

It is ordered that this motion to
 recuse is denied because there
 is not a sufficient legal or factual
 basis for the relief requested.

Diana R. Williams
 11th of February, 2025

CC: SAO, DEFT
 Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for
 Baltimore County, MD
 February 11, 2025

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE COUNTY

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

STATE OF MARYLAND

IN THE MATTER OF

VS.

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

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

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the
 Defendant's 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 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.) The evidence of the Defendant's website address cited in her Motions docketed on 7-10-24 and her 4 other Motions

docketed, thereafter, 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, www.diarrr.com, because the Defendant cited her website address in all of these Motions to substantiate other material facts and evidence asserted in her Motions. 2.) 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 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to impinge upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 3.) On 12-12-24 and after researching on the backgrounds of Judge D. Robinson, Jr.

it was revealed that he 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, both of whom, again, are being alleged in the Defendant's present civil litigation and/or in 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have

committed other crimes. 4.) Also, during her research on this same day, the Defendant discovered that Judge Glass was appointed to her superlative position as a Circuit Court Judge for Baltimore County in 2014 by Martin O'Malley. 5.) On 12-13-24, after researching the background of Judge S. Bailey, the Defendant discovered that she was, also, appointed to an elite position as a Circuit Court Judge for Baltimore County in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. 6.) On 12-14-24, after researching the background of Judge Alexander, it was revealed that he was, too, appointed to his distinct position as a Circuit Court Judge in 2010 by Martin O'Malley, who, again, along with Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials, 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

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

INTRODUCTION

U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland 18.101.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 in breaching Federal Statute 28 alleged in both Motions to have infringed upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Instant Motions or presiding over her other Motions mailed on this day since Judge R. Cahill is being an appearance that Judge R. Cahill would be biased and/or impartial in presiding over the Defendant's the presiding Judge and his Orders be deemed void and of no effect as a matter of law because there is Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) which mandates that he voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to failing to adhere to substantiate that Judge R. Cahill has violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-21-24, from which Judge R. Cahill responds to in his Orders, docketed on 11-13-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof or facts cited in Judge R. Cahill's Order crimes. Moreover, in the material facts in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 11-14-24 she alleges that 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other committed other 1091 - Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other government officials, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & Hogan, all of whom are being asserted in the Defendant's present civil litigation, along with former elite Administrative and/or as Circuit Court Judges by Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, and/or by Larry Judge Alexander and Judge S. Bailey would be impartial and/or biased due to being appointed to their and of no effect as a matter of law since there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Judge Glass, Orders and Judgments of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey void office. And, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that "fraud upon the Court" deems the not in the Judge's judicial capacity, has committed "fraud on the Court", and has violated his/her oath of after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that Judge has acted in the Judge's personal capacity and disqualified and recused themselves because the Courts have affirmed that, if a Judge issues any Order 455(a), Judge D. Robinson Jr. Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey should have voluntarily misconduct in office, and/or other committed other crimes. 8.) Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & officials have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other government civil litigation which cite, among other things, that the evidence will substantiate the material facts that Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey had access to the Defendant's Motions in her present website which contain the Defendant's Motions in her present civil litigation, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., office, and/or other committed other crimes. 7.) As a result of having access to the Defendant's

The written Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution require judges to recuse themselves from cases in two situations, namely, where the judge has a financial interest in the case's outcome and where there is otherwise a strong possibility that the judge's decision will be biased. In the United States Constitutional Law, a Due Process Clause is found in both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Constitution uses the phrase in the 5th and 14th Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5th Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14th Amendment protects them from actions by state and local government.

The Supreme Court has held that, if a judge wars against the Constitution in breaching the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution or if he/she acts without jurisdiction, then that judge has engaged in treason to the Constitution, which suggests that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce. Since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts.

Relative to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), the Supreme Court has ruled and reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", Levine v. United States, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960), citing Offutt v. United States, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13 (1954). In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held that disqualification of a judge is mandatory if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality (Liteky v. U.S., 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). The Court has, too, affirmed that, should a judge not disqualify himself/herself as required by law, then the judge has given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which could potentially further disqualify the judge. Further, the Court have determined that, should another judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance of partiality" and has possibly disqualified himself/herself. Moreover, the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. Wherefore, the U.S. Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio." The Supreme Court has decided that, should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by law.

STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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."

The evidence of my 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 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to impinge upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts.

As asserted earlier, after research the background of 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), 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 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other committed U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other committed other crimes as a result of knowingly and willingly: 1.) 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 trade 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.

Further, in the material facts in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 11-14-24, she alleges that the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge R. 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 and his Orders be deemed void and of no effect as a matter of law 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 as a result of infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311.

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 Petitioner's 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 ammunition. 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 ammunition. 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 Firmarm (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 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. 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 all of Motions and/or Exhibits, which continue to plead for a Reconsideration in her numerous Motions, which basically pleads for reconsideration in granting the Defendant her legally owned firearm and ammunition, 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. & 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

Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

Respectively Submitted

The Defendant pleads that her Motions be granted.

CONCLUSION

Judge Barbera.

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.

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, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials are being 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.

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 ammunition and to have a hearing on the Defendant's Motions. Moreover, 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.

131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 16th day of December 2024, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing 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 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: Hon. President and the Hon. Military Tribunal, and the Commission on Judicial Disabilities

Exhibit 1

COMPLAINANT INFORMATION

First Name: Diana

Last Name: Williams

Address: 131 Calvin Hill Ct

City: Balto. State: Md. Zip Code: 21222

Phone Number: 410-868-6013

Email: lady-daw Verizon.net

Preferred Title and Pronoun:

Ms.

Mr.

Judge

Dr.

She/Her

He/Him

They/Them

Other

If you are currently incarcerated, please check the box below and provide your Inmate Number:

Inmate ID Number

NA

JUDGE INFORMATION

First Name: Dersey

Last Name: Robinson

Court:

Supreme Court of Maryland

Appellate Court of Maryland

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: C-03-CR-20-002995

Case Number (include all letters and numbers):

Case Type:

Civil

Criminal

Family/Domestic

Juvenile

Probate

Traffic

Protective/Peace Order

Sexual Harassment

Other

Date(s) of Hearing(s) or Other Proceeding(s):

Waiting for my repeated requests for hearing on my motions!