COMPLAINANT INFORMATION

First Name: Diana Last Name: Williams

Address: 131 Calvin Hill Ct. City: Balto. State: Md. Zip Code: 21224

Phone Number: 410-868-6013

Email: dlady_da@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 _____ N/A

JUDGE INFORMATION

First Name: Julie Last Name: Glass

Court:

- [ ] Supreme Court of Maryland
- [ ] Appellate Court of Maryland
- [x] Circuit Court
- [ ] District Court
- [ ] Orphans' Court

County/City: Balto. County

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: State of Maryland vs Diana R. Williams

Case Number (include all letters and numbers): C-03-CR-20-002995

Case Type:

- [x] Civil
- [x] 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:

- [ ] Plaintiff/Petitioner/Appellant
- [x] 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: N/A I'm being represented Pro Se

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

WITNESS INFORMATION

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

Name: _____

Address: N/A

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email: _____

STATEMENT OF FACTS

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

See "Attachment" for 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: 1-20-25

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, and the State of Maryland Commission on Judicial Disabilities ("Commission")

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams, Whistleblower, whose Criminal Case Number is **C-03-CR-20-002995**

Re: 1.) Plea that our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI conduct its own investigation into the allegations cited in my Official Complaint to the Commission mailed on 12-16-24 ("12-16-24 Official Complaint") and, again, in this instant **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS"** forms to the Commission, which are additional material facts and evidence to further to substantiate the same allegations proclaimed in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint against Judge Glass, namely, the allegations of breaching 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 Maryland Rule 2-311, especially since there are allegations of Officers of the Court violating the federal crimes Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091. **2.)** Plea that you, Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI to be in charge of overseeing the Commission to ensure the granting of my plea to the Commission to immediately assign another Investigative Counsel to preside over my 12-16-24 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: 1-20-25

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 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibits 195 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 12-16-24 Official Complaint, 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 Glass.** 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, copies are made of my, which have the Findings and Orders of **all** of the presiding Judges, with the only exception being Judge Glass' Orders, written on the first page of my Motions. Still too, I'm pleading 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 12-16-24 Official Complaint, 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 Glass.**

STATEMENT OF ADDITION MATERIAL FACTS AND EVIDENCE TO SUBSTANTIATE

ALLEGATIONS CITED ABOVE

Attached as Exhibit 1 is my letter mailed on 1-2-25 to the Administrative Clerk of Baltimore County Circuit Court along with **2** accompanying Exhibits (Exhibit 198 on my website), which responds to the

Administrative Clerk's requests in her memo dated 12-23-24 (Exhibit 197 on my website), which basically seeks for validation of my criminal case's name and case number. As verified by the two Exhibits, which are copies of Judge Glass' 6-12-24 and 8-26-24 Orders relevant to expungement of my record, my criminal case is entitled **State of Maryland vs Diana R. Williams** and my Case Number is **C-03-CR-20-002995**.

Germane to my case's status being found on the Circuit Court's website, when I viewed the Circuit Court's website to make a copy of the my case's status on 7-11-24, I recognized that the Circuit Court for Baltimore County no longer docketed my Motions and Exhibits. I made a copy of the status of my case on from the "File Date: 06/12/2024" to the "File Date of 07/11/24 (Exhibit 207 on my website). When I viewed the Circuit's Court's website on 7-26-24, I made a copy of the status of my case from the "06/14/2024" to the "File Date: 07/11/24" (Exhibit 207' on my website). As evidence by the copies of a section of the status of my case, each of my attached **2** Exhibits was posted on 7-11-24 on the Court's website as a "Supporting Exhibit". Also, as evidenced by these copies of a section of the status of my case, my Motions mailed on 6-28-24 (as evidenced by the "Certificate of Service included in my motions, which include my signature and the date) were docketed on 7-10-24.

When I called the Court to inquire about not being able to respond in a timely fashion to the presiding Judges' Findings and Orders because I was no longer able to view the status of my case on the Circuit Court's website, Ms. Kira, one of the supervisory clerks, amongst other things, told me that she would docket my Motions and that I could call the clerk's office any time to inquire about the status of my case. My Motions docketed on 7-10-24 have yet to be assigned a presiding Judge by the two the Administrative Judges-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over criminal cases, namely, Judge Robinson and Judge Cahill.

