I declare more material facts and legal arguments to support my allegations of the breaching 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, Judge M. Schreiber, Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, Judge J. Nugent, and/or Judge Geller. Thus, I state that ..."**As asserted in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, from which Judge M. Schreiber II responds to in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, the Petitioner continues to suffer financial hardship and can't afford to make copies of all of the material evidence that could accompany her instant Motions, her 9-8-23 Motions, and/or her other Motions to substantiate the alleged pattern of deceit, but through the support of her family, the Petitioner alleges that she has been able to maintain her website for public access to the Petitioner's instant Motions, to her other Motions, to the corresponding Findings and Orders by presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II and by all of the former presiding Judges, and access to the Petitioner's Official Complaints and/or the Addendums against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against the 3 original presiding In Banc Judges, against the other former presiding Judges, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other governmental officials. The 10-20-23 Findings and Order by Judge M. Schreiber II can be located as Exhibit 154 on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's instant Motions dated 11-1-23, which include her Motion for Disqualification against Judge M. Schreiber II, can be located as Exhibit 155 on the Petitioner's website. The 8-29-23 Findings and Order by Judge J. Geller can be located on the Petitioner's website as Exhibit 146 on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which include her Motion for Disqualification against Judge J. Geller can be located as Exhibits 147, 148, and 149 on the Petitioner's website. The 6-8-23 Findings and Order by Judge John Nugent can be located as Exhibit 141 on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, which include her Motion for Disqualification against Judge John Nugent can be located as Exhibits 142 and 143 on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's Motions, which include her Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions, her Official Complaints against Judge Fletcher-Hill and/or the Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill are in the record and/or can be located on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 16, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 71, 72, 77, 81, 94, 96, 98, 100, 113, and 114. The Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill can be viewed on the**

Petitioner's website as Exhibits 50, 51, 52, 67, 95, 97, 99, and 112. The Petitioner's Motions, which include her Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions, her Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges and/or other Official Complaints and other Addendums which include allegations against the panel of In Banc Judges are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits on her website, namely, 16, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, and/or Exhibit 94. The Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits, 73, 75, and 93. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualification and/or Substitution against Judge Karen Friedman, her Official Complaint, and/or the Petitioner's Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman are in the record and/or can be viewed from the Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, namely, Exhibits 16, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 54, 55, 56, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81. The Findings and Orders of Judge Karen Friedman can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 47, 48, and 49. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions against Judge Michel Pierson, her Official Complaint, and/or Addendums to the Petitioner's Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits 16, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81 on her website. The Findings and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 59, 63, 66, and 70. The Petitioner's Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, her Addendums to her Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other Official Complaints and/or Addendums to other Official Complaints which include allegations against Chief Judge Barbera can be viewed from Exhibits 6, 16, 43, 45, 54, 56, 77, and/or Exhibit 81 on the Petitioner's website.

As evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve the material facts that he breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he should have set aside his judgment after thoroughly reviewing all of Petitioner's relevant and lengthy Motions, which include her 2-27-23 Motions which assert as material facts that Larry Hogan, who, along with Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government official, is being alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and/or in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have violated 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. Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order that he infringed upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 because: 1.) Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Judge M. Schreiber II is mandated to voluntarily disqualify, recuse himself as the presiding judge, and set aside his judgment due to their being an appearance that Judge M. Schreiber II might be biased and/or impartial because he was appointed in 2022 to the 8th Circuit for Baltimore City by Larry Hogan, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and/or in her Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. 2.) Due to Petitioner's alleged financial loss as a result of his alleged

infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Judge M. Schreiber II has committed "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce. 3.) As a result of Judge M. Schreiber II violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11, the Petitioner alleges that she continues to undergo more financial loss, more loss of property, and more tremendous emotional distress. 4.) Since under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, it is mandated that the Petitioner has a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions from her In Banc Review, Judge M. Schreiber II has violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution because he was the only presiding over the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review. 5.) Since under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, it is, too, mandated that the Petitioner have a right to an oral Hearing before the panel of 3 In Banc Judges decides to grant or deny the Petitioner's Petition, Judge M. Schreiber II has ,again, breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution as a result of his failure grant the Petitioner's Motion for an oral Hearing because the evidence substantiate the material facts that all of the previous presiding Judges over the Petitioner's Motions in her appeal in the In Banc Review violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in denying the Petitioner her right to an oral Hearing prior to deciding to deny the Petitioner's Petition. 6.) Since under Maryland Rule 2-311, it is mandated that if the Petitioner motions for a hearing as prescribed in Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) and as asserted in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which contain her 11th Motion for a Hearing on her Motions, then she has a right to a hearing, Judge M. Schreiber II infringed upon Maryland Rule 2-311 in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to a hearing on her 9-8-23 Motions.

The evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in Judge M. Schreiber II's 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioners 9-8-23 Motions, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, also, substantiates these other statements of "UNDISPUTED FACTS", which are, too, material, namely: that: 1.) Judge M. Scheiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, the material facts that, in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, she alleges that her 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under 18 U.S.C & Section 242 were repetitiously and/or deliberately violated: a.) by the previous presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, by Judge John Nugent, by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other former presiding Judges, beginning with Judge Karen Friedman, with whom the Petitioner filed her first Motion for Disqualification against in 2018 because all of the former presiding Judges failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as mandated under Federal Statute, Section 455(a)) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to there being an appearance of impartiality and/or bias because each one of these Officers of the Court was appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted 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.) by all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to these Officers of the Court repeatedly and/or intentionally violating Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner an oral Hearing before a panel of 3 presiding Judges because the panel of 3 In Banc Judges who initially presided over the Petitioner's In Banc Review denied the Petitioner's Petition before

granting the Petitioner's right to an oral Hearing as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 2.) Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order whether the evidence substantiate the material facts that, in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which respond to Judge M. Geller's 8-29-23 Findings and Order (Exhibit 146 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions (Exhibits 142 and 143 on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner alleges that her 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under 18 U.S.C & Section 242 were deliberately violated by the previous presiding Judge, Judge M. Geller because: a.) Judge J. Geller's 8-29-23 Findings and Order fail to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments which the Petitioner alleges substantiate the 8 Motions in her 6-20-23 Motions, whose Heading is entitled "1.) 1ST MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THEREBY, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. 2.) 1ST MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 JUDGMENTS OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT DUE TO HIS VIOLATIONS OF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C, SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF HIS: A.) VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 IN FAILING TO DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS A PRESIDNG JUDGE DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF HIM BEING IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED BECAUSE OF HIS APPOINTMENT BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE . B.) VIOLATING 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, MOTIONS FROM HER IN BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILNG TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILNG TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDNGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITON FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. E.) FAILNG TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY INFRINGED UPON BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL DUE TO HIS REPEATED AND DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE

18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 1ST MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE 3-21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 4.) 2ND MOTION THAT JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ORDERS THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM. 5.) 5TH MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. 6.) 7TH MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A). 7.) 5TH MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 8.) 9TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-31". b.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order any of the material facts and legal arguments assert to substantiate the Petitioner's 8 Motions within her 6-20-23 Motions. c.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions , whether to set aside his judgment and the judgments of John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the judgments of the previously presiding Judges and deem all of their Orders void as a matter of law due to their continuous and/or deliberate infringing upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to these Officers' of the Court repeatedly and/or deliberately breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by not voluntarily disqualifying and recusing themselves due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as a result of their appointments by Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are 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. d.) Judge J. Geller fails to set aside the Judgment filed on 3-23-23, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, because of the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature indicating who wrote the Findings and Order filed on 3-23-23. e.) Judge J. Geller disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, the allegations that he deliberately infringed upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to his intentional breaching of 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 In Banc Review, not just solely Judge J. Geller being the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 8-29-23 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review. f.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, whether Judge John Nugent and Judge Fletcher-Hill infringed upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to their repeated and intentional breaching of 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 In Banc Review. g.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the initial panel of 3 In Banc Judges have repetitiously and/or intentionally

failed to grant the Petitioner's her right to an oral hearing as, also, mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 3.) Judge M. Schreider II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order that he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to his failing to disclose, consider, and resolve the Petitioner's 3rd Motion for Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, mandate that the clerks record, verbatim, the Heading of the Petitioner's Motion, a legal document, on the Circuit Court's website, which is viewed by the public.

In addition, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioners 9-8-23 Motions, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions substantiate that, in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, Judge M. Schreiber II fail to disclose, consider, and resolve other statements of "UNDISPUTED FACTS" declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which are material in tracing the history of the alleged repetitious and/or intentional violations of the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to, amongst other things, the repeated and/or deliberate violations of Federal Statute and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by all of the former presiding Officers of the Court due to their repeated and/or intentional refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves. These other undisputed facts include: 1.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division whose responsibilities include assigning judges to civil case, presided over the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, 8-6-18, and 9-17-18 Motions from her initial civil litigation (Exhibits 38, 36, 42, 41, 58, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) as evidenced by his responses in his 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, 9-4-18 Findings and Orders (Exhibits 50, 46, 52, and 57, respectively, on the Petitioner's website),and the evidence of the Petitioner's 4-7-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, and 12-27-22 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review,(Exhibits 94, 96, 98, and 100, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) as evidenced by Judge Fletcher-Hill's responses in his 6-21-22, 8-4-12, 12-16-22, and 2-16-23 Findings and Orders (Exhibits 95, 97, 99, and 112 on the Petitioner's website). Thus, the evidence substantiate the material fact that the Petitioner was coerced to have to file 9 separate Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill for violating her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his repetitiously and intentionally infringing breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judges because of the appearance of his being impartial and/or biased as a result of being appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions and in her Civil Complaint filed in 2017 to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. Moreover, since the evidence support the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill has unlawfully presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation at least 4 times, Judge Fletcher-Hill has, thereby, repeatedly and intentionally breached Maryland Rule 18.102. 11 5(c), which prohibits a judge from presiding over a party's appeal in a civil litigation after the judge has been a presiding Judge in the initial civil litigation. Still too, for the 6th time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has assigned only judges who were appointed by

