

IN THE MATTER  
THE PETITION OF  
DIANA R. WILLIAMS

\* IN THE  
\*  
\* CIRCUIT COURT  
\*  
\* FOR  
\*  
\* BALTIMORE CITY  
\*  
\* Case No. 24-C-17-004535

RECEIVED  
2023 NOV -1 AM 11:30  
CIVIL DIVISION

\*\*\*\*\*1\*\*\*\*\*

1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. 2.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE 10-20-23 JUDGMENT OF JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II DUE TO HIS VIOLATIONS OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C, SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF HIS: A.) VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 IN FAILING TO DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS A PRESIDNG JUDGE DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF HIM BEING IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED BECAUSE OF HIS APPOINTMENT BY THE FORMER GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, LARRY HOGAN, WHO IS, ALSO, BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED 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 . B.) VIOLATING ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE J. GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE J. GELLER, JUDGE JOHN



**NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND/OR INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. E.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY INFRINGED UPON BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL DUE TO HIS REPEATED AND DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ASSIGN A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY WES MOORE, LARRY HOGAN, MARTIN O'MALLEY, CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, OR BY ANY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED 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 IN THE PETITIONER'S 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 4.) 9<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II, JUDGE J. GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND/OR BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A). 5.) 11<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 6.) 7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE 3-21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 8.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN- CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ORDER THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S**

**WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM**

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: 1.) 1<sup>st</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge M. Schreiber II, For Violating The Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To His Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18,102.11 And, Also, Committing "Fraud Upon The Court, Treason To The Constitution, And Interference With Interstate Commerce. 2.) 1<sup>st</sup> Motion To Set Aside 10-20-23 Judgment Of Judge M. Schreiber II Due To His Violations Of The Petitioner's 14<sup>TH</sup> Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of His: A.) Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 In Failing To Disqualify And Recuse Himself As A Presiding Judge Due To The Appearance Of Him Being Impartial And/Or Biased Because Of His Appointment By The Former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, Who Is, Also, Being Alleged To Have Breached 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 . B.) Violating Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution In Failing to Have A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside over the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motion from Her Appeal in the in Banc Review. C.) Failing To Disclose,



Consider, And Resolve In His 10-20-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, If The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repetitiously And/Or Deliberately Violated By Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Due To Their Repeatedly And/Or Intentionally Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And, Also, Repetitiously And/Or Deliberately Committing "Fraud Upon The Court", Treason To The Constitution, And/Or Interference With Interstate Commerce. D.) Failing To Disclose, Consider, And Resolve In His 10-20-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, If The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repetitiously And/Or Deliberately Violated By Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review Due To Their Repeated And/Or Intentional Violation Of Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution In Failing To Grant The Petitioner An Oral Hearing Before The Panel Decided To Deny The Petitioner's Petition For An In Banc Review. E.) Failing To Disclose, Consider, And Resolve In His 10-20-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, If The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repetitiously And Intentionally Infringed Upon By Judge Fletcher-Hill Due To His Repeated And Deliberate Violations Of Maryland 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 1<sup>st</sup> Motion To Have The Judge-In-Charge Of The Civil Division, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Assign A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside Over The Petitioner' In Banc Review Who Were Not Appointed By Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Chief Judge Barbera, Or By Any Government Officials Who Are Being Alleged To Have Breached 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 In The Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions. 4.) 9<sup>TH</sup> Motion For All Judgments By Judge M. Schreiber II, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, The Panel Of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, And/Or By Judge Karen Friedman Be Set Aside And Their Orders And Deem All Of Their Orders Void As A Matter Of Law Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). 5.) 11<sup>th</sup> Motion For A Hearing On The Motions As Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311. 6.) 7<sup>TH</sup> Motion For Reconsideration. 7.) 3<sup>rd</sup> Motion To Set Aside The Judgment Of Judge John Nugent Filed On 3-23-23 Since There Is No Written Or Stamped Signature Of Judge John Nugent On The 3-21-23 Findings And Order. 8.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion To Have The Judge-In-Charge Of The Civil Division, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Order The Clerk To File On The Circuit Court's Website The Heading Of The Petitioner's Motions Verbatim 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, for the first time, Judge M. Schreiber II, has violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law by: 1.) breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11 and have, also, committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the appearance of Judge M. Schreiber II being impartial and/or biased



because of his appointment 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 infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 2.) failing to set aside his judgment filed on 10-20-23 and to deem his Order as void as a matter law due to his infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a ) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 3.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated 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 from her In Banc Review, instead of having himself as the only presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions from her In Banc Review. 4.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's 10<sup>th</sup> Motion for her right to an oral Hearing because the previous presiding Judges, namely, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the 3 panel of In Banc Judges repeatedly denied the Petitioner's right to an oral Hearing as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 5.) failing disclose, consider, and resolve the Petitioner's Motion to set aside the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, due to the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature, which indicate what Judge wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the 8 Motions cited in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which include Motions alleging repeated and/or deliberate violations of the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, breaching the Rule of Law, by Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher, and by all of the other judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation from her Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation (Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin) due to these Officers' of the Court repetitious and/or intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a ), Maryland Rule 18.102.11), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws. 7.) failing disclose, consider, and resolve the 9-8-23 Petitioner's Motion to set aside the judgements of the previous presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the judgments of the other former presiding Judges and to deem all of their Orders void as a matter of law due to their continuous and deliberate breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by not voluntarily disqualifying and recusing themselves due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as a result of their appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are, also, 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. 8.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and



Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order whether and, for the 6<sup>th</sup> time, the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division of the Circuit Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his failure, as the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, who represents the Court, to grant the Petitioner's Motion to assign judges to preside over her civil litigation who were not appointed by government officials are 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, which include Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials. 9.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order if the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, along with Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because these Judges repeatedly and/or deliberately violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to have an oral Hearing before deciding to deny the Petitioner's Petition. 10.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill due to his repeated and deliberate violations of Maryland 18.102.11 5(c). 11.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, and by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and/or intentional failure to grant the Petitioner's 7<sup>TH</sup> Motion For Reconsideration. 12.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, and by John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and/or intentional failure to grant the Petitioner's 11<sup>th</sup> Motion for a Hearing on the Motions as mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311.

## INTRODUCTION

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Petitioner 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



speakech 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 judgment is GOD'S: and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it." Moreover, also, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Jeremiah 9:23-25, the Scripture states "Thus, saith the LORD, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: But, let him that glorieth, glory in this. That he understandeth and knoweth ME, that I am the LORD which exercises loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the LORD. Behold the days come saith the LORD that I will punish all them which are circumcised with the uncircumcised." In the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Proverbs 6:16-19, it states that "These six things doth the LORD hate, yea, seven are an abomination to HIM: a proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, a false witness that speaketh lies, and, he that soweth discord among brethren." Still too, in the HOLY SCRIPTURES, namely, Psalm 34:19 declares "Many are the afflictions of the righteous: but the LORD delivereth him out of them all." Further, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, Isaiah 48:22 cites that "There is no peace, saith the LORD, unto the wicked." Moreover, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, Ezekiel 18:21-23 asserts that "But, if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all MY statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him: in his righteousness that he had done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the LORD GOD: and not that he should return from his ways and live?"

According the Oxford English Dictionary, the Rule of Law limits the arbitrary power of those in authority, prevents the arbitrary use of power, applies all laws equally to all citizens of the country, protects against private power, keeps public authorities honest, and protects fundamental rights, including the security of persons and contract, property, and human rights. No one, including the government and judges, is above the Rule of Law.

The United States 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 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14th protects them from actions by state and local government. Moreover, the written Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution, namely, the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments, 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.

Federal Statute, Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a), which is applicable for all judges in all states, holds that, if there is even an appearance in impartiality, then the judges must recuse themselves voluntarily, and a party does not have to file a Motion for Disqualification because the judges are required by this federal law to recuse themselves in any proceeding in which their impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Judges do not have discretion not to disqualify



themselves, and by law, judges are bound to follow the law. Moreover, the written Statute, Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), cites that any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself/herself in any proceeding in which his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Further, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) declares that, if proper grounds for recusal exist and the judge is aware of the grounds but still refuse to recuse himself/herself, then there may be penalties levied against the judge for not recusing himself/herself.

Moreover, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 mandates that judges voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves in which their impartiality and/or bias might reasonably be questioned.

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). Also, 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.

The Appellant Courts have, also, ruled that, should a judge who has been disqualified by law fail to recuse himself/herself, then the judge is in violation of the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution (*United States v. Sciuto*, 521 F.2d 842, 845 (7th Cir. 1996).

The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, , the Exhibits accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts cited in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENTS OF UNDISPUTED FACTS**" will substantiate the allegations that, for the first time, Judge M. Schreiber II, has violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law by: 1.) breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11 and have, also, committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the appearance of Judge M. Schreiber II being impartial and/or biased because of his appointment by Larry Hogan, who, along with Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials, 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.) failing to set aside his judgment filed on 10-20-23 and to deem his Order as void as a matter law due to his infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a ) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 3.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated 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 from her In Banc Review, instead of having himself as the only presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions from her In



Banc Review. 4.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's 10<sup>th</sup> Motion for her right to an oral Hearing because the previous presiding Judges, namely, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the 3 panel of In Banc Judges repeatedly denied the Petitioner's right to an oral Hearing as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 5.) failing disclose, consider, and resolve the Petitioner's Motion to set aside the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, due to the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature, which indicate what Judge wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the 8 Motions cited in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which include Motions alleging repeated and/or deliberate violations of the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, breaching the Rule of Law, by Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher, and by all of the other judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation from her Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation (Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin) due to these Officers' of the Court repetitious and/or intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws. 7.) failing disclose, consider, and resolve the 9-8-23 Petitioner's Motion to set aside the judgements of the previous presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the judgments of the other former presiding Judges and to deem all of their Orders void as a matter of law due to their continuous and deliberate breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by not voluntarily disqualifying and recusing themselves due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as a result of their appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are, also, 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. 8.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order whether and, for the 6<sup>th</sup> time, the Judge-In- Charge of the Civil Division of the Circuit Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his failure, as the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, who represents the Court, to grant the Petitioner's Motion to assign judges to preside over her civil litigation who were not appointed by government officials are 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, which include Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government officials. 9.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right



and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order if the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, along with Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because these Judges repeatedly and/or deliberately violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to have an oral Hearing before deciding to deny the Petitioner's Petition. **10.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill due to his repeated and deliberate violations of Maryland 18.102.11 5(c). **11.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, and by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and/or intentional failure to grant the Petitioner's 7<sup>th</sup> Motion For Reconsideration. **12.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, and by John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and/or intentional failure to grant the Petitioner's 11<sup>th</sup> Motion for a Hearing on the Motions as mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311.

