

S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. ii.) Judge Alexander refusing to determine in her Order if my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were violated by the previous presiding Judge, namely, Judge S. Bailey, who is being alleged in my Motions, which include my Motions docketed on 7-10-24 and on 9-4-24, and in other Motions, to have impinged upon my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 as a result of refusing to grant my right to repossess my firearm and 15 bullets, although I had successfully been in compliance with all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. iii.) Judge S. Bailey breaching my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by violating her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order due to refusing to grant my right to repossess my firearm and 15 bullets since I had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. 14.) Judge Robinson failed in his responsibility to determine if my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were invaded upon by Judge Glass and Judge Alexander since the evidence of the facts stated in their Findings and Orders substantiate that Judge Glass and Judge Alexander and the evidence and material facts and legal arguments declared in my 2 separate motions mailed on 11-21-24 substantiate that, like Judge Cahill, Judge Robinson failed to determine in their Findings and Orders: a.) any of the if the material facts in my Motions mailed on 11-21-24 support the allegations in my Motions that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were invaded upon by Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander and Judge S. Bailey. b.) if the material facts in my Motions mailed on 11-21-24 substantiate the allegations that Judge S. Bailey violated my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by refusing to adhere to her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order and grant my right to repossess my firearm and 15 ammunition since I had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. 15.) Judge Robinson, like the previous presiding Judges, namely, Judge Cahill, Judge Alexander, Judge Glass, and Judge S. Bailey, simply deny my Motions, although as repeatedly declared in my 11-21-25 Motions, at the hearing held on 6-9-24 before the presiding Judge, Judge Glass, the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified that the State of Maryland had no problem with my repossessing my legally own firearm and 15 ammunition, informed Judge Glass that Judge S. Bailey did not state in her Order dated 5-20-21 that I could not repossess my firearm and ammunition, and came over to where I was seated and showed me a copy of the same document from Judge S. Bailey that I had on the table before me. Moreover, as evidenced in the record, the attorney representing the State of Maryland has not responded to any of my motions docketed from 7-10-24 and onward and since the 6-9-24 hearing, but has remained acquiesce in responding to

any of my Motions. 16.) The evidence of lack thereof of facts cited in Judge Robinson's Orders docketed on 12-5-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my Motions docketed on 11-21-24, from which Judge Robinson responds to in his 12-5-24 Orders, substantiate my allegations that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were, too, infringed upon by Judge Robinson because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Order whether the allegations in my Motions docketed on 11-21-24, namely, that Judge S. Bailey, the first presiding Judge, breached my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to impinging upon her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to impinging upon her own Order, especially since Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, and Judge Alexander failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if the material facts and legal arguments cited in my Motions substantiate that Judge S. Bailey did violate the my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order. 17.) Exhibit 1 attached to this instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS" forms to the Commission is my response to the letter dated 2-27-24 from the Administrative Clerk for the Circuit for Baltimore County (Exhibit 206 in my website), which requests that I provide evidence to validate my criminal case's name, which is State of Maryland vs Diana R. Williams, and case number, which is C-03-CR-20-002995, and that I resubmit my 2 separate Motions mailed on 12-16-24 back to her office to be filed in the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, which I mailed on 1-2-25 and mailed a copy of these documents to the Commission on the same day, (except for mailing a copy of the Motions because I had mailed a copy of these Motions to the Commission on 12-16-24 and as supporting attachments to my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission (Exhibit 195 on my website). 18.) The hearing before Judge Glass on 6-9-24 was in response to my Motions mailed on 5-30-23. 19.) The Heading in my Motions mailed on 5-30-23 is entitled "1.) MOTION TO HAVE THE DEFENDANT'S LEGAL FIRMARM AND AMUNITIONS RETURNED TO THE DEFENDANT. 2. MOTION TO HAVE THE DEFENDANT'S RECORD EXPUNGED". In these Motions, I declare, amongst other material facts that "I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant's: 1. Motion To Have The Defendant's legal Firmarm And Amunitions Returned To The Defendant. 2. Motion To Have The Defendant's Record Expunged based on the grounds and authorities cited below.

According to the Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21, the Defendant was ordered Probation before Judgment (Criminal Procedure Article & 6-220) for two years, with no supervision, to have no contact with the victim, Amy Penn, to surrender firearms, and may not own or possess a firearm during her probationary period. With today being 5-30-23, the evidence of the material fact that the Defendant record available to the Court substantiates the material fact that the Defendant has honored all of her probation requirement. Since the