According to the Commission's organizational structure, Tanya Bernstein is employed as the Director/Investigative Counsel for the Commission. The Commission is appointed by the Governor, which includes either being appointed by Wes Moore and/or by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan, and Martin O'Malley, who, along with former Chief judge Barbera, the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, Judges, and/or other governmental are being alleged in my **2** separate Motions mailed on 12-16-24 (Exhibits 194 and 194' on my website), in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 195 on my website), in my present appeal in the In Banc Review in my civil litigation in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, and/or in other Motions to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or the attempted to and/or the conspired to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities due to knowingly and willingly: **a.)** allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades by the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City (the Mayor and Baltimore City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and the present Mayor, Brandon Schott, against **all** of the present members of the City Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter "City Council"), and against those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993. **b.)** having ignored for years the alleged heinous crimes against the Mayor of Baltimore City, owners of the public

schools, namely, that of repetitiously and/or intentionally exposing our children to lead poisoning for decades and, thereby, violating Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other possible criminal acts. **c.)** refusing to prosecute for over a quarter of a century the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/ other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. **d.)** and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes.

Since allegations are made in my Motions and in other documents that the evidence will support that Officers of the Court have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or the attempted to and/or the conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, have invaded upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), have breached my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and/or my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, it is my plea that our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI conduct its own independent investigation in regard to my 12-16-24 and my 12-26-24 Official Complaints to the Commission (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on my website). Moreover, I'm alleging that Tanya Bernstein and the Commission are violating my 14th due to impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C 7 455(a) due to failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Officers of the Court since **there is an appearance that Tanya Bernstein and the Commission would be biased and/or impartial** as a result of Tanya Bernstein being hired as the Director/Investigative Counsel for the Commission, and the Commission being appointed by the Governor, which could include either being appointed by Wes Moore or by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan, and Martin O'Malley, **all** of whom, along with former Chief judge Barbera, are being alleged in my **2** separate Motions mailed on 12-16-24, other Motions, and/or in 12-16-24 Official Complaint to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or attempted to and/or the conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091. Thus, it is, too, my plea that, you, Hon. President Trump, whose Inauguration Ceremony as our official Hon. 47th President of the U.S. is scheduled for today, namely, 1-20-25, the same day I mailed my **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS"** to the Commission, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI to launch its own investigation into my **2** separate Official Complaints to the Commission, namely, my 12-16-24 Official Complaint and my 12-26-24 Official Complaint, and to have supervision in overseeing the Commission to ensure the granting of my plea by the Commission to immediately assign another Investigative Counsel who does not work under the Commission to preside over a thorough investigation of the material facts and evidence, especially since it is being alleged by me that the Commission and the Director/Investigative Counsel, Tanya Bernstein,

are violating my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of impinging upon Federal 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 Wes Moore and/or being appointed by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan or Martin O'Malley, **all** of whom, along with former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland ("former Chief Judge Barbera"), the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, the Judges, and/or other governmental are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or the attempt to and/or the conspiracy to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities.

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

As evidenced by the lack of facts and supporting evidence declared in Tanya Bernstein's 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusion (Exhibit 209 on my website), which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission (Exhibit 195 on my website), I'm alleging that the evidence substantiate the allegations that, like in her 2018 Findings and Conclusion, Tanya Bernstein has failed to disclose, consider, and resolve a **single** material fact and/or legal argument proclaimed in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint that substantiate the allegations in my Official Complaint, namely, that the evidence support the assertion 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 Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or intentionally violated **by Judge Glass.** Still too, as evidenced by the facts cited in **both** of her 2018 and in her 1-3-25 Findings and Orders and the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 2018 and in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission from which Tanya Bernstein responds to, other declaring the Rule 18.421, Tanya Bernstein fails to provide a shred of material facts and/or evidence that would disprove the material facts and legal arguments alleged in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint.

In Tanya Bernstein's Findings dated 12-27-24, she states that "Pursuant to Maryland Rule 18-421 (b), the allegations have been considered and found not to constitute a meritorious complaint that should be pursued because they are factually unfounded or even if proved, fail to establish "Sanctionable conduct", impairment, or disability. Please provide an accurate case name, and case number. If you have additional information in support of the allegations, please submit it in writing within the next 30 days either by mail to the address above or by email to commJD@mdcourts.gov." Also, in her memo, Tanya Bernstein asserts that "The Maryland Commission on Judicial Disabilities ("Commission") has received your correspondence containing allegations against **Judge Dennis Robinson** of the Circuit Court

for Baltimore County". However, as evidenced by the Attachment to my 12-16-24 Official Complaint entitled "Attachment as "Material facts", in my Complaint, I assert 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 repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by **Judge Robinson, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and by Judge S. Bailey.**

