

IN THE MATTER OF
STATE OF MARYLAND
VS.
DIANA R. WILLIAMS
CIRCUIT COURT
BALTIMORE COUNTY
Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995

1.) 1ST MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 3RD MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. DUE TO HIS CONTINUOUS LAW FARE IN REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY BREACHING THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S 1-21-25 PLEA TO OUR 45TH - 47TH HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP AGAINST JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. 2.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 3RD MOTION TO JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS AS PERMITTED 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 For Disqualification Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. As The Presiding Judge And As The Judge-In-Charge Of Presiding Over Assigning A Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 3rd Motion For Disqualification Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Due To His Continuous Law Fare In Repeatedly And Deliberately Breaching Of The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Plea To Our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 3rd Motion To Judge D. Robinson, Jr. For A Hearing On Her Motions 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, the Defendant is informing Judge D. Robinson Jr. that, on 1-21-25, she sent by certified mail her "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on the Defendant's website), which, amongst other things, requests that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, or the newly appointed U.S. Attorney for Maryland to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's Official Complaint to the Commission mailed on 12-16-24 (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) and stated, again, in her "Pleads", namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or deliberately breaching 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. & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. Moreover, our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the newly appointed U.S. Attorney for Maryland have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, have access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges. 2.) For the 3rd time, the evidence of the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 3-3-25, which respond to one of the Defendant's 2nd separate Motions docketed 2-28-25, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. continues to deliberately engage in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to failing to: a.) consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order the if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions substantiate sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's being granted her "Relief Requested", as afforded her under the 2nd Amendment, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunition. b.) consider, disclose, and resolve if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 2-28-25 and in her other Motions support the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judges, has redundantly and intentionally 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 his refusal to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order if the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were repeatedly and/or deliberately violated by the previous presiding Judges. 3.) For the 3rd time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare by infringing upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 28 455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would be biased and/or impartial

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 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, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified

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

since: a.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his privileged 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 are being alleged, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant's Motions from her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City and cited as Exhibits on the Defendant's website, whose website address is stated in her Motions to Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and all of the other former presiding Judges. b.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 2-28-25 to have invaded upon 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 Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 4.) For the 3rd time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to grant the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

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.

As stated in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 2-28-25 and in her other Motions, because of the Defendant's financial hardship at this time, she is unable to afford the cost of printing copies of all of her numerous and lengthy Motions, Official Complaints, and other material evidence on her website, www.DianaWilliams.org, that need to be submitted into the record as evidence to further substantiate the allegations that the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been repetitiously and/or intentionally violated by Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and all of the former presiding. Thus, it is the Defendant's request that, since she give the Exhibit Number on her website to each of her signed and dated Motions, her Official Complaints, and other documents when citing the document, that all of these documents be submitted as more evidence into the record of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County.

According to online research, Law fare includes an attempt to damage or delegitimize an opponent, or to deter an individual's usage of his/her legal rights. In her letter that was sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads, amongst other things, that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed DOJ, Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S. Attorney for Maryland to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 "Pleads" namely, that of determining whether the evidence substantiate the assertions that the Defendant is being redundantly and/or deliberately denied her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15th amendments because Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching 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 & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, which prevents the Defendant from being granted her relief requested, namely, that of being granting right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets. Moreover, the following are more material facts and legal arguments which substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr., the presiding Judge, continues to intentionally engage in Law fare in redundantly and willingly invading upon 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 & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 2-311 by failing to give sufficient legal and factual basis for his denial of the Defendant's "Relief Requested", which is simply that of granting the

Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition: 1.) The evidence of a copy postage and receipt from the local Post Office substantiate that the Defendant sent a certified document sent to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump on 1-21-25, in which the Defendant pleads, amongst other things, that our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump assigns the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, or the newly appointed U.S. Attorney for Maryland to conduct an investigation into the allegations declared in the Defendant's 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 "Pleads" namely, that the evidence substantiate the allegations that the Defendant is being redundantly and/or deliberately denied her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunition because Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare by repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching 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 & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to prevent the Defendant from being granted her relief requested in her numerous Motions, namely, that of being granted her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets. Moreover, our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, has access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges. 2.) The evidence provided during the 6-9-24 hearing before the presiding Judge, Judge Glass, on the Defendant's Motions n docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website), which is in the record before Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and which substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully completed the requirements mandated in the 4-page 2-year Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey dated 5-20-21 (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 2-28-25 and is Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website). 3.) The evidence of the testimony of the State of Maryland, the opposing party, cited during the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass, namely, that the State of Maryland would not oppose the Defendant repossessing her firearm and 15 bullets since the Defendant had fulfilled the State of Maryland's requirement of waiting 3 years before being granted an expungement of her records. 4.) The Defendant is alleging that the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in all of her Motions from which Judge D. Robinson presided over (Exhibits 223, 219, and 192, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and the evidence of the facts stated in Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Findings and Orders, which responds to the Defendant's Motions and which are written on at the top of the first page of the Defendant's Motions, substantiate her allegations that Judge D. Robinson Jr. continues to use Law fare in her present criminal cases because the evidence in his Findings and Orders substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. has failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Orders: a.) any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 2-28-25 or any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's previous Motions in which Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was the presiding Judge. 5.) The evidence during the 6-9-24 hearing of Judge Glass verbally granting the Defendant her plea in her Motions to have her record expunge substantiate that the Defendant has successfully completed the requirements mandated in the 4-page 2-year Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey dated 5-20-21. 6.) At the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website), which include a Motion for expungement of her criminal record, Judge Glass

informed the Defendant that she has to Order a Stay on the granting of the Defendant's expungement in order to allow the Motion for the granting of her legally owned firearm and ammunition can be resolved before Judge S. Bailey, otherwise the Defendant would not be able to have file a hearing on her Motion or file any other Motion because an expungement implies that the case no longer exists. 7.) As proclaimed in the Defendant's Motions entered on the Court's website on 7-10-24 (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant's website), which respond to Judge Bailey's Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 and stated at the top of the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website), during the 6-9-24 hearing, the attorney representing the State of Maryland informed Judge Glass that, since the Defendant had fulfilled her requirement of waiting 3 years for an expungement of her Records, the State of Maryland would not disagree with the Defendant having repossession of her firearm and 15 ammunition. 8.) Although the Defendant continues to forward a copy of all of her Motions to the State of Maryland as evidenced by the Certificate of Service in the Defendant's Motions, the Defendant is aware that the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified at the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass that the State of Maryland would not object to the Defendant having repossession of her firearm and ammunition. 9.) The material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions support the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge, failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings: a.) the Defendant's allegations that the former presiding Judges have redundantly and/or intentionally 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 their refusing to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings if the evidence substantiate that the Defendant had since 5-23-23 successfully been in compliance with all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21 and, therefore, the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repurchase her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets must be granted. b.) the Defendant's allegations that her Motions docketed on 7-10-24 has yet to be presided over by Judge D. Robinson although the Defendant has made the request all of her Motions presided over by Judge D. Robinson and in her Motions presided over by the former Judges, especially Judge S. Bailey since these Motions respond to Judge S. Bailey Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 and declared at the top of the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website). 10.) For the 3rd time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare by violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would be biased and/or impartial since: a.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his privileged 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 to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crime in the Defendant's Motions in her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Motions which are cited on Defendant's website, whose website address is stated in her Motions filed in this Circuit Court and, thereby, accessible to Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and all of the other former presiding Judges. b.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr., the presiding Judge, and the Judge-in-Charge of assigning himself to be the presiding Judge over the Defendant's Motions, although Judge D. Robinson is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's