government officials who are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities, which include Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, and/or any government official cited in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and/or in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. In fact, attached to the Petitioner's instant Motions as Exhibit 1 is her "6th URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" to the Governor of Maryland, Gov. Moore, which declares in the Heading of the Petitioner's urgent missive "Re: 1.) "6TH URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES, THAT IS, FOR YOU, GOV. MOORE, to exercise your Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland, representing a GOVERNMENT OF WE THE PEOPLE, BY WE THE PEOPLE, AND FOR WE THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND, WHO WILL UPHOLD OUR 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY AND, FOR THE SECOND TIME, ORDERS the JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL to: a.) assign a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over my 11-1-23 Motions and to grant my right to an oral Hearing before the panel of 3 Judges deny or grant my Petition as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for In Banc proceedings. b.) assign only judges who were not appointed by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore, another former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, another former Governor of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, Martin O'Malley, the former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, or any of the government officials that are cited in my 2-27-23 Motions and/or in my 2nd Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint because all of these government officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S . Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. 2.) 2nd REQUEST THAT THE U.S ATTORNEY OF MARYLAND, EREK L. BARRON, AND THE STATE ATTORNEY FOR BALTIMORE CITY, IVAN BATES, regardless of whether Gov. Wes Moore issue the ORDERS and Judge Fletcher-Hill adheres to or reject the ORDERS, that both of you will continue your investigation and disclose and resolve the allegations that indictments need to brought against the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, the former presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, the former presiding Judges over my appeal in the In Banc Review, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges who initially presided over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation and all of the other judges who presided over my initial civil litigation, which, also, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, because the evidence substantiate the material facts that these Officers of the Court have repeatedly and/or deliberately m violated y 14th Amendment Right , my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 241, and/or my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by repetitiously and/or intentionally: a.) committed the Federal crimes of violating Federal Statute violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and the federal crimes of "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce due to their repetitious and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) in refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and/or to deem each of their Orders as void due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as presiding Judges as a result of being appointed to the elite positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in my 2-27-23 Motions and/or in my 2nd Addendum to 2-18-20 Official Complaint to have

breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. b.) committed the same other federal and/or state crimes alleged in my 3-9-18 Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 37 on my website), the first Judge that presided over my initial civil litigation, which include repetitiously and/or deliberately committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Part1, Chapter 73 & 1512, concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071, Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001." 2.) The material facts that the evidence of the first 5 Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, which accompany the her 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on the Petitioner's website) and which are, also, material evidence in the Petitioner's Motions and in her 2017 Civil Complaint, prove, unequivocally, and in less than 5 minutes of reading, that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera intentionally committed the alleged prejudicial error of perjury in her 2015 Findings and Order, which, in turn, caused the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals (Exhibit 11 on the Petitioner's website) to have, yet, to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc judges from Circuit Court breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right by committing perjury and infringing upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right in breaching Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that the owners of Baltimore City Public Schools from at least 1993 to the present, which include Kurt Schmoke and Martin O'Malley, every member of the City Council who was a member of the City Council between 1993 until the present, Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged to have repeatedly and deliberately violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts for decades. Further, the Petitioner asserts in her Motions that the prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera appears to constitute another example of "Fraud upon the Court, and in order to understand how the first 5 Exhibits substantiate that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury and/or Fraud upon the Court, one must know that Maryland Rule 7-104 allows a party 30 days to file an appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, with the first of the 30 days beginning on the day that the last judgment of the Circuit Court is "entered" into the record by the clerk. Exhibit 1 is copy of the document that gives the "entry" date of the 2015 In Banc judges' last judgment from the Circuit Court, namely, the denial of the Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration on July 6, 2015. Exhibit 2 is a copy of the docket receipt from the clerk of the Court of Appeals which gives the date that the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals was filed in the record of this court, namely, on August 3, 2015. Exhibit 3 is a copy of the Court of Appeals' Order dated 9-21-15, which is signed by Chief Judge Barbera and declares that the Petitioner's Writ was denied because it was filed late. Exhibit 4 is a copy of the Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals which asserts, amongst other things, that the evidence in the record of this court, which include Exhibits 1 and

2 support the material fact that the Petitioner's 2015 Writ was filed in the Court of Appeals prior to the 30-day expiration date. Exhibit 5 is Chief Judge Barbera's Order dated 11-23-15, which, again, denies the Petitioner's 2015 Writ, but this time Chief Judge Barbera's denial is without any explanation. 3.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact, although his term expired in 2019, Judge John Nugent was appointed as one of the judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera, who is being alleged by the Petitioner to have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. 4.) The material facts that the evidence supports the fact that the Petitioner asserts that, during her research on 6-8-23 on the background of Judge John Nugent, she discovered that Judge John Nugent was appointed Chair, Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee, Judicial Council, in 2022 by the new Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Joseph M. Getty. 5.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner declares that she researched the background of Judge Joseph M. Getty and discovered that he was appointed in

September 2021 as the new Chief Judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals by Chief Judge Barbera and that Chief Judge Barbera became the former Chief Judge of the Court of Maryland when she retired in September 2021. 6.) The material facts that the evidence supports the fact that the Petitioner asserts that, during her research on 6-8-23, she discovered that she could file a "Motion to set aside judgment", which is a request for the court to nullify or vacate a judgment or verdict that had previously been reached in the case after a judgment or verdict in a case has been delivered. 7.) The material facts that the evidence supports the fact that the Petitioner proclaims that, during her research on 6-8-23, she discovered that a Motion to set aside a judgment is generally filed if new evidence comes to light after the case has ended that may cast doubt on the original verdict and that it can be filed long after a verdict or judgment has been issued, even years. 8.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner is asserting that she that she is only presuming that Judge John Nugent is the judge who wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order because there is no signature on her copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order and that the initials "N.J" is not on her coy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 9.) The material fact that the evidence supports the fact that the Petitioner filed her initial Civil Complaint against the Defendant in the Circuit Court on 9-17-17. 10.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, after the Defendant filed a Motion on 11-17-17 to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint, she filed her first Motions (Exhibit 39 on the Petitioner's website, which includes her Motions to dismiss the Defendant's Motion and to amend the punitive damages in her Civil Complaint. In her 12-22-17 Findings and Order (Exhibit 47 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Karen Friedman grants the Defendant's Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint. 11.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that she filed her 1-3-18 Motions (Exhibit 35 on the Petitioner's website) in response to Judge Karen Friedman's 12-22-17 Findings and Order, and the Heading in her 1-3-18 Motions is entitled "MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, AND GRANTING OF THE PLANTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND THE PUNITIVE DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVILCOMPLAINTS". 12.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in her 1-31-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 48 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Karen Friedman denies the Petitioner's 1-3-18 Motions.

The Petitioner asserts that, while researching causes for filing her next Motion, she believes that, through DIVINE providence, she was led to the material fact that Judge Karen Friedman was appointed by Martin O'Malley in 2014. 13.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, in her 2-15-18 Motions (Exhibit 34 on the Petitioner's website), she include her first Motion for Substitution of Judge Karen Friedman as the presiding Judge over her civil litigation, and the Heading in the Petitioner's 2-15-18 Motions is entitled "MOTIONS FOR SUBSTITUTION, TO DISMISS JUDGE FRIEDMAN'S ORDERS, AND TO HAVE ANOTHER JUDGE CONSIDER THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OFADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, and GRANTING OF THE PLANTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND THE PUNITIVE DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL COMPLAINT. 14.) The material facts that the evidence supports the fact that, as substantiated in 2-15-18 Motions, amongst other things, the Petitioner pleads for a substitution of Judge Karen Friedman and states that ....."due to a conflict of interest and/or the appearance of a conflict of interest and/or being impartial and/or having the appearance of impartiality and, thereby, breaching Canons 1 and 2 in the Judicial Code of Conduct for Judges. Canon 1 stipulates that a judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety. And, Canon 2 cites that a judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently. Judge Friedman was one of the judges appointed in 2014 to Maryland Eighth Circuit Baltimore City by the Former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley"..... 15.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, in her 3-1-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 49 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Karen Friedman denies the Petitioner's 2-15-18 Motions. 16.) The material facts that the evidence supports the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, during her research, she discovered that, in addition to continuing to violate Federal Statute 28. U.S.C & 455(a) and Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Judicial Code of Conduct for Judges (hereinafter"Canons"), Judge Karen Friedman appeared to be breaching other federal and/or state laws and, thus, the Petitioner filed an Official Complaint) against Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 37 on the Petitioner's website), which was completed and mailed to our Hon. President on 3-9-18. 17.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, as evidenced by her Court-stamped Motions, the Petitioner, also, filed her 3-9-18 Motions (Exhibit 38 on the Petitioner's website) in response to Judge Karen Friedman's 3-1-18 Findings and Order on this same day, which include the Petitioner's 2nd Motion for Disqualification against Judge Karen Freidman for violating the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to Judge Karen Friedman breaching Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. &455 and the Canons in failing to disqualify and recuse herself from presiding over the Petitioner's civil litigation due to the appearance of her being bias and/or impartial as a result of Judge Karen Friedman being appointed by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's civil litigation to have breached 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. The Heading in the Petitioner's 39-18 Motions is entitled "MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN, MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN FOR COMMITTING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION, MOTION FOR ANOTHER SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN'S ORDERS AND TO HAVE ANOTHER JUDGE CONSIDER THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY

JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, AND GRANTING OF THE PLANTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND THE PUNITIVE DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL COMPLAINTS". 18.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the evidence of the signature on the 3-30-18 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 3-9-18 Motions, substantiate that Judge Karen Friedman did not respond to the Petitioner's 3-9-18 Motions, but Judge Fletcher-Hill responds and denies the Petitioner's 3-9-18 Motions in his 3-30-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 50 on the Petitioner's website). As evidenced in these Findings, there is no written communication in Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings acknowledging and/or confirming that Judge Karen Friedman was disqualified and recused as the presiding Judge. 19.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in responding to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 3-30-18 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 4-6-18 (Exhibit 36 on the Petitioner's website), which include her first Motion for Disqualification and Substitution of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge; and, in his 4-16-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 46 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Fletcher-Hill denies the Petitioner's 4-6-18 Motions. 20.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order dated 4-16-18, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 4-27-18 (Exhibit 42 on the Petitioner's website), which include the Petitioner's 2nd Motion for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill for violating the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due his failure to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding due because of Judge Fletcher-Hill's appointment to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in my civil litigation to have infringed 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. Also, the Petitioner alleges in these Motions that the evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill has, too, obstructed justice and violated other federal and/or state laws; and, the Heading in the Petitioner's 4-27-18 Motions is entitled "MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION TO HAVE A SPECIAL JUDGE TO DETERMINE IF THE MATERIAL FACTS BELOW SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN NEED TO BE REFERRED FOR IMPEACHMENT BY GOVERNOR HOGAN, SANCTIONED BY THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION, DISQUALIFIED FROM PRESIDING OVER THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL CASE, AND BE REFERRED FOR INVESTIGATION BY A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR RELEVANT TO ALLEGATIONS OF CRIMINAL ACTS, JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, MOTION TO HAVE ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN DISMISSED, AND A MOTION TO HAVE THE SPECIAL JUDGE FOR A SUBSTITUTION AND/OR JUDGE ALFRED NANCE FOR A SUBSTITUTION TO CONSIDER GRANTING ALL OF THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS." 21.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the, as evidenced from the date on the Petitioner's 4-27-18 Motions and the date on Judge Fletcher's 7-23-18 Findings and Order which responds to s the Petitioner's 4-27-18 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill took almost 3 months to respond to the Petitioner's 4-27-18 Motions in his denial asserted in his 7-23-18 Findings and Order. 22.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner asserts that, after reading over Judge Fletcher-Hill's 7-23-18 Findings and Order, she believes that the SPIRIT OF GOD led her to understand that the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in <u>all</u> of the Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's Motions, substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill

continuously obstructed justice and violated the same federal and state laws as Judge Karen Friedman, and, therefore, on 8-6-18,

the Petitioner filed an Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibit 43 on the Petitioner's website), which includes allegations that he, like Judge Karen Friedman, repeatedly and intentionally committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of breaching of the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and other federal statutes under 18 USC 242. 23.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the evidence of the stamped date by the clerk substantiates the material fact that on 8-6-18, the Petitioner, also, filed her Motions, which respond to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 7-23-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 41 on the Petitioner's website). 24.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, prior to receiving Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order responding to her 8-6-18 Motions, the Petitioner alleges that she wrote 4 Addendums to her 8-6-18 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, namely, the Addendums dated 8-9-10, 8-10-18, 8-27-18, and 8-31-18, which are Exhibits 44, 45, 54, and 55, respectively, on the Petitioner's website. 25.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill denies the Petitioner's 8-6-18 Motions in his 9-4-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 57 on the Petitioner's website), and in response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 9-4-18 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 9-17-18, (Exhibit 58 on the Petitioner's website), which include the Petitioner's 4th Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill. Moreover, accompanying the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions as Exhibits are copies of her 8-6-18 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill and her 3rd emailed Addendum to her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibits 43 and 54, respectively, on the Petitioner's website). 26.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions, which respond to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 9-4-18 Findings and Order were denied on 12-7-18 by another judge, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, who never cited in his Findings that Judge Fletcher-Hill was disqualified and recused as the presiding Judge. 27.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in his 12-7-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 59 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions, Judge Michel Pierson simply ordered that the "Plaintiff's Motion (No. 27) is STRICKEN", that the "Defendants shall not be required to respond to any future Filings by Plaintiff in this case unless expressly ordered by this Court", and that the "Clerk shall close this case." 28.) The material facts that the

evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, during her research on the issue of whether written Motions can be "Stricken" from the record of the court as ordered by Judge Michel Pierson in his 12-7-18 Findings and Order, she believes that, again, through DIVINE guidance, she came across other very critical material facts, namely, that Judge Michel Pierson was appointed by Chief Judge Barbera in 2013 and that she could file a Motion for a hearing on my Motions. 29.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in her 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on the Petitioner's website), which

respond to Judge Michel Pierson's 12-7-18 Findings and Order, the Petitioner pleads her 1st Motion for a Hearing on her Motions and she, also, Motions for a removal of Judge Michel Pierson as the presiding Judge because she questions whether there is an appearance of a bias and/or impartiality due to his appointment by Chief Judge Barbera who is being alleged to have deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury and that the first 5 Exhibits on her website accompany the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions as "Exhibits" in order to substantiate the allegation that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in 2015. The Heading in the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions is entitled "MOTION FOR HON. GOV. HOGAN TO EXPEDITIOULY APPOINT A JUDGE TO HAVE A HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE MICHEL P IERSON'S 12-7-18 DECISION AND ORDERS, BUT IF THIS MOTION IS DENIED, MOTION TO STILL HAVE A HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE MICHEL'S PIERSON'S 12-7-18 DECISION AND ORDERS, MOTION TO HAVE HON. GOV. HOGAN TO EXPEDITIOUSLY APPOINT A JUDGE TO DETERMINE IF THE MATERIAL FACTS CITED IN THESE MOTIONS SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, THE ADMINISTRATOR OVER THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY CIRUCIT COURT: (1.) INTENTIONALLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND HAS DELIBERATELY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING THE PLAINTIFF'S 7TH AND 14TH AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242. (2.) NEEDS TO BE REFERRED TO BE INVESTIGATED BY A SPECIAL STATE PROSECTOR DUE TO PLAINTIFF'S SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS OF HIS DELIBERATELY COMMITTING THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND OF HIS DELIBERATELY COMMITTING THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING THE PLAINTIFF'S 7TH AND 14TH AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242, AND MOTION TO HAVE APPOINTED JUDGE BY HON. GOV. HOGAN TO RECONSIDER GRANTING ALL OF THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS". 30.) The material facts that the evidence supports the fact that, on 12-20-18, the Petitioner filed her Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson and mailed the original copy to your office, Hon. President (Exhibit 61 on the Petitioner's website). Amongst other material facts, the Petitioner alleges in her Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson that the evidence in the record substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson has repeatedly and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), committed misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, and, therefore, infringed upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under 18 USC 242. 31.) The material fact that the evidence supports the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, on 1-4-19, she mailed her 1st emailed Addendum to her 12-20-18 Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson (Exhibit 62 on the Petitioner's website) to our Hon. President. 32.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in Judge Michel Pierson's Findings and Order dated 2-6-19 (Exhibit 63 on the Petitioner's website), he denies the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions, and, in response to Judge Michel Pierson's Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 2-15-19 (Exhibit 64 on the Petitioner's website), which include another Motion to have another judge preside over her civil litigation. Moreover, the Petitioner asserts that, although she does not actually cite the phrase, "Motion for Disqualification" in her 2-15-19 Motions, she does declare in her 2-15-19 Motions that she questions Judge Michel Pierson's impartiality and/or bias as the presiding Judge due to his being appointed by Chief Judge Barbera, who is being

alleged in my civil litigation and in other Motions to have committed the prejudicial error of perjury, a very material fact. 33.) The material fact that the evidence supports the fact that the he Petitioner alleges that, included in her 2-15-19 Motions is another Motion for a hearing on the Motions as afforded under Maryland Rule 2-311. 34.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Judge Michel Pierson denies the Petitioner's 2-15-19 Motions in his Findings and Order dated 8-8-19 (Exhibit 66 on the Petitioner's website), and, in response to Judge Michel Pierson's 8-8-19 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 8-22-19 (Exhibits 67 and 67' on the Petitioner's website), which include another Motion for Disqualification of Judge Michel Pierson. 35.) The material fact that the evidence supports the fact that the he Petitioner asserts that, on 8-29-19, she emailed copies of her second plea to Gov. Hogan (Exhibit 69 on the Petitioner's website) to the Whitehouse and to other governmental agencies. 36.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, although in his 1-2-20 Findings and Order, Judge Michel Pierson denies the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions and ordered that the "Clerk shall not accept any further filings in this action other than a Order of Appeal accompanied by the filing fee and further ORDERED the clerk to close this case.", in her appeal of the 1-2-20 Findings and Order by Judge Michel Pierson, on 1-14-20, the Petitioner petitioned that a panel of 3 In Banc Judges preside over her In Banc Review in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City by filing her Petition and Memorandum (Exhibits 72 and 71, respectively, on the Petitioner's website). The Petitioner alleges that, in her Memorandum, she states "9 Questions for Review" and/or legal arguments, along with the supporting material facts, that she wanted the panel of In Banc judges to disclose, consider, and resolve before deciding to grant or deny the Petitioner's Petition. 37.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, in her Order dated 1-24-20, Judge Carrion, the "Administrative & Chief Judge", assigned three "designated judges to preside over the Petitioner's In Banc Review as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 38.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that her 1-14-20 Memorandum is lengthy due to the fact that she traces the material facts and legal arguments that substantiate the repeated allegations of how her 14th Amendment Right and her right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were being repetitiously violated, starting in 2018 with her first Motion for Disqualification against Judge Karen Friedman, the first judge to preside over her 2017 Civil Complaint and then the repeated Motions of Disqualification against Judge Karen Friedman, against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and against Judge Michel Pierson due to their repeated and intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) as a result of their repeated and intentional refusals to disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as a result of there being an appearance of their being bias and/or impartial because all of these Officers of the Court were appointed to the privileged positions as Administrative Judges by O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have infringed 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. 39.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, in her 1-14-20 Memorandum, she, also, declares that the evidence support the material fact that, due to the 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by former Chief Judge Barbera, the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court

intentionally committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill deliberately violated her 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley is being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 40.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, on 1-24-20, the Administrative & Chief Judge presiding over the 3 panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Carrión, designated herself, along with 2 other judges to make up the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Melissa Phinn and Judge R. Rubin. 41.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that on the 1-24-20 Order by Judge Carrion (Exhibit 73 on the Petitioner's website), there is no disclosure of the filing of the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum), nor is does the Circuit Court's website reveals the material fact that the Petitioner filed her Memorandum on the same day that she filed her Petition, namely, on 1-14-20 and as evidenced by the Circuit Court's stamp of the filing date of the Petitioner's Petition and on her Memorandum as 1-14-20 (Exhibits 71 and 72 on the Petitioner's website). 42.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, shortly after filing her Petition and Memorandum 1-14-20, she did some research on the panel of In Banc Judges and discovered that panel of In Banc Judges presiding over her Petition were 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 panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or Judge Karen Friedman. 43.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner asserts that she filed her first Motions against the panel of In Banc Judges on 1-29-20 (Exhibit 74 on the Petitioner's website), which include the Petitioner's first Motion for Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges as the presiding Judges due to the material facts that her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under 18 U.S.C., Section 242 were being violated by the panel of In Banc judges because the evidence support the allegation that the panel of In Banc judges were obstructing justice and violating federal and/or state laws, which include failing to disqualify and recuse themselves, voluntarily, as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the material facts that the Petitioner question the impartiality and/or bias of the panel as the presiding Judges 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 alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 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. 44.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, on 2-4-20, the Defendant filed a Motion (Exhibit 76 on the Petitioner's website), in which the Defendant pleads for the In Banc panel to dismiss the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Petition. 45.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, on 2-6-20, the panel of In Banc Judges issued two separate Orders (Exhibit 75 on