Moreover, as evidenced in her 2018 and 12-1-3-25 Findings and Conclusion, it appears that Tanya Bernstein, simply quoted, almost verbatim, the same reasons for her conclusion in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint as she declared in her 2018 Conclusion for denying my 2018 Official Complaint, namely, that the allegations in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint did not constitute a meritorious complaint. However, as evidenced by her 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusion and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission, Tanya Bernstein failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings any of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint which substantiate the allegations 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 repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by **Judge Glass.** Just as significant, Tanya Bernstein states as a fact in her Findings that the allegations cited in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint was against **Judge Robinson** , although the evidence in the **"Re" section" of my 12-16-24 Attachment to the STATEMENT OF FACTS** forms to the Commission clearly proclaim that I'm alleging 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 repetitiously and/or deliberately violated **by Judge Robinson, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey.**

I believe that Tanya Bernstein has damaged her credibility due to being misleading in stating the facts, which could insinuate that **only** Judge Robinson is being in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to have redundantly and/or intentionally infringed upon 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. Also, as evidenced by the lack thereof of facts as supported by the evidence in Tanya Bernstein's 1-3-25-Findings and Conclusion and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint, the evidence substantiate the allegations that Tanya Bernstein fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Conclusion **any** of the material facts and legal arguments stated in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint which substantiate these allegations. Therefore, I'm requesting that the Commission assigns another Investigative Counsel to preside over the instant **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS"** forms to the Commission and over my 12-16-24 Complaint (Exhibit 195), which are additional material facts and evidence to further substantiate the allegations stated above and in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint against Judge Glass. Cahill. Further, I'm pleading that the Commission assigns an outside, independent Investigative Counsel to preside over this instant "**ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATE OF FACTS"** forms to the Commission of additional material facts and supporting evidence to further substantiate the allegations in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission. I will be sending a copy of my 12-16-24 Complaint (Exhibit 195 on

my website) and a copy of this instant **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATE OF FACTS"** to further substantiate the allegations in my 12-16-24 Complaint to our Hon. President Trump, whom I pray will have the Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI to launch its own independent investigation. Moreover, it is my plea that the Commission: **1.)** mandates that the new, independent Investigator substantiates his/her reasons for his/her Findings and Conclusion with, in addition to citing the Rule, the material facts being supported by the evidence. **2.)** orders the a new, independent Investigator to have copies of my Motions which have the presiding Judges' Findings and Orders cited on the first page of my Motions, my Official Complaints, and other documents, which I've given Exhibit numbers on my website and to include these documents as part of the evidence in the record of the Commission.

The evidence supporting the material facts below will further substantiate the allegations that Tanya Bernstein and Judge Glass used the same pattern of deceit in attempting to conceal the allegations 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 deliberately violated by Tanya Bernstein and Judge Glass using the pattern of deceit, which includes: **1.)** misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. **2.)** misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se. **3.)** concealing in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court that are contrary to her Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. **4.)** concealing in her Findings the material facts and legal arguments cited in Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se that are contrary to her Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. **5.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. **6.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as proclaimed in my Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se.. **7.)** concealing in their Findings that the evidence in the record support the allegations that Officers of the Court exhibited judicial misconduct and obstructed justice by, amongst other things, committing the prejudicial error of perjury. **8.)** and/or concealing in their Findings that the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court, as asserted in my Official Complaints, and/or as declared in my Motions.

These are the **"ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS AS SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE"** as cited in these instant **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS",** (Exhibit 195' on my website) and as declared in my Motions mailed on 9-4-24, 10-1-24, 10-21-24, and 11-18-24, (Exhibits 189, 190, 190', 190'', 190''', 191, 191', 192, and/or 192',respectively, on my website), I repeatedly motioned for Judge Glass to preside over my Motions relevant to extending the stay on the expungement of my record until my criminal case has been resolved in its entirety, but Judge Alexander, Judge Cahill, and Judge Robinson presided over these pleadings and has denied my 6th Motion for a stay on the expungement of my

