

IN THE MATTER  
THE PETITION OF  
DIANA R. WILLIAMS

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

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

RECEIVED  
CIRCUIT COURT FOR  
BALTIMORE CITY  
23 APR -5  
CIVIL DIVISION

\*\*\*\*\*

1.) 9<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, FOR THE NINTH TIME, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REPETITIOUSLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 2.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AND, THUS, FOR THE FIFTH TIME, COMMITTING " FRAUD UPON THE COURT" AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY CONTINUOUSLY INFRINGING UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 3.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AND TO HAVE AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL ACCEPTS OR DENIES THE PETITION AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND TO SELECT JUDGES 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 AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE, BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 4.) 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 5.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 6.)

**MOTION FOR THE COURT TO ORDER THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM AS CITED IN HER MOTIONS. 7.) 8<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S**

**"7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS**

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: 1.) 9<sup>TH</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Fletcher-Hill For Violations Of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And, Thus, For Ninth Time, Committing Fraud Upon The Court", Treason Against The Constitution, Interference With Interstate Commerce, And Breaching The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Repetitiously Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 2.) 5<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Fletcher-Hill For Violations of Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) And, Thus, For The Fifth Time, Committing "Fraud Upon The Court" And Breaching The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Continuously Infringing Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 3.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion To Have A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To To Preside Over the Petitioner's In Banc Review And To Have An Oral Hearing Before The Panel Accept Or Deny The Petition And To Have An Oral Hearing Before the Panel Accepts Or Denies the Petition As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, And To Select Judges 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 And/Or Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - Genocide Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 4.) 6<sup>TH</sup> Motion For All Orders By Judge Fletcher-Hill, By The Panel Of In Banc Judges, By Judge Michel Pierson, and By Judge Karen Friedman Be Deemed Void As A Matter Of Law Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 5.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For Reconsideration Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 6.) Motion For The Court To ORDER The Clerk To File On The Circuit Court's Website The Heading Of The Petitioner's Motions Verbatim As Cited In Her Motions. 7.) 8<sup>th</sup> Motion for A Hearing on the Motions as Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311 Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions 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, is that, in the 3-21-23 Findings and Order by the Court filed by the clerk on 3-23-22 and which respond to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, the Court's 3-23-23 Order denies only the Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> Motion, but fails to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the 7 Motions cited in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions to the Court, which include Motions alleging repeated and 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, the Rule of Law, by Judge Fletcher and by all of the other judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation in the Petitioner's 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 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin) due to these Officers' of the Court repetitious and intentional: a.) 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, other federal and/or state laws. b.) committing of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce. c.) violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) which mandates that, if the evidence substantiates an Officer of the Court has breached Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), then the judge must be immediately disqualified and recused as the presiding Judge and all of the Orders of the judge be deem void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a).

## 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 speaketh unto his friend", and Moses informed the judges in Israel of GOD'S law and employed the judges over the various tribes in Israel in Judges 6:16-17, saying, "And, I charged your judges at that time, saying. Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD'S: and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it." 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, judgement, 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, 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 19: 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?"

In the Oxford English Dictionary, the Rule of Law is defined as "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." The Rule of Law implies that 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 principle is intended to be a safeguard against arbitrary rulings in individual cases. Moreover, 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 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 14th protects them from actions by state and local government. The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, [www.dianawilliams.com](http://www.dianawilliams.com), the Exhibit accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts cited in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in the 3-23-23 Findings and Order of the Court and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Petitioner's s instant Motions, (which are, too, alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or other Motions) substantiate the material facts, namely, that the 3-23-23 Findings and Order the Court fail to state all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions in 3-23-23 Findings and ORDER of the Court which include: 1.) The material fact that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate that the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and intentionally violated by Judge Fletcher-Hill who has, thus far and according to Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ), unlawfully presided over 5 of the Petitioner's Motions relating to her appeal of the her initial civil litigation because Judge Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges who presided over at least three of the Petitioner's Motions relating to her initial civil litigation. 2.) The material fact that the evidence, indisputably substantiate that the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18,

U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repeatedly and deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the previously presiding Judges (which, again include Judge Fletcher-Hill) due to the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher Hill ( who was one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation) Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, and Judge R. Rubin, and the other two former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson and Judge Karen Friedman, repeatedly and deliberately violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 as a result of their repetitious and deliberate refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recused themselves because Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) mandates their voluntary disqualification and recusal, especially in light of the material fact that, in in the Petitioner's Motions she continued to cite that she questions the appearance of impartiality and/or biased by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Officers of the Court who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or who presided over her appeal in the In Banc Review of the Petitioner's initial civil litigation due to the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges (again, which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill) were appointed to the elite position as Administrative Judges by the former Gov. of Maryland and Mayor of Baltimore City from 1999 to 2007 (and, thus, one of the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City) and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom, along with Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson and Judge Karen Friedman, the other owners of owners of the Baltimore City Public Schools (the Mayor and City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott, every member of the City Council who was a member between 1993 until the present, other Officers of the Court, the former Gov. of Md., Larry Hogan, the present Gov. of Md., Wes Moore, and/or other government agencies are being alleged have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities by: a.) having exposed our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based hazards since at least 1993. b.) having 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 because the blood lead testing will not reveal the lead in the blood after about 45 days. Lead stays in the bones for nearly 30 years. Lead is a poison, and when it becomes hazardous, it can possibly kill you. c.) failing in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of the children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison. d.) having for decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, misconduct in office, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. e.) having refused to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for decades. f.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities for close to a quarter of a century. 2.) The material fact that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate that the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and deliberately infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges who for almost six years repeatedly and deliberately violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 as substantiated in the legal arguments and material facts in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, which are Motions from which the Court's respond to in its 3-23-23 Findings and Order, but the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the 3-

23-23 Finding and ORDERS substantiate the material fact that the 3-23-23 Findings and Order by the Court should have included ORDERS not only mandating immediate disqualification and recusal of Judge Fletcher as the presiding Judge but an ORDER mandating that **all** of the **ORDERS** by Judge Fletcher-Hill and **all** **ORDERS** by the former presiding Judge (which include Judge Fletcher-Hill) be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a ) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, which further resulted in the repetitious and intentional breaching of the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law. 3.) The material fact that, since the evidence, indisputably, substantiate that the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-Hill and **all** of the other presiding Judges who for almost six years repetitiously and intentionally not violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a ) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, but also, due to these Officers of the Court repetitiously and intentionally violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ) (the evidence substantiate that only Judge Fletcher-Hill deliberately breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ) at least four times), Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing "Fraud Upon the Court", committing Treason to the Constitution, committing Interference with Interstate Commerce and/or by continuously infringing upon other federal and/or state laws, therefore the 3-23-23 Findings and Order by the Court should have included in its 3-23-23 Finding and ORDERS the material facts that, again, the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law were repeatedly and deliberately infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill and **all** of the other previously presiding Judges (which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill) due to their repeated and intentional violations of these federal and/ state laws, and, thus, again, including in its 3-23-23 Findings and ORDER an ORDER mandating the immediate disqualification and recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill and as required by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a ) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and, too, issue an ORDER mandating **all** ORDERS by Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other presiding Judges be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and include these material facts in the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and ORDER. 5.) The material fact that, since the evidence, indisputably, substantiate that the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-Hill and **all** of the other presiding Judges who for almost six years repetitiously and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a ) and 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", committing Treason to the Constitution, committing Interference with Interstate Commerce and/or by continuously infringing upon other federal and/or state laws, therefore, the 3-23-23 Findings and Order by the Court should have included in its 3-23-23 Finding and ORDERS these material facts and that, as repeatedly substantiated in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and which, also, substantiate the continuous and deliberate breaching of the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law as a result of the continuous and deliberate breaching of these federal and/or state laws by Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other presiding Judges. 6.) The material fact that, since the evidence, indisputably, substantiate that the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-Hill and **all** of the other presiding Judges who for almost six years repetitiously and intentionally not violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a ) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 but, also, due to these Officers of the Court repetitiously and deliberating violating Maryland Rule 2-311, namely, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin, and one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson. Thus, the 3-23-23 Findings and ORDER by the Court should have included these material facts to substantiate that repeatedly and intentionally the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18,