Moreover, the Petitioner alleges that the evidence that will be submitted during Discovery and revealed during her requested jury trial, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, Exhibit 1 that accompanies her instant Motions, and/or the material facts stated in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENTS OF UNDISPUTED FACTS**" will substantiate the allegations that: **1.)** The Petitioner continues to undergo more financial loss, more loss of property, and more tremendous emotional distress as a result of repetitiously and/or deliberately having her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 violated and, thus, the Rule of Law, due to the repeated and/or intentional infringements of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge M. Schreiber II, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges due to their failure to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, as well as set aside all of their judgments and deem all of their Orders void as mandated under Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S. as a result of there being an appearance that all of these Officers of the Court could be biased and/or impartial as a result of their special appointments by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged to have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities. **2.)** The facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the 10-20-23 Findings and Order by Judge M. Schreiber II, from which his 10-20-23 Findings and Order respond to, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions support the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber II violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, Section 242 because Judge M. Schreiber II fails



to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were intentionally breached due Judge M. Schreiber II violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which further resulted in his engagements in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce. 3.) The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions support the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber II violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, Section 242 because Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and/or intentionally breached by Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, and Judge Fletcher-Hill due to their repeated and/or intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which further resulted in their repetitiously and/or deliberately engaging in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce. 4.) The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions support the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber II violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, Section 242 because Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and/or intentionally violated by the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, who initially presided over the Petitioner's appeal in her In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation because all of these Officers of the Court repetitiously and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which further resulted in their repeatedly and deliberately engaging in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce.

### STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

In the WORD OF GOD, namely, in in Leviticus 19: 15, the LORD spoke to Moses and said "*Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor.*" Also, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Ephesians 6:10-18, it declares, "*Finally, my brethren, be strong in the LORD, and in the power of HIS might. Put on the whole armour of GOD that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of GOD that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with*



truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness. And, your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace. Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And, take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the SPIRIT, which is the WORD OF GOD: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, And watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints.” In Isaiah 54: 14-17, it asserts that “In righteousness shalt thou be established: thou shalt be far from oppression; for thou shalt not fear: and from terror: for it shall not come near thee. Behold, they shall surely gather together, but not by ME: whosoever shall gather together against thee shall fall for thy sake. Behold, I have created the smith that bloweth the coals in the fire, and that bringeth forth an instrument for his work: and I have created the waster to destroy. No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the LORD, and their righteousness is of ME saith the LORD.” In the HOLY BIBLE, namely, in Revelation 21:7-8, it cites that “He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his GOD, and he shall be MY son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.”

As defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, the Rule of Law is “**The authority and influence of law in society, especially when viewed as a constraint on individual and institutional behavior; (hence) the principle whereby all members of a society (including those in government) are considered equally subject to the Rule of law.**” Further, under the Rule of Law, government authority may only be exercised as afforded in our great Constitution in accordance with written Statutes, Laws, Regulations, Rules, etc., which were adopted through an established procedure.

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 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14<sup>th</sup> protects them from actions by state and local government.

Under Federal Statute, 28 U.S. Code § 455(a) - Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge, any justice, judge, or magistrate of the U.S shall disqualify himself in any proceeding, including a proceeding in which his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned or where the judge has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding.

According to the facts stated on the website, "Corrupt Judges", 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 suggest that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce, and, also, since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts. 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, as stated on this website, the Court have determined that, should another judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance of partiality" and has possibly disqualified himself/herself. Moreover, the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. Wherefore, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio."

Moreover, on the website, "Corrupt Judges, it states that the Appellant Courts have, also, affirmed that Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. "is directed against the appearance of partiality, whether or not the judge is actually biased," and that "Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a) is not intended to protect litigants from actual bias in their judge but rather to promote public confidence in the impartiality of the judicial process." Judges do not have discretion not to disqualify themselves, and by law, judges are bound to follow the law. Taylor v. O'Grady, 888 F.2d 1189 (7th Cir. 1989). The 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals has repeatedly held that positive proof of the partiality of a judge is not a requirement, only the appearance of partiality as in the case of Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp., 486 U.S. 847, 108 S.Ct. 2194 (1988). Also, this Court has decided that "what matters is not the reality of bias or prejudice but its appearance" United States v. Balistrieri, 779 F.2d 1191 (7th Cir. 1985). Still too, the 7th Circuit declares that "a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final." Further, the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit has determined that "Fraud upon the Court" immediately removes jurisdiction from that Court as well as vitiates (makes ineffective - invalidates) every decision or Order from that point on.

