

ALL REQUESTS FOR RELIEF CONSIDERED AND  
RESPECTFULLY DENIED.

Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for  
Baltimore County, MD  
October 4, 2024

IN THE MATTER OF

STATE OF MARYLAND

10/06/2024 7:46:36 AM

Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for  
Baltimore County, MD  
October 11, 2024

cc: SAO, DEF.OPD

Robert E. Cahill, Jr.

IN THE

CIRCUIT COURT

VS.

FOR

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

BALTIMORE COUNTY

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN ANOTHER JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION GERMANE TO JUDGE ALEXANDER'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 9-25-24 BECAUSE IN THE INSTANT MOTION JUDGE ALEXANDER IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AND MOTION**

**FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTION**

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant's Motion To Have The Judge-In-Charge Over Criminal Cases To Assign Another Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motion For Reconsideration Germane To Judge Alexander's Order Docketed On 9-25-24 Because In The Instant Motion Judge Alexander Is Being Alleged To Have Violated The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right And her Civil right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 And Motion For A Hearing On The Motion 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: 1.) For the 1<sup>st</sup> time, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge Alexander's Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions (along with the two accompanying 2 Exhibits), from which Judge Alexander responds to in her Findings and Order, substantiate that Judge Alexander has violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup>

Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242. The evidence of Judge Alexander only having the word, "DENIED" stamped on the copy of the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions mailed to the Defendant on 9-25-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, from which Judge Alexander responds to in her Order docketed 9-25-24 substantiate the material facts that Judge Alexander infringed upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by failing to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the materials facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 9-page Motions which substantiates the allegations that the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were violated by Judge S. Bailey's, the presiding Judge's due Judge S. Bailey infringing upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets, although since 5-21-23, the evidence substantiate that the Defendant had successfully complied with all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. 2.) For the 1<sup>st</sup> time, Judge Alexander has breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 in denying the Defendant her right to have a Hearing on the Motions as requested by the Defendant and as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

#### **STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

The evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-4-24, substantiate the allegation that Judge Alexander fails to cite a single piece of evidence to support of her denial of the Defendant's Motions, but has completely ignored the Rule of Law due to infringing upon the Defendant's her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to disclose, consider, and resolve, amongst other things, if by Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by unlawfully denying the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 ammunitions and not upholding her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order. As evidenced by the Order from Judge Alexander, which was docketed on 9-25-24, Judge Alexander's only response to the Defendant's 9-page Motions docketed on 9-4-24 is to have stamped on the copy of the Defendant's Motions the word, "DENIED", thus, failing to state any evidence and/or fact that would justify her denial of the Defendant's Motions and then denying the Defendant's Motion for a hearing on her Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. The Heading in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions is entitled **1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF ASSIGNING JUDGES TO CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN JUDGE M. GLASS TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S: a) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF HER ORDERS ENTERED BY THE CLERK ON 8-27-24 IN THIS CASE UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY. b.) 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION BY THE DEFENDANT TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE M. GLASS' ORDER ENTERED IN THIS CASE ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY. c.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A HEARING ON THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND ON THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS DOCKETED ON 7-10-24 AS PROVIDED**

**UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES ORDER THAT THE DEFENDANT'S CASE CONTINUES TO APPEAR ON THE COURT'S WEBSITE, "CASE SEARCH"**