the Petitioner's website). In their first 2-6-20 Findings Order, the panel of In Banc Judges dismissed the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Petition without allowing the Petitioner to have an oral Hearing as mandated by Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution and, also, without disclosing, considering, and resolving any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Memorandum which substantiate why the Petitioner's Petition should be granted. 46.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the evidence of the two 2-6-20 Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges substantiate that the panel of In Banc Judges failed to disclose in their 2-6-20 Findings and Order the material facts that the Petitioner filed her 1-14-20 Memorandum along with the Petitioner's Petition on 1-14-20. 47.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, on one of their two 2-6-20 Findings Orders, the panel of In Banc Judges denies the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions (Exhibit 74 on the Petitioner's website). 48.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the, in their two 2-6-20 Findings Orders, the panel of In Banc Judges, also, fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Memorandum, which, again, justify the granting of the Petitioner's Petition. 49.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in responding to the Defendant's Motion filed on 2-4-20 and the denial of her 1-29-20 Motions in the 2-6-20 Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 2-13-20 (Exhibit 77 on the Petitioner's website), in which, amongst other things, the Petitioner alleges the material facts stated above, which include the material fact that the panel of In Banc Judges breached Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution and, thus, declares that..... "The Maryland Constitution cites that, upon the decision or determination of any point, or question, by the Court, it shall be competent to the party, against whom the ruling or decision is made, upon motion, to have the point, or question reserved for the consideration of the three Judges of the Circuit, who shall constitute a court in banc for such purpose. Moreover, when review by a court in banc is permitted by the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner may have a judgment or determination of any point or question reviewed by a court in banc by filing a notice for in banc review. Issues are reserved for in banc review by making an objection in the manner set forth in Rules 2-517 and 2-520. Again, the Court of Appeals set out the details of in banc practice in rule 2-551 of the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure. A "hearing," as opposed to an argument, is automatically scheduled, but may be waived by consent of all parties. Since the Petitioner did not waive her right to a hearing, the consent by all parties to waive the hearing was not given. Thus, according Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner had a right to a hearing before the In Banc panel once she was granted her Petition for Review on 1-24-20 before the panel of judges and then the panel of judges may decide at the hearing to dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for In Banc Review and Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review. The Petitioner has yet to have a hearing before the panel of In Banc judges as required by Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, instead of the panel of In Banc judges deciding on 2-6-20 to unlawfully dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review. Furthermore, Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution requires the banc panel to file a brief statement of the reasons for the decision or shall dictate the reasons into the record."..... 50.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, after reading over the facts proclaimed in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the two sets of 2-6-20 Findings and Orders of the panel of In Banc Judges which respond to her 1-29-20 Motions, she believes that the HOLY GHOST led her to understand that the panel of In Banc Judges was breaching the Petitioner's 14th Amendment

Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by infringing upon the Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and other federal and/or state laws and that the Petitioner needed to file an Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges. 51.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, on 2-18-20, she mailed the original copy of her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges (Exhibit 78 on the Petitioner's website) to our Hon. President and sent a copy to another governmental official, and in her Official Complaint, the Petitioner alleges that, amongst other things, she asserted that the panel of In Banc Judges committed the federal crimes of: a.) violating the Petitioner's right to have them disqualified and recused from presiding over my In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation as mandated under Federal Statute U.S.C & 455 (a) due to there being an appearance of panel of In Banc judges being 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 alleged to have infringed 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.) misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. c.) depriving the Petitioner of her 14th Amendment Right and breaching other federal statutes and laws. d.) tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Part1, Chapter 73 & 1512. e.) and/or committing the federal crimes of concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071. 52.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, after re-reading her 2-13-20 Motions, she believes that the SPIRIT OF GOD led her to recognize that her 2-13-20 Motions did not respond to the panel of In Banc Judges' 2-6-20 Findings and Order, which denies the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motion for Disqualification. 53.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, on 2-19-20, she filed another set of Motions, which includes her 2nd Motion for Disqualification of the panel of In Banc Judges as the presiding Judges over her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation. 54.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the Heading in the Petitioner 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 FEDRAL 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". 55.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, on 4-3-20, she wrote an Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint) against the panel of In Banc Judges and against other Officers of the Court (Exhibit 81 on the Petitioner's website), and her Addendum has four "Re" sections and that the section entitled "Re: 1" is the Petitioner's 1st Addendum to her 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; and, the section entitled "Re: 2" is the Petitioner's Addendum to her "925th Addendum and counting to my 5-6-16 Official Complaint" (Exhibit 11 on the Petitioner's website), which includes these same allegations 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 the Petitioner's 925th Addendum to her 5-6-16 Official Complaint. 56.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, after taking over two years, the panel of In Banc judges denies the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions in their 3-30-22 Findings and Orders (Exhibit 93 on the Petitioner's website). 57.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in response to the 3-30-22 Findings and Orders from the panel of In Banc Judges, the Petitioner filed her 4-7-22 Motions (Exhibit 94 on the Petitioner's website), which, amongst other things, disclose the material facts that the panel of In Banc Judges responded to the Defendant's 2-4-20 Motion on 2-13-20, but allowed over two years to lapse before responding to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions. Also, within the Petitioner's 4-7-22 Motions is her 3rd Motion for Disqualification of the panel of In Banc Judges under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and a Motion to have all the Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman deemed void due to breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), and the Heading in the Petitioner's 4-7-22 Motions is entitled "3rd MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 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 STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 3RD MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS" 58.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the panel of In Banc Judges did not respond to the Petitioner's 4-7-22 Motions, but Judge Fletcher-Hill responds and denies the

Petitioner's Motions in his 6-17-22 Findings and Order (Exhibit 95 on the Petitioner's website), which are Motions from the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation. 59.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill knows that he is one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's Motions from her initial civil litigation and, therefore, under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), he is disqualified and recused from presiding over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation. 60.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, when she filed her Motions dated 6-24-22 (Exhibit 96 on Petitioner's website), which respond to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 6-17-22 Findings and Order, she didn't know about Maryland Rule 18. 102.11 5(c), but the Petitioner does state, amongst other material facts and legal arguments, that Judge Fletcher-Hill should know that Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 require that he voluntarily disqualifies and recuses himself as the presiding Judge since there is an appearance of his being bias and/or impartial due to his being appointed in 2009 as an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged to have repetitiously and intentionally breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 61.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the he Petitioner alleges that, also, in her 6-24-23 Motions, she asserts that Judge Fletcher-Hill should be aware of the material facts that all of his Findings and Orders are deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), as well as every decision or Order from him thereafter; the Heading in the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions is entitled "5TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11 AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WHO WAS RECUSED IN 2018 AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE, 2ND MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 4TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS". 62.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, as a result of her doing some research on the judges that were appointed by Martin O'Malley, she believes that it was through DIVINE revelation that it was revealed to her during her research that: a.) Judge Carrion and the Petitioner completed their undergraduate study and graduated from the College of Notre Dame in Maryland in 1981. b.) Judge Karen Friedman was appointed by the Biden's Administration on November 16, 2021 to serve as the Director of Criminal Justice Innovation, Development, and Engagement at the Department of Justice. c.) Judge Rubin was nominated by the Biden's Administration on November 3, 2021 and confirmed on March 23, 2022 to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. 63.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that, in his 8-1-22 Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill denies the Petitioner's 6-24-22 Motions, and in responding to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 8-1-22 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 8-11-22 (Exhibit 98 on the Petitioner's website), whose Heading is entitled "5TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11 AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WHO WAS RECUSED IN 2018 AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE, 2ND MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED

VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 4TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS". 64.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, amongst other things, in her 8-11-22 Motions, she asserts that is she aware of the fact that, when calling the Circuit Court, the recording informs the individual of the likelihood that his/her conversation will be recorded for quality control purposes, and, therefore, she knows that was possible that her conversations would be recorded prior to my speaking to the clerk and the supervisor on 8-18-22, before talking with another clerk on 8-22-22, even before conversing with the young lady who refuse to give the Petitioner her name on 8-22-22, and/or prior to having a conversation with "Ms." on 8-22-22. In these conversations, the Petitioner declares that one and/or more of the material facts, namely, that: a.) When she checked the Circuit Court's website on 8-18-22, her Motions dated 8-11-22 were entered on the Circuit Court's website as "Motion" and "Request for Hearing on Selection Motion", and when she checked the Circuit Court's website just prior to calling the Circuit Court on the morning of 8-22-22, her 8-11-22 Motions were entered on the Circuit Court's website as "6th Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" under Federal Statue 28 U,S,C, & 455(a)" and "Request for Hearing on Selected Motion". b.) The Petitioner did not file "a Motion", but she filed "Motions" and proceeded to read, verbatim, the Heading in her 8-11-22 Motions to the supervisor on 8-18-22, whose Heading is entitled "6TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND 2ND MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, 3rd MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 5TH MOTION FOR A HEARINGON THE MOTIONS". c.) The Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions should be stated, verbatim, as they are declared in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions. d.) The clerk/s should not attempt to hide the facts in the Heading of the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions from the public's view on the Circuit Court's website, namely, that it is being alleged in the Heading of my Motions that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the "Judge-in-Charge" over the Civil division in the Circuit Court, has committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the sixth time, has breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) for the second time, has breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for the second time, has violated the "Rule of Law" for the sixth time, and that a Motion for a hearing on the Petitioner's Motions has been requested for the fifth time. e.) No Officer of the Court, which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill, is above the Rule of Law. f.) Judge Fletcher-Hill should have known that Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 require his voluntary disqualification and recusal since there is an appearance of his being bias and/or impartial as a result of Judge Fletcher-Hill being appointed as an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in my Motions to have committed misconduct in office and/or other federal crimes. g.) According to Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Judge Fletcher-Hill should not have presided over the Petitioner's 4-7-22 and 6-24-22 Motions,

should not preside over her 8-11-22 Motions, nor should Judge Fletcher-Hill preside over any other Motions in my appeal in the In Banc Review because Judge Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges who presided over my initial civil litigation. 65.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill denies the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions in his 12-16-22 Findings and Order (Exhibit 99 on the Petitioner's website), and in response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her 12-27-22 Motions (Exhibit 100 on the Petitioner's website), which include the Petitioner's 7th Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the Heading in Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions is entitled "7TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND VIOLATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 3RD MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 2ND MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, JUDGES NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES, 4TH MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, 2ND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 6TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". 66.) The material fact that the evidence supports the fact that, in responding to the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill denies her Motions in his 2-16-23 Findings and Order (Exhibit 112 on the Petitioner's website). 67.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 2-16-23 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her 2-27-23 Motions (Exhibits 113 and 114 on the Petitioner's website), and the Heading in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions is entitled "1. MOTION FOR THE COURT TO STAY THE OTHER MOTIONS CITED BELOW UNTIL GOV. MOORE RESPONDS TO THE PETITIONER'S 2-17-23 CERTIFIED LETTER, WHICH PLEADS THAT GOV. MOORE EXERCISES HIS EXECUTIVE POWER AND ORDER AN IMMEDIATE STAY ON JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL BEING THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND ORDER AN IMMEDIATE RECUSAL OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO HIS BREACHING FOR THE EIGHTH TIME FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND FOR THE FOURTH TIME VIOLATING MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (C) . 2.) 8TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, FOR THE EIGHTH TIME, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14th AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REPETITIOUSLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11. 3.) 4th MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AND, THUS, FOR THE FOURTH TIME, COMMITTING" FRAUD UPON THE COURT" AND BREACHING THE PETTIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY CONTINUOUSLY INFRINGING UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 4.) 3rd MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED

UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND TO SELECT JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - GENOCIDE. 5.) 5TH MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11. 6.) 3rd MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 7TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". 68.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, on 3-23-23 when she checked the Circuit Court's website to find out the status of her 2-27-23 Motions, she noticed that, in response to her Motions, it was entered "Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. N, J" (Exhibit 138 on the Petitioner's website). 69.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the e Petitioner asserts in her 4-5-23 Motions (Exhibit 139 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, that, although she had not received her copy of the Court's Finding and Order as of the date that she filed her Motions, namely, on 4-5-23, she was able to file her approximately 35-page Motions dated 4-5-23 premised on the citing from the Court's website of the 3-23-23 Finding and Order by the Court and from recognizing for that, for almost 6 years of filing her Motions in this civil litigation, the usual pattern exercised by all of the judges relevant to their Findings, namely, that of continually refusing to grant the Petitioner's Motion for Hearing on the Motions, but instead assert the same unsubstantiated one-line phrase of declaring that the Petitioner's Motions are "frivolous and without merit ". 70.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the he Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, which respond to the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, include as Exhibit 1 a copy of the Petitioner's 3rd URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION to Gov. Moore, sent by certified and regular mail (Exhibit 140 on the Petitioner's website), and the Heading of the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions is entitled "9TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, FOR THE NINTH TIME, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14th AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REPETITIOUSLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1ST MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 2.) 5th MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AND, THUS, FOR THE FIFTH TIME, COMMITTING" FRAUD UPON THE COURT" AND BREACHING THE PETTIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY CONTINUOUSLY INFRINGING UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1ST MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 3.) 4th MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AND TO HAVE AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL ACCEPTS OR DENIES THE PETITION AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND TO SELECT JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C &

1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE, BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1ST MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 4.) 6TH MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1ST MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 5.) 4TH MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1ST MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 6.) MOTION FOR THE COURT TO ORDER THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM AS CITED IN HER MOTIONS. 7.) 8TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1ST MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS" 71.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, on 5-1-23, the Petitioner called the Circuit Court, spoke with "Mr.", reminded him that she had spoken to him on 4-14-23 germane to the 5 issues and informed "Mr." that she have yet to receive the copy of the 3-23-23 Court's Finding and Order that has the Judge's signature stamped in the "signature" section in the 3-23-23 Finding and Order of the Court. 72.) The material fact that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner is asserting that she have yet to receive a copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order of the Court that has the stamped signature of the judge who wrote the 3-23-23Findings and Order. 73.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that the Petitioner alleges that, on 6-8-23, she checked the Circuit Court's website and found out that the clerk entered the Judge's response to her 4-5-23 Motions on this day and mailed her a copy on the same day of the 6-8-23 Findings and Order by Judge John Nugent, the new presiding Judge. 74.) The material facts that the evidence support the facts that the Petitioner asserts that, after researching the background of Judge John Nugent on 6-8-23 and discovering that, although his termed expired in 2019, Judge John Nugent was appointed as one of the judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera, the Petitioner included in her 6-20-23 Motions (Exhibit 142 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to Judge John Nugent's 6-8-23 Findings and Order and which, amongst other things, cite the material facts that Judge John Nugent, the presiding Judge, the previous presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and <u>all</u> of the other former judges who presided over civil litigation and over my appeal in the In Banc Review, have repeatedly and deliberately breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to their repetitious and intentional violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.1 02.11 due to their refusing to disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges because of an appearance of their being biased and/or impartial because of their appointments to the distinguished positions by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091- Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18, U.S.C. & 1091U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide. 75.) The material fact that the evidence supports the fact that Judge John Nugent did not respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, but Judge J. Geller, a new presiding Judge, responded to the Petitioner's Motions in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order (Exhibit 146 on the Petitioner's website). 76.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that, in Judge J. Geller's 8-29-23 Findings and

Order, he not only fails to cite one reason for denying the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, but fails disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge and set aside his judgment due to his violating the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 as a result of his infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 because there is an appearance that he could be biased and/or impartial because he was appointed in 2012 by Martin O'Malley , who is being alleged in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in all of her other Motions, in her 2017 Civil Complaint, and in her 2nd Addendum to our Hon. President 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, committed misconduct in office, and/or violated other federal and state laws.".... 9.) After researching Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III's background, I discovered that he was appointed to the superlative Administrative position by Larry Hogan, who, along with Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and Wes Moore, is being alleged in my civil litigation and/or in my 2nd Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our 45th-47th Hon. President to have trespassed Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to invade Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. Therefore, in my 11-14-24 Motions, I filed my 1st Motion for Disqualification of Judge Dorsey, Charles, III. As evidenced in my Motions filed on 11-14-24, amongst other material facts and legal arguments, I declare that ...."**The Petitioner proclaims 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 <u>there being an appearance that Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry,III would be impartial and/or biased</u> 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 transgressing Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a panel of <u>3</u> 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."....** 10.) Still too, in my <u>2</u> separate 12-26-24 Motions pleading for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Dorsey, Charles, III (Exhibits 208' and 208'', respectively, on my website), I assert that.... **On 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that <u>there was an appearance of an Officer of the Court, the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial</u> and, removed the Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an <u>"appearance of impropriety"</u> and declared that "this is the rare case in which disqualification is mandated and no other remedy will suffice to restore public confidence in the integrity of these proceedings."... 11.)** In one of my most recent Motions filed on 12-26-24, namely my Motion pleading for Disqualifications of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside

over civil cases (Exhibit 208''), I assert, amongst other material facts and legal arguments that ....." **The evidence substantiates the material fact that, since the filing of these instant Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-In-Charge in the Civil Division of assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, has not ORDERED the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber II, to respond to the Petitioner's Motions filed on 11-1-23, which respond to the Findings and Order entered on the Court's website on 10-20-23 from the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions. Instead of first assigning a Judge to preside over the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions filed over a year ago, Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned Judge Dorsey, Charles, III to preside over the Petitioners 3 separate Motions filed on 10-14-24 and over her 11-14-24. As evidenced in her 11-14-24 Motions, the Petitioner declares in these Motions that, if Judge Dorsey, Charles, III presides over her hearing on her Motions scheduled for 12-6-24, 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 transgressing 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 for a Hearing on her Motions filed on 10-15-24, because these are Motions from the Petitioner's appeal of her initial civil litigation in an In Banc Review.**

Moreover, as evidenced in their Opinion, on 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that there was an appearance of an Officer of the Court, the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial and, removed the Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an "appearance of impropriety" and declared that "this is the rare case in which disqualification is mandated and no other remedy will suffice to restore public confidence in the integrity of these proceedings."

As of 2018, Judge Fletcher-Hill became the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over civil cases in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. Thus, far, Judge Fletcher-Hill has presided in assigning 10 Judges to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation, which includes assigning himself as one of the Judges over her Motions 8 times. The 10 Judges assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation, thus far, are the two present presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber, II, as well as the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Karen Friedman, and Judge Fletcher-Hill, who assigned himself to preside over 4 of the Petitioner's Motions from her initial civil litigation and to preside over 4 of her Motions from the Petitioner's present appeal in the In Banc Review. Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the presiding Judges, including the two present presiding Judges,

were appointed by one of the former Governors of Maryland, Martin O'Malley (hereinafter "Martin O'Malley"), by former Chief Judge Barbera, by another former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan "(hereinafter "Larry Hogan") and/or by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore (hereinafter "Wes Moore"), all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's initial Civil Complaint filed in 2017, in her 12-23-24 Motions, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have breached 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 crimes acts 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 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, breaching 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.

Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. Judge John Nugent was appointed to his distinctive position in the Circuit Court in Baltimore City in 2016 and, although his term expired in 2019, Judge John Nugent was appointed as one of the Judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera in 2017. Judge J. Geller was, also, appointed by Martin O'Malley to the elite position of an Administrative Judge in May of 2012. One of the two presiding Judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation, Judge M. Schreiber II, was appointed to the honored position as an Administrative Judge 2022 by another former Governor of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan. And, the other presiding Judge over the Petitioner's present appeal in the In Banc Review, Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III, was, too, appointed to the superlative Administrative position by Larry Hogan in 2016. Judge Michel Pierson was appointed in 2013 by Chief Judge Barbera, who is being proclaimed in the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions, in other Motions, and in her 2017 Civil Complaint to have willingly fractured the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil

Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of her deliberately committing the prejudicial error of perjury. 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 City 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. As stated in the Petitioner's Motions, 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 the Petitioner's civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. The first presiding Judge over my 2017 Civil Complaint, namely, Judge Karen Friedman was appointed to her privileged position as an Administrative Judge in 2014 by Martin O'Malley.

Thus far, all of the presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill himself, were assigned by Judge Fletcher-Hill to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation, although as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Petitioner's civil case (who assigned himself as a presiding Judge over 8 of the Petitioner's Motions) and all of the other presiding Judges, as Officers of the Court, knew and/or should have known upon reading the Petitioner's Motions, that, under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), they should have voluntarily disqualified and recused themselves because there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to the Petitioner's civil litigation, and all of the other presiding Judges he assigned to preside over my civil litigation, which includes assigning himself twice as one of the presiding Judges, would be impartial and/or biased due to their distinguished appointments by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan and/or by Wes Moore because these present and/or former government officials are being alleged to have invaded 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 crimes. Moreover, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the present presiding Judges, and all of the presiding Judges cited above have repeatedly and/or deliberately impinged upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to violating various federal and state laws, which include redundantly and/or willingly breaching 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.