Defendant's has satisfied the Court's requirement in complying with all conditions, the Defendant is pleading that the Court dismiss the action against the Defendant and, thus, no criminal proceeding will take place, and, therefore, the State Prosecutor and/or the Police Department do not need to continue to hold the Defendant's legal firearm and her 15 bullets for evidence during the criminal proceedings. During the arrest of the Defendant on 10-19-20, the police confiscated the Defendant's gun which was inside the Defendant's blue gun case which was closed, six ammunition inside the gun, 9 ammunition, a thumb drive, a piece of paper with notes written it, and the certificate indicating the Defendant's ownership of the firearm underneath the sponge inside the gun case. On this same day and as witnessed by the Defendant's soulmate, Mr. Jimmy Porter, a police officer returned the Defendant's blue gun case and all of the Defendant's items except for her firearm which was loaded with 6 ammunition and the Defendant's 9 ammunition were under the sponge in the Defendant's gun case. Consequently, the Defendant is pleading that her firearm and 15 ammunition be returned to the Defendant in a timely manner. Furthermore, the Defendant is pleading that, since she has successfully complied with her 2-year unsupervised probation, the Defendant no longer has a conviction on your record. Therefore, the Defendant is, also, pleading that the Court have her record be expunged as soon as possible." ... 19.) As declared in my Motions docketed on 7-10-24, which as of 1-20-25 has yet to assigned a presiding Judge by the two Administrative Judges-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over criminal cases, namely, Judge Robinson and Judge Cahill, and/or as asserted in my 9-4-24 Motions (Exhibit 189 on my website), the evidence of Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order substantiate, indisputably, that Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Order failed to adhere to the conditions that she ordered in her 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order. 20.) As substantiated in my Motions docketed on 7-10-24, which respond to Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Order, which are docketed on 6-25-24 with a stamped on the 1st page of 5-30-23 Motions (Exhibit 203 on my website), along with other pleadings, I motion for a hearing on these Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, thereby giving Judge S. Bailey, the State of Maryland, me, the Defendant, the opportunity to determine whether my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were breached by Judge S. Bailey. Moreover, as evidenced by the documents attached to my Motions docketed on 7-10-24, I attached 2 Exhibits (Exhibit 188 on my website). Exhibit 1 is a copy of my 11-6-20 email to my Public Defender at the time and Exhibit 2 is a copy of my 11-10-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President Trump. Included in my Official Complaint and/or in my emailed addendum to my Public Defender are allegations of obstructions of justice by various government officials and more details in regard to my legally owned firearm and my 15 ammunition that are not stated above. Moreover, in my Motions docketed on 7-10-24, I proclaim, amongst other material facts, that ... "The Defendant is alleging that the evidence in the record, the 2 Exhibits which accompany these Motions, the Exhibits on the Defendant's

facts that will be forthcoming, substantiate the allegations that the Defendant's 2nd website, the material facts cited below, and/or other material

Amendment Right, her 14 Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 241, and/or the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 have been infringed upon by Judge Bailey in failing to grant the Defendant's 5-20-21 Motions, which include the Defendant's Motion to have her legally owned firearm and ammunition. The material facts are: 1.) The Defendant is alleging that Judge Bailey is breaching her mandates in her 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order because Judge Bailey's Order does not state in this Order that part of the probation requirement would include the Court ordering the "forfeiting" of the Defendant's firearm and ammunition. 2.) As evidenced in the 6-13-24 Order by the Court, the Court granted the Petitioner's request for expungement, which substantiate that the Defendant had completed the requirements as mandated in Judge Bailey's 5-20-21

Probation/Supervision Order and has been in compliance with the mandate for expungement by the State of Maryland since 5-21-24. 3.) The Defendant is alleging that it is essential that the presiding Judge who issued the 6-13-24 Finding and Order, which included ordering a 30-day stay on the expungement, order another extension to "stay the expungement until the case is resolved, since during the 6-12-24 hearing, the Court informed the parties that she was ordering a "stay of 30 days on the expungement Order, otherwise the case would be dismissed and the Defendant would no longer have a case and her right to have her 5-30-21 Motions considered, disclosed, and resolved by Judge Bailey. 4.) The Defendant is asserting that, during the 5-20-21 hearing before Judge Bailey, she does not recall hearing Judge Bailey assert that she was mandating that the "forfeiting" of the Defendant's firearm and

ammunitions as part the plea bargain. 5.) The Defendant is asserting that, prior to and/or during the hearing on 5-20-21, the Public Defender never informed the Defendant that the Public Defendant's Office had agreed with the State of Maryland to settle for a plea bargain and that the plea bargain would include having the Defendant's legally owned firearm and ammunition "forfeited". 6.) The Defendant is alleging that during the only meeting with this Public Defender, namely, the meeting they had before the hearing on 5-20-21, the Public Defender's responses assured her that he had neither read any of the Defendants emails forwarded to the attorney whom she had prior to his representing her, namely, Attorney Coleman, especially her email forwarded to Attorney Coleman on 11-6-21 (Exhibit 1) and the Defendant's Official Complaint to the President of the U.S. and others government officials against the Police Department, the State of Prosecutor's Office, and others. In her Official Complaint, which the Defendant alleges that she mailed a copy to Attorney Coleman on 11-20-21, the Defendant asserts, amongst other things, the tampering with evidence as it relates to the Defendant's firearms and/or ammunition and/or gun case, removal of evidence relevant to the Defendant's firearms and/or ammunition, and fraud in the facts stated in

police report from the Police Department and/or in the charging documents of the State

Prosecutor's office germane to the Defendant's firearms and/or ammunition. 7.) The Defendant is alleging that this email, her Official Complaint, and/or other emails and Addendum to her Official Complaint against the Police Department, the State Prosecutors Office, and other agencies which has been forwarded to our Hon. President of the U.S. are included on the Defendant's website as Exhibits 83-86 and Exhibits 88-91. 8.) 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 ammunition forfeited as part of any plea bargain. 9.) The Defendant is asserting 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 ammunition. 10.) 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 ammunition 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 ammunition, she [the Defendant] would have certainly not agreed to a plea bargain. 11.) 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. 12.) Also, during the hearing on 6-12-24, the attorney representing the State of Maryland informed the Court that, since the Defendant had fulfilled her requirement for expungement by the State of Maryland, the State of Maryland would not disagree with the Defendant receiving her firearm and ammunition. 13.) During the hearing on 6-12-24, the State of Maryland informed the presiding Judge that, in mandates in Judge Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, there is no citing that the Defendant's firearm and ammunition are forfeited as part of the Probation/Supervision Order, and the attorney from the State of Maryland walked over to the Defendant's side of the Court and showed the Defendants a copy of Judge Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, although the State of Maryland did not know that the Defendant had her copy of this same Order with her." 21.) Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 responds to my Motions mailed on 5-30-23, which is stamped on a copy of the first page of my Motions mailed on 5-30-23. Judge S. Bailey's Order was docketed on 6-25-24 which was after the 6-9-24 hearing on my Motions mailed on 5-30-23 before the presiding Judge, Judge Glass. As stated earlier, during the hearing, amongst other things, Judge Glass informed me that she was granting part of my Motions, namely, the expungement of my record but that she would Order a 30-stay on her 6-12-24 Order until the