record until my criminal cases has been resolved in its entirety. These additional material facts as supported with the evidence further substantiate that Judge Glass violated 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 Maryland Rule 2-311; these additional allegations include thefollowing: **1.)** As evidenced by her Finding and Orders docketed 6-12-24 Judge Glass ordered the 30-day stay on the expungement of my record and on 8-26-24 ordered the final execution of the expungement of my record (see attachments to Exhibit 195' on my website). **2.)** The Heading in my other Motions mailed on 12-16-24 (Exhibit 191' on my website), which responds to Judge Robinson's Orders docketed on 12-5-24, is entitled **"1ST MOTION TO HAVE AN ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY GOV. WES MOORE, THE FORMER GOVERNORS OF MARYLAND, MARTIN O'MALLEY AND LARRY HOGAN, OR FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, TO ASSIGN A JUDGE WHO IS NOT APPOINTED BY WES MOORE, MARTIN O'MALLEY, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR.'S 12-5-24 ORDER (DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW), WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 6TH MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER (DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW) DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER (DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW) DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY, BECAUSE JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR., JUDGE GLASS, JUDGE ALEXANDER, AND JUDGE S. BAILEY ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242, FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTION AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311"**. And in these Motions, amongst other material facts and legal arguments, I declare that ..."**On 6-9-24, Judge M. Glass presided over a hearing on the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23, which pleaded for the Defendant to be able to repossess her firearm, her 15 ammunitions, and for an expungement of the Defendant's criminal case. Amongst her Findings and Orders dated 6-13-24 relating to the 6-9-24 hearing, Judge M. Glass cites that .... "The Court STAYED the entry of the Order for Expungement of Records for thirty days", and Judge J. Glass, also, ORDERED that the "undersigned Court's review of the Court File, the Order for Probation, docketed May 20, 2021, states Petitioner was ordered to "surrender firearms." Additionally, a docket entry from the date of sentencing that "all items seized [should be are] to be forfeited to the forfeiting authority." As such, this matter SHALL be forwarded to the sentencing Court for consideration of the request to have the seized firearm and ammunition returned to Petitioner as requested in Petitioners' Motion docketed on June 1, 2023."...**

Judge S. Bailey, who presided over the Defendant's 5-20-21 hearing and who was the sentencing Court relative to ordering the conditions in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, ordered in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24, which responds to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23, the denial of the Defendant's plea for her firearms and ammunitions. Further, in her Findings and Order which is stated on the first page of the Defendant's 6-1-23-Motions, Judge S. Bailey doesn't cite, specifically, what Court Recording and documents contained in the Court record that would justify substantiate that the Defendant's agreed to the forfeiture of her legally owned

firearm and ammunitions. As evidenced by the facts stated in her Findings and Order entered on the Court's website on 6-25-24, Judge S. Bailey, but simply declares that "After review of the Court Recording and documents contained in the Court file, the Motion to Have Defendant's Legal Firmearm (sic) [should be "Firearm"] and Ammunitions Returned is hereby DENIED".

As proclaimed in the Defendant's Motions entered on the Court's website on 7-10-24, which respond to Judge Bailey's Findings and Order entered on 6-25-24 on the Court's website and which include a Motion for a Hearing on her Motions, during the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge M. Glass, the attorney representing the State of Maryland informed the presiding Judge that, since the Defendant had fulfilled her requirement for expungement of her Records by the State of Maryland, the State of Maryland would not disagree with the Defendant having repossession of her firearm and ammunitions. Also, during the hearing on 6-9-24, the State of Maryland informed Judge M. Glass that there is no citing in Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 5-20-21 that asserts that the Defendant's firearm and ammunition are forfeited. Further, the Defendant is asserting that she has never read or received a copy of the plea bargain, nor did she sign any plea bargain, nor would she have given her Public Defender permission to have her firearm and ammunitions forfeited as part of any plea bargain. The Defendant proclaims that she was never informed by her Public Defender at any time during her only contact with her Public Defender before the hearing on 5-20-21 that part of the plea agreement included confiscating, permanently, her legally owned firearm and ammunitions. Still too, as evidenced in the transcript of the hearing held on 6-12-24, after the Court informed the Defendant that there was a document in the record of the 5-20-21 hearing before Judge Bailey that declared that the Defendant's legally owned firearm and ammunitions are "forfeited", the Defendant informed the Court that she does not recall ever hearing Judge Bailey state that her firearm and ammunition were being forfeited and had she read or had known about there being such a stipulation in the plea agreement of her right to possess her legally owned firearm and ammunitions, she [the Defendant] would have certainly not agreed to a plea bargain. As evidenced in the transcript of the hearing on 6-12-24, the Defendant informed the Court that, although the Complainant never appeared for the hearing, the Defendant asserts that she would have certainly requested a hearing if she knew that having her firearm and ammunition forfeited was part of the plea bargain. Furthermore, during the hearing before Judge Glass on 6-9-24, the attorney representing the State of Maryland informed the presiding Judge that, in her copy of Judge S. Bailey's 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, namely, on page 3, only one box is checked and the only statement written is that, during the Defendant's probation, she had to surrender her firearms. Then, the attorney representing the State of Maryland walked over to the Defendant's side of the Court and showed the Defendants her copy of page 3 of the Judge S. Bailey's Order, but the Defendant asserts that she had her own copy of this same Order and was looking at the same page where the statement by the Judge orders the Defendant to surrender her firearms while on probation. Moreover, although the Defendant Certificate of Service substantiate that the Attorney representing the State of Maryland has received copies of <u>all</u> of Motions and/or Exhibits, which continue to plead for a Reconsiderations in her numerous Motions, which basically pleads for reconsideration in granting the Defendant her legally owned firearm and ammunitions., the Attorney representing the State of

Maryland has never filed a Motion in opposition to the Defendants Motions and has, thus, remained acquiesce.