The evidence in the record of the Courts, on the Petitioner's website, and elsewhere substantiate the allegations that, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey and Judge M. Schreiber, and the former presiding Judges, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman knew and/or should have known, also, that they were invading the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, therefore, transgressing the Rule of Law, because: 1.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in over her appeal in the In Banc Review knew and/or should have known that he/she should have set aside his/her judgment and deem his/her Findings and Order void and of no effect as a matter of law, namely, under Federal Stature 28 U.S.C & 455(a,) because there is an appearance that

he/she would be biased and/or impartial as a result of being appointed to the prestige Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, and/or Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in her other Motions filed on 12-23-24, in her Motions filed on 12-14-24, in the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions dated 10-15-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint to have infringed 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 crimes. 2.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in over her appeal in the In Banc Review knew and/or should have known that, in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in her 3 individual Motions filed on 10-15-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23 in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, and against all of the 8 other presiding, she has alleged that, due to the 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc Judges from the Circuit Court intentionally committed perjury, violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of assigning judges to preside over my present civil litigation, as the presiding Judge during this time deliberately violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint. 3.) The Petitioner asserts that each of these presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, knew and/or should have known that denying, unlawfully, the Petitioner's Motions, especially the Petitioner's Motion to dismiss the Defendant's Motion to dismiss her Civil complaint, he/she would prevent the Petitioner from having the opportunity to move forward to Discovery in her civil litigation, which include the evidence to substantiate the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions and/or Civil Complaint and that would be revealed during her requested jury trial, namely, that the evidence would substantiate, unequivocally, that Martin O'Malley, Kurk Schmoke, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, Wes Moore, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 4.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation, from Judge Michel Pierson to the presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber II, knew and/or should have known that they were deliberately and/or continuously impinging upon Maryland Rule 2-311 because each of these Judges failed to grant the Petitioner's right to a hearing as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, but have deprived the Petitioner of her right to a hearing on the Motions, even though the Petitioner pleaded for hearing on her Motions in all of her Motions filed since 12-17-18. 5.) Judge Fletcher-Hill, the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber II, and all of the former presiding Judges Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned to preside over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc

Review of her initial civil litigation, knew and/or should have known that they were intentionally and/or repetitiously breaching Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's right, as permitted under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, to: a.) an oral hearing before deciding to deny or grant the Petitioner's Petition. b.) her right to have 3 Judges presiding over the Petitioner's In Banc Review as stipulated in Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 6.) The written Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution require judges to recuse themselves from cases in two situations, namely, where the judge has a financial interest in the case's outcome and where there is otherwise a strong possibility that the judge's decision will be biased. In the United States Constitutional Law, a Due Process Clause is found in both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Constitution uses the phrase in the 5th and 14th Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5th Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14th Amendment protects them from actions by state and local government. 7.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in over her appeal in the In Banc Review knew and/or should have known that, germane to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), the Supreme Court has ruled and reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", Levine v. United States, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960), citing Offutt v. United States, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13 (1954). In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held that disqualification of a judge is mandatory if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality (Liteky v. U.S., 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). The Court has, too, affirmed that, should a judge not disqualify himself/herself as required by law, then the judge has given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which could potentially further disqualify the judge. Further, the Court have determined that, should another judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance of partiality" and has possibly disqualified himself/herself. Moreover, the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. Wherefore, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio." Further, the Supreme Court has decided that, should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by law. Still too, the Supreme Court has held that, if a judge wars against the Constitution in breaching the Due Process Clause of the U.S Constitution or if he/she acts without jurisdiction, then that judge has engaged in treason to the Constitution, which suggest that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce. Since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts. Moreover, on 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that there was an appearance of an Officer of the Court, the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial and, removed the Fulton County

District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an "appearance of impropriety" and declared that "this is the rare case in which disqualification is mandated and no other remedy will suffice to restore public confidence in the integrity of these proceedings."

The evidence substantiates the material fact that, since the filing of these instant Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-In-Charge in the Civil Division of assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, has not ORDERED the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber II, to respond to the Petitioner's Motions filed on 11-1-23 (Exhibits 155 and 156, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Findings and Order entered on the Court's website on 10-20-23 from the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions. Instead of first assigning a Judge to preside over the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill ignored having the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions filed over a year ago, assigned Judge Dorsey, Charles, III to preside over the Petitioners 3 separate Motions filed on 10-14-24 (Exhibits 180, 181, 182, and 183 on the Petitioner's website) and to preside over her 11-14-24 (Exhibit 187 on the Petitioner's website), although the Petitioner asserts in her 11-14-24 that, if Judge Dorsey, Charles, III presides over her hearing on her Motions scheduled for 12-6-24, 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 transgressing 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 for a Hearing on her Motions filed on 10-15-24, because these are Motions from the Petitioner's appeal of her initial civil litigation in an In Banc Review."... 12.) In the **"ARGUMENT"** section of my Motion in my 12-26-24 Motions pleading for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Dorsey, Charles, III (Exhibit 208''on my website), I declare that **"The Petitioner asserts that, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over her civil litigation, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber II, and all of the other former presiding Judges cited above knew and/or should have known that they were violating the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to redundantly and/or willingly breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges due to their prestigious appointments by Martin O'Malley former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan and/or by Wes Moore because there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill the two present presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber, II, and the other former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel**

Pierson, Judge Karen Friedman, and Judge Fletcher-Hill would be impartial and/or biased due to their special appointments by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, and/or by Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged to in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in her other Motions filed on 12-23-24, in her Motions filed on 12-14-24, 10-15-24, and on 11-1-23, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23, in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, and/or in other Motions 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, Genocide." 13.) As cited in my most recent Motions filed on 12-26-24,as asserted in my 12-23-25 Official Complaint to the Commission, and/or as declared in my 11-1-23 Motions, which are yet to be assigned a Judge to preside over by the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to civil cases, Judge Fletcher-Hill has, also, presided over assigning himself as one of the presiding Judges over at least 8 of my Motions from my initial civil litigation to my present appeal in the In Banc Review. Instead of the previously presiding Judge, Judge Karen Friedman responding to my 3-9-18 Motions (Exhibit 37 on my website), which respond to Judge Karen Friedman's Findings and Order docketed on 3-3-18 (Exhibit 49 on my website), Judge Fletcher-Hill responded to my 3-9-18 Motions in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 3-30-18 (Exhibit 50 on my website). In his Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill simply states that the " Plaintiff Diana R. Williams has filed a motion titled "Motion for Judicial Disqualification of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion for Sanctions against Judge Karen Friedman for Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion for Clarification, Motion for Another Substitution, Motion to dismiss Judge Karen Friedman's Orders and to Have Another Judge Consider the Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration, for a New Trial by jury, to Enter a New Judgment Because Addition Evidence, and Granting of the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend the Punitive Damage in the Plaintiff's Civil Complaints" (Docket Entries 9000, 10,000, 11000.12000, and 13000). No hearing is necessary. Because of the nature of Plaintiff's arguments, this Court, as the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Docket, has considered the Motion. All of Plaintiff's arguments turn on her central contention that Judge Friedman should have recused herself and should be disqualified from participation in this action because Judge Friedman was initially appointed to the bench by Governor Martin O'Malley and because Plaintiff makes allegations against former Governor O'Malley. This fact does not provide any basis for recusal or disqualification. Many judges of this Court, including this Court, were initially appointed by Governor O'Malley, and that fact alone does not mean these judges cannot be impartial in an action including allegations against the former Governor. Plaintiff thus has not stated any reason to disqualify judge Friedman or to re-open any of her rulings in this action. According, it is this 30th day of March, 2018, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore Part 26, hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motions for Judicial Motion for Judicial Disqualification of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion for Sanctions against Judge Karen Friedman for Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion for Clarification, Motion for Another Substitution, Motion to dismiss Judge Karen Friedman's Orders and to Have Another Judge Consider the Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration, for a New Trial by jury, to Enter a New Judgment Because Addition Evidence, and Granting of the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend the Punitive Damage in the Plaintiff's Civil Complaints" (Docket Entries 9000, 10,000, 11000.12000, and 13000) is DENIED. It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of this Court shall send copies of the ORDER to all parties in the case. It is further ORDERED that this case remains closed." The evidence of the facts declared in and/or the lack thereof of facts proclaimed in his Findings and Order and the evidenced of the material facts and legal arguments professed in the my 3-9-18 Motions substantiate my allegations

that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 were being infringed upon due to his failure to consider, disclose, and resolve that **there is an appearance that Judge Karen Friedman would be biased and/or impartial** in presiding over a civil case in which she has to determine if the evidence substantiate the facts being alleged against Martin O'Malley, the former Gov. of Maryland who appointed Judge Karen to her privileged position as an Administrative Judge in 2014, namely, that of being declared in my 3-9-18 Motions and in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have routinely defied 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. Moreover, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in in my 3-9-18 Motions (Exhibit 38 on my website) and the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Courts website on 3-30-18 (Exhibit 50 on my website), which respond to my 3-9-18 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve **all** of the material facts and legal arguments in my Motions, which, amongst other things, substantiate the averments that my 14th Amendment and my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 were being continuously usurped by Judge Karen Freidman because she, time and time again, failed to disclose, consider, and resolve **any** of the material facts and/or legal arguments in **any** of my Motions, from which her Findings and Order respond to, which include the allegations that my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 were being continuously traduced by Judge Friedman due to her failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding Judge as mandated under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) because **there is an appearance that she would be impartial and/or biased** because of her privileged appointment in 2014 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in my 3-9-18 Motions and in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have infringed 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. The Heading in my 3-9-18 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN, MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN FOR COMMITTING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION, MOTION FOR ANOTHER SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN'S ORDERS AND TO HAVE ANOTHER JUDGE CONSIDER THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, AND GRANTING OF THE PLANTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND THE PUNITIVE DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVILCOMPLAINTS." 14.)** In response Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 3-30-18, I filed my 4-6-18 Motions. The Heading in my 4-6-18 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO SANCTION JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO HAVE JUDGE NANCE FOR A SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE JUDGES LISTED BELOW, AND MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL'S ORDERS TO DENY THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN, MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN FOR COMMITTING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION, MOTION FOR ANOTHER SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN'S ORDERS AND TO HAVE ANOTHER JUDGE CONSIDER THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, AND GRANTING OF THE PLAINTIFF'S**

