

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: 1.) 1st Motion To Have Another Administrative Judge, Who Was Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley, Former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, And/Or By Wes Moore, To Preside Over Assigning As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges, And To, Also, Assign Judges Who Were Not Appointed by Martin O'Malley, Former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, And/Or By Wes Moore To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motion For Reconsideration Of Disqualification Of Judge Dorsey, Charles, III As The Presiding Judge And That His 4 Separate Findings

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

1.) 1st MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND THAT HIS 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 BE DEEMED VOID AND OF NO EFFECT UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENODICE. 2.)

IN THE MATTER

THE PETITION OF

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE CITY

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

DEC 25 2024

and Orders Docketed On 12-16-24 Be Deemed Void And Of No Effect Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) Since The Evidence Substantiate The Allegations That Judge Dorsey, Charles, III Has Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Because, Amongst Other Things, There Is An Appearance That Judge Dorsey, Charles, III Would Be Biased And/Or Impartial Due To Being Appointed In 2016 By Larry Hogan, Who, Along With Martin O'Malley, Former Chief Judge Barbera, And/or Wes Moore, Is Being Alleged In These Instant Motions And Other Motions To Have Impinged Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide And/or Has Attempted To And/Or Has Conspired To Trespass Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

CR 59 (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 Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner are that: 1.) For the first time, the Petitioner has attached as Exhibit 1 a copy of part of the evidence in the Petitioner's 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission for Judicial Disabilities against Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, Judge, against Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over Judges to preside over civil cases, against the other presiding Judge, namely, Judge M. Schreiber, II, and against the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Karen Friedman, and Judge Fletcher-Hill, and has as Exhibit 194 on her website, www.diana.rwlliams.com, a copy of her entire Official Complaint to the Commission for Judicial Disabilities all of the 10 Judges who has, thus far has presided over the Petitioner's civil litigation. 2.) For the first time, Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III has violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law by: a.) transgressing Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and/or Maryland Rule 18,102.11, committing "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with Interstate Commerce if he refuses to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review as ordered under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to there being an appearance that Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be impartial and/or biased because of his: i.) privileged appointment in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan (hereinafter "Larry Hogan"), who, along with another former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley (hereinafter "Martin O'Malley), former Chief Judge Barbera, and the present Governor Maryland, Wes Moore (hereinafter "Wes Moore), is being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to usurp Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. ii.) being the presiding Judge to preside over the Petitioner's instant Motions in which, he, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III is alleged to have breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, is being alleged to have trespassed Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and Maryland Rule 2-311. b.) encroaching upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over the

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.

Germane 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

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

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

Petitioner's Motions for a Hearing since the Petitioner's Motions for a Hearing are Motions from her appeal of her initial civil litigation in an In Banc Review in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City.

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.

In regard to the written Maryland Rules in Civil and Criminal proceedings, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 asserts that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned.

Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) Hearing--Other Motions states that "A party desiring a hearing on a motion, other than a motion filed pursuant to Rule 2-532, 2-533, or 2-534, shall request the hearing in the motion or response under the heading "Request for Hearing. The title of the motion or response shall state that a hearing is requested. Except when a rule expressly provides for a hearing, the court shall determine in each case whether a hearing will be held, but the court may not render a decision that is dispositive of a claim or defense without a hearing if one was requested as provided in this section."

Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution asserts that, in an In Banc Review, a panel of 3 Judges shall preside over the In Banc Review proceedings.

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying for maintenance of her website so that the Petitioner can continue to post Motions, Findings and Orders from the presiding Judges, and other relevant Exhibits that are and/or will be included during Discovery in the Petitioner present civil litigation. Although on a fixed income, the Petitioner is now able to make her own payments, but she is unable to afford, at this time, to make copies of all of the pages of all of the Exhibits that will be included in the record. Exhibit 1 is the first page of a copy of page to the Petitioner's 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission for Judicial Disabilities against Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and against Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, against the other presiding Judge, namely, Judge M. Schreiber, II, and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Karen Friedman, and Judge Fletcher-Hill. The Petitioner asserts that her complete 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities can be located on her website as Exhibit 18, 194, which, amongst other things, alleges that her 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, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been repetitiously and/or intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions and as one of the presiding Judges who assigned himself 8 times to preside over the Petitioner's Motions, and have been violated by

the two presiding judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, and Judge M. Schreiber, and by all of the former presiding judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Carron, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman

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."