U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges due to their continuous and deliberate infringing upon Maryland Rule 2-311. 6.) The evidence, indisputably, substantiate the material facts that the 3-23-23 Finding and ORDERS should have included the material facts in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions which substantiate

that the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 have been violated by the Court and, also, repetitiously and deliberately breached by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the former presiding Judges due to the Court's failure to disclose, consider, and resolve in its 3-23-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, all of the material facts and legal arguments that substantiate the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, which include the legal arguments and material facts that substantiate the material fact that: a.) for the eighth time the Petitioner has motioned Court to Order a disqualification and recusal of the presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill due to the material fact that evidence in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions substantiate his deliberate violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. b.) for the seventh time the Petitioner has motioned for a Hearing on her Motions as stipulated in Maryland Rule 2-311. c.) for the fourth time the Petitioner has motioned for Disqualification of the present presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill for breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). d.) for the fifth time the Petitioner has motioned that all Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, by the panel of In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge and Judge Rubin, and all the Orders by the former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, namely, by Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by Judge Karen Friedman, be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 e.) has for the fourth time motioned to have a panel of In Ban Judges to continue to preside over the Petitioner's In Banc Review as mandated under Article IV of the Maryland Constitution by having a panel of 3 In Banc Judges preside over the Petitioners Motions in her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and the Petitioner's right to an oral hearing before the panel of In Banc judges decides to accept or deny the Petition. f.) has for the fifth time motioned for a panel of In Banc judges who were not appointed by Martin O'Malley and Chief Judge Barbera to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation g.) for the fifth time the Petitioner has motioned for Motion for Reconsideration. h.) for the seven time has motioned as stipulated in Maryland Rule 2-311 for a Hearing on the Petitioner's Motions. 7.) The material fact that the since the evidence, indisputably, substantiate that the 3-23-23 Findings and ORDER by the Court which respond to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, did not disclose, consider, and resolve the legal argument and material facts that, repeatedly and deliberately the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and deliberately infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges who for almost six years repeatedly and deliberately violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or other federal and state laws for nearly six years, the Petitioner 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> "URGENT PLEADINGS" sent certified and by regular mail to Gov. Moore and dated 1-10-23, 2-17-23 (which are Exhibits 1 and 2, which are two of the 7 Exhibits that accompany the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions) are her urgent pleadings to Gov. Moore, requesting that her grievances against the Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the other presiding Judges be investigated as stipulated in WE THE PEOPLE'S 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment right. As substantiated by the copies of the Exhibits that accompany the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, the Petitioner pleads to Gov. of Moore for a REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES AS STIPULATED IN OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT due to the material fact that, amongst other things, the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Orders fail to disclose, consider, and resolve the material fact that the material facts in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill and every one of the former presiding Judges (which, again, include Judge Fletcher-Hill) have for nearly 6 years continuously and deliberately violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and, thus, the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under

Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and the Rule of Law have been breached for nearly six years. 8.) The evidence of the legal arguments and the material facts in Exhibit 1, which is a copy of the Petitioner's 3<sup>rd</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION to Gov. Moore and which was sent by certified and regular mail on 4-5-23, indisputably, substantiate the material facts that the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in 3-23-23 Finding and ORDERS substantiate the material fact that the 3-23-23 Finding and ORDER by the Court fail to disclose, consider, and resolve the material fact that the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions proves, unequivocally, the Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 mandate that all of ORDERS by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all ORDERS by the former presiding judges, which again, include Judge Fletcher-Hill must be deemed void as a matter of law because the evidence substantiate that all of these Officers of the Court have repeatedly and intentionally failed to disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Officers as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves, especially in light of the material fact that the Petitioner continuously asserts in her numerous Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges the material fact that she questions the appearance of an impartially and/or biased due to the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges were appointed by the former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley and/or by the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and other Motions to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities. Moreover, as evidenced by the legal arguments and material facts cited in the copies of the Pleadings, in all three of the Petitioner's Urgent and Time Sensitive Pleadings, the Petitioner PETITIONS FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES AS STIPULATED IN OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT, THAT IS, FOR GOV. MOORE to exercise his Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland, representing a GOVERNMENT OF WE THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE, AND FOR THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND WHO WILL UPHOLD OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY ORDER a Disqualification and Recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation because the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's approximately 30-page 2-27-23 Motions ( Exhibits 113 and 114 on the Petitioner's website), and the evidence of the Circuit Court's Order entered by the clerk on the Court's public-viewing website on 3-23-23 which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions by simply citing "**Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. N.J**" substantiate the material fact that the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and Order fail to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the very material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, which include the allegations of repeated and deliberate violations of the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thus, a breaching of the Rule of Law, by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the former presiding Judges (which, again, include Judge Fletcher as being one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation in 2018) due to their repeated and intentional breaching of the Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce and/or infringing upon other federal and/or state laws.

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. Since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts.



The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence that will be submitted into the record during Discovery and during the actual jury trial, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, the Exhibit accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts proclaimed in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that the evidence of the material fact that the 3-23-23 Finding by the Court does not disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 which, also, include the material facts and/or legal arguments that substantiate the allegations that: **a.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill has engaged in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce for the ninth time. **b.)** the panel of In Banc Judges who formerly presided over the Petitioner's In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin, and the former presiding Judges over her initial civil litigation, which, again, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, along with Judge Michel Pierson and Judge Karen Friedman, have, also, repeatedly engaged in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce.

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 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. 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. Further, the written Statute, 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. The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, the Exhibit that accompany the instant Motions, and/or the material facts stated in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that: **1.)** The evidence in the 3-23-23 Finding and Order by the Court substantiate the material facts that the 3-23-23 Court's Order does not disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in the 7 Motions within the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, which, too, include the material facts that evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges, which again include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have repeatedly and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and, thereby, has repetitiously and intentional breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by repeatedly and deliberately infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11.

Germane to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), the Supreme Court has ruled and reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", Levine v. United States, 362 U.S. 610, 80

S.Ct. 1038 (1960), citing *Offutt v. United States*, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13 (1954). In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held that disqualification of a judge is mandatory if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality ( *Liteky v. U.S.*, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). The Court has, too, affirmed that, should a judge not disqualify himself/herself as required by law, then the judge has given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which could potentially further disqualify the judge. Further, the Court have determined that, should another judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance of partiality" and has possibly disqualified himself/herself. Moreover, the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. Wherefore, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio."

The Supreme Court has decided that, should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by law. The Petitioner alleges that the evidence that will be submitted during Discovery and during her requested jury trial, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, the Exhibit accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts stated in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that the Petitioner continues to undergo financial loss, loss of property, and tremendous emotional distress due to, amongst other things: **1.)** The evidence of the material fact that the 3-23-23 Finding and Order by the Court does not **Order** Judge Fletcher-Hill to disqualify and recuse himself from presiding over the Petitioner's 6 other Motions in her 2-27-23 Motions and/or from presiding over the Petitioner's instant Motions. **2.)** The evidence of the material fact that the Court's 3-23-23 Order does not disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in the 6 Motions within the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, which include the allegations that the Petitioner continues to undergo financial loss, loss of property, and tremendous emotional distress as a result of having her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, as a result of the repeated and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges ( which include Judge Fletcher-Hill) due to the their repetitious refusal of these Officers of the Court to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, especially in light of the fact that, in her colossal Motions for Disqualifications against these Officers of the Court, the Petitioner repetitiously states that she questions that there is an appearance of these Officers of the Court being biased and/or impartial due to their special appointment as Administrative Judges by the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and other Motions to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed

misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities. 3.) The evidence of the material fact that the Court's 3-23-23 Order does not ORDER that all ORDERS by Judge Fletcher-Hill and by all of the other presiding Judges be deemed void as a matter of law Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), although the evidence of the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions substantiate that the Petitioner has pleaded in the Court for 4<sup>th</sup> time that all of the ORDERS by Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other former presiding Judges be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11.

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. Balistreri*, 779 F.2d 1191 (7th Cir. 1985). The 7th Circuit, also, stated 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.

The 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals has, too, determined that, if a judge is disqualified according to Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a) but fail to recuse himself/herself, then that judge is acting in the judge's "personal capacity" and not in the judge's "judicial capacity" and has, thus, committed "Fraud upon the Court". In the case of *Bulloch v. United States*, 763 F.2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985), the court stated "Fraud upon the Court is fraud which is directed to the judicial machinery itself and is not fraud between the parties or fraudulent documents, false statements or perjury. ... It is where the court or a member is corrupted or influenced or influence is attempted or where the judge has not performed his judicial function --- thus where the impartial functions of the court have been directly corrupted." And, the Circuit Court has determined that, when a judge acts in his/her personal capacity and not in his/her judicial capacity, it causes the court to be directly corrupted and further "embrace that species of fraud which does, or attempts to, defile the court itself, or is a fraud perpetrated by officers of the court so that the judicial machinery cannot perform in the usual manner its impartial task of adjudging cases that are presented for adjudication." *Kenner v. C.I.R.*, 387 F.3d 689 (1968); 7 Moore's Federal Practice, 2d ed., p. 512, 60.23.

In regard to the written Maryland Rules in Civil and Criminal proceedings, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 asserts that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Maryland Rule 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." The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on her website, the Exhibit accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts asserted in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the allegations that the Court's 3-23-23 Order does not disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and/or legal arguments in the 6 other Motions within the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, which, further, include the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that the evidence in her 2-27-23, 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and in some of the Petitioner's other Motions substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill, along with the previously presiding Judges, namely, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman have repetitiously and deliberately violated Maryland Rule 18-102.11, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 ( c), and/or Maryland Rule 2-311(f) and have, therefore, continuously intentionally infringed upon the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and the Rule of Law due to their continuous and deliberate breaching of Maryland Rule 18-102.11, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 ( c), and/or Maryland Rule 2-311(f).