Also, the Rule of Law is applicable in Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 and 242, and on the website,



“Corrupt Judges”, it asserts that under the Federal Statute, Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241, Conspiracy Against Rights that **“This statute makes it unlawful for two or more persons to conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person of any state, territory or district in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him/her by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, (or because of his/her having exercised the same)” .....**

The Rule of Law is, too, applicable in Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, which is a Federal Statute that covers specifically “Crimes against Humanity”. As proclaimed from the Legal Information Institute from the webpage of Cornell Law School, Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 declares **“(a ) Basic Offense.—Whoever, whether in time of peace or in time of war and with the specific intent to destroy, in whole or in substantial part, a national, ethnic, racial, or religious as such— (1) kills members of that group; (2) causes serious bodily injury to members of that group; (3) causes the permanent impairment of the mental faculties of members of the group through drugs, torture, or similar techniques; (4) subjects the group to conditions of life that are intended to cause the physical destruction of the group in whole or in part; (5) imposes measures intended to prevent births within the group; or (6) transfers by force children of the group to another group; shall be punished as provided in subsection (b)...**

Further, the Rule of Law is applicable in Federal “Acts”, which includes the “Crimes against Humanity Act of 2010. This Act amends the federal criminal code to impose a fine and/or prison term of up to 20 years on any person/s who engages in conduct that would infringe upon specific federal criminal laws. Conduct that breaches specific federal criminal laws includes knowingly, willingly, and systematically attacking any civilian population of at least 50 victims, federal crimes of murder, kidnapping, peonage, involuntary servitude, forced labor or trafficking in persons, sex trafficking of children, sexual abuse, hostage taking, torture, extermination, national, ethnic, racial, or religious cleansing, or measures intended to prevent births.

The Rule of Law is, too, applicable to the written Maryland Rules in Civil and Criminal proceedings and in the written Maryland Constitution. 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 18-102.11 5 (c) states that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge previously presided as a judge over the matter in another court. 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.”** Moreover, Article IV §22 of the Maryland Constitution mandates that a panel of three judges are mandated to preside over an In Banc Review, and the Petitioner has a right to an oral hearing before the 3-panel member of the Banc Review prior to the panel rendering their decision.

The Petitioner alleges in her instant Motions (Exhibit 155 on the Petitioner's website) that on 10-23-



23 she checked the Circuit Court's website to find out the status of her 9-8-23 Motions (Exhibits 147, 148, and 149 on the Petitioner's website) and noted that the Circuit Court's website had as the "filing date" of the Findings and Order to her 9-8-23 Motions as 10-20-23. Although the Findings and Order were issued by a new presiding Judge, namely, by Judge M. Schreiber II on 10-12-23, when filing Motions in a timely manner, the Court counts as the first day of the filing of the Findings and Order the day the clerk "filed" the Findings and Order on the Circuit Court's website.

As evidenced by the Heading in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, the Circuit Court's "filings" of the Petitioner's Heading does not state, verbatim, the actual Heading in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions. The Petitioner alleges that she believes that the SPIRIT OF GOD has led her to understand that, since the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber, and all of the former presiding Judges (with the only exception being the initial presiding Judge because the Petitioner alleges that she was not aware of Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) at that time in her civil proceeding) have failed to grant the Petitioner's Motion for a Hearing on her Motions as mandated under Maryland Rule 2-11 (f), that she should continue to state precisely in her Motions what issues she wanted the judges to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders. Moreover, the Petitioner alleges that the SPIRIT OF TRUTH has led her to, further, understand that the evidence of the Findings and Order by Judge M. Schreiber II and over 90% of the Findings and Orders by all of the former presiding Judges over her civil litigation and her present appeal in the In Banc Review, whose Civil Complaint was filed in 2017, support the allegations that all of these Officers of the Court cite, basically, the same phrase to support their Findings and Orders, without an iota of evidence to substantiate their Findings. The Petitioner alleges that, similar to her other Motions, her instant Motions are lengthy because the Petitioner has to reiterate the material facts and legal arguments which were not disclosed, considered, or resolved in Judge M. Schreiber II's 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions and which are very material, as well as disclose the new material facts and legal arguments that are, also, material in refuting the denial of her 9-8-23 Motions by Judge M. Schreiber II. Still too, the Petitioner alleges that the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in the Findings and Orders of Judge M. Schreiber II and all of the former presiding Judges (whose Findings and Orders are given Exhibit numbers and cited below) and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in her 9-8-23 Motions and in her other Motions substantiate the allegations that the presiding Judge and all of the former presiding Judges have repeatedly and/or deliberately failed to disclose, consider, and resolve over 95% of the material facts and/or legal arguments in her 9-8-23 Motions and/or in all of her other Motions, beginning from the first Judge who presided over her initial civil litigation up to the present presiding Judge over her appeal in the In Banc Review, namely, Judge M. Schreiber II. In fact, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in Judge M. Schreiber II's 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, substantiate the material facts that, Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments that the Petitioner alleges substantiate the 8 Motions cited in her 9-8-23 Motions, whose Heading is entitled **"1<sup>st</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE J. GELLER FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION,**



AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. 2.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE 8-29-23 JUDGMENT OF JUDGE J. GELLER DUE TO HIS VIOLATIONS OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C, SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF HIS: A.) VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 IN FAILING TO DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS A PRESIDNG JUDGE DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF HIM BEING IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED BECAUSE OF HIS APPOINTMENT BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED 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 . B.) VIOLATING ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 6-20-23 MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILNG TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 8-29-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 6-20-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 8-29-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 6-20-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. E.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 8-29-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 6-20-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY INFRINGED UPON BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL DUE TO HIS REPEATED AND DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ASSIGN A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED 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. 4.) 8<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A). 5.) 10<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 6.) 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE



**3-21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 8.) 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN- CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ORDER THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM"**

The Petitioner alleges that the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments, which support her filing 8 Motions within her 9-8-23 Motions and from which Judge M. Schreiber II responds to in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, and the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the Findings and Order of Judge M. Schreiber II substantiate the material facts that Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions. In his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, Judge M. Schreiber II justifies his denial of the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions by simply stating, that **"Upon consideration of Petitioner's "1<sup>st</sup> Motion for Disqualification Against Judge J. Geller for Violating Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, etc" (Paper No. 46/0), it is hereby this 12<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2023 by the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, ORDERED, that: The Motion (Paper No. 46/0) is DENIED."** The Petitioner alleges that she believes that, on 10-27-23, the SPIRIT OF TRUTH led her to understand that, although the evidence of the facts cited in Judge M. Schreiber II's 10-20-23 Findings and Order substantiate that he fails to disclose any of the material facts and legal arguments that support the Petitioner's 8 Motions within her 9-8-23 Motions, Judge M. Schreiber II does disclose in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to her 9-8-23 Motions, a portion of the first Motion within the Petitioner's 8 Motions in her 9-8-23 Motions. As cited above, in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, Judge M. Schreiber II does state **"1<sup>st</sup> Motion for Disqualification Against Judge J. Geller for Violating Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right"** but fails to disclose all of the Petitioner's 1 Motion in her 9-8-23 Motions, which in its entirety states **"1<sup>st</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE J. GELLER FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE"**.

After researching on line the background of Judge M. Schreiber II on 10-23-23, the Petitioner alleges that she discovered that Judge M. Schreiber II was appointed to Maryland 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit for Baltimore City on April 20, 2022 by Larry Hogan, who is, also, being alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have 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 have committed other criminal acts. As alleged in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, from which Judge M. Schreiber II responds to in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, other critical material facts are that Martin O'Malley, who was Mayor of Baltimore City from 2000 to 2007, along with the other Mayors of Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, which include Kurt Schmoke, every member of the City Council who was a member of the City Council between 1993 until the present, Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are, too, being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have 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 have committed other



criminal acts as a result of having: a.) continuously, deliberately, directly, and/or indirectly exposed our children to lead poisoning in Maryland schools since at least 1993. b.) yet to fulfill their duty and obligation to test all of our children that may have been exposed to lead poisoning using the special X-Ray machine to determine the cumulative amount of lead in the bones. c.) failed in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of our children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison. d.) some Officers of the Court and/or other governmental officials, who are responsible for the health and safety of our children, having ignored the alleged heinous crimes against the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, that of infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, and in some cases for decades. e.) other governmental officials, who are, also, Officers of the Court, having refused to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who have been alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately, exposed our babies to such potential poison, and, again, in some instances for almost 30 years. f.) some of the Officers of the Court and/or governmental officials having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free.

As evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s 9-8-23 Motions, from which Judge M. Schreiber II responds to in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, the previous presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill, who was, also, the presiding Judge prior to Judge John Nugent presiding, the panel of the 3 In Banc Judges who originally presided over the Petitioner’s Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, and the presiding Judges over the Petitioner’s initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, were, also, all appointed by two former government officials, namely, by Martin O’Malley and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are, too, being alleged in the Petitioner’s 9-8-23 Motions, in her 2-27-23 Motions, and/or in the Petitioner’s other Motions, to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have 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 have committed other criminal acts. The evidence substantiate the material facts that: 1.) Judge J. Geller was appointed to the 8th Judicial Circuit for Baltimore City in Maryland by Martin O’Malley, and assumed office on May 18, 2012. 2.) Judge John Nugent was appointed Chair, Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee in 2019 by former Chief Judge Barbera and appointed chair of the Alternative Dispute Resolution for the Maryland Rules subcommittee by the new Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Joseph M. Getty. 3.) Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O’Malley. 4.) Judge Carrion’s appointment by Chief Judge Barbera as an Administrative Judge for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City became effective on January 12, 2020. 5.) Judge Mellissa Phinn was appointed as an Associate judge on the 8<sup>th</sup> judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O’Malley on December 28, 2012. 6.) Judge Julie Rubin was, also, appointed as an Associate judge on the 8<sup>th</sup> judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O’Malley on December 28, 2012. 7.) Judge Michel Pierson was appointed by former Chief Judge Barbera in 2013 as an Administrative Judge. 8.) Judge Karen Friedman was appointed by Martin O’Malley in 2014.