Motions to have invaded upon her 14th Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 2-18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a). 11.) The evidence of the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Order (written at the top of the Defendant's Motions docketed on 2-28-25, which are Exhibits 223 and 224, respectively, on the Defendant's website, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions, from which Judge D. Robinson, Jr. responds to in his Findings and Orders, substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was obligated to determine 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 as alleged in the Defendant's Motions since the evidence substantiate the material facts that Judge R. Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders, which respond to the Defendant's Motions (Exhibits, 190, 190', 191, 189, and 187', respectively, on the Defendant's website) if the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 were breached due to Judge S. Bailey violating 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 Judge S. Bailey's refusal to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets, especially in light of the material fact that the Defendant had since 5-23-23 successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. 12.) The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 4 separate Motions docketed since 7-10-24 Motions (Exhibits 188, 189-193', and 219-220, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge R. Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, 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 from other documents on the Defendant's website. 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 in the Circuit Court in Baltimore City and to recognize that that the present Governor 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 by the Defendant 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. 13.) After researching the background of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and discovering 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, the Defendant, also, research the background of Judge Glass and discovered that she was appointed to her superlative Administrative by Martin O'Malley. 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. And, on 12-14-24, after going on line to research the background of Judge Alexander, it was discovered that Judge Alexander was, too, appointed in 2010 by Martin O'Malley, who, along with Wes Moore and Larry Hogan, 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. 14.) As a result of having access to the Defendant's website which contain the Defendant's Motions in her present civil litigation in Baltimore City Circuit Court, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Glass, and Judge S. Bailey had access to reading the Defendant Motions which allege 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 misconduct in office, and/or other committed other crimes Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Glass, and Judge S. Bailey should have voluntarily disqualified and recused themselves, and their Orders should be deemed void and of no effect as a matter of law, as have been upheld in cases before the Supreme Court, 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 and/or as Circuit Court Judges by Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley and/or by Larry Hogan, all of whom are being asserted in the Defendant's present civil litigation, along with former Chief Judge Barbera and/or other government officials, 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 transgress 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. 15.) 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 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, he, 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 in violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11and Maryland Rule 2-311. 16.) On 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that there was an appearance of an Officer of the Court, the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial and, removed the Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an "appearance of impropriety" and declared that "this is the rare case in which disqualification is mandated and no other remedy will suffice to restore public confidence in the integrity of these proceedings." ...

If Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would grant the Defendant's repeated Motions for a hearing on her Motions, then Judge D. Robinson, Jr would have the opportunity to provide tangible evidence to substantiate sufficient legal or factual basis for is repeated denials of the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right, namely, to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition. Judge D. Robinson, Jr. as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of assigning himself to preside over Defendant's Motions, has access to the evidence in the record which, irrefutably, substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and the former presiding Judges have engaged in Law fare due to repeatedly and/or intentionally violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of infringing upon the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and her 15 ammunition and refuse to grant the Defendant a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and all of the other former presiding Judges should be cognizant of the material fact that they are engaging in Law fare (and in the case of Judge. D. Robinson, Jr. and Judge Cahill have repetitiously engaged in Law fare) by redundantly and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of infringing upon the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and her 15 ammunition since the evidence, unequivocally, substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 5-20-21 2-year Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey and that there is no statement in the Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey that declares that the Defendant can't repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition upon successfully completing Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervisor Order. The Defendant, who is alleging that she was has witnessed for over a quarter of a century the corruption in our judicial system by Officers of the Court, stands in 100% agreement with the declaration proclaimed on the media on 3-19-25 by our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, namely, that "We have rogue Judges that are destroying our country."

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 March 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1.) 1st

Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion For Disqualification Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. As The Presiding Judge And As The Judge-In-Charge Of Presiding Over Assigning A Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 3rd Motion For Disqualification Of Judge D.

Robinson, Jr. Due To His Continuous Law Fare In Repeatedly And Deliberately Breaching Of The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C.,

Section 242 Due To Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Plea To our 45th - 47th Hon.

President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 3rd Motion To Judge D. Robinson, Jr. For A Hearing On Her Motions 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: Our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland

Arena Williams
131 Calver Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Circuit Court for Baltimore County
County Courts Building
P.O. Box 6754
Pawson, Md. 21285-6754

Attention: Supervisory Clerk: Ms. Kira