According to our written Maryland Constitution, that is, Article IV §22 of the Maryland Constitution, 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 is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on her website, the Exhibit accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts declared in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**" will substantiate the 3-23-23 Court's Findings and Order do not disclose, consider, and resolve the 6 Motions within the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, which, too, include the material facts and legal arguments that substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of In Banc Judges have deliberately and repeatedly infringed upon Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution and have, thus, intentionally and continuously breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thus, the Rule of Law, by deliberately and repetitiously violating Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution.

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

The 3-21-23 Finding and Order of the Court entered by the clerk on the Circuit Court's public-viewing website on 3-23-23 (and which responds to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's approximately 30- page 2-27-23 Motions) declares on the Circuit Court's website "**Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. N.J**". Although the evidence of the Heading in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions (Exhibits 113 and 114 on the Petitioner's website) substantiates the material fact the Petitioner pleads 7 Motions in her 2-27-23 Motions, the evidence of the 3-23-23 Court's Order substantiates that the Court's Order only responds to the Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> Motion in her 2-27-23 Motions. Still too, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and

Order and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments proclaimed in the body of the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, which the Petitioner alleges necessitated her pleading 7 Motions in the Heading of the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, and which, also, substantiate the material fact that the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and Order fail disclose, consider, and resolve all of the Petitioner's Motions in her the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions. Moreover, the 3-23-23 Finding and ORDER by the Court substantiate the evidence of the 7 Motions in the Heading of the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions substantiate the material fact that the fail to disclose, consider, and resolve by issuing Findings and ORDERS relevant to the Petitioner's other 6 Motions in her 2-27-23 Motions. The evidence of the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions substantiate the material fact that the 6 other Motions cited in the Heading of the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions includes a Motions alleging repeated and intentional violations of her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right and, thus, the Rule of Law, by Judge Fletcher and all of the other judges who formerly presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation in her Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 and who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation. The Petitioner alleges that the material facts in her 2-27-23 Motions overwhelmingly substantiate the allegations that these Officers' of the Court have repetitiously and deliberately breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and infringed upon the Rule of Law, as a result of repetitiously and intentionally violating **1.)** Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). **2.)** Maryland Rule 18.102.11. **3.)** Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ) and Article IV of the Maryland Constitution repeatedly and deliberately breached only by Judge Fletcher-Hill . **4.)** Maryland Rule 2-311 (f). **5.)** committing of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce. **6.)** and/or other federal and/or state laws.

The evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the 3-23-23 Finding and Order by the Court and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions from which the Court's Finding and Order responds substantiate that the 3-23-23 Findings and ORDER by the Court fail to disclose, consider, and resolve all the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Petitioner 2-27-23 Motions, which include pleading in her Motions that, if the evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other previously presiding Officers of the Court have repeatedly and intentionally breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right and, thus, the Rule of Law, and repetitiously and deliberately infringed upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, then the Court issue more ORDERS which mandate that: **1.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill be immediately disqualified and recused from presiding over any other Motion from the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review. **2.)** all ORDERS by Judge Fletcher-Hill and by all of the other former presiding Judges be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. **3.)** Since the evidence in the record substantiate the material fact that, for the fifth time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has deliberately breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ) due to his unlawfully presiding Judge over by Petitioner's 4-17-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, and 12-27-22 Motions in the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation because the evidence substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill, was one of the judges who presided over her initial civil litigation, namely, the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, and 8-6-18 Motions, Judge Fletcher, again, be mandated to immediately disqualify and recused as from presiding over the other 6 Motions in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, the Petitioner's instant Motions,

or presiding over any other future Motions relevant to Motions in this In Banc Review, regardless of the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill is the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division.

As evidenced by the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions from which the Court renders its 3-23-23 Findings, the Court failed to disclose, consider, and resolve the material fact that the evidence support the material fact that the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right and, thus, the Rule of Law, were continuously and deliberately infringed upon as supported by the material facts and legal arguments in her 2-27-23 Motions. The Court's 3-23-23 Finding and Order do not ORDERS responding to the Petitioner's: 1.) 8<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification of the present presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill, for infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 2.) 7<sup>th</sup> Motion for Hearing on her Motions. 3.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification of the present presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill for breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). 4.) 5<sup>TH</sup> Motion for all Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, by the panel of In Banc Judges, by Judge Michel Pierson, and/or by Judge Karen Friedman be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), under Maryland Rule 18.102.11and/or under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). 5.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion to have a panel of In Banc judges who were not appointed by the former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley and the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals, Chief Judge Barbera, due to the material fact that both of these individuals are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S.CODE 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 GENOCIDE. 6.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion for Reconsideration. 7.) 3<sup>rd</sup> Motion to have a panel of In Ban Judges to continue to preside over the Petitioner's In Banc Review as mandated under Article IV of the Maryland Constitution by having a panel of 3 In Banc Judges preside over the Petitioners Motions in her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and the right to an oral hearing before the panel of In Banc judges decides to accept or deny the Petition.

Still too, the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Order do not disclose consider, and resolve the material fact that the material facts relevant to the background history of the Petitioner's appeal of her initial civil litigation cited in her 2-27-23, 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions and other Motions in her Civil Complaint filed in 2017 are crucial to substantiating the Petitioner's allegations that the evidence support the material facts that first Judge who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and everyone of the former presiding Judges who has presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or who presided over her appeal in the In Banc Review have repeatedly and deliberately breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 24 , and, thus, the Rule of Law, as a result of their repetitiously and intentionally violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce and/or infringing upon other federal and/or state laws. Therefore, below are more of the material facts and legal arguments as supported by the evidence and cited in the Petitioner's 2-27-23, 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, in other Motions, and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to her Official Complaints against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, against

other Officers of the Court, and/or against other government officials, that substantiate: **1.)** The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner has repetitiously asserted in her Motions that, because of her financial hardship, she can't afford to make copies of all of the material evidence at this time that could accompany these Motions and that are in the record of the Courts, but because her family has supported her in maintaining her website and, thus, most of the evidence germane to the Petitioner's present civil litigations, which include the Official Complaints and/or the Addendums against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against the former presiding judges, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other governmental officials are posted on her website. Thus, the evidence of the material fact that 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, Exhibit 112, and/or 116. 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, 111, and 115. 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, 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. **2.)** The evidence of the material fact that, in 2018, Judge Fletcher-Hill became the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 2017 civil litigation, and only after the Petitioner had filed several Motions, including Motions for Disqualification against Judge Karen Friedman, the original presiding Judge over the Petitioner's present civil litigation. **3.)** The evidence of the material fact that the evidence in the record of the 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, and 9-4-18 Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill presided over the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, and 8-6-18 Motions, respectively. **4.)** The evidence of the material fact that, in each of her Motions dated 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 8-6-18, and 9-17-18, the Petitioner include a Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge as required by Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11 due to the appearance of there being a bias as a result of Judge Fletcher-Hill's

appointment in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions, Civil Complaint, and other documents in the record to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities. Moreover, in these Motions and others, the Petitioner cites that she questions the impartiality and/or bias of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge due to her believing that Judge Fletcher-Hill would be impartial and/or biased because she has alleged in her Civil Complaint, in her other Motions, in her Official Complaint and/or Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, other significant material facts, namely, that the evidence that accompanied her 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals (Exhibit 11 on her website) and her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court (Exhibit 7 on her website) substantiate the allegations that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and breached 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 her 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley is being alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or possibly criminal activities. 5.) The evidence of the material fact that the evidence of Judge Fletcher-Hill's 6-17-22, 8-4-22, 12-16-22, and 2-16-23 Findings and Orders responding to the Petitioner's 4-7-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, and 12-27-22 Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill substantiate the material fact that, for the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge Fletcher-Hill has violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). 6.) The evidence of the material fact that the evidence of Judge Fletcher-Hill's 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, and 9-4-18 Findings and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, and 8-6-18 Motions, respectively, substantiate the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the presiding Judges in the Petitioner's initial civil proceeding, and, therefore, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) mandates that Judge Fletcher-Hill be disqualified from presiding over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review. 7.) The evidence of the material fact that the evidence of the Petitioner's Motions dated 4-7-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, 12-27-22, and 2-27-23 in the record substantiate the material fact that these are Motions from the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, where Judge Fletcher-Hill was the presiding Judge who was unlawfully. 8.) The evidence of the material fact that the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in all of the Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher Hill and by all of the Findings and Orders of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin, as well as the former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's repeated Motions for Disqualification against these judges substantiate the material facts that all of these Officers of the Court have knowingly, willingly, and repeatedly breached 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 of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce and/or other federal and state laws. 9.) The evidence of the material fact that the evidence of the facts declared in and/or the lack thereof of facts proclaimed in the Findings and Orders of Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman, which respond to the