issue of my repossessing my legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition were brought before the presiding judge. 22.) As evidenced by the docketing of my Motions on 7-10-24, included in these Motions are my response to Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders docketed on 6-25-24 and a Motion for a hearing on the Motions. 23.) I'm asserting that I made copies of a section of the status of my case from the Court's website posting on 7-11-24 and 7-26-24 which give the status of my case from "File Date: 06/12/2024" to "File Date: 07/11/2024" (Exhibit 207 on my website) and the status of my case from "06/14/2024 to "File Date: 07/11/2024 (Exhibit 207' on my website) to substantiate that my Motions docketed on 7-10-14 was before the expiration of Judge Glass' Order of the 30-day stay on the expungement of my record issued by her on 6-12-24. Again, copies of Judge Glass' 2 Orders are attached as Exhibit 1 in this instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS" forms to the Commission. 24.) My letter dated 1-2-25 to the Commission is my response to the letter dated 2-27-24 from the Administrative Clerk for the Circuit for Baltimore County (Exhibit 208 on my website). 25.) As asserted in my Motions docketed on 7-10-24, during the hearing before Judge Glass, the presiding Judge, Judge Glass told me that she would not rule on my Motion to have my firearm returned because she was reading from a document that stated that Judge S. Bailey stipulated that I had forfeited my right to have my firearm and ammunition returned; therefore, she would refer my Motion for repossessing my firearm and ammunition to Judge S. Bailey. 26.) Also, during the hearing, I informed Judge Glass that, although the Complainant never appeared for the hearing, I would have certainly requested a hearing if I knew that having my firearm and ammunition forfeited was part of the plea bargain. 27.) During the hearing on 6-9-24, Judge Glass informed both parties, namely, the State of Maryland and me, that should was going to grant my Motion for an expungement of my record, but if she did not put a stay on the expungement of my record, my case would no longer exist and, therefore, I could not have any other Motion consider, and resolve before a presiding Judge due to the case being no longer on the record of the Court. 28.) As evidenced by the material facts stated in my Motions docketed on 7-10-24, which include my first Motion for a stay on Judge Glass' 6-12-24 Order for expungement of my record until my case had been resolved in its entirety, I asserted that the reason for my motioning the stay on Judge Glass' 6-12-24 Order was due to Judge Glass informing the parties during the 6-9-24 hearing that if my stay on the expungement does not exist, then my criminal case would no longer exist. 29.) In my Motions docketed on 7-10-24, I motioned for a hearing on these Motions before Judge S. Bailey to have her provide the tangible evidence to substantiate that I forfeited my right to my legally purchased firearm and ammunition. 30. I motioned for a hearing on my Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in my Motions docketed on 7-10-24. 31.) While waiting the presiding Judge to respond to my Motions docketed on 7-10-24, I received a copy of Judge Glass' 8-26-24 Order in the mail, which included an Order the final execution of my 30-day stay on the expungement of my record. In response to Judge Glass' 8-26-24 Order, in my Motions docketed on 9-4-24 (Exhibit

189), I include my 1st Motion to stay Judge Glass' 8-26-24 Order for final execution of my expungement record until my criminal case was resolved in its entirety. The Heading in my Motions filed and docketed on 9-4-24 is entitled "1st MOTION TO THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF ASSIGNING JUDGES TO CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN JUDGE M. GLASS TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S: a) 1st MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF HER ORDERS ENTERED BY THE CLERK ON 8-27-24 IN THIS CASE UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY. b.) 2ND MOTION BY THE DEFENDANT TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE M. GLASS' ORDER ENTERED IN THIS CASE ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY. c.) 1ST MOTION TO HAVE A HEARING ON THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND ON THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS DOCKETED ON 7-10-24 AS PROVIDED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) 1ST MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES ORDER THAT THE DEFENDANT'S CASE CONTINUES TO APPEAR ON THE COURT'S WEBSITE, "CASE SEARCH". Amongst other material facts, in these Motions, I declare that ... "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 Firmwear (sic) [should be "Firearm"] and Ammunitions Returned is hereby DENIED". 6.) As proclaimed in the Defendant's Motions entered on the Court's website on 7-10-24 and which respond to Judge Bailey's Findings and Order entered on 6-25-24 on the Court's website, 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 receiving expungement and of the repossession of her firearm and ammunition. 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. After this statement, 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 Judge S. Bailey's 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, namely, condition number 33 box, whose box is checked and the only statement written is "Surrender firearms and Def may not own or possess a firearm". The Defendants declares that she her copy of this same Order and was, already looking at the same page when the attorney representing the State of Maryland came over to the Defendant's seating" 32.) Instead of Judge Glass presiding over my 9-4-24 Motions, Judge Alexander presided over my Motions as evidenced by the docketed date of her Order stamped and the 1st page of a copy of my 9-4-24 Motions, along with the word, "DENIED" and her signature (Exhibit 189 on my website). Moreover, although in the Heading of my Motions filed on 9-4-24, I motioned for a hearing on my 9-4-24 Motions, in her 9-25-24 Findings, Judge Alexander denied my right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to have a hearing on my