MOTION TO AMEND THE PUNITIVE_DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL COMPLAINTS" [SHOULD BE "COMPLAINT"]. **15.)** In his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 4-16-18 (Exhibit 46 on my website), which respond to my 4-6-18 Motions (Exhibit 36 on my website), Judge Fletcher-Hill denies my 4-6-18 Motions and asserts that the "Plaintiff follows a familiar pattern. Any judge wo decides an issue against her necessarily must be biased and unfair. This Court has carefully considered her motion and finds no merit in any of her arguments. According, it is this 16th day of April, 2018, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, part 26, hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion (Docket Entries 15000, 16000, 17000, 18000 & 19000 is DENIED. It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of this Court shall send copies of this Order to all parties in the case. It is further ordered THAT THIS CASE REMAINS CLOSED." **16.)** In response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 3-30-18, I filed my 4-6-18 Motions. The Heading in my 4-6-18 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO SANCTION JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO HAVE JUDGE NANCE FOR A SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE JUDGES LISTED BELOW, AND MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL'S ORDERS TO DENY THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN, MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN FOR COMMITTING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION, MOTION FOR ANOTHER SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN'S ORDERS AND TO HAVE ANOTHER JUDGE CONSIDER THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, AND GRANTING OF THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO** AMEND THE PUNITIVE_DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL COMPLAINTS" [SHOULD BE "COMPLAINT"]. **17.)** In his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 4-16-18 (Exhibit 46 on my website), which respond to my 4-6-18 Motions (Exhibit 36 on my website), Judge Fletcher-Hill denies my 4-6-18 Motions and asserts that the "Plaintiff follows a familiar pattern. Any judge wo decides an issue against her necessarily must be biased and unfair. This Court has carefully considered her motion and finds no merit in any of her arguments. According, it is this 16th day of April, 2018, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, part 26, hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion (Docket Entries 15000, 16000, 17000, 18000 & 19000 is DENIED. It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of this Court shall send copies of this Order to all parties in the case. It is further ordered THAT THIS CASE REMAINS CLOSED." **18.)** As evidenced by the facts stated in his Findings and Order entered on the Court's website on 4-16-18 and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments proclaimed in my 4-6-18 Motions, from which Judge Fletcher-Hill responds to, Judge Fletcher-Hill, again, fails to disclose, consider, and resolve **all** of the material facts and legal arguments in my 4-6-18 Motions which substantiate the declarations that my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were being infringed upon by Judge Karen Friedman because she refuse to voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding Judge since **there is an appearance that she would be impartial and/or biased** as a result of her distinguished appointment in 2014 by Martin O'Malley ,who is being alleged in my civil litigation to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to overstep Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **19.)** I believe the SPIRT OF GOD led me to do some research on background of Judge Fletcher-Hill before responded to his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 4-16-18, which is his

response to my 4-6-18 Motions. During my research, I discovered that Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. Therefore, in my Motions filed on 4-27-18 (Exhibit 42 on my website), along with asserting the material facts and legal arguments to substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill was continuing to trespass on my 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by recurrently disregarding various federal and state laws, which include contravening upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. § 455 in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge **as a result of there being an appearance that, he, Judge Fletcher-Hill might be impartial and/or bias** due to: **a.)** the allegations made against Judge Fletcher-Hill in my 2017 Civil Complaint and in reiterated in my 3-9-18 Motions. **b.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill being appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being averred in my civil litigation to have infringed 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.

The Heading in my 4-27-18 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION TO HAVE A SPECIAL JUDGE TO DETERMINE IF THE MATERIAL FACTS BELOW SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN NEED TO BE REFERRED FOR IMPEACHMENT BY GOVERNOR HOGAN, SANCTIONED BY THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION, DISQUALIFIED FROM PRESIDING OVER THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL CASE, AND BE REFERRED FOR INVESTIGATION BY A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR RELEVANT TO ALLEGATIONS OF CRIMINAL ACTS, JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, MOTION TO HAVE ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN DISMISSED, AND A MOTION TO HAVE THE SPECIAL JUDGE FOR A SUBSTITUTION AND/OR JUDGE ALFRED NANCE FOR A SUBSTITUTION TO CONSIDER GRANTING ALL OF THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS." 20.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill took almost 3 months to respond to my 4-27-18 Motions (Exhibit 42 on my website) and, finally, denied my Motions in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 7-23-18 (Exhibit 52 on my website). Judge Fletcher-Hill justifies denying my Motions by proclaiming that the "Plaintiff continues her pattern of challenging the fairness of any judge who decides any issue against her. This Court has considered her motion and finds no merit in any of her arguments." **21.)** As evidenced by the facts stated in his Findings and Order and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments proclaimed in my 4-27-18 Motions, from which Judge Fletcher-Hill responds to, Judge Fletcher-Hill, again, does not disclose, consider, and resolve **any** of the material facts and legal arguments in my 4-27-18 Motions, which include my 2nd Motion for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill for breaching my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 because, for the 2nd time, Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disqualify himself as required under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to **there being an appearance of him being impartial and/or biased** as a result of, amongst other material facts, his sterling Administrative appointment in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who, again, is being alleged in my 8-6-18 Motions, in my Civil Complaint, in other Motions to have violated 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. **22.)** I believe that the SPIRIT OF GOD led me to understand that the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in **all** of the Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill and the

material facts and legal arguments cited in my Motions from which Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Orders respond to, substantiate the assertions that, like Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Fletcher-Hill continuously obstructed justice in infracting various federal and state laws, which include invading Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 Therefore, in addition to working on filing my next Motions, which would include my 3rd Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill, I worked on filing my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill. **23.)** On 8-6-18, I filed my Motions dated 8-6-18 (Exhibit 41 on my website), which respond to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 7-23-18. Also, on this same day, I mailed the original copy of my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill on the same day to you, Hon. President Trump (Exhibit 43 on my website). Amongst other things, my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill includes the allegations that he, like Judge Karen Friedman, redundantly and consciously committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of breaching of my 14th Amendment Right and other federal statutes under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242. **24.)** The Heading in my 8-6-18 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION TO HAVE A JUDGE APPOINTED BY GOVERNOR HOGAN TO DETERMINE IF THE MATERIAL FACTS CITED BELOW SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE FLETCHER- HILL HAS REPEATEDLY BREACHED U.S.C.CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OR REASONABLE INFERENCE FROM THE EVIDENCE TO JUSTIFY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL'S 7-26-18 [should be 7-23-18] DECISIONS AND ORDERS BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL'S DECISIONS ARE CONTRARY TO THE LAW, MOTION FOR CLARIFICIATION, MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION TO HAVE A SPECIAL JUDGE TO DETERMINE IF THE MATERIAL FACTS BELOW SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN NEED TO BE REFERRED TO IMPEACHMENT BY GOVERNOR HOGAN, SANCTIONED BY THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION, DISQUALIFIED FROM PRESIDING OVER THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL CASE, AND BE REFERRED FOR INVESTIGTION BY A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR RELEVANT TO ALLEGATIONS OF OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE UNDER U.S. CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505, MOTION TO HAVE ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLECTCHER-HILL AND JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN DISMISSED, AND A MOTION TO HAVE THE SPECIAL JUDGE FOR SUBSTITUTION AND/OR JUDGE ALFRED NANCE FOR A SUBSTITUTION TO CONSIDER GRANTING ALL OF THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS."** **25.)** Prior to receiving Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order responding to my 8-6-18 Motions, I wrote 4 Addendums to my 8-6-18 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, namely, the Addendums dated 8-9-10, 8-10-18, 8-27-18, and 8-31-18, which are Exhibits 44, 45, 54, and 55, respectively, on my website. Moreover, for a while, during the weekday, I emailed the Addendums to the Whitehouse's email address and to the email addresses of other governmental agencies. **26.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill denies my 8-6-18 Motions in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 9-4-18 (Exhibit 57 on my website). In his Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill cites that "...Plaintiff continues her pattern of challenging the fairness of any judge who decides any issue against her. This Court has considered her motion and finds no merit in any of her arguments. According, it is this 4th day of September, 2018, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part, 26, hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motions (Paper No. 26) is DENIED. It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of this Court shall send copies of this Order to all parties in the case. It is further OARDERED that this case remains closed." **27.)** As evidenced by the facts stated in his Findings and Order and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in my 8-6-18 Motions (Exhibit 41 on my

website), from which Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order respond to, Judge Fletcher-Hill's fails to disclose, consider, and resolve, **any** of the material facts and legal arguments in substantiates the declarations that Judge Fletcher-Hill routinely and willfully disregarded my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of encroaching upon a variety of federal and state laws, which include repetitiously and willfully infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as decreed under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) which, also, ORDER 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 of Judge Fletcher-Hill being impartial and/or biased** as a result the allegations made against him, namely,: **A.)** In my initial in my 2017 Civil Complaint, in my 8-6-18 Motions, and in other Motions, I alleged that that the evidence substantiate the material facts that, in 2014, the In Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached my 14th Amendment Right, and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to conceal the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill, who was the presiding Judge over my 2014 Civil Complaint, tampered with my 14th Amendment Right and transgressed Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss my 2014 Civil Complaint in order to prevent me from having a jury trial which would expose the evidence which support the material facts, namely, that: **1.)** For decades, our children in the public schools in Maryland have been deliberately subjected to lead-tainted drinking water, lead-based paint hazards 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 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. **2.)** The owners of the public schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are must be accountable and liable because the evidence substantiate the declarations that these government officials repeatedly and/or purposely ruptured Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities as a result of knowingly and willingly: **i.)** allowing our children to be endangered by lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for over a quarter of a century. **ii.)** having ignored the alleged heinous crimes against the owners of the public schools, namely, that of premeditatedly and/or intentionally exposing our children to lead poisoning and, thereby, breaching 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. **iii.)** refusing to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have frequently and designedly disregarded 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. **iv.)** 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 contend to have intruded 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/or other crimes. **B.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed to the elite position of an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to trespass Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes. **26.)** In response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 9-4-18, which responds to my 8-6-18 Motions, I filed my Motions dated 9-17-18 (Exhibit 58 on my website), which include my 4th Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill. Accompanying my 9-17-18 Motions are copies of my 8-6-18 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill and my 3rd emailed Addendum to my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibits 43 and 54, respectively, on my website).