Moreover, the evidence of the fact stated in and/or the lack thereof of fact cited in Judge Alexander's Order and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions substantiate the material facts that Judge Alexander fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts in the Defendant's Motions to substantiate the Defendant's allegations that her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were infringed upon by the presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 which respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed 6-1-23. The material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed 9-4-24, include the following: 1.) Due to successfully completing on 5-20-23 all of the conditions mandated in the 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, which is Exhibit 1 in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, the Defendant mailed her Motion<sup>s</sup> on 5-30-23, which amongst other things, plead to have her firearm and 15 ammunitions returned to the Defendant. The Defendant's Motions were docketed on 6-1-23 and the Heading in her Motions is entitled "1. Motion To Have The Defendant's legal Firearm And Ammunitions Returned To The Defendant. 2. Motion To Have The Defendant's Record Expunged". 2.) In the body of the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23, she declares that,..."According to the Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21, the Defendant was ordered Probation before Judgment (Criminal Procedure Article & 6-220) for two years, with no supervision, to have no contact with the victim, Amy Penn, to surrender firearms, and may not own or possess a firearm during her probationary period. With today being 5-30-23, the evidence of the material fact that the Defendant record available to the Court substantiates the material fact that the Defendant has honored all of her probation requirement. Since the Defendant's has satisfied the Court's requirement in complying with all conditions, the Defendant is pleading that the Court dismiss the action against the Defendant and, thus, no criminal proceeding will take place, and, therefore, the State Prosecutor and/or the Police Department do not need to continue to hold the Defendant's legal firearm and her 15 bullets for evidence during the criminal proceedings. During the arrest of the Defendant on 10-19-20, the police confiscated the Defendant's gun which was inside the Defendant's blue gun case which was closed, six ammunitions inside the gun, 9 ammunitions, a thumb drive, a piece of paper with notes written it, and the certificate indicating the Defendant's ownership of the firearm underneath the sponge inside the gun case. On this same day and as witnessed by the Defendant's soulmate, Mr. Jimmy Porter, a police officer returned the Defendant's blue gun case and all of the Defendant's items except for her firearm which was loaded with 6 ammunitions and the Defendant's 9 ammunitions with were under the sponge in the Defendant's gun case. Consequently, the Defendant is pleading that her firearm and 15 ammunitions be returned to the Defendant in a timely manner. Furthermore, the Defendant is pleading that, since she has successfully complied with her 2-year unsupervised probation, the Defendant no longer has a conviction on your record. Therefore, the Defendant is, also, pleading that the Court has her record be expunged as soon as possible." ... 3.) On 6-9-24, there was a hearing on the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23, presiding over by Judge M. Glass. Amongst her Findings and Orders dated 6-13-24 relating to the 6-9-24 hearing, Judge M. Glass cites that .... "The Court STAYED the entry of the Order

for Expungement of Records for thirty days", and Judge J. Glass, also, ORDERED that the "undersigned Court's review of the Court File, the Order for Probation, docketed May 20, 2021, states Petitioner was ordered to "surrender firearms." Additionally, a docket entry from the date of sentencing that "all items seized [are] to be forfeited to the forfeiting authority." As such, this matter SHALL be forwarded to the sentencing Court for consideration of the request to have the seized firearm and ammunition returned to Petitioner as requested in Petitioners' Motion docketed on June 1, 2023." ...