material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's corresponding Motions, which include several Motions for Disqualification against each of these judges for repeated violation of Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18-102.11, substantiate the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other former presiding Judges have been able to for almost 6 years to continually deny the Petitioner's Motions without disclosing, considering, and resolving all of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Petitioner's Motions and without affording the Petitioner's right to have her repeated Motions for a Hearing on her Motions granted. **10.)** The evidence of the material fact that Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution mandates that the Petitioner's In Banc Review, which includes her Motions filed during the In Banc Review proceeding, be presided over by a panel of 3 In Banc Judges, not by one judge and that the Petitioner be granted an oral hearing before the panel of Judges decides to accept or reject the Petitioner. **11.)** The evidence of the material fact that the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Petitioner's Motions substantiate the material facts that: **a.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the previous presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in her appeal in the In Banc Review of the Petitioner's initial civil litigation have repetitiously and intentional refused to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding judges due to being in continuous violation of Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18-102.11. **b.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of In Banc Judges have repeatedly and deliberately breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. **c.)** The evidence substantiates the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill has, also, not only infringed upon Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 (c) for the several times but has, too violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for on several occasions. **d.)** The evidence substantiates the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, and Judge Michel Pierson have breached the Petitioner's rights repeatedly and deliberately as stipulated in Maryland Rule 2-311(f), in repetitiously denying every one of the Petitioner's Motions for a Hearing on her Motions. **12.)** The evidence of the material fact that the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's Motions substantiate the material facts that: **a.)** Judge Michel Pierson presided over the Petitioner's initial civil proceeding after Judge Fletcher-Hill was recused in 2018 from presiding over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation. **b.)** Judge Michel Pierson's last Findings and Order in the Petitioner's initial civil litigation was rendered on 1-2-20. **c.)** In response to Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed a Petition for an In Banc Review and her Memorandum in Support of her In Banc Review on 1-14-20. **d.)** On 1-24-20, the panel of In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, and Judge R. Rubin were designated as the presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review. **e.)** when the panel of In Banc Judges issued their Findings and Orders on 3-30-22 to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions, Judge Rubin had left the Circuit Court and assumed her appointed position to the Biden's Administration as the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, with her first day starting on 3-23-22. **13.)** The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner asserts in her Motions that she questions the legality of Judge Rubin's signature being on the 3-30-22 Findings and Order by the panel of In Banc Judges since Judge Rubin was no longer a judge in the Circuit Court as of 3-23-22. **14.)** The evidence of the material facts that the evidence of his Judge Fletcher-Hill's 4-7-22, 6-17-22, 8-1-22, 12-17-22, and 2-16-22 Findings and Orders which respond to the Petitioner's 3-30-22, 4-17-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, and 12-27-22 Motions, substantiates that Judge Fletcher-Hill repeatedly breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) because Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Orders are responding to Motions in the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review, but since Judge

Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges who formerly presiding over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ) disqualifies Judge Fletcher-Hill from presiding over Petitioner's appeal of her initial civil litigation. 15.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner has motioned for the 7<sup>th</sup> time to the Court that she be granted her right as afforded by Maryland Rule 2-311 to be granted her Motion for a Hearing on her Motions and has been ORDERED, denied, by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judge except for Judge Karen Friedman due to the material fact that the Petitioner did not know that Maryland Rule 2-311 permits her to Motion for a Hearing on her Motions when Judge Karen Friedman was the presiding Judge. 16.) The evidence of the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to cite in his 4-7-22, 6-17-22, 8-1-22, or 12-17-22 Findings and Orders the material fact that Judge Rubin was no longer a judge in the Circuit Court as of 3-23-22, and, therefore, Judge Rubin was no longer one of the panel of In Banc Judges presiding over the Petitioner's Motions from the appeal in the In Banc Review. 17.) The evidence of the material fact that the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in the 2-16-23, 12-17-22, 8-1-22, 6-17-22, and 4-7-22 Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-17-22 Motions, substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner alleges in her 2-13-20 Motions that the evidence substantiate that the panel of In Banc Judges denied her Petition for an In Banc Review before allowing the Petitioner her right to an oral hearing as stipulated in Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution. 18.) The evidence of the material facts that Martin O'Malley appointed Judge Fletcher-Hill to the prominent position as an Administrator to the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City in 2009 and appointed Judge Barbera to the elite position as the new Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals in 2013. 19.) The evidence of the material facts that the other former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman were appointed, also, to the privileged position as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera. 20.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner alleges in her Motions the material fact that there is evidence of the public acknowledgement of the close relationship amongst Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, and/or Judge Karen Friedman. And, under Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman are mandated to disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges since there is an appearance that they would be impartial and/or biased due to their unique appointments as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/or 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 and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities. 21.) The evidence of the material fact that that the Petitioner alleges in her Motions that she asserts in her 2-13-20 Motions that she questions the impartiality and/or fairness in the panel of In Banc Judges rendering their Findings and Order to the Defendant's 2-6-20 Motion on 2-13-20 but issued their Findings and Orders to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 Motions over two years later, namely, on 3-30-22. Still too, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in the 2-16-23, 12-16-22, 8-1-22, and 6-17-22 Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his

Findings and Order the material fact that the Petitioner alleges in her 2-13-20 Motions that the evidence substantiate that the panel of In Banc Judges denied her Petition for an In Banc Review before allowing the Petitioner her right to an oral hearing as stipulated in Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution. Moreover, the Petitioner cites that her 2-13-20 Motions states that: a.) **“The Maryland Constitution cites that, upon the decision or determination of any point, or question, by the Court, it shall be competent to the party, against whom the ruling or decision is made, upon motion, to have the point, or question reserved for the consideration of the three Judges of the Circuit, who shall constitute a court in banc for such purpose. Moreover, when review by a court in banc is permitted by the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner may have a judgment or determination of any point or question reviewed by a court in banc by filing a notice for in banc review. Issues are reserved for in banc review by making an objection in the manner set forth in Rules 2-517 and 2-520. Again, the Court of Appeals set out the details of in banc practice in rule 2-551 of the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure. A “hearing,” as opposed to an argument, is automatically scheduled, but may be waived by consent of all parties. Since the Petitioner did not waive her right to a hearing, the consent by all parties to waive the hearing was not given. Thus, according Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner had a right to a hearing before the In Banc panel once she was granted her Petition for Review on 1-24-20 before the panel of judges and then the panel of judges may decide at the hearing to dismiss the Petitioner’s Petition for In Banc Review and Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review. The Petitioner has yet to have a hearing before the panel of In Banc judges as required by Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, instead of the panel of In Banc judges deciding on 2-6-20 to unlawfully dismiss the Petitioner’s Petition for an In Banc Review. Furthermore, Article IV, § 22 of the Maryland Constitution requires the banc panel to file a brief statement of the reasons for the decision or shall dictate the reasons into the record. The evidence of the facts and/or lack thereof in their 2-6-20 Findings and Decision and Order of the panel of In Banc judges which are response to the Petitioner’s Questions presented for Review in her Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review.....** d.) failed in their obligation as Officers of the Court and as asserted in the procedures for an In Banc Review to disclose, consider, and resolve a single Question Presented for Review in the Petitioner’s Memorandum in Support of an In Banc s that would substantiate the Petitioner’s legal arguments for granting her Petition for an In Banc Review.....” b.) she questions the impartiality and/or fairness in the panel of In Banc Judges rendering their Findings and Order to the Defendant’s 2-6-20 Motion on 2-13-20 but issued their Findings and Orders to the Petitioner’s 2-13-20 Motions over two years later, namely, on 3-30-22. c.) the Defendant has not responded to any of the Petitioner’s Motions since responding to her 1-14-20 Petition, nor have Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, or Judge Michel Pierson mandated a response from the Defendants germane to any of the Petitioner’s Motions filed since 2-13-20. d.) she questions the impartiality and/or fairness by the panel of Banc Judges in failing to disclose in their 1-24-20 Order or in their 2-6-20 Findings and Orders the material fact that the Petitioner filed her Notice for an In Banc Petition and her Memorandum in Support for An In Banc Review on the same day, namely, on 1-14-20. e.) there is no evidence of a “filed date” or “entry date” of the Petitioner’s 1-14-20 Memorandum, but the Petitioner does have copies of these two documents which were stamped by the clerk as filed on 1-14-20, which are labeled as Exhibits 71 and 72 on her website. 22.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in panel of In Banc judges 3-30-22 Findings and Order and the

evidence of the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Petitioner's 2-19-20 Motions, whose 3-30-22 Findings and Orders from the panel of In Banc Judges are responding to, substantiate the material facts that the panel of In Banc judges fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in their 3-30-22 Findings and Orders the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 2-19-20 Motions, whose Heading is entitled **"MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES' 2-6-20 ORDER TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR AN IMMEDIATE "SUBSTITUTION" AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, MOTION FOR "SUBSTITUTION" IN BANC PANEL OF JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE HEARING BECAUSE THE PRESIDING IN BANC PANEL OF JUDGES ARE ONE OF THE JUDGES IN THE PETITIONER'S 2-17-20 OFFICIAL COMPLAINT TO THE FBI, HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP, HON. GOV. HOGAN, CONGRESS, AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WHO ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INTENTIONALLY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512, HAVE CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071, AND, IN DECIDING THE PETITIONER'S 1-14-20 PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW, HER 1-14-20 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AN IN BANC REVIEW, AND IN HER 1-29-20 MOTIONS, WHICH INCLUDES THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, TO HAVE REPEATEDLY, DELIBERATELY, EXCESSIVELY, AND EGREGIOUSLY: 1.) ABUSED THEIR POWER. 2.) DISPLAYED TOTAL CONTEMPT FOR THE RULE OF LAW. 3.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE IN THE CONDUCT OF THE OFFICE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505. 4.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF DEPRIVING THE PETITIONER OF HER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENTS RIGHTS, AND BY VIOLATING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242. 5.) TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512. 6.) CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071. MOTION TO HAVE THE "SUBSTITUTION" PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES APPOINTED BY HON. GOV. HOGAN TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS, AND MOTION TO HAVE THE "SUBSTITUTION" PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO RECONSIDER THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW AND ALL OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS."** 23.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she questions the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, or Judge Karen Friedman disclosing, considering, and resolving these critical material facts as well, namely, that the Petitioner alleges in her 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals (Exhibit 4 on her website) and in her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court that, due to the alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera, the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved. 24.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that, in her 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court (Exhibits 7 and 9 on the Petitioner's website, she asserts the material fact that 5 of the Exhibits that accompanied her Petition, which are the first 5 Exhibits on her website, substantiate, unequivocally, and in less than 5 minutes of reading, the allegation that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in her 2015 Findings and Order. Moreover, the Petitioner alleges that the evidence that accompanied