Motions. 33.) In response to the Judge Alexander's Order docketed on 9-25-24, I mailed 2 separate Motions on 10-1-24. The heading in one of my Motions mailed on 10-1-24 (Exhibit 190 on my website) is entitled "MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN ANOTHER JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION GERMANE TO JUDGE ALEXANDER'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 9-25-24 BECAUSE IN THE INSTANT MOTION JUDGE ALEXANDER IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTION". As evidence by the material facts declared in this set of Motions, amongst other material facts, I proclaim that "The evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-4-24, substantiate the allegation that Judge Alexander fails to cite a single piece of evidence to support of her denial of the Defendant's Motions, but has completely ignored the Rule of Law due to infringing upon the Defendant's her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to disclose, consider, and resolve, amongst other things, if by Judge 5. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by unlawfully denying the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 ammunition and not upholding her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order. As evidenced by the Order from Judge Alexander, which was docketed on 9-25-24, Judge Alexander's only response to the Defendant's 9-page Motions docketed on 9-4-24 is to have stamped on the copy of the Defendant's Motions the word, "DENIED", thus, failing to state any evidence and/or fact that would justify her denial of the Defendant's Motions and then denying the Defendant's Motion for a hearing on her Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311".... 34.) The heading in my other Motions mailed on 10-1-24 (Exhibit 190' on my website) is entitled "2ND MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN JUDGE GLASS TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDERS DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY AND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS". As evidenced by the facts asserted in these Motions, amongst other material facts, I declare that..."During the hearing in June of 2024, Judge Glass informed the Defendant that she was ordering a 30-day stay on the expungement; otherwise, the case would be dismissed because the Defendant criminal case would no longer exist. Still too, as evidenced in the transcript of the hearing held on 6-12-24, after Judge Glass 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 ammunition 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 ammunition, she [the Defendant] would have certainly not agreed to a plea bargain. Moreover, as evidenced in the transcript of the hearing on 6-12-24, the Defendant informed Judge Glass that, although the complainant never appeared for the hearing, the Defendant asserts that she would have certainly requested to move forward with a jury trial if she knew that having her firearm and ammunition were being forfeited was part of the plea bargain. Also, during the hearing on 6-12-24, the attorney representing the State of Maryland informed Judge Glass that, since the Defendant had fulfilled her requirement for expungement by the State of Maryland, the State of Maryland would not disagree with the Defendant receiving her firearm and ammunition"..... 35.) As evidenced by the findings and Orders docketed 10-11-24, Judge Cahill presided over my Motions mailed on 10-1-24 and simply has stamped on the 1st page of one of my Motions mailed on 10-1-24 that "ALL REQUESTS FOR RELIEF CONSIDERED AND RESPECTFULLY DENIED", has stamped on my other Motions mailed on 10-1-24 the word, "DENIED", and has his signature on the first page of each of my Motions mailed on 10-1-24. 36.) In response to the Judge Cahill's findings Orders docketed on 10-11-24, I mailed my 2nd separate Motions on 10-21-24. The heading in one of my Motions mailed on 10-21-24 (Exhibit 190" on my website) is entitled "MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN ANOTHER JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RELATIVE TO JUDGE R. CAHILL'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 10-11-24 BECAUSE IN THE INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION JUDGE R. CAHILL IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AND MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE ORDER THE PRESIDING JUDGE TO HAVE A MOTION ON THE HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". As evidence by the material facts declared in this set of Motions, amongst other material facts, I assert that ..."The evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in his Order docketed on 10-11-24, which responds to the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, substantiate the allegations that Judge R. Cahill breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Order: a.) if the evidence substantiate the allegations that the previous presiding Judge, Judge Alexander, infringed upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in her 9-25-24 Findings and Order, which respond to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, which respond to Judge Glass' Order docketed on 8-27-24, the allegation that the other presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, violated the Defendant's 14 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). b.) if the evidence substantiate the allegations substantiate the material facts that Judge S. Bailey, the other former presiding Judge, 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) in 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 and since the Order docketed on 9-25-24, which respond the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-4-24, which respond to Judge Glass's Order docketed on 8-27-24, the allegations that Judge S. Bailey, the other former presiding Judge, violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24, which respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-24 as a result of infringing upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) in 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. Moreover, the evidence of the fact stated in and/or the lack thereof of fact cited in Judge R. Cahill's Order and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions, from which Judge R. Cahill's Order respond to, substantiate the material facts that Judge R. Cahill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts in the Defendant's Motions to substantiate the Defendant's allegations that her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were infringed upon by the presiding Judges, namely, Judge Alexander and Judge S. Bailey. In her Finding and Order docketed on 9-25-24, which respond to the Defendant's Motion docketed on 9-4-24, Judge Alexander fails to disclose, consider, and resolve if the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were infringed upon by Judge S. Bailey, the previous presiding Judge, who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions to have breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, which is Exhibit 1 in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions. Still too, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge R. Cahill's Order docketed on 10-11-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, from which Judge R. Cahill

responds to in his Order, substantiate the Defendant's allegations that her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were infringed upon by Judge R. Cahill because he failed to, also, disclose, consider, and resolve in his Order whether the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, namely, that Judge S. Bailey, the other former presiding Judge, breached Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order.

Section 242 due to breaching her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, which is Exhibit 1 in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, especially Judge Alexander failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24, if the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions substantiate that Judge S. Bailey did violate the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order.