4.) In response to Judge M. Glass' Order dated 6-13-24, 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 (Exhibit 1 that accompanied the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions), ruled on the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 as evidenced in her Findings and Order entered on the Court's website on 6-25-24. 5.) The evidence of the facts cited in and/or lack thereof of facts stated in Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Order entered on the Court's website on 6-25-24, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23, from which Judge S. Bailey respond to in her Findings entered the Court's website on 6-24-23, substantiate the material facts that Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to permit the Defendant to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions although the evidence in the record substantiate that the Defendant had satisfactorily complied with all of the conditions in Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order and that Judge S. Bailey did not include in her Probation/Supervision Order that the Defendant will not be allowed to repossess her firearm and 15 ammunitions after successfully complying with her Order. 6.) As of 5-20-23, the Defendant successfully maintained and complied with all of the conditions under Judge S. Bailey's two year mandates in her 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21 and has successfully completed the States 3- year probation requirement before permitting the expungement of the Defendant's criminal case. 7.) Since 5-20-23, the evidence substantiate that the Defendant has successfully maintained and complied with all of the conditions under Judge S. Bailey's two year mandate as ordered in her 4-page Probation/Supervision Order 5-20-21, the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervisory Order and the conditions stipulated under the Order signed by the presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, are no longer in effect and/or applicable to the Defendant. 8.) In her Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 6-25-24, Judge Bailey doesn't cite specifically what Court Recording and documents contained in the Court record that would justify her denying the Defendant's 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and ammunitions. 9.) 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 Firmearm (sic) [should be "Firearm"] and Ammunitions Returned is hereby DENIED". 10.) As proclaimed in the Defendant's Motions entered on the Court's website on 7-10-24 and which respond to Judge Bailey's Findings and Order entered on 6-25-24 on the Court's website, 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 receiving expungement and of the repossession of her firearm and ammunitions. 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. After this statement, 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 Judge S. Bailey's 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, namely, condition number 33 box, whose box is checked and the only statement written is "Surrender firearms and Def may not own or possess a firearm". The Defendants declares that she her copy of this same Order and was, already looking at the same page when the attorney representing the State of Maryland came over to the Defendant's seating. 11.) The Defendant is asserting that, during the 5-20-21 hearing before Judge Bailey, she does not recall hearing Judge Bailey assert that she was mandating that the "forfeiting" of the Defendant 's firearm and ammunitions as part the plea bargain. 12.) The Defendant is asserting that, prior to and/or during the hearing on 5-20-21, the Public Defender never informed the Defendant that the Public Defendant's Office had agreed with the State of Maryland to settle for a plea bargain and that the plea bargain would include having the Defendant's legally owned firearm and ammunitions "forfeited". 13.) The Defendant is alleging that during the only meeting with this Public Defender, namely, the meeting they had before the hearing on 5-20-21, the Public Defender's responses assured her that he had neither read any of the Defendants emails forwarded to the attorney whom she had prior to his representing her, namely, Attorney Coleman, especially her email forwarded to Attorney Coleman on 11-6-21 (Exhibit 1) and the Defendant's Official Complaint to the President of the U.S. and others government officials against the Police Department, the State of Prosecutor's Office, and others. In her Official Complaint, which the Defendant alleges that she mailed a copy to Attorney Coleman on 11-20-21, the Defendant asserts, amongst other things, the tampering with evidence as it relates to the Defendant's firearms and/or ammunitions and/or gun case , removal of evidence relevant to the Defendant's firearms and/or ammunitions , and fraud in the facts stated in police report from the Police Department and/or in the charging documents of the State Prosecutor's office germane to the Defendant's firearms and/or ammunitions. 14.) The Defendant is alleging that this email, her Official Complaint, and/or other emails and Addendum to her Official Complaint against the Police Department, the State Prosecutors Office, and other agencies which has been forwarded to our Hon. President of the U.S. are included on the Defendant's website as Exhibits 83-86 and Exhibits 88-91. 15.) 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 ammunitions forfeited as part of any plea bargain. 16.) The Defendant is asserting 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 ammunitions. 17.) 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 ammunitions 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 ammunitions, she [the Defendant] would have certainly not agreed to a plea bargain. 18.) 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. 19.) Also, during the hearing on 6-12-24, the attorney representing the State of Maryland informed the Court that, since the Defendant had fulfilled her requirement for expungement by the State of Maryland, the State of Maryland would not disagree with the Defendant receiving her firearm and ammunitions. 20.) During the hearing on 6-12-24, the State of Maryland informed the presiding Judge that, in mandates in Judge Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, there is no citing that the Defendant's firearm and ammunition are forfeited as part of the Probation/Supervision Order, and the attorney from the State of Maryland walked over to the Defendant's side of the Court and showed the Defendants a copy of Judge Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, although the State of Maryland did not know that the Defendant had her copy of this same Order with her. 21.) In responding to Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Order entered on the Circuit Court's website on 6-25-24, the Defendant mailed her Motions on 6-28-24 to the Court and the other party as evidenced by the 6-28-24 receipt from the local post office (Exhibit 2 that accompanied the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions), although the Defendant's Motions were entered on the Circuit Court's website on 7-10-24. The two attachments to the Defendant's 6-28-24 Motions are entered on 7-11-24 on the Circuit Court's website under the title of "Supporting Exhibit", and "Supporting Exhibit 1" is on the Defendant's website, *M. W. Diana Williams.com*, as Exhibit 83 and Supporting Exhibit 2" is on the Defendant's website as Exhibit 91. The Heading in the Defendant's 7-10-24 Motions entered on the Circuit Court's website on 7-10-24 is entitled "1.) MOTION TO HAVE A RECONSIDERATION OF THE COURT'S ORDER FILED ON 6-25-24. 2.) MOTION TO HAVE A HEARING ON THE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 3. MOTION TO HAVE THE COURT'S ORDER FILED ON 6-12-24 TO STAY THE DEFENDANT'S EXPUGEMENT FOR 30 DAYS BE EXTENDED UNTIL THE CASE IS RESOLVED". 22.) In the body of her Motions mailed entered on the Circuit Court's website on 7-10-24, the Defendant asserts that ... "According to the Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 by the presiding Judge, Judge Bailey, the Defendant was ordered Probation before Judgment (Criminal Procedure Article & 6-220) for two years, with no supervision, to have no contact with the victim, Amy Penn, to surrender firearms, and may not own or possess a firearm during her probationary period. Furthermore, as evidenced by the transcript of the hearing on 6-12-24 before the presiding Judge, the State of Maryland confirmed that the Defendant has, also, completed their required 3 year probationary period, and, therefore, the State of Maryland declared during the hearing that the Defendant meets the qualification for having her record to be expunged and that the State of Maryland will not deny the Defendant her right to have her legally owned firearm and ammunitions returned to her. Therefore, the Defendant is alleging that her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 241, and/or the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 have been violated by Judge Bailey's Findings and Order filed by the clerk on 6-25-24 which responds to Defendant's 5-30-23 Motions due to, amongst other things, the material facts that the Defendant has honored all of her probation requirements as, also, reiterated in the 6-13-24 Findings and Order by the presiding Judge.... Further, Judge Bailey fails to include in her Findings and Order filed 6-25-24 any tangible evidence, indicating the specific "Court Recording" or "document" that she alleges substantiate her Finding and Order, but simply alleges in her Findings and Order that "After review of the Court Recording and documents contained in the Court file, the Motion to Have Defendant's legal Firemearm [should be "Firearm"] (sic) and Ammunitions Returned