After researching Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III's background, the Petitioner discovered that he was appointed to the superlative Administrative position by Larry Hogan, who, along with Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and Wes Moore, is being alleged in the Petitioner's civil litigation and/or in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have trespassed Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. Therefore, in her 11-14-24 Motions, the Petitioner filed her 1st Motion for Disqualification of Judge Dorsey, Charles, III. As evidenced in her Motions filed on 11-14-24, the Petitioner proclaims that, if Judge Dorsey, Charles III presides over her Motions for a hearing on her Motions scheduled for 12-06-24, her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, would be violated because 1.) Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11, committing "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with interstate commerce as a result of his refusal to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge as decreed under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to there being an appearance that Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be impartial and/or biased since he was appointed by Larry Hogan, who, along with Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and Wes Moore, is being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 2.) Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be transgressing Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a panel of 3 in Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's appellant proceedings in the In Banc Review, which include the Petitioner's Motions for a Hearing on her Motions filed on 10-15-24, Motions from the Petitioner's her appeal of her initial civil litigation in an In Banc Review in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City.

Also, in her Motions filed on 11-14-24, the Petitioner declares that she looks forward to having the hearing on her Motions scheduled for 12-6-24 with a panel of 3 in Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for In Banc proceedings.

The Petitioner asserts that, when she checked the Circuit Court's website on 12-17-24, she noticed that was stated "Order denying Plaintiff's Request for a Hearing on a Motion for Default Judgment, Plaintiff's Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill, Plaintiff's Motion for Disqualification of Judge Dorsey and the Motions Hearing scheduled for December 6th 2024 be CANCELLED." The Petitioner was informed that Judge Dorsey, Charles, III was the presiding Judge who had given the 3

Orders and who cancelled the 12-6-24-court-scheduled remote hearing on 12-16-24. In her other Motion for Default Judgment filed on 12-23-24, the Petitioner give detail material facts relevant to her being coerced to wait by remote on the telephone for nearly 3 hours after hearing the AI say "good bye" and the telephone disconnect on several occasions.

In her instant Motions, the Petitioner asserts that Judge Dorsey, Charles III has invaded her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, because: 1.) Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III has trespassed Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11, and, since under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Judge Dorsey, Charles, III has committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with Interstate Commerce, his ORDERS must be deemed void and of no effect as a matter of law and according to similar cases of violation under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 that has been brought before the U.S. Supreme because of Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III's refusal to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24 and her 11-14-24 Motions, which includes the Petitioner's 1st Motion for Disqualification of Judge Dorsey, Charles, II as decreed under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to there being an appearance that Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III would be impartial and/or biased since: a.) Judge Dorsey, Charles, III was appointed in 2016 as a Judge in the Baltimore City Circuit Court by Larry Hogan, who is being alleged in my Motions to have impinged upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. b.) Judge is the presiding Judge who is being alleged in the Petitioner's 11-14-24 Motions to have impinged upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18,102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III intruded upon Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a panel of 3 in Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions for a Hearing on my Motions filed on 10-15-24, which are Motions from the Petitioner's appeal of her initial civil litigation in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City.

Moreover, the Petitioner is motioning for a hearing on these Motions.

CONCLUSION

Thus, in conclusion, the Petitioner pleads the Court grants her Motions.

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 23rd day of December 2024, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's 1.) 1st Motion To Have Another Administrative Judge, Who Was Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley, Former

Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, And/OR By Wes Moore, To Preside Over Assigning As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges, And To, Also, Assign Judges Who Were Not Appointed by Martin O'Malley, Former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, And/OR by Wes Moore To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motion For Reconsideration Of Disqualification Of Judge Dorsey, Charles, III As The Presiding Judge And That His 4 Separate Findings and Orders Docketed On 12-16-24 Be Deemed Void And Of No Effect Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) Since The Evidence Substantiate The Allegations That Judge Dorsey, Charles, III Has Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Because, Amongst Other Things, There Is An Appearance That Judge Dorsey, Charles, III Would Be Biased And/OR Impartial Due To Being Appointed In 2016 By Larry Hogan, Who, Along With Martin O'Malley, Former Chief Judge Barbera, And/or Wes Moore, Is Being Alleged In These Instant Motions And Other Motions To Have Impinged Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 -Genocide And/or Has Attempted To And/OR Has Conspired To Trespass Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid, to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd, Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Petitioner is requesting a hearing on her Motions.

CC: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Mr. Conway, Clerk of the Court

Exhibit 1

COMPLAINANT INFORMATION

First Name: Diana
Last Name: Williams
Address: 134 Calvin Hill Ct
City: Balto. State: MD Zip Code: 21222
Phone Number: 410-868-6013
Email: dladysdad@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

JUDGE INFORMATION

First Name: Charles
Last Name: Bersey
Court:

- Supreme Court of Maryland
- Appellate Court of Maryland
- Circuit Court
- District Court
- Orphans' Court

County/City: Balto. City

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:
Case Number (include all letters and numbers): 24-C-17-004535
Case Type:

- Civil
- Criminal
- Family/Domestic
- Juvenile
- Probate
- Traffic
- Protective/Peace Order
- Sexual Harassment
- Other

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

(See Attachment A "for more details")
Since Sept. 2018 I've requested in all of my motions for a hearing on my motions.