Further, the evidence of the material fact that Judge R. Cahill fails to disclose in his Order docketed on 10-11-24 one material fact and/or legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24 and from which he respond in his Order, substantiate the material fact that, without a single explanation for doing so, Judge R. Cahill refused to grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motion mailed on 10-1-24 as pleaded in the Motion and as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311." 37.) The heading in my other Motions mailed on 10-21-24 (Exhibit 190" on my website) is entitled "3rd MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN, NOT JUDGE R. CAHILL, BUT ASSIGN JUDGE GLASS TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDERS DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY AND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTION AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". As evidenced by the facts asserted in these Motions, amongst other material facts, I state that..." For the 3rd time, the Defendant is motioning the Judge-in-Charge over assigning a Judge to preside over the Defendant's criminal case to assign, not Judge R. Cahill, but assign Judge M. Glass to preside over the Defendant's instant Motion for Reconsideration to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Orders docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order entered in this case on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety because: a.) Judge Glass is the Judge who initially presided over the Defendant's Expungement hearing June 9, 2024, is the Judge who ordered the Defendant that granting of the Defendant's Expungement because Judge Glass informed the Defendant that her criminal case would no longer exist without the Stay on the Expungement. b.) Judge Glass is the presiding Judge whose 8-27-24 Order the Defendant responded to in her 9-4-24 Motions, in which one of her Motions pleads for the Judge-in-Charge Over Criminal Case to

assign Judge M. Glass, to preside over the Defendant's Motion to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Order docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order entered in this case on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety. c.) There is appearance that the presiding Judge, Judge R. Cahill, would be impartial and/or biased due to the fact that the Defendant is alleging in her other Motions mailed on this same day, namely, 10-21-24, that Judge R. Cahill have breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by ignoring the Rule of Law and, thus, failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Order docketed on 10-11-24, which responds to the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, any material facts and/or legal argument in the Defendant's 7-page Motion and which substantiate the allegations that the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 were violated by the previous presiding Judges, namely, Judge Alexander and by Judge S. Bailey; also, Judge R. Cahill failed to allow the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland 2-311. d.) The evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge Cahill Order docketed on 10-11-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, from which Judge R. Cahill responds to in his Order, substantiate that Judge R. Cahill violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 by ignoring the Rule of Law in failing to disclose, consider, and resolve, in his Order, whether Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets, although the Defendant had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21, especially in view of the material facts that the presiding Judge, Judge Alexander, failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24, which respond to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, if Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 s by infringing upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets because the Defendant had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. 2.) For the 1st time, the Defendant is pleading that the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Defendant's Motions order that the presiding Judge grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on the instant Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 and as pleaded in the Defendant's Motion".... 29.) As evidenced by the Orders docketed 11-13-24, Judge Cahill presided over my Motions mailed on 10-21-24 by simply having stamped the word, "DENIED" and his signature on the first page of my 2 separate

Motions. Further, Judge Cahill failed to grant my right to have a hearing on the Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 and as motioned in my 2 separate Motions mailed on 10-21-24. 38.) In response to the Judge Cahill's 2 sets of Findings Orders docketed on 11-13-24, I mailed 2 separate Motions on 11-18-24. The heading in one of my Motions mailed on 11-18-24 (Exhibit 191 on my website) is entitled "MOTION TO HAVE JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. TO ASSIGN ANOTHER JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RELATIVE TO JUDGE R. CAHILL'S ORDERS DOCKETED ON 11-13-24 BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT IS ALLEGING IN THIS INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND IN HER OTHER MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT JUDGE R. CAHILL IS BEING ASSERTED TO HAVE VIOLATED FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.101.11 AND, THUS, HAVE BREACHED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C. SECTION 242 AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AND MOTION TO HAVE JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. ORDER THE PRESIDING JUDGE TO HAVE A MOTION ON THE HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". As evidence by the material facts declared in this set of Motions mailed on 11-18-24, amongst other material facts, I proclaim that "...1. For the 1st time, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge Cahill Order docketed on 11-13-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-21-24, from which Judge R. Cahill responds to in his Order, substantiate that Judge R. Cahill has violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to failing to adhere to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) which mandates that he voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding judge because there is an appearance that Judge R. Cahill would be biased and/or impartial in presiding over the Defendant's instant Motions or presiding over her other Motions mailed on this day since Judge R. Cahill is being alleged in both Motions to have infringed upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242. 2.) Although the Defendant makes the pleading in her Motions, for the 1st time, Judge Cahill has invaded the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to the evidence substantiating the allegations that both of these former presiding Judges breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 by 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 (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) and although not one of these Judges provided tangible evidence to support

denying the Defendant's firearm and 15 ammunition, nor would either of these Judges grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on the Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. 3.) For the first time, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge Cahill Order docketed on 11-13-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-21-24, from which Judge R. Cahill responds to in his Order, substantiate that Judge R. Cahill transgressed the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by ignoring the Rule of Law in failing to disclose, consider, and resolve, in his Order, whether Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by impinging upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets because the Defendant had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21, and especially since Judge Alexander failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24 if Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by impinging upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets because the Defendant had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. 4.) For the 1st time, the Defendant is pleading that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. orders that the Defendant have a hearing on the instant Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311"..... 39.) The heading in my other Motions mailed on 11-21-24 (Exhibit 191' on my website) is entitled "3rd MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN, NOT JUDGE R. CAHILL, BUT ASSIGN JUDGE GLASS TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDERS DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY AND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTION AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". As evidenced by the facts asserted in these Motions, amongst other material facts, I state that..." For the 3rd time, the Defendant is motioning the Judge-in-Charge over assigning a Judge to preside over the Defendant's criminal case to assign, not Judge R. Cahill, but assign Judge M. Glass to preside over the Defendant's instant Motion for Reconsideration to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Orders docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order entered in this case on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety because: a.) Judge Glass is the Judge who initially presided over the Defendant's Expungement hearing June 9, 2024, is the Judge who ordered the Defendant Stay on the granting of the Defendant's Expungement because Judge Glass informed the Defendant that