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se


131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 1<sup>st</sup> day of October 2024, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing Motion To Have The Judge-In-Charge Over Criminal Cases To Assign Another Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motion For Reconsideration Germane To Judge Alexander's Order Docketed On 9-25-24 Because In The Instant Motion Judge Alexander Is Being Alleged To Have Violated The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right And her Civil right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 And Motion For A Hearing On The Motion was mailed, postage paid to: Baltimore County State Attorney, 401 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland, 21204.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

is hereby DENIED". 23.) As evidenced in the 6-13-24 Order by the Court, the Court granted the Petitioner's request for expungement, which substantiate that the Defendant had completed the requirements as mandated in Judge Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order and has been in compliance with the mandate for expungement by the State of Maryland since 5-21-24. 24.) As evidenced in the Defendant's Motion dated 10-1-24 whose Heading is entitled "2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN JUDGE GLASS TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDERS DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY AND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS". 25.) The Defendant is alleging that it is essential that the presiding Judge who issued the 6-13-24 Finding and Order, which included ordering a 30-day stay on the expungement, order another extension to "stay the expungement until the case is resolved, since during the 6-12-24 hearing, the Court informed the parties that she was ordering a "stay of 30 days on the expungement Order, otherwise the case would be dismissed and the Defendant would no longer have a case and her right to have her 5-30-21 Motions considered, disclosed, and resolved by Judge Bailey. 26.) In her Order responding to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, Judge Alexander simply has stamped at the top of the copy of the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions received by the Defendant on 10-28-24 the word "DENIED", thus, failing to disclose, consider, and resolve a single material fact and legal argument in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions and cited above and refused to grant the Defendant a hearing on the Motions as requested by the Defendant and permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. 27.) The Defendant is alleging in that the evidence substantiate the material facts in these instant Motions mailed on 10-1-24 that Judge Alexander has infringed upon the Defendant's her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to disclose, consider, and resolve, amongst other things, if by Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by unlawfully denying the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 ammunitions. 28.) The Defendant is asserting that Judge Alexander would be infringing upon her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 the Defendant's if Judge Alexander fails to voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding Judge due to there being an appearance that she would be biased and/or impartial in presiding over these instant Motions due to her being in alleged in the Motion for Reconsideration of violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. in failing to Order the Defendant's firearm and 15 ammunitions returned to her because the Defendant has successfully complied with all the conditions under Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order.

### CONCLUSION

Thus, in conclusion, the Defendant pleads that the Court grants her Motions.

Respectively Submitted