Although Judge Glass who issued her 6-13-24 Finding and Order, which included ordering a 30-day stay on the Defendant's expungement, in all of her Motions docketed since 7-10-24, the Defendant include a separate Motion pleading for a continued stay on the expungement of the Defendant's criminal case being finalized as declared in Judge Glass' final Order issued on 8-27-24 until the criminal case is resolved in its entirety, otherwise as repeatedly cited by Judge Glass during the 6-9-24 hearing, without her extending a stay on the expungement, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist, which means that the Defendant would no longer be able to file Motions of any kind and have a hearing on the Motions in order to substantiate the Defendant's allegations that the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and the presiding Judges, namely, Judge R. Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey have repetitiously and/or intentionally breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102, and Maryland Rule 2-311 and that Judge S. Bailey has violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by infringing upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) as a result of refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets, although the Defendant had successfully been in compliance all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. that her because her case would no longer exist.

Moreover, as being alleged in these instant Motions, the evidence will substantiate the material facts that this is the Defendant's 6th Motion for a continuation of the stay on the execution of the Defendant's expungement because Judge Glass informed the Defendant during the hearing on 6-9-24 that the Defendant criminal case would no longer exist without the stay on the expungement and because the Defendant has yet to have the matter of her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 being violated due to Judge S. Bailey unlawfully denying the Defendant her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions and to have a hearing on the Defendant's Motions.....

....As evidenced in the record, Judge Glass was given access to the Defendant's website address in all of her Motions docketed from 7-10-24 and onward. Further , the Defendant alleges that, because she has discovered during her research on the background of that Judge Glass on 12-12-24 that she was appointed by Martin O'Malley in 2014 to her privileged position as a Circuit Court Judge and because Judge Glass has had access to the Defendant's website address to read her Motions in her present civil litigation, which allege, amongst other material facts, that the evidence will substantiate that Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials are bine g breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes. Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) mandates Judge Glass to voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as a presiding Judge, that her Orders be deemed as void and of no effect since there is an appearance that Judge Glass may have been biased

and/or impartial in deciding to remove the 30 day Stay on the expungement as evidenced in her 8-27-24 final Order of the execution of the Defendant's expungement because Judge Glass had access to the Defendant's 6 other Motions, beginning with the Defendant's 7-10-24 Motions and thereafter including a Motion for a continuation of the Stay on the Defendant's expungement until the Defendant's criminal case is resolved in its entirety. Again, Judge Glass, the presiding Judge during the hearing on 6-9-24, expressly declared that, if she issues an Order of expungement, then the Defendant's criminal case no longer exist.

Further, in these instant Motions, the Defendant is pleading for a hearing on these Motions and, for the 4th time, a stay on Judge Glass' 8-27-24 final Order of expungement, and is motioning for an Administrative Judge, who was not appointed by Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over assigning another Judge, other than Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Judge R. Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, or and Judge S. Bailey, and not to assign a Judge to preside over the Defendant's Motions who was **appointed by Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera."... 3.)** On 19-19-24, 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 45th – 47th Hon. 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." 4.)** Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), since **there is an appearance that Judge Glass would be impartial and/or biased** due to being appointed to her elite position as Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, who, along with Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other government officials, is being asserted in my present civil litigation, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other committed other crimes, Judge Robinson and the presiding Judges should have voluntarily disqualified and recused themselves as presiding Judges. **5.)** The U.S Supreme Court has already established that, if the allegations substantiate a violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), then the Judge has committed "Fraud upon the Court", and, thus, the Orders of Judge are deemed void and of no effect. **6.)** Due to the evidence supporting the allegations of their infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Judge Glass has, thereby, committed "Fraud on the Court", has acted in her individual capacity and not in her judicial capacity, and has violated her oath of. **7.)** Judge Glass' Orders are deemed void and of no effect because Judge Glass was disqualified as a presiding Judge as decreed under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) since **there is an appearance that Judge Glass would be impartial and/or biased** as a result of being appointed to her elite position as an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in my present appeal in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other committed other crimes.

Cc: Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Newly Appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, Newly Appointed Director of the FBI, Public