Moreover, in her instant Motions, the Petitioner alleges that the evidence of the facts declared in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the 10-20-23 Findings and Order by Judge M. Schreiber II, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited her 9-8-23 Motions, which respond to the 8-29-23 Findings and Order of the previous presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller substantiate the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber II, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges repetitiously and/or intentionally violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Rights under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 and/or under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of their repeatedly and/or intentionally refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and to deem each of their Orders as void due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as presiding Judges as a result of being appointed to the elite positions by

Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. Also, the Petitioner alleges that the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in her 9-8-23 Motions, from which Judge M. Schreiber II responds to in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his Findings and Order, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's other Motions, and the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts proclaimed in the Findings and Orders of all of the former presiding Judges who responded to her other Motions substantiate the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber II and all of the previous presiding Judges were repetitiously and/or deliberately deceitful because in each of the Findings and Orders by these Officers of the Court, there is the same pattern of: 1.) misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. 2.) misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my Oral Arguments. 3.) concealing in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court that are contrary to their Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. 4.) concealing in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in her Oral Arguments that are contrary to their Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. 5.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as declared in the Petitioner's Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in her Oral Arguments. 7.) concealing in their Findings that the evidence in the record support the allegations that Officers of the Court exhibited judicial misconduct and obstructed justice by, amongst other things, committing the prejudicial error of perjury. 8.) and/or concealing in their Findings that the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court and/or as asserted in the Petitioner's Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in her Oral Arguments substantiate the allegations that other Officers of the Court failed to perform their duties and legal requirements, which include upholding and



enforcing: a.) the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right granted by our great Constitution. b.) the Petitioner's Civil Rights as afforded under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 and/or under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242. c.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). d.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 4-204, and/or other Maryland Rules governing judicial proceedings. e.) other federal and/or state laws.

As asserted in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, from which Judge M. Schreiber II responds to in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, the Petitioner continues to suffer financial hardship and can't afford to make copies of all of the material evidence that could accompany her instant Motions, her 9-8-23 Motions, and/or her other Motions to substantiate the alleged pattern of deceit, but through the support of her family, the Petitioner alleges that she has been able to maintain her website for public access to the Petitioner's instant Motions, to her other Motions, to the corresponding Findings and Orders by presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II and by all of the former presiding Judges, and access to the Petitioner's Official Complaints and/or the Addendums against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against the 3 original presiding In Banc Judges, against the other former presiding Judges, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other governmental officials. The 10-20-23 Findings and Order by Judge M. Schreiber II can be located as Exhibit 154 on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's instant Motions dated 11-1-23, which include her Motion for Disqualification against Judge M. Schreiber II, can be located as Exhibit 155 on the Petitioner's website. The 8-29-23 Findings and Order by Judge J. Geller can be located on the Petitioner's website as Exhibit 146 on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which include her Motion for Disqualification against Judge J. Geller can be located as Exhibits 147, 148, and 149 on the Petitioner's website. The 6-8-23 Findings and Order by Judge John Nugent can be located as Exhibit 141 on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, which include her Motion for Disqualification against Judge John Nugent can be located as Exhibits 142 and 143 on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's Motions, which include her Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions, her Official Complaints against Judge Fletcher-Hill and/or the Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill are in the record and/or can be located on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 16, 36, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 71, 72, 77, 81, 94, 96, 98, 100, 113, and 114. The Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 50, 51, 52, 67, 95, 97, 99, and 112. The Petitioner's Motions, which include her Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions, her Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges and/or other Official Complaints and other Addendums which include allegations against the panel of In Banc Judges are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits on her website, namely, 16, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, and/or Exhibit 94. The Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits, 73, 75, and 93. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualification and/or Substitution against Judge Karen Friedman, her Official Complaint, and/or the Petitioner's Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman are in the record and/or can be viewed from the Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, namely, Exhibits 16, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 54, 55, 56, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81. The Findings and Orders of Judge Karen Friedman can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 47, 48, and 49. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions against Judge Michel Pierson, her Official Complaint, and/or Addendums to the Petitioner's Official Complaint against



Judge Michel Pierson are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits 16, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81 on her website. The Findings and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 59, 63, 66, and 70. The Petitioner's Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, her Addendums to her Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other Official Complaints and/or Addendums to other Official Complaints which include allegations against Chief Judge Barbera can be viewed from Exhibits 6, 16, 43, 45, 54, 56, 77, and/or Exhibit 81 on the Petitioner's website.

As evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve the material facts that he breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he should have set aside his judgment after thoroughly reviewing all of Petitioner's relevant and lengthy Motions, which include her 2-27-23 Motions which assert as material facts that Larry Hogan, who, along with Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and other government official, is being alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order that he infringed upon the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 because: **1.)** Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Judge M. Schreiber II is mandated to voluntarily disqualify, recuse himself as the presiding judge, and set aside his judgment due to their being an appearance that Judge M. Schreiber II might be biased and/or impartial because he was appointed in 2022 to the 8th Circuit for Baltimore City by Larry Hogan, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and/or in her Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. **2.)** Due to Petitioner's alleged financial loss as a result of his alleged infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Judge M. Schreiber II has committed “Fraud Upon the Court”, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce. **3.)** As a result of Judge M. Schreiber II violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11, the Petitioner alleges that she continues to undergo more financial loss, more loss of property, and more tremendous emotional distress. **4.)** Since under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, it is mandated that the Petitioner has a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions from her In Banc Review, Judge M. Schreiber II has violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution because he was the only presiding over the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review. **5.)** Since under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, it is, too, mandated that the Petitioner have a right to an oral Hearing before the panel of 3 In Banc Judges decides to grant or deny the Petitioner's Petition, Judge M. Schreiber II has ,again, breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution as a result of his failure grant the Petitioner's Motion for an oral Hearing because the evidence substantiate the material facts that all of the previous presiding Judges over the Petitioner's Motions in her appeal in the In Banc Review violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in denying the Petitioner her right to an



oral Hearing prior to deciding to deny the Petitioner's Petition. **6.)** Since under Maryland Rule 2-311, it is mandated that if the Petitioner motions for a hearing as prescribed in Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) and as asserted in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which contain her **11<sup>th</sup>** Motion for a Hearing on her Motions, then she has a right to a hearing, Judge M. Schreiber II infringed upon Maryland Rule 2-311 in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to a hearing on her 9-8-23 Motions.

The evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in Judge M. Schreiber II's 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, also, substantiates these other statements of "**UNDISPUTED FACTS**", which are, too, material, namely: that: **1.)** Judge M. Scheiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, the material facts that, in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, she alleges that her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under 18 U.S.C & Section 242 were repetitiously and/or deliberately violated: **a.)** by the previous presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, by Judge John Nugent, by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other former presiding Judges, beginning with Judge Karen Friedman, with whom the Petitioner filed her first Motion for Disqualification against in 2018 because all of the former presiding Judges failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as mandated under Federal Statute, Section 455(a)) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to there being an appearance of impartiality and/or bias because each one of these Officers of the Court was appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have 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 have committed other criminal acts. **b.)** by all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to these Officers of the Court repeatedly and/or intentionally violating Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner an oral Hearing before a panel of **3** presiding Judges because the panel of **3** In Banc Judges who initially presided over the Petitioner's In Banc Review denied the Petitioner's Petition before granting the Petitioner's right to an oral Hearing as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. **2.)** Judge M. Schreiber II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order whether the evidence substantiate the material facts that, in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which respond to Judge M. Geller's 8-29-23 Findings and Order (Exhibit 146 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions (Exhibits 142 and 143 on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner alleges that her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under 18 U.S.C & Section 242 were deliberately violated by the previous presiding Judge, Judge M. Geller because: **a.)** Judge J. Geller's 8-29-23 Findings and Order fail to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments which the Petitioner alleges substantiate the 8 Motions in her 6-20-23 Motions, whose Heading is entitled "**1.) 1<sup>st</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THEREBY, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. 2.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 JUDGMENTS OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT DUE TO HIS VIOLATIONS OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT**



AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C, SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF HIS: A.) VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 IN FAILING TO DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS A PRESIDNG JUDGE DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF HIM BEING IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED BECAUSE OF HIS APPOINTMENT BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE . B.) VIOLATING 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, MOTIONS FROM HER IN BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILNG TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER’S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER’S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTING “FRAUD UPON THE COURT”, TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILNG TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDNGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER’S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER’S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER’S IN BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER’S PETITON FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. E.) FAILNG TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER’S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER’S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY INFRINGED UPON BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL DUE TO HIS REPEATED AND DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE 3-21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 4.) 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION THAT JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ORDERS THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT’S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER’S MOTIONS VERBATIM. 5.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER’S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O’MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. 6.) 7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A). 7.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 8.) 9<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-31”. b.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order any of the material facts and legal arguments assert to substantiate the Petitioner’s 8 Motions within her 6-20-23 Motions. c.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his



8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, whether to set aside his judgment and the judgments of John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the judgments of the previously presiding Judges and deem all of their Orders void as a matter of law due to their continuous and/or deliberate infringing upon the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to these Officers' of the Court repeatedly and/or deliberately breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by not voluntarily disqualifying and recusing themselves due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as a result of their appointments by Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, 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 have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. d.) Judge J. Geller fails to set aside the Judgment filed on 3-23-23, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, because of the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature indicating who wrote the Findings and Order filed on 3-23-23. e.) Judge J. Geller disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, the allegations that he deliberately infringed upon the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to his intentional breaching of 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 from her In Banc Review, not just solely Judge J. Geller being the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 8-29-23 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review. f.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, whether Judge John Nugent and Judge Fletcher-Hill infringed upon the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to their repeated and intentional breaching of 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 from her In Banc Review. g.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the initial panel of 3 In Banc Judges have repetitiously and/or intentionally failed to grant the Petitioner's her right to an oral hearing as, also, mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 3.) Judge M. Schreider II fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order that he violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 due to his failing to disclose, consider, and resolve the Petitioner's 3<sup>rd</sup> Motion for Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, mandate that the clerks record, verbatim, the Heading of the Petitioner's Motion, a legal document, on the Circuit Court's website, which is viewed by the public.