her criminal case would no longer exist without the Stay on the Expungement. b.) Judge Glass is the presiding Judge whose 8-27-24 Order the Defendant responded to in her 9-4-24 Motions, in which one of her Motions pleads for the Judge-in-Charge Over Criminal Case to assign Judge M. Glass, to preside over the Defendant's Motion to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Orders docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order entered in this case on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety.".... 40.) As stated in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint and/or as alleged in my Motions mailed on 12-16-24, as evidenced by the Order docketed 12-5-24, Judge Cahill did not preside over my Motions mailed on 11-18-24, but the presiding Judge was Judge Robinson, who is, also, one of the Administrative Judges-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to criminal cases. As evidenced in his Findings on a copy of the 1st page of my Motions mailed on 11-21-24, Judge Robinson has stamped on my Motions the word "DENIED" and his signature. Also, like all of the previous presiding Judges, Judge Robinson, also, fails to grant my right to have a hearing on the Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 and as motioned in my Motions mailed on 11-18-24. In response to the Judge Robinson's Orders, I mailed my 2 separate Motions, which respond to Judge Robinson's 2 separate Findings and Orders on 12-16-24. The Heading in my 2 separate Motions mailed on 12-16-24 and the material facts and legal arguments are declared above, beginning with the paragraph that that declares "These are the "ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS AS SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE" as cited in these instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS",.... of this instant ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS.

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

Exhibit 1

To: J. Ensor, Administrative Clerk for the Circuit Court for Baltimore County

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams, Defendant in Criminal Case Number, C-03-CR-20-002995

Re: Evidence of my Criminal Case Number, C-03-CR-20-002995 from the attached 2 Exhibits and from the evidence of other Exhibits on my website.

Date: 1-2-25

Because of my financial hardship at this time, I'm only able to attach to this missive 2 pieces of the

evidence to confirm that my Criminal Case Number is C-03-CR-20-002995, namely, the 2

attachments that accompany this letter as Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2. Thanks to the help of my family members, I'm able to maintain my website, www.dianarw.com. Moreover, around 1-8-25,

Exhibit 188 through Exhibit 198, which are some of my Motions mailed to the Court, the State of Maryland's filings to the Court, and the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges stamped on my

Motions, will, also, be posted on my website as more evidence that will substantiate the consistent use of this same case number by me, by the State of Maryland, and in the Findings and Orders of Judge

Robinson, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey. Copies of any of the Exhibits on my website are possible to be made, which includes copies of this memo and the two accompanying

Exhibits (Exhibit 198 on my website), and thus, allowing each of these Judges to have his/her clerk to go on my website and make a copies until I can afford to send copies to all of the presiding judges of this

same letter and attaching Exhibits.

As required by Md. Rule 20-106(d) and Md. Rule 20-203(a)(3)(B)) and as declared in the "Rejected

and Returned Paper Filing Status Notice - MDDEC ACTION" form, Exhibits 1 and 2 are attached to this letter as evidence to substantiate my Criminal Case Number, C-03-CR-20-002995, which I've used as my

criminal case number in filing all of my Motions, have been used in the filings by the State of Maryland, and is cited in Judge Glass' 6-12-24 Order (Exhibit 1 and is Exhibit 195 on my website), which gives a 30-

day stay on the Expungement of my record and in her Order on 8-26-24 (Exhibit 2 and is Exhibit 196 on my website), which calls for, amongst other things, a final execution of the expungement of my record.

By 5-20-23, I had successfully completed all of the conditions in Judge S. Bailey's

Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 (Exhibit 197 on my website), but Judge S. Bailey failed to adhere to her own Probation/Supervision Order and, thus, I'm alleging that, in doing so, Judge S. Bailey

has breached my 14th Amendment Right and my 2nd Amendment Right to repossess my legally owned firearm and my 15 ammunitions. Wherefore, beginning with my Motions docketed on 7-10-24 (Exhibit

188 on my website, Motions which has yet to be presided over by Judge S. Bailey, which include Motion for a Reconsideration of Judge S. Bailey Order docketed on 6-25-24, my first Motion for a stay on the 30-

day stay in Judge Glass' 6-12-24 Order until this criminal case has been resolved in its entirety, and which include my first Motion for a hearing on my 7-10-24 Motions). And, in all of my Motions docketed

since 7-10-24, I've included a Motion for a continual stay on my expungement until my criminal case has been resolved in its entirety, and in each of my Motions filed since Judge Glass' Orders dated 6-12-24

and 8-26-24 ordering execution of the expungement of my record, I've included a Motion for a stay on

the execution of Judge Glass' Orders dated 6-12-24 and 8-26-24 until my criminal case has been resolved in its entirety. Also, in my 7-10-24 Motions and in all of my Motions filed thereafter, I've motioned for a hearing on my Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, which would give Judge S. Bailey and all of the presiding Judges, which include Judge Robinson, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, and Judge Alexander, an opportunity to provide tangible evidence to substantiate that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, Maryland Rule 2-311, and, thus, the Rule of law, are not continually being invaded upon by each of these presiding Judges, beginning with Judge S. Bailey and ending with Judge Robinson. Moreover, Judge Robinson and/or Judge Cahill, the Administrative Judges-in-Charge-of assigning the presiding Judges to my criminal case has not ordered, as pleaded in my colossal Motions, the presiding Judge to grant my right to a hearing on the record as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to provide both parties, the presiding Judge, Judge Robinson, and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey to showcase the evidence to disprove the allegations that the Judge Robinson, and all of the former presiding Judges have violated my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, Maryland Rule 2-311.

Thus, in conclusion, it's my prayer that my 2nd "original" Motions mailed on 12-16-24, with the same Case Number asserted above, and which are enclosed in this envelope be resubmitted, filed, and docketed on the Circuit Court's website, along with all of my other Motions and all of the presiding Judges' Findings and Orders, which include all of Judge Robinson's, Judge Cahill's, Judge Glass', Judge Alexander's, and Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders.