The Heading in my 9-17-18 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR HON. GOV. TO HAVE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL IMMEDIATELY DISQUALIFIED FROM PRESIDIG OVER THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS AND/OR CIVIL CASE, IMPEACHED, DISBARRED, AND CHARGED CRIMINALLY BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL IS ONE OF THE JUDGES IN THE PLAINTIFF'S OFFICIAL LETTER AND EMAILED ADDENDUMS TO HON. GOV. HOGAN, HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP, CONGRESS, AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES THAT IS ALLEGED TO HAVE REPEATEDLY AND INTIONALLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFESANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND HAVE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING THE PLAINTIFF'S 7TH AND 14TH AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242, AND BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER,IN DECIDING THE PLAINTIFFF'S LAST THREE MOTIONS, HAS: 1.)REPEATEDLY, DELIBERATELEY, EXCESSIVELY, AND EGREGIOSLY ABUSED HIS POWER. 2.) DISPLAYED TOTAL CONTEMPT FOR THE RULE OF LAW. 3.) UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505,REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE IN THE CONDUCT OF THE OFFICE. 4.) REPEATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES UNDER 18 USC BY DEPRIVING THE PLAINTIFF OFHER 7TH AND 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND BY VIOLATING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS. MOTION TO HAVE HON. GOV.HOGAN TO APPOINT ANOTHER JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RESONSIDERATIOF OF ALL OF HER 8-6-18 MOTIONS, MOTION TO HAVE THE COURT POSTS THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS AS TITLED, AND A MOTION TO STAY ANY DECISION AND ORDER ON THES MOTIONS UNTIL HON. GOV. HOGAN AND.OR HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS."** **28.)** My 9-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 58 on my website) responding to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 9-4-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 57 on my website) were denied in the Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 12-7-18 (Exhibit 59 on my website) by a new presiding Judge, namely, Judge Michel Pierson. **29.)** 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). The Heading in my 4-7-22 Motions is entitled **"3rd MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 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 STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 3RD MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS" 30.)** 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. These Motions are Motions from my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation. Judge Fletcher-Hill and denies my Motions in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 6-17-22 (Exhibit 95 on my website), and cites in his Findings and Order that "On consideration of Plaintiff's "3rd Motion for Disqualification for 'Fraud upon the Court' under Federal Statue 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 Statue 28 U.S.C. & 455(A), Motion for Reconsideration, and 3rd Motion for a Hearing on the Motions" (Paper No. 39), the motion being frivolous and lacking merit, it is this 17th day of June, 2022, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 26, hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's "3rd Motion for Disqualification [etc.]" is DENIED." **31.)** As evidenced by the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in Judge Fletcher-Hills' Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 6-17-22(Exhibit 95 on my website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 4-17-22 Motions (Exhibit 94 on my website), from which Judge Fletcher-Hill responds, Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order all of the material facts and legal arguments in my 4-17-22 Motions, which include the proclamations that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the presiding Judge, the panel of In Banc Judges, and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman have redundantly and intentionally disregarded my 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because: **a.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill purposely and/or repeatedly refused to follow the Rule of Law, namely, to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as ordered under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a)) and his/her ORDER be deemed void as a matter of law and ,thereby, be of no legal force or effect because **there is an appearance that each one of these presiding Judges would be biased and/or impartial** as a result of being appointed to his/her distinguished Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being contended in my 4-17-22, 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, in my Memorandum, in other Motions, and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have usurped 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. **b.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, and Judge Michel Pierson transgressed Maryland Rule 2-311 as a result of knowingly and repetitiously denying my rights to have a hearing on the Motions as plead in my Motions. **c.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill impinged upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to allow a panel of 3 Judges to presiding over my appeal in the In Banc Review. **d.)** Although I didn't know about this Maryland Rule until after I had filed my 6-24-22

Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) due to his assigning himself, as the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, to preside over my Motions from my appeal in the In Banc Review, because he was one of the presiding Judges over my initial civil litigation. **e.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of In Banc Judges violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in denying me my right to have an oral hearing before a panel of 3 In Banc Judges prior to the Judges deciding to deny or grant my Petition. **32.)** In response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 6-17-22 (Exhibit 95 on my website), I filed my Motions dated 6-24-22 (Exhibit 96 on my website), which include my 5th Motion for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill and a Motion for a hearing on these Motions. The Heading in my 6-24-22 Motions is entitled **"5TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11 AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WHO WAS RECUSED IN 2018 AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE, 2ND MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 4TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS" 33.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill denies my 6-24-22 Motions (Exhibit 96 on my website) in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 8-4-22 (Exhibit 97 on my website). In his Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill proclaims that "On consideration of Plaintiff's "5th Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud upon the Court under Federal Statue 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 against Judge Fletcher-Hill who was Recused in 2018 as the Presiding Judge, by the Panel of In Banc Judges, by Judge Michel Pierson, and by Judge Karen Friedman be Deemed Void as a Matter of Law under Federal Statue 28 U.S.C. & 455(A) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Motion for Reconsideration, and 4th Motion for a Hearing on the Motions" (Paper No. 40), the motion being frivolous and lacking merit, it is this 1st day of August, 2022, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 26, is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's "5th Motion for Disqualification[etc.]" is DENIED." **34.)** As evidenced by the facts declared in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 8-4-22 and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments cited in my 6-24-22 Motions, from which Judge Fletcher-Hill responds to, Judge Fletcher-Hill, again, fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order all of the material facts and legal arguments in my 6-24-22 Motions, which include the declarations that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman have recurrently and willfully ruptured my 14TH Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because of Judge Fletcher-Hill's, the panel of In Banc Judges', and the other former presiding Judges' : **a.)** violations of various federal and state laws, including intentionally and/or repetitiously impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to their intentional and continuous refusals to adhere to the Rule of Law, namely, to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as decreed under this Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a)), and his/her ORDER d be deemed void as a matter of law and ,thus, be of no legal force or effect since **there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill and each of the other former presiding Judges would be biased and/or impartial** as a result of being appointed to their top-notch Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being asserted in my 4-17-22, 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, in my Memorandum, in other Motions, and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have encroached

upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to tamper with Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **b.)** repeated dismissal of my Petition before allowing me to have an oral hearing before the panel of 3 In Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. **c.)** repetitious failure to have a panel of 3 In Banc Judges preside over my Motions as dictated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. **d.)** continuous failure to have all Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill and **all** of the other former presiding Judges to be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a). **d.)** and/or repeated denial of my plea and right under Maryland Rule 2-311 to have a hearing on my 4-17-22 Motions. **35.)** After I had filed my 6-24-22 Motions, I continued my researching and studying in more depth on Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and I believe that the SPIRIT OF GOD led me to continue reading **all** of the sections of Maryland Rule 18.102.11, which include Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). Under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), a judge is prohibited from presiding over an appeal of a case if he/she was one of the presiding Judges over the initial civil litigation. As the Judge-in-Charge of the civil division, Fletcher-Hill knows and/or should have known that he was fracturing my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) disqualified him as a presiding Judge over my 4-7-22 and 6-24-22 Motions, and **any** other Motions filed during my appeal in the In Banc Review. **36.)** In responding to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 8-4-11, I filed my 8-11-22 Motions, and along with asserting the 5 material facts stated above, I include the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill knows and/or should have known that he was invading my 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) prohibits him from presiding over my Motions from my appeal in the In Banc Review of the initial civil litigation because he was one of the judges who presided over my initial civil litigation. The Heading of my 8-11-22 Motions is entitled **"6TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND 2ND MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, 3rd MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 5TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS" 37.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill denies my 8-11-22 Motions (Exhibit 98 on my website) in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 12-16-22 (Exhibit 99 on my website). In his Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill simply declares that "On consideration of Plaintiff's "6th Motion for Disqualification for 'Fraud upon the Court' under Federal Statue 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and under 'the Rule of Law' against Judge Fletcher-Hill and 2nd Motion for Disqualification for 'Fraud upon the Court' under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 (c) against Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion to Have a Panel of In Banc Judges to Continue to Preside over the Petitioner's In Banc Review as Mandated under Article IV *& 22 of the Maryland Constitution, 3rd Motion for all Orders by judge Fletcher-Hill, by the Panel of In Banc Judges, by Judge Michel Pierson, and by Judge Karen Friedman be Deemed Void as a Matter of

Law under Federal Statue 28 U.S.C. & 455(A) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Motion for Reconsideration, and 5th Motion for a Hearing on the Motions" (Paper No. 41), the motion being frivolous and lacking merit, it is this 12th day of December, 2022, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 26, is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's "6th Motion for Disqualification[etc.]" is DENIED." **38.)** As evidenced by the facts declared in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 12-16-22 and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments cited in my 8-11-22 Motions, from which Judge Fletcher-Hill responds to, Judge Fletcher-Hill, again, fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order **all** of the material facts and legal arguments in my 8-11-22 Motions, which include the "7 declarations of my 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 being recurrently and/or willingly invaded upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, and/or the other former presiding Judges as a result of repeated and/or deliberate infringements upon: **a.)** Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to their calculated and continuous refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as regulated 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 since **there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill and each of the other former presiding Judges would be biased and/or impartial** as a result of being appointed to their stellar Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being declared in my 4-17-22, 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, in my Memorandum, in other Motions, and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have contravened Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to impinge upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **b.)** Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which constitutes "Fraud upon the Court" by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges and, thus, having all Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges who were appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Judge Barbera to be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a). **c.)** Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) by Judge Fletcher-Hill. **d.)** Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges over my appeal in the In Banc Review because these Judges deprived me of my right to have an oral hearing before a panel of 3 In Banc Judges. **e.)** Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges who presided over my Motions from my appeal due to failing to have a panel of 3 In Banc Judges preside over my Motions from my In Banc Review once the first panel of In Banc Judges were no longer presiding over my appeal in the In Banc Review. **f.)** Maryland Rule 2-311 in denying my right to have a hearing as permitted and pleaded in my 6-24-22 Motions. **g.)** and/or the Rule of Law in breaching the various federal and/or state laws. **39.)** In response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 12-16-22 (Exhibit 99 on my website), which respond to my 8-11-22 Motions, I filed my Motions dated 12-27-22 (Exhibit 100 on my website), which include my 7th Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud upon the Court" against Judge Fletcher-Hill and a Motion for "Fraud upon the Court" against **all** of the former presiding Judges over my appeal in the In Banc Review and against the former presiding Judges over my initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill. Moreover, in the body of my Motions, I cite the material facts that substantiate the assertions that Judge Fletcher-Hill, again, fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order, which respond to my 8-11-22 Motions, **all** of the material facts and legal arguments in

my 8-11-22 Motions, which include the declarations of my 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 being redundantly and/or knowingly intruded upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, and/or the other former presiding Judges, which include violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to their intentional and continuous refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as demanded under this federal law) and his/her ORDER be deemed void as a matter of law and ,therefore, be of no legal force or effect because **there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill and each of the other former presiding Judges would be biased and/or impartial** as a result of being appointed to their exceptional Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley and/or Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being proclaimed in my 4-17-22, 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, in my Memorandum, in other Motions, and/or in my 2017 Civil Complaint to have overstepped 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. The Heading in my 12-27-22 Motions is entitled **"7TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION , AND VIO LATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 3RD MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 2ND MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, JUDGES NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES, 4TH MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, 2ND MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 6TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311" 40.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill denies my 12-27-22 Motions (Exhibit 100 on my website) in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-16-23 (Exhibit 112 on my website). In his Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill states that "On consideration of Plaintiff's "7th Motion for Disqualification for 'Fraud upon the Court'" (Paper No. 42), the motion being frivolous and lacking merit, it is this 15th day of February, 2023, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 26, is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's "7th Motion for Disqualification [etc.]" is DENIED." **41.)** As evidenced by the facts declared in his Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 2-16-23 and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments cited in my 12-27-22 Motions, from which Judge Fletcher-Hill responds to, Judge Fletcher-Hill, again, fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order all of the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-27-22 Motions, which include the declarations of my 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 being continuously and/or deliberately infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, and/or the other former presiding Judges, which include impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to their redundant and/or calculated refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges 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 to