In addition, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioners 9-8-23 Motions, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions substantiate that, in his 10-20-23 Findings and Order, Judge M. Schreiber II fail to disclose, consider, and resolve **other statements of "UNDISPUTED FACTS"** declared in the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions, which are material in tracing the history of the alleged repetitious and/or intentional violations of the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to, amongst other things, the repeated and/or deliberate violations of



Federal Statute and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by all of the former presiding Officers of the Court due to their repeated and/or intentional refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves. These other undisputed facts include: 1.) The material facts that the evidence support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division whose responsibilities include assigning judges to civil case, presided over the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, 8-6-18, and 9-17-18 Motions from her initial civil litigation (Exhibits 38, 36, 42, 41, 58, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) as evidenced by his responses in his 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, 9-4-18 Findings and Orders (Exhibits 50, 46, 52, and 57, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), and the evidence of the Petitioner's 4-7-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, and 12-27-22 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review, (Exhibits 94, 96, 98, and 100, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) as evidenced by Judge Fletcher-Hill's responses in his 6-21-22, 8-4-22, 12-16-22, and 2-16-23 Findings and Orders ( Exhibits 95, 97, 99, and 112 on the Petitioner's website). Thus, the evidence substantiate the material fact that the Petitioner was coerced to have to file 9 separate Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill for violating her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his repetitiously and intentionally infringing breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judges because of the appearance of his being impartial and/or biased as a result of being appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions and in her Civil Complaint filed in 2017 to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. Moreover, since the evidence support the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill has unlawfully presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation at least 4 times, Judge Fletcher-Hill has, thereby, repeatedly and intentionally breached Maryland Rule 18.102. 11 5(c), which prohibits a judge from presiding over a party's appeal in a civil litigation after the judge has been a presiding Judge in the initial civil litigation. Still too, for the 6<sup>th</sup> time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has assigned only judges who were appointed by government officials who are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities, which include Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, and/or any government official cited in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. In fact, attached to the Petitioner's instant Motions as Exhibit 1 is her "6<sup>th</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" to the Governor of Maryland, Gov. Moore, which declares in the Heading of the Petitioner's urgent missive "Re: 1.) "6<sup>TH</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES, THAT IS, FOR YOU, GOV. MOORE, to exercise your Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland, representing a GOVERNMENT OF WE THE PEOPLE, BY WE THE PEOPLE, AND FOR WE THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND, WHO WILL UPHOLD OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY AND, FOR THE SECOND TIME, to ORDER the JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL to: a.) assign a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over my 11-1-23 Motions and to grant my right to an oral Hearing before the panel of 3 Judges deny or grant my Petition as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for In Banc proceedings. b.) assign only judges who were not appointed by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore (hereinafter "Wes Moore", former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan



(hereinafter "Larry Hogan"), another former Governor of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, Martin O'Malley (hereinafter "Martin O'Malley"), the former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or by any of the government officials that are cited in my 11-1-23 Motions, in my 2-27-23 Motions and/or in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint because all of these government officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. 2.) 2<sup>nd</sup> REQUEST THAT THE U.S ATTORNEY OF MARYLAND, EREK L. BARRON, AND THE STATE ATTORNEY FOR BALTIMORE CITY, IVAN BATES, regardless of whether Wes Moore issues the ORDERS or whether Judge Fletcher-Hill adheres to and/or reject the ORDERS, that both of you initiate an investigation and disclose and resolve the Findings regarding the allegations the evidence in the Circuit Court and on my website will substantiate that the presiding Judge, Judge M. Schreiber II, the former presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, the former presiding Judges over my appeal in the In Banc Review, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges who initially presided over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation and all of the other judges who presided over my initial civil litigation, which, also, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have repeatedly and/or deliberately violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 241, and/or my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by repetitiously and/or intentionally: a.) committing the Federal crimes of violating Federal Statute violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and the federal crimes of "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce due to their repetitious and/or intentional infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) in refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and deem each of their Orders as void due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as presiding Judges as a result of being appointed to the elite positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in my 2-27-23 Motions and/or in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to 2-18-20 Official Complaint to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities." 2.) The material facts that the evidence of the first 5 Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, which accompany the her 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on the Petitioner's website) and which are, also, material evidence in the Petitioner's Motions and in her 2017 Civil Complaint, prove, unequivocally, and in less than 5 minutes of reading, that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera intentionally committed the alleged prejudicial error of perjury in her 2015 Findings and Order, which, in turn, caused the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals (Exhibit 11 on the Petitioner's website) to have, yet, to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc judges from Circuit Court breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right by committing perjury and infringing upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right in breaching Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that the owners of Baltimore City Public Schools from at least 1993 to the present, which include Kurt Schmoke and Martin O'Malley, every member of the City Council who was a member of the City Council between 1993 until the present, Officers