her 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals substantiate the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and infringed 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 fact that, in the Petitioner's 2014 civil litigation, Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and breached 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 critical allegations, namely, that Martin O'Malley, who was Mayor of Baltimore City from 1999 to 2007 and, thus, one of the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, along with the other Mayors of Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, which include Kurt Schmoke, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott, and the other owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, every member of the City Council who was a member between 1993 until the present, Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the judges who presiding over her present civil litigation that is on appeal, other Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials who are responsible for the health and safety of our children are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities by: a.) having exposed our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based hazards since at least 1993. b.) having 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 because the blood lead testing will not reveal the lead in the blood after about 45 days. Lead stays in the bones for nearly 30 years. Lead is a poison, and when it becomes hazardous, it can possibly kill you. c.) failing in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of the children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison. d.) having for decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, misconduct in office, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. e.) having refused, for nearly a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for decades. f.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities for close to a quarter of a century. 25.) The evidence of the material fact that Kurt Schmoke was the Mayor of Baltimore City and Martin O'Malley was a member of the City Council when the Petitioner initially started whistleblowing about the lead hazards in the schools in 1996. 26.) The evidence of the material fact that, during the Petitioner's continued whistleblowing, Martin O'Malley became Mayor of Baltimore City in 1999 and held this office for 8 years, and he became Governor of Maryland in 2007 and held this position, also, for 8 years.

Moreover, the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Order do not disclose consider, and resolve these material historical background of the Petitioner's appeal of her initial civil litigation, whose initial Civil Complaint was filed in 2017 and which are crucial to substantiating the Petitioner's allegations that the first Judge who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and everyone of the other judge who has presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or her appeal in the In Banc Review are being have repeatedly and deliberately breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 24 , and, thus, the Rule of Law, as a result of their repetitiously and intentionally violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. Consequently, below are more of some of the material facts and legal arguments as supported by the evidence and cited in the Petitioner's 2-27-23, 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, in other Motions, in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to her Official Complaints and/or in her **2<sup>nd</sup> Official Addendum to the Petitioner's 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill**, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other government officials that the evidence substantiate that material facts, namely, that: **1.)** The evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and ORDER and all of the facts stated in and/or lack of thereof of facts asserted in all the Findings and Order by Judge Fletcher-Hill and in all of the Findings and Orders by the other presiding Judges, (which again, include Judge Fletcher-Hill) ,the evidence facts declared in and/or the lack thereof of facts proclaimed in the 3-23-23 Finding and Order of the Court and the evidence of the all of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in all of the Petitioner's Motions, beginning with her first Motions in 2018, unequivocally, substantiate that: **a.)** The Petitioner's 2-27-23, 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, 4-7-11, and all of her other Motions are not "frivolous" or "lacking in merit". **2.)** The Court's 3-23-23 Findings and ORDER and all of Findings and ORDERS by Judge Fletcher- Hill, and all of the formerly presiding Judges, namely, Judge Carrión, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, consistently and as stated in the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-28-20 Official Complaint follow the same pattern. And, in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to her 2-28-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, the Petitioner asserts that she alleges that, in the 3-23-23 Findings and Orders of the Court and in all the Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges, the evidence support the material facts that citing the facts in their Findings and Orders, **"The pattern employed by these Officers of the Court includes: 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 the differences in their facts and legal argument that are contrary to the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings and Recommendations by other Officers of the Court and that are substantiated by the evidence in the record. 4.) concealing in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments declared in my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my Oral Arguments that are contrary to their Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings the differences in their facts and legal arguments that a contrary to the**

material facts and legal arguments asserted in my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my Oral Arguments and that are 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 my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my 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 my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my 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.) my liberty granted by our great Constitution as stated in the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment. b.) my Civil Rights, which are my rights to be an active part of a society and economy without discrimination or oppression as afforded under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 and 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 4-204, and other Maryland Rules governing judicial proceedings. e.) and/or other federal and state laws.”

Also, the Court’s 3-23-23 Findings and Order do not disclose consider, and resolve these material background history of the Petitioner’s appeal of her initial civil litigation, whose initial Civil Complaint was filed in 2017 and which are vital to substantiating the Petitioner’s allegations that the first Judge who presided over the Petitioner’s initial civil litigation and every other judge who has presided over the Petitioner’s initial civil litigation and/or her appeal in the In Banc Review are being have repeatedly and deliberately breached the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 24 , and, thus, the Rule of Law, as a result of their repetitiously and intentionally violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. Wherefore, below are more of the material facts and legal arguments as supported by the evidence and cited in the Petitioner’s 2-27-23, 12-27-22, and/or in her 2<sup>nd</sup> **Official Addendum to the Petitioner’s 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill**, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O’Malley, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other government officials that the evidence substantiate that material facts, namely, that: **1.)** The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner asserts that she called the Circuit Court on 8-18-22 and informed the clerk and the supervisor that the Heading in her 8-11-22 Motions was not entered on the Circuit Court’s website as it is cited in the Heading of her Motions, but was entered on the Circuit Court’s website as **“Motion” and “Request for Hearing on Selection Motion”**. **2.)** The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she read the Heading of her Motions to the supervisor and protested vigorously that the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions should be inserted on the Circuit Court’s website exactly as it is stated in the Heading of her Motions. **3.)** The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner declares that she called the Circuit Court and declared to the clerk ( whose name the Petitioner prefers not reveal in order to protect the innocent),after finding out on the morning of 8-22-22 that the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions was still not recorded as declared in the Heading of the Petitioner’s Motions but was entered on the Circuit Court’s website as **“ 6<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification for “Fraud Upon the**

**Court” under Federal Statue 28 U,S,C, & 455(a)” and “Request for Hearing on Selected Motion”, and cited her righteous indignation in regard to the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions not being entered on the Circuit Court as cited in the Heading of her Motions. 4.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner asserts that the clerk requested that the Petitioner give her a few minutes to speak with her supervisor, and after speaking with the supervisor, the clerk informed the Petitioner that the supervisor declared that there would be no changes made to what was written on the Circuit Court’s website. 5.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner states that she asked this clerk if she could speak to Ms. Marilyn Bentley, the Clerk of the Court, and the clerk connected the Petitioner to Ms. Bentley’s office. 6.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she was informed by a female that Ms. Bentley was not available. 7.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner asserts that she asked the female, “To whom am I speaking with” and was informed by the young lady that she could not give the Petitioner her name, but inquired as to why the Petitioner was calling Ms. Bentley’s office. 8.) The evidence support the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she repeated, again, amongst other things, her righteous anger in not having the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions stated on the Circuit Court’s website as it is stated in the Heading of her Motions. 9.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she was told by this female she would connect her to “Ms.” (whose name the female did mention, but to protect the innocent, the Petitioner will call her “Ms.”) who could assist her. 10.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner claims that, when calling the Circuit Court, the recording informs the individual of the likelihood that his/her conversation will be recorded for quality control purposes. 11.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges she knew that it was possible that her conversation was being recorded prior to her speaking to the clerk and the supervisor on 8-18-22, before talking with another clerk on 8-22-22, prior to conversing with the young lady who refuse to give the Petitioner her name on 8-22-22, and/or before having a conversation with “Ms.” on 8-22-22. Informed these females, during the various conversations and at difference times of one or more of the material facts, namely, that: a.) The Petitioner’s Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions was entered on the Circuit Court’s website as **“Motion” and “Request for Hearing on Selection Motion”** when she checked the Circuit Court’s website on 8-18-22, and the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions was entered on the Circuit Court’s website as **“6th Motion for Disqualification for “Fraud Upon the Court” under Federal Statue 28 U,S,C, & 455(a)” and “Request for Hearing on Selected Motion”** when the Petitioner checked the Circuit Court’s website just prior to calling the Circuit Court on the morning of 8-22-22. b.) The Petitioner did not file “a Motion”, but filed “Motions” and proceeded to read, verbatim, the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions, which is entitled **“6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR “FRAUD UPON THE COURT” UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER “THE RULE OF LAW” AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR “FRAUD UPON THE COURT” UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER’S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, 3<sup>rd</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARINGON THE MOTIONS”**. c.) The Petitioner’s**



Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions should be stated, verbatim, on the Circuit Court's website as it is cited in the Heading of her Motions. d.) The clerk/s should not attempt to hide the material facts in the Heading of the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions from the public's viewing on the Circuit Court's website, namely, that it is being alleged in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the "Judge-in-Charge" over the Civil division in the Circuit Court, has committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the sixth time, has breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5( c) for the second time, that Judge Fletcher-Hill has breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for the second time, that Judge Fletcher-Hill has violated the "Rule of Law" for the sixth time, and that a plea for a hearing on the Petitioner's Motions has been requested for the fifth time. e.) No Officer of the Court, which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill, is above the Rule of Law. f.) Judge Fletcher-Hill should know that Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 require his voluntary disqualification and recusal since there is an appearance of his being bias and/or impartial as a result of Judge Fletcher-Hill being appointed as an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions to have committed misconduct in office and/or federal crimes. g.) According to Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Judge Fletcher-Hill should not have presided over the Petitioner's 4-7-22 and 6-24-22 Motions, should not preside over her 8-11-22 Motions, nor should Judge Fletcher-Hill preside over any other Motions originating from the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation since Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation. 12.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she was informed by "Ms." during their one-on-one telephone conversation that "Ms" was in agreement with the some of the material facts stated above by Petitioner. 13.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges she was assured by "Ms." on the morning of 8-22-22 that she would retrieve the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions and that by the end of the work day, the Heading of the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions would be entered on the Circuit Court's website exactly as it is declared in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions. 14.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner claims that she was pleased when she checked the website, again, prior to 5:00 p.m. on 8-22-22 and the Heading of her Motions filed on 8-11-22 was entered on the Circuit Court's website precisely as stated in the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions. 15.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner proclaims that she called the Circuit Court and spoke with "Ms.", whom the Petitioner asserts that she had a conversation with on 8-22-22 and who had the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions cited on the Circuit Court's website as clearly delineated in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions, after returning home from filing her 12-27-22 Motions in the Circuit Court. The Petitioner declares that she pleaded with "Ms." to make sure that the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions was stated on the Circuit Court's website exactly as it is proclaimed in the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions. 16.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner asserts that "Ms." assured her that she would make an effort to ensure that the Petitioner's Heading in her 12-27-22 Motions is entitled, verbatim, as in the Petitioner's actual 12-27-22 Motions, whose Heading is entitled **"7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND VIOLATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST**

JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, JUDGES NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES, 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311".

17.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner declares that, on 12-28-22, she checked the Circuit Court's website and discovered that the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions on the Circuit Court's website is not declared, verbatim, as in the Heading of her actual 12-27-22 Motions, but is stated as follows: **"7th Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" Under Federal Statue 28 U,S,C, & 455(a), Under MD Rule 18.102.11 and under "The Rule of Law" Against Judge Fletcher-Hill and 2nd Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" under MD Rule 18.102.11 5(C) Against Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion to Have a Panel of In Banc Judges to Continue to Preside Over the Petitioner's In Banc Review as Mandated under Article IV & 22 of the MD Constitution, 3rd Motion for All Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, by the Panel of In Banc Judges, by Judge Michel Pierson, and by Judge Karen Friedman be Deemed Void as a Matter of Law under Federal Statue 28 U.S.C & 455(A) and under MD Rule 18-102.11, Motion for Reconsideration"**. 18.) The evidence support the material fact that the evidence of the Heading in her 12-27-22 Motions substantiates the material facts, namely, that clerk who posted the Petitioner's Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions, a legal document, on the Circuit Court's website for public viewing failed to: a.) state in its entirety the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion as proclaimed in the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions, which declares **"2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, JUDGES NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES"**. b.) include the fact that, within the Heading of the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions is her Motion entitled **"2<sup>nd</sup> Motion for Reconsideration"** not a "Motion for Reconsideration" as cited on the Circuit Court's website. c.) include the Petitioner's last Motion stated within the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions, which proclaims **"AND 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311"**. 19.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she called the Circuit Court on 12-29-22 and spoke with "Ms. P" (whose name the Petitioner will omit to protect the innocent) germane to having the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions asserted, verbatim, on the Circuit Court's website as stated in the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions. 20.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she informed "Ms. P" that "Ms." was the individual who had the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions changed on the Circuit Court's website to declare what is exactly written in the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions. 21.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner asserts that "Ms. P" assured her that she would get "Ms." to change the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions on the Circuit Court's website to reflect what is clearly cited in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions. 22.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that, when she checked the Circuit Court's website on 12-30-22 and noticed that the Heading in her 12-27-22 Motions was still not written, verbatim, on the Circuit Court's

website, she called the Clerk of the Court's office and asked to speak to Mr. Xavier Conaway, the newly elected Clerk of the Court for Baltimore City. Further, the Petitioner declares that the female who answered the telephone told the Petitioner her name, informed her that she was Mr. Conaway's Assistant, and inquired as to why the Petitioner wanted to speak with Mr. Conaway. 23.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she explained to "Ms. A." (whose name the Petitioner will not declare in order to protect the innocent) that the clerk did not state, verbatim, the Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions on the Circuit Court's website and that the Petitioner had encountered the same problem with having the Heading of her 8-11-22 Motions being written precisely as the Heading in her 8-11-22 Motions until she spoke with "Ms." who assured the Petitioner on 8-22-22 and kept her promise in having the Heading of the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions entered on the Circuit Court's website exactly as it is stated in the Heading of her Motions on this same day. 24.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner states that she informed "Ms. A" that it appears that, if a clerk fails to proclaim, verbatim, on the Circuit Court's website the Heading of her Motions, which is viewed publicly, then that clerk could be guilty of committing Fraud. 25.) The evidence support the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that "Ms. A" informed her that she would get back to her by the end of the work day. 26.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner declares that, before 5:00 p.m. on this same day, she checked her telephone messages and discovered that "Ms. A", left a message in which "Ms. A", amongst other things, informed the Petitioner that she had sent emails to the individuals that the Petitioner had spoken to her about over the telephone and that she and/or they would be in touch with the Petitioner after January 3, 2023. 27.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner proclaims that she immediately, called "Ms. A", informed her that she had received her message, and told "Ms. A" that she wanted her to compare what is written on the Circuit Court's website as the Heading to the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions with the actual Heading of her 12-27-22 Motions. 28.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she gave "Ms. A" her website address and the Exhibit Number to her 12-27-22 Motions posted on the Petitioner's website. 29.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner declares that, although the date was unintentionally omitted, the undated copy of the missive to the Clerk of the Court (Exhibit 101 on the Petitioner's website) was completed and dropped off at the local post office box on 1-7-23. Still too, the Petitioner asserts that another copy of this same letter was sent, again, to Mr. Conaway with a handwritten "Note" at the bottom of the letter dated 1-12-23 (Exhibit 102 on the Petitioner's website), which explains that the date was mistakenly omitted in the original memo. The Petitioner declares that on 1-14-23 she sent this same memo to Mr. Conaway (Exhibit 5 which is, also, cited as Exhibit 105 on the Petitioner's website) but this time the letter was sent certified as indicated in the handwritten note at the bottom of this letter. In the handwritten note written by the Petitioner on the third copy of the same undated letter, the Petitioner alleges that she wrote the handwritten "Note" dated 1-14-23 to Mr. Xavier to affirm that the same letter sent to him twice through regular mail was being sent to him a third time, certified. The Petitioner alleges that, on 2-16-23, she received mail from the Office of the Clerk of the Court, not from the postal service as in the case with Judge Fletcher's returned postal receipt. The Petitioner alleges that inside the mail from the Office of the Clerk was the Petitioner's envelope which contained her 1-14-23 certified letter, the Petitioner's envelope was opened which had inside of it the same letter sent certified to Mr. Conaway on 1-14-23, and on the certified receipt from the postal service, it has the date of 2-9-23 given as the day on which "Mr. J. Smith's" name

is signed and printed and certified receipt. 30.) The evidence supports the material fact that the Petitioner's undated letter to Mr. Conaway on 1-7-23 states "To: Mr. Xavier Conaway, Clerk of the Court for Baltimore City

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams

Re: Plead to follow the protocol for recording the Heading of a legal document on the Circuit Court's website for public viewing

If a clerk fails to state on the Circuit Court's website the Heading in a party's 12-27-22 Motions, a legal document, as clearly delineated in the Heading of the Motions, which is viewed by the public, then that clerk could be guilty of committing Fraud, which is a crime. One of the main responsibilities of the Clerk of the Court is to record land deeds, mortgages, plats, conveyances and other precious documents. I do not want the Clerk of the Court to be in danger of being alleged to have committed Fraud in altering the Heading of an official legal document, thus deceiving and misrepresenting on the Circuit Court's website, which is opened to the public for viewing, the actual Heading in a legal document, namely, in the Heading of my 12-27-22 Motions. Further, I don't want the Clerk of the Court to be accused of intentionally committing Fraud as a result of repetitiously refusing to change the Circuit Court's posting of the altered Heading of an official legal document to the verbatim quoting as stated in the Heading of the official legal document, even after being warned of the material facts that I, the Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se in this Civil litigation, am alleging that, if the Clerk of the Court do not mandate that the clerk declare, verbatim, the Heading in the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions, then Clerk of the Court should hold some responsibility in the allegation of Fraud in altering the Heading in a legal document on the Circuit Court's website that it used for public viewing.