Sincerely,

CC: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Commission on Judicial Disabilities, Judge Robinson, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, Judge S. Bailey, Ms. Kira

CIRCUIT COURT OF MARYLAND FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY
401 Bosley Avenue, P.O. Box 6754
TOWSON, MD 21285-6754
Main: 410-887-2601



Case Number: C-03-CR-20-002995
Tracking Number: 180001854535
Other Reference Number(s): D-08-CR-20-001544; 202930549

STATE OF MARYLAND VS. DIANA RENA WILLIAMS

State ID: AR: DOB: 09/05/1959
Attorney for Defendant: Attorney Number:

ORDER FOR EXPUNGEMENT OF RECORDS
(Md. Rule 4-508)

Having found that Diana Rena Williams of 131 Calvin Hill Ct Dundalk, MD 21222-0000 is entitled to expungement of the police records pertaining to their arrest, detention, or confinement on or about 06/09/2021 at Baltimore County, Maryland, by a law enforcement officer of the Baltimore County Police Department and the court records in this action, it is by the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, Maryland, on 06/12/2024 ORDERED that the clerk serve a true copy of this order on each of the parties to this proceeding; and it is further ORDERED that the clerk serve on each custodian of police and court records designated in this order, a copy of this order and a blank Expungement Certificate of Compliance (form CC-DC-CR-077). The State Court Administrator shall electronically transmit to the Central Repository a blank Expungement Certificate of Compliance with a notice of the data in the Order for Expungement of Records; and it is further ORDERED that within 60 days after the entry of this order, or notice to the Central Repository, if this order is stayed, 30 days after the stay is lifted, the clerk and the following custodians of court and police records and the Central Repository shall (1) expunge all court and police records pertaining to this action or proceeding in their custody, (2) file an executed Certificate of Compliance, and (3) serve a copy of the Certificate of Compliance on the applicant/petitioner/defendant; and it is further ORDERED that the clerk and other custodians of records upon receipt of this order or notice if it is not stayed or notice that the stay is lifted shall remove the records from public inspection; and it is further ORDERED that this order: is stayed pending further order of the court. is not stayed.

CUSTODIAN

ADDRESS

Office of the State's Attorney, Baltimore Co.
Court Reporter/Digital Recording
District Court of Maryland, Baltimore Co.
Baltimore County Police Department
Baltimore County Detention Center
Executive Director of Commissioners

Served electronically via MDEC System
Served electronically via MDEC System
Served electronically via MDEC System
700 East Joppa Road, 5th Floor, Towson, Maryland 21286
720 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland 21204
251 Rowe Boulevard, Suite 431, Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Date: 06/12/2024

Judge

06/12/2024 2:40:53 PM

NOTICE TO APPLICANT/PETITIONER/DEFENDANT: Until a custodian of records has received a copy of this order AND filed a Certificate of Compliance, expungement of the records in the custody of that custodian is not complete and may not be relied upon.

Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for
Baltimore County, MD



CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY,
MARYLAND
401 Bosley Avenue, P.O. Box 6754, Towson, MD, 21285-6754

Main: 410-887-2601

Exhibit 7

Case Number: C-03-CR-20-002995
Tracking Number: 180001854535
Other Reference Number(s): D-08-CR-20-001544; C-03-CV-20-003862

STATE OF MARYLAND VS. DIANA RENA WILLIAMS

Date: 8/26/2024

ORDER

It is this 26th day of August, 2024, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore County hereby so
ORDERED, the Stay entered in this case on June 12, 2024, is hereby LIFTED; and it is hereby further so
ORDERED, the Expungement, previously GRANTED SHALL now be executed.

08/26/2024

Date

Judge

08/26/2024 12:31:53 PM

Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for
Baltimore County, MD
August 27, 2024

Clerk: Docket Order, Copy Parties

Exhibit 2



CIRCUIT COURT DISTRICT COURT OF MARYLAND FOR

Located at 401 Borden Ave, Baltimore, MD 21201
Court Address: 401 Borden Ave
Case No. 180001854535
Defendant: Diana Williams

(IF AVAILABLE, PLACE LABEL HERE OR AT TOP OF PAGE.)

SID No.: 180001854535
Tracking No.: 180001854535
Other Reference No.:
Convicted Count(s): 2 - 2nd Degree Assault
Sentence: 2 yrs unsupervised probation

Part of Sentence Executed: Suspended:
Balance of sentence suspended upon admission to treatment pursuant to HG § 8-507

Credit for Time Served: Participate and pay for psychological counseling
Length of Probation: 2 mo/yr(s)

PROBATION/SUPERVISION ORDER

Probation Before Judgment (Criminal Procedure Article § 6-220)

IT IS ORDERED THAT the above named defendant:

Be Supervised by Community Supervision

Be Supervised by Alternative Community Service:

Be Unsupervised.

Probation begins on 10/1/18 on 10/1/18

Date

Your first appointment with the supervising agency is _____ and the place to report to is _____

Your failure to report could result in your arrest.

Standard Conditions (1-10): All Standard Conditions All Standard Conditions except Nos. _____

1. Report as directed and follow your supervising agent's lawful instructions.

2. Work and/or attend school regularly as directed and provide verification to your supervising agent.

3. Get permission from your supervising agent before changing your home address, changing your job, and/or leaving Maryland. Additional Comments: _____

4. Obey all laws.

5. Notify your supervising agent at once if charged with a criminal offense, including jailable traffic offenses. Additional Comments: _____

6. Get permission from the court before owning, possessing, using, or having under your control any dangerous weapon or firearm of any description. Additional Comments: _____

7. Permit your supervising agent to visit your home.

8. Do not illegally possess, use, or sell any narcotic drug, controlled substance, counterfeit substance, or related paraphernalia. Additional Comments: _____

9. Appear in court when notified to do so.

Case No. 105-18-30-2995

10. Pay all fines, costs, restitution, and fees as ordered by the court or as directed by your supervising agent through a payment schedule.

