

CC:SAO:DEF

IN THE

STATE OF MARYLAND

IN THE MATTER OF

CIRCUIT COURT

VS.

FOR

BALTIMORE COUNTY

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995


1.) 1ST MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF
EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-27-24, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 7TH
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 DOCKETED
ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY, OTHERWISE THE DEFENDANT'S
14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND THE DEFENDANT'S CIVIL RIGHT
UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WILL CONTINUE TO BE VIOLATED. 2.) MOTION FOR A

HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the
Defendant's: 1.) 1ST Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion To Stay The Execution Of
Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24, Which Is The Defendant's 7TH 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 Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case Is Resolved In Its
Entirety, Otherwise The Defendant's 14TH Amendment right, Her 2ND Amendment Right, And Her Civil
Continue To Be Violated. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motion As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-
311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below.

CR59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that
could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the
Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Defendant, who is being
represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and
produced earlier by the Defendant, is that: for the first time: 1.) For the 7TH time the Defendant is
motioning a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Order issued on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on

Denied because there is not a
sufficient legal or factual
basis for the relief requested.



5th of March, 2025

The following material facts and legal arguments as stated in the second of the Defendant's 2 Motions mailed on 12-16-24 but docketed on 1-10-25 and as declared in the Defendant's 1-20-25 Addendum to her 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities ("Commission") and to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, and which give sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's right to have a 7th Motions for a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Order issued on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this Criminal Case is resolved in its entirety, namely: 1.) 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 ammunition, 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 [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'

STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Defendant believes that our great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their ruling, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11, "And the LORD spake into Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend", and Moses informed the judges in Israel of GOD'S law and employed the judges over the various tribes in Israel in Judges 6:16-17, saying, "And, I charged your judges at that time, saying, Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD'S; and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it."

INTRODUCTION

the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this Criminal Case is resolved in its entirety, with the legal and factual basis being that without the Stay on the expungement, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist as cited by the presiding Judge, Judge Glass, during the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's 5-23-23 Motions, which are Motions to expunge the Defendant's record and to grant the Defendant her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and 15 ammunition. Judge Glass granted the Defendant's Motion for Expungement but informed the Defendant and the Attorney representing the State of Maryland that, if there is no stay on the execution of the Defendant's expungement, then the Defendant would no longer have a criminal case existing and thus could not have her Motion for repossession of her firearm and 15 ammunition to be consider, disclosed, and resolved by Judge S. Bailey or any other presiding Judge because the case would not long exist.

Motion docketed on June 1, 2023." ... 2.) Judge S. Bailey, who presided over the Defendant's 5-20-21 hearing and wrote the 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order which was effective for 2 years (Exhibit 1 that accompany the first of the 2 separate instant Motions), denied the Defendant's Motion to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition as evidenced from her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 and written at the first page of the Defendant's Motions (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website), which simply states "After review of the Court Recording and documents contained in the Court file, the Motion to Have Defendant's Legal Firearm (sic) [should be "Firearm"] and Ammunitions Returned is hereby DENIED". 3.) As proclaimed in the Defendant's Motions entered on the Court's website on 7-10-24 (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant's website, www.dianarwilliams.com), 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 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. 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 ammunition 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 ammunition. 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 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. 4.) 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. 5.) 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. 6.) The evidence of the Defendant's website address cited in my Motions docketed since 7-10-24 substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge R. Cahill, Judge Alexander, Judge Glass, and Judge S. Bailey, have had access to the Defendant's website because the Defendant cited her website address in all of these Motions to substantiate other material facts and evidence asserted in her Motions. Since Judge D. Robinson and each of the former presiding Judges had access to the Defendant's website address, Judge D. Robinson and the former presiding Judges have had the opportunity to read the Defendant's Motions and the Findings and Orders by the Judges in her present civil litigation and to recognize that the Gov. of Maryland, Wes Moore (herein Wes Moore), two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Martin O'Malley and Larry Hogan, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged in the Defendant's present civil litigation and/or in 2nd Addendum to our Hon. President to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 7.) After research the background of Judge D. Robinson, Jr., the presiding Judge on 12-12-24, the Defendant discovered that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his elite Administrative position in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, and was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore. During her research on this same day, the Defendant discovered that Judge Glass was appointed to her superlative position in the Circuit Court for Baltimore County in 2014 by Martin O'Malley, and in researching the background of Judge S. Bailey, the Defendant discovered that she was appointed her superior status as a Circuit Court Judge 2009 by Martin O'Malley. On 12-14-24, while researching the background of Judge Alexander, the Defendant discovered that he, too, was appointed to his privileged position as a Circuit Court Judge in 2010 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Defendant's present civil litigation to have 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 committed other crimes. Moreover, Judge S. Bailey is the first presiding Judge to have had access to the Defendant's website address from the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-10-24, which gave Judge S. Bailey access to the Defendant's Motions in her present civil litigation in which the Defendant alleges, amongst other