Sincerely,

Cc: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Ms. Adrienne"

Still too, the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Order do not disclose consider, and resolve these material facts in the background history of the Petitioner's appeal of her initial civil litigation, whose initial Civil Complaint was filed in 2017 and which are crucial to substantiating the Petitioner's allegations that the first Judge who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and every other judge who have presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or her appeal in the In Banc Review are being have repeatedly and deliberately breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 24 , and, thus, the Rule of Law, as a result of their repetitiously and intentionally violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. Therefore, below are still more of some of the material facts and legal arguments as supported by the evidence and cited in the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Official Addendum to the Petitioner's 2-18-20 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Carrion, against Judge Phinn, against Judge Rubin, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Karen Friedman, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Martin O'Malley, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other government officials, that the

evidence substantiate that material facts that the Petitioner alleges that: **1.)** The evidence of the material facts that, due to the material fact that the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and Order responding to the Petitioner's 2-27-22 Motions and the evidence of Judge Fletcher-Hill's Motions, which include repetitious pleadings that these Officers of the Court determine if the evidence in the record, undeniable, substantiate the material fact that the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right and, thus, a violation of the Rule of Law, as a result of the repeated and intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the previous presiding Judges and, then the Court include in their Findings and Orders an ORDER to immediately disqualify and recuse Judge Fletcher-Hill from presiding over the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and to issue an ORDER to deem all ORDERS by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all ORDERS by the other presiding Judges as void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11.

**2.)** The evidence of the material facts that, since the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Petitioner's 2-27-23, 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 5-24-22, and 4-17-22 Motions and in her other Motions substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges failed enforce and uphold the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right and, thus, a violation of the Rule of Law, due to the material fact that the evidence substantiate the repeated and intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the previous presiding Judges, the Court should have included in their 3-23-23 Findings and Order, other ORDERS, which include ORDERS mandating immediate disqualification and recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill from presiding over the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions and issue an ORDER to deem all ORDERS by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all ORDERS by the other presiding Judges as void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, the Petitioner has sent by certified and regular mail 3 "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITIONS" to the Gov. of Maryland, Wes Moore. Exhibits 1 and 2 are two of 7 Exhibits that accompany the Petitioner's 2-27-22 Motions, which are copies of the first two certified letters sent to Gov. Moore on 1-10-23 and 2-17-23, respectively, and which substantiate the material facts in the Introduction of these instant Motions. Furthermore, Exhibit 1 a copy of the Petitioner's 3<sup>rd</sup> "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" that was sent by certified and regular mail on 4-5-23 requesting, amongst other he enforce the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right, her 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment Right, and, thus, the Rule of Law, to PETITION FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES AS STIPULATED IN OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT, 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 ORDER: The material facts cited in the Introduction of these instant Motions from copies of the Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> "URGENT TIME SENSITIVE PLEADINGS" sent by certified and regular mail to Gov. Moore on 1-10-23 and 2-17-23, respectively, are substantiated by Exhibits 1 and 2. The two Exhibits are among 7 Exhibits that accompany the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions (Exhibits 113 and 114 on the Petitioner's website). Attached to the Petitioner's instant Motions as "Exhibit 1" is a copy of the Petitioner's "3<sup>rd</sup> URGENT TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" (Exhibit 117 on the Petitioner's website) sent by certified and regular mail to Gov. Moore on 4-5-23.

**3.)** The evidence of the material fact that as evidenced by the facts declared in Exhibit 1 attached to the Petitioner's instant Motions, in the "Re:" section of her 3<sup>rd</sup> URGENT TIME SENSITIVE PLEADING, the Petitioner states "Re: "3<sup>RD</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE" PETITION FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES AS STIPULATED IN OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT, 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 ORDER: 1.) a Disqualification and Recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation because the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the 7 Motions within my approximately 30-page 2-27-23 Motions ( Exhibits 113 and 114 on my website, and the evidence of the Circuit Court's Order entered by the clerk on the Court's public-viewing website on 3-23-23 which responds to my 2-27-23 Motions by simply citing "Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. N.J" substantiate the material fact that the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and Order fail to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the very material facts and legal arguments cited in the body of my 2-27-23 Motions to the Court, which include the allegation of repeated and deliberate violations of my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thus, a breaching of the Rule of Law by Judge Fletcher-Hill as a result of his intentional and: a.) for the eighth time, violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and, thereby, has breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 for the eighth time in infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the eighth time. b.) for the fourth time, infringing upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) and Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), therefore, has breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, for the fourth time in breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) and Maryland Rule 2-311(f) for the fourth time. c.) for the 4<sup>th</sup> time, violating Article IV of the Maryland Constitution and has, thus, for the 4<sup>th</sup> time breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 for the 4<sup>th</sup> time in violating Article IV of the Maryland Constitution for the 4<sup>th</sup> time. d.) and, has repeatedly infringed upon other federal and/or state laws and, thus, has continuously breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by repeatedly violating other federal and/or state laws. 2.) an enforcement of Article IV in the Maryland Constitution which stipulates that a panel of 3 In Banc Judges preside over my Motions in my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation and that I have an oral hearing before the panel of Judges decides to accept or deny my Petition. 3.) that only judges who were not appointed by the former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, preside over my In Banc Review because Martin O'Malley, Chief Judge Barbera, along with Judge Fletcher-Hill, all of the other presiding Judges over my present civil litigation and the appeal, other Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged in my Motions, in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint, and/or in other Official Complaints to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws." 4.) The evidence of the material fact that, similar to the Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADINGS, in her 3<sup>rd</sup> missive sent by certified and regular mail on 4-5-23 to Gov. Moore, amongst other things, the Petitioner asserts "My other two "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADINGS" to you, Gov. Moore, were, also, sent by certified and/or regular mail on 1-10-23 and 2-17-23, respectively. As declared in these two URGENT PLEADINGS, in my new Motions, in my 2-27-23 Motions, in other Motions, and in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, the evidence in the record of the court, on my website, and/or that will be admitted

into evidence during Discovery and/or during my requested jury trial will substantiate the allegations that the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott and every member of the City Council of Baltimore from 1993 to the present, Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges over my initial civil litigation and on the appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation, other Officers of the Court, former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan and Martin O'Malley, our present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore, and/or other governmental officials have: 1.) allowed our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at least 1993 and are, thereby, being alleged to have since 1993 intentionally 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, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws. 2.) for almost 3 decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempt and conspiracy to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, commit misconduct in office, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. 3.) refused for over a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials whose being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 3 decades. 4.) and/or 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 who have been 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 other criminal acts.” 5.) The evidence of the material fact that in the section of the Petitioner’s 2-27-23 Motions labeled “Argument”, she asserts that “The Petitioner’s argues that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner’s website, and evidence that will be admitted during Discovery and revealed during the Petitioner’s requested jury trial support the material facts, namely, the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the other judges who formerly presided over her appeal in the In Banc Review of the Petitioner’s initial civil litigation, and the judges who presided over her initial litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have continued to deliberately, unlawfully, deny the Petitioner’s Motions, which include repeated Motions for their Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill and the other formerly presiding Judges for deliberately and repetitiously breaching Federal Statute, Maryland Rule, Maryland Rule 5(c), and/or other Federal and State laws, and, thus, infringing upon the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and/or breaching the Rule of Law in order to, ultimately, grant the Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Petitioner’s 2017 Civil Complaint in order to attempt to continue to conceal the critical material facts which will be revealed during the hearing, which include the allegations that: 1.) In her 2015 Motion for Consideration to the Court of Appeals and in her 2016 Petition to the Supreme that the first 5 Exhibits on the her website, namely, Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 which can be read in about 5 minutes, prove, indisputably, that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury, which is “Fraud Upon the Court”. 2.) Due to alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera, the issues raised in the Petitioner’s 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which includes the material facts that the Petitioner alleges that the evidence that accompanied her 2015 Writ to the

Court of Appeals, the evidence on her website, and/or the evidence in the record of the Petitioner's 2014 Civil proceedings in the Circuit Court substantiate the allegations, namely that, in their 2014 the Findings, the In Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to cover up the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and breached 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 Martin O'Malley, who was Mayor of Baltimore City from 1999 to 2007 and, thus, one of the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, along with the other Mayors of Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott, and the other owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, every member of the City Council who was a member between 1993 until the present, and/or other governmental officials who are responsible for the health and safety of our children are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities by: a.) having exposed our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based hazards since at least 1993. b.) having 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 because the blood lead testing will not reveal the lead in the blood after about 45 days. Lead stays in the bones for nearly 30 years. Lead is a poison, and when it becomes hazardous, it can possibly kill you. c.) failing in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of the children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison. d.) having for decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of misconduct in office, crimes against humanity, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. e.) having refused, for nearly a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison. f.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal activities for several decade."