Fine(s) of \$ _____ paid through Community Supervision Clerk's Office Sheriff's Office

Court costs of \$ _____ paid through Community Supervision Clerk's Office

Supervision fee of \$50/month paid through Community Supervision Supervision fee waived

Restitution of \$ _____ to _____

paid through Community Supervision State's Attorney's Office by _____ Date _____

Public Defender fees of \$ _____ to the Office of the Public Defender for counsel fees.

Pay the following fees through Community Supervision or _____:

Victims of Crime Fund \$ _____

CICF costs \$ _____

Other costs (Specify) \$ _____

The Division of Parole and Probation is hereby granted the discretion to refer the collection of funds it is authorized to collect to the State's Central Collection Unit without the need of further court approval.

B. Special Conditions (11-35):

11. Provide DNA sample as required by law by _____ Date _____

12. Submit to evaluation and attend and successfully complete mental health treatment as directed by your supervising agent.

13. Submit to, successfully complete, and pay required costs for evaluation, testing and treatment education, as directed by your supervising agent.

14. Attend and successfully complete alcohol drug alcohol and drug treatment education program _____ Name of Program _____

15. Enroll in, pay any required costs for, and successfully complete treatment at _____

16. Attend and successfully complete parenting class.

17. Attend _____ self-help group meetings per week for _____ weeks. Attendance may be modified by your supervising agent after _____ weeks.

18. Totally abstain from alcohol, illegal substances, and abusive use of any prescription drug.

19. Apply for alcohol restriction on driver's license within 10 days of trial date for _____ year(s)/month(s).

20. Refrain from driving and/or attempting to drive after consuming alcohol.

21. Attend Victim Impact Panel meetings when notified.

22. Attend and successfully complete MVA Driver Improvement Program.

23. Attend and successfully complete MVA Alcohol Education Program. (Social Drinkers Only)

24. Have Ignition Interlock installed for _____ months and pay costs. Employment vehicle

Defendant's attorney - [unclear] [unclear]

- 33. Other _____
- 32. To be supervised by means of electronic monitoring electronic monitoring with victim stay-away alert technology.
- Defendant shall enter treatment program immediately upon admission.
- Defendant shall successfully complete treatment program and comply with terms of aftercare plan.
- 31. Defendant shall keep appointment for HG § 8-505 evaluation and shall immediately enter the recommended program upon admission.
 - (i) To reside or habitually live.
 - (ii) To carry on employment or vocation that is full-time or part-time for a period exceeding 14 days or for an aggregate period exceeding 30 days during a calendar year, whether financially compensated, volunteered, or for the purpose of government or educational benefit; or
 - (iii) To attend a public or private educational institution, including a secondary school, trade or professional institution, or institution of higher education, as a full-time or part-time student.
 - (iv) As a transient with the intent to be in the State for a period exceeding 14 days or an aggregate period exceeding 30 days during the calendar year.
- 30. Register as sexual offender with the supervising authority under the provisions of Criminal Procedure Article, Title 11, Subtitle 7:
 - (1) A Tier I Sex Offender;
 - (2) A Tier II Sex Offender;
 - (3) A Tier III Sex Offender;
 - (4) A sexually violent predator;
 - (5) A Tier I Sex Offender who, before moving into this State, was required to register in another State;
 - (6) A Tier II Sex Offender, Tier III Sex Offender, or sexually violent predator who, before moving into this State, was required to register in another State;
 - (7) A Tier I, Tier II, Tier III Sex Offender, or a Sex Offender who is required to register in another State, jurisdiction, a federal, military, or tribal court, or a foreign government, who is not a resident of this State, and who enters this State;
- 29. Home confinement/detention to _____ for _____ months.
 - Special conditions (e.g. doctor's appointments, attending classes, etc.) _____
- 28. Do not enter or be found near _____
- 27. Have no contact with _____ by _____ Date _____ and pay required costs.
- 26. Attend and successfully complete domestic violence counseling at _____ of _____ and pay required fees.
- 25. Complete _____ hours of community service by _____ Date _____, under the direction of _____ and pay required fees.

Case No. _____

2017-08-20-2498

Printed Name _____
 Witness Signature _____
 City, State, Zip _____
 Address _____
 Defendant's Signature _____

Date _____
 Date of Birth _____
 Telephone Number _____
 E-mail _____

I have read, or have had read to me, the above conditions of probation. I understand that if I do not follow these conditions, I could be returned to court charged with a violation of probation.

If I fail to abide by the above conditions, the court could enter judgment against me and proceed with disposition as if I had not been placed under probation. I have been notified and understand that by consenting to and receiving a stay of judgment under Criminal Procedure Article, § 6-220, I waive my right to appeal from a judgment of guilty by the court in this case.

I understand that my failure to pay fines, costs, and fees may result in my case being referred to the State's Central Collection Unit, resulting in an additional collection fee as permitted by law.

I understand that Parole and Probation may impose Graduated Sanctions upon me for any technical violation of the above conditions of probation, as authorized pursuant to Correctional Services Article, §§ 6-111 and 6-121.

CONSENT

Date _____
 Judge _____
 ID Number _____

- C. 34. Comply with special conditions of lifetime supervision - see form CC-DC-CR-136.
- D. Recommendations to the supervising agency:
- 35. Transfer supervision to _____, Maryland.

Case No. _____