things, that the evidence will substantiate the material facts that Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other government officials 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 Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a). 8.) Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Judge D. Robinson Jr. Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey should have voluntarily disqualified and recused themselves because the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge’s personal capacity and not in the judge’s judicial capacity, has committed “Fraud on the Court”, and has violated his/her oath of office. And, the U.S. Supreme Court has already established that “Fraud upon the Court” deems the Orders and Judgments of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey void and of no effect as a matter of law since there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey would be impartial and/or biased due to being appointed to their elite Administrative positions by Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley and/or by Larry Hogan, all of whom, along with former Judge Barbera and other government officials, are being asserted in the Defendant’s present civil litigation and/or in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or 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 as a result of knowingly and willingly: i.) allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades. ii.) having ignored the alleged heinous crimes against the owners of the public schools, (the Mayor and Baltimore City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young and Brandon Schott, against all of the present members of the City Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter “City Council”), and against those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993 to repetitiously and/or intentionally expose our children to lead poisoning through lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazard, thereby, infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to traduce Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other possible criminal acts. iii.) refusing to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately intruding upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. iv.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Judges, 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 transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes. 9.) The evidence substantiate the material fact that the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and all of the former presiding Judges, including Judge S. Bailey, have denied the Defendant’s right to a hearing on her Motions as pleaded in all of the Defendant’s Motions filed since 7-10-24 and as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.


ARGUMENT

Since the evidence of Exhibit 1 that is attached to these Motions, indisputably, substantiate that Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order doesn't mandate that the Defendant could not repossess her legally owned firearm and ammunition upon successfully complying with the conditions in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order, since the evidence of the facts declared in the Findings and Orders of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and of all of the former presiding Judges substantiate that Officers of the Court fail to provide any tangible evidence to substantiate their denial/s of the Defendant's Motions, there is no legal or factual basis for Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and/or any of the other former presiding Judges denying the Defendants her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and her ammunition without violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, nor the right of the Defendant to have a hearing on her Motions as pleaded and as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. Thus, Judge D. Robinson knows that if he denies the Defendant her Motion for the Stay on the execution of Judge Glas' 8-27-24 Order, then Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would be correct in citing in his 1-11-25 Findings and Orders that the Defendant have no "legal or factual basis" for motioning the granting of the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and her ammunition without violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist.

CONCLUSION

The Defendant pleads that her Motions be granted.

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 21st day of January 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1.) 1st Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed on 8-27-24, which is The Defendant's 7th 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 Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise The Defendant's 14th Amendment right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Continue To Be violated. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motion As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Baltimore County State Attorney, 401 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland, 21204.

Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Cc: Cc: 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General for the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland

Arona Mathanig
131 Calver Street
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Attention: Supervisory Clerk: Mr. Kira

Circuit Court for Baltimore County
County Courts Building
P.O. Box 6754
Greenbelt, Md. 21755-6754



Retail



21285

RDC 99

\$1.57

R2304W119779-2

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FCM LETTER
DUNDALK, MD 21222
FEB 21, 2025