
IN THE MATTER OF

STATE OF MARYLAND

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

VS.

BALTIMORE COUNTY

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

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

1.) 1ST MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION

OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-27-24, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 9TH MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT OF

ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND/OR TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS

ENTIRETY, OTHERWISE, THE PRESIDING JUDGE, JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. IS ENGAGING IN LAW FARE BY BREACHING, FOR THE 4TH TIME, THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND

AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND THE DEFENDANT'S CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S 1-21-25 PLEADS 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 4TH MOTION TO JUDGE D.

ROBINSON, JR. FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND

RULE 2-311

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant's: 1.) 1ST Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed on 8-27-24, Which Is The Defendant's 9th Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And/Or To Continue The Stay On The Expungement Of Judge Glass' Order Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, The Presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Is Engaging In Law Fare By Breaching, For The 3rd Time, The Defendant's 14th Amendment right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And The Defendant's Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleads To Our Hon. 45th—47th President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 4th Motion To Judge D. Robinson, Jr.

For A Hearing On The 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: 1.) For second 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, which, amongst other things, request that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed DOJ, the newly appointed 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 Official Complaint to the Commission mailed on 12-16-24 on Judicial Disabilities 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, Attorney K. Hayes, 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 9th time, the Defendant is motioning a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Order issued on 8-27-24 and/or to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this Criminal Case is resolved in its entirety, with the legal and factual basis being that, without the Stay on the expungement, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist. 3.) For the 4th 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 due to violating Maryland Rule 2-311 in failing to allow the opposing party, the State of Maryland, a time limit of 15 days to respond to the Defendant's Motion before issuing his Findings and Order. 4.) For the 4th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare in breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by denying the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

INTRODUCTION

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, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in 2nd Chronicles 19: 6-7, king Jehoshaphat, one of the kings of

And, pronounces to judges why they should not be impartial and/or biased in their judgment, "And said to the Judges, Take heed what ye do: for ye judge not for man, but for the LORD, who is with you in the judgment: Wherefore now let the fear of the LORD be upon you, take heed and do it; for there is no iniquity with the LORD our GOD, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts."

STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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. The evidence of the material facts cited in the Defendant's 4 separate Motions from which Judge D. Robinson presided over, which are cited as Exhibits on the Defendant's website, www.dionna-williams.com, and the evidence of the Findings and Orders of Judge D. Robinson, Jr., which are stamped on the first page of the Defendant's Motions (Exhibits 188, 189-193, 219-220, 231, and 232, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate the material facts that the instant Motions include the Defendant's 4th Motion to the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., for a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, her 9th Motion to continue the Stay on the expungement Of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024, and her 4th Motion to Judge to Judge D. Robinson, Jr to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Order docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until the Defendant's criminal case is resolved in its entirety. As evidenced in the record, during the hearing on 6-9-24, the presiding Judge on , Judge Glass granted the Defendant's Motion for Expungement of her record but informed the Defendant and the Attorney representing the State of Maryland that, if there is no stay on the execution of the Defendant's expungement, then the Defendant would no longer have a criminal case existing and, thus, could not have her Motion for repossession of her firearm and 15 ammunition to be considered, disclosed, and resolved by Judge S. Bailey, the Judge who presided over the Defendant's proceedings on 5-20-21, nor would any other Judge preside over her case because the Defendant's case would no longer exist. The Defendant alleges that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to criminal cases, should be knowledgeable of the fact that, if he continues to deny the Defendant's repeated Motions for a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Orders for expungement of

Judges to criminal cases, then he would not have to grant the Defendant's 4th Motion for a hearing on her Motions in order to consider, disclose, and resolve whether the evidence substantiate that he, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has violated, for the 4th time, 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 because the evidence substantiate the following material facts and legal arguments, which are cited in the last 4 separate Motions from which Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the presiding Judge, are declared in the Defendant's other Motions, and/or are asserted in the "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, namely, that: 1.) The Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 by Judge S. Bailey and there is no statement in her Probation/Supervision Order 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. 2.) In all of the Defendant's Motions, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his Findings and Orders, the Defendant states the material facts and legal arguments in her Motions substantiate the allegations that there is no legal or factual basis for Judge S. Bailey, the original Finder of Fact, denying the Defendant's relief requested, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition because: a.) The evidence in the record of the testimony given by the Defendant during the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website) before Judge Glass, the presiding Judge, 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). b.) Also, the evidence of the testimony cited during the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass by the State of Maryland, the opposing party, 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 substantiate that the Defendant has successfully completed the requirements mandated in the 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued by Judge S. Bailey on 5-20-21. c.) Moreover, the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified during the hearing before Judge Glass on 6-9-24 that, in the Probation/Supervision Order signed on 5-20-21 by Judge S. Bailey, the Order does not declare that the Defendant could not repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets after successfully completing the mandates in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order; then, the Attorney representing the State of Maryland, walked over to the Defendant's table to show the Defendant a copy of the Probation/Supervision Order, although she wasn't aware that the Defendant had own her copy of the same document until she saw the Defendant looking at the same Order. d.) 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. 3.) The Defendant alleges that evidence before Judge D. Robinson, Jr., presiding Judge, and that was before all of the former presiding Judges substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the other presiding Judges erred in failing to determine if the evidence support the material facts that 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 repetitiously and/or intentionally violated by Judge D. Robinson and all of the former presiding Judges because these Officers of the Court repeatedly and/or deliberately failed to consider, disclose, and resolve if Judge S. Bailey, erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 due to there being no legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's her legally own firearm and 15 bullets; again, the evidence in the record substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the requirements in her Probation/Supervision Order and, therefore, Judge S. Bailey's denial breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242. 4.) For the 4th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has intentionally denied the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to

General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney Hayes, have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, has access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and all of the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges.


ARGUMENT

Judge D. Robinson Jr. should be cognizant of the material fact that, if he denies the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record, then there would be an automatic denial of the Defendant's Motion for a hearing on her other Motions, which include a 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 and her Motion for a hearing on her Motions. Moreover, as the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over criminal cases and as the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. should be cognizant of the material facts that not one of the 4 former presiding Judges granted the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions, although the Defendant has repeatedly motioned for a hearing on her Motions and a Motion for a Stay on the 8-27 and 9-13-24 Orders by Judge Glass until the her case is resolved in its entirety, otherwise the issue of determining if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 by infringing upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to adhere to her 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 would never be considered, disclosed, and resolved.

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 5th day of April 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1.) 1st Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed on 8-27-24, which is The Defendant's 9th Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And/Or To Continue The Stay On The Expungement Of Judge Glass' Order Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, The Presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Is Engaging In Law Fare By Breaching,

For The 3rd Time, The Defendant's 14th Amendment right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And The Defendant's Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleads To Our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On The Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 4th Motion To Judge D. Robinson, Jr. For A Hearing On The 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: 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the newly FBI, Mr. K Patel, and U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes

Anaia Williams
131 Calvin Hall Ct.
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Circuit Court for Balto. County
County Courts Building
P.O. Box 6754

Towson, Md. 21285-6754
Attention: Supervisory Clerk: Ms. Tina