## ARGUMENT

An attorney, who has been practicing law for over 45 years, declares "A legal system that does not follow the rule of law and apply it fairly and equally to ALL, is not a legal system at all." The evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in the 3-23-23 Findings and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Petitioner's s instant Motions, (which are, too, alleged in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or other



Motions) substantiate the material facts, namely, that the 3-23-23 Finding and Order the Court fail to state all of the material facts and legal arguments in the 2-27-23 Petitioner's Motions in his 3-23-23 Findings and ORDER which include the material fact that: 1.) the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the material fact that the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and intentionally violated by Judge Fletcher-Hill who has, thus far and according to Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ), unlawfully presided over 5 of the Petitioner's Motions relating to her appeal of the her initial civil litigation because Judge Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges who presided over at least three of the Petitioner's Motions relating to her initial civil litigation. 2.) the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the material fact that the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, were repetitiously and intentionally violated by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the previously presiding Judges (which, again include Judge Fletcher-Hill) due to the material facts that the evidence substantiate the material fact that that all of these Officers of the Court repeatedly and deliberately violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 as a result of their repeated and deliberate refusals to voluntarily disqualify and recused themselves because in the Petitioner's Motions she continued to cite that she questions the appearance of impartiality and/or biased by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the Officers of the Court who presided over her initial civil litigation and/or presiding over her appeal in the In Banc Review of the Petitioner's initial civil litigation due to the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges, which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill, were appointed to the elite position as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/ or by Chief Judge Barbera , both of whom are being alleged to have repetitiously and deliberately 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, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws. 3.) the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the material facts that the 3-23-23 Finding and ORDERS should have included ORDERS not only mandating immediate disqualification of Judge Fletcher but that all of the ORDERS by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all ORDERS by the former presiding Judge (which include Judge Fletcher-Hill) be deemed void as a matter of law due to the repeated and deliberate violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a ), and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and, thus, the repetitious and intentional breaching of the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law. 4.) the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the material facts that the 3-23-23 Finding and ORDERS should have included the material facts in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions which substantiate the continuous and deliberate breaching of the Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the previous presiding Judges (which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill) not only due to their repetitiously and intentionally breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a ), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5, and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c but, also, because of these Officers' of the Court repeatedly and deliberately violating Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), breaching Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing "Fraud Upon the Court", committing Treason to the Constitution, committing Interference with Interstate Commerce and/or by infringing upon other federal and/or state laws.

**CONCLUSION**

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

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court


Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

**Certificate of Service**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 5<sup>th</sup> day of April 2023, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's: 1.) 9<sup>TH</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Fletcher-Hill For Violations Of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And, Thus, For Ninth Time, Committing Fraud Upon The Court", Treason Against The Constitution, Interference With Interstate Commerce, And Breaching The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Repetitiously Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 2.) 5<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Fletcher-Hill For Violations of Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) And, Thus, For The Fifth Time, Committing "Fraud Upon The Court" And Breaching The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Continuously Infringing Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c) Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 3.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion To Have A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside Over the Petitioner's In Banc Review And To Have An Oral Hearing Before The Panel Accept Or Deny The Petition And To Have An Oral Hearing Before the Panel Accepts Or Denies the Petition As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, And To Select Judges 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 And/Or Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - Genocide Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 4.) 6<sup>TH</sup> Motion For All Orders By Judge Fletcher-Hill, By The Panel Of In Banc Judges, By Judge Michel Pierson, and By Judge Karen Friedman Be Deemed Void As A Matter Of Law Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup>

Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 5.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For Reconsideration Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions. 6.) Motion For The Court To ORDER The Clerk To File On The Circuit Court's Website The Heading Of The Petitioner's Motions Verbatim As Cited In Her Motions. 7.) 8<sup>th</sup> Motion for A Hearing on the Motions as Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311 Because The Court's 3-23-23 Order Only Denies The "Stay" In The 1<sup>st</sup> Motion Of The Petitioner's "7" 2-27-23 Motions was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd., Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Diana R. Williams", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

**REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

Petitioner is requesting a hearing on her Motions.

Cc: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Public

# Exhibit 1

To: Gov. Of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams

Re: "3<sup>RD</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE" PETITION FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES AS STIPULATED IN OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT, 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 ORDER:

1.) a Disqualification and Recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation because the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the 7 Motions within my approximately 30-page 2-27-23 Motions ( Exhibits 113 and 114 on my website, [www.diana-r-williams.com](http://www.diana-r-williams.com) ) and the evidence of the Circuit Court's Order entered by the clerk on the Court's public-viewing website on 3-23-23 which responds to my 2-27-23 Motions by citing "Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. N.J" substantiate the material fact that the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and Order fail to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the very material facts and legal arguments cited in the body of my 2-27-23 Motions to the Court, which include the allegations of repeated and deliberate violations of my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thus, a breaching of the Rule of Law, by Judge Fletcher-Hill as a result of his intentional and: a.) for the eighth time, violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and, thereby, has breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 for the eighth time in infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the eighth time. b.) for the fourth time, infringing upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) and Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), therefore, has breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, for the fourth time in breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) and Maryland Rule 2-311(f) for the fourth time. c.) for the 4<sup>th</sup> time, violating Article IV of the Maryland Constitution and has, thus, for the 4<sup>th</sup> time breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in violating Article IV of the Maryland Constitution for the 4<sup>th</sup> time. d.) and, has repeatedly infringed upon other federal and/or state laws and, thus, has continuously breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by repeatedly violating other federal and/or state laws. 2.) an enforcement of Article IV in the Maryland Constitution which stipulates that a panel of 3 In Banc Judges presides over my Motions in my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation and that I have an oral hearing before the panel of In Banc Judges decides to accept or deny my Petition. 3.) that only judges who were not appointed by the former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, preside over my In Banc Review because Martin O'Malley, Chief Judge Barbera, along with Judge Fletcher-Hill, all of the other presiding Judges over my present civil litigation and the appeal, other Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged in my Motions, in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint, and/or in other Official Complaints to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws.

Date: 4-5-23

I'm righteously indignant due to material fact that the evidence of the 3-21-23 Finding and Order of the Court entered by the clerk on the Circuit Court's public-viewing website on 3-23-23 which responds only to my 1<sup>st</sup> Motion of the 7 Motions within my approximately 30 page 2-27-23 Motions by simply citing "Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. N.J" without disclosing considering, and resolving all of the material facts and legal arguments in my 7 Motions dated 2-27-23. The 3-23-23 Order by the Court only denies my 1<sup>st</sup> Motion of the 7 Motions asserted in the Heading of my 2-27-23 Motions, which is my plea for a STAY on the Court's responding to my 6 other Motions until you, Gov. Wes Moore, had the opportunity to respond to my 2<sup>nd</sup> Urgent and Time Sensitive Pleading dated 2-17-23, which was sent by certified and regular mail to your office on this same date and which, too, amongst other petitions, pleads for you, Gov. Moore, to immediately Order disqualification and recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge for the same reasons cited in the "Re:" section of this missive.

The Court's 3-23-23 Order doesn't Order the disqualification and recusal of the Judge-in Charge of the Civil Division at the Circuit Court, namely, Judge Fletcher-Hill, as being the presiding Judge over my 6 other Motions declared in my 2-27-23 Motions, nor does the 3-23-23 Order of the Court Orders Judge Fletcher-Hill's disqualification and recusal as the presiding Judge over my new Motions, which responds to the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and Order and which will be displayed on my website no later than 4-5-23 as Exhibit 116. Still too, the 3-23-23 Finding and Order of the Court fail to disclose consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in the 7 Motions within my Motions, which, too, include my plea that the Court determines if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, have been repeatedly and deliberately breached due to the alleged repetitious and intentional violations of the Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ), and/or other federal and/or state laws by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the former presiding Judges which substantiates my 2-27-23 Motions, which include my: a.) 8<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification of the present presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill for infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. b.) 7<sup>th</sup> Motion for Hearing on her Motions. c.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification of the present presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill for breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c). d.) 5<sup>th</sup> Motion for all Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, by the panel of In Banc Judges, by Judge Michel Pierson, and/or by Judge Karen Friedman be deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), under Maryland Rule 18.102.11and/or under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c).

Again, and as alleged in my new 4-5-23 Motions, in my 2-27-23 Motions, and in my other previous Motions, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments stated in my Motions and the accompanying Exhibits in the record and on my website will substantiate the material facts that, since the beginning of my civil litigation in 2017 to the present, I've been coerced to file numerous Motions alleging repeated and deliberate breaching of my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18 US.C & Section, 242, therefore, the violations of the Rule of Law, by Judge Fletcher and all of the other judges who formerly presided over my initial civil litigation and my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation due to these Officers of the Court repetitiously and deliberately infringing upon 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), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, Interference with Interstate Commerce and/or infringing upon other federal and/or state laws.

My previous Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, my Addendums to my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or my other Official Complaints in which Judge Fletcher-Hill's alleged violations of federal and state laws are included are on my website. My Motions, which include Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, my Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or other Official Complaints and/or other Addendums which include allegations against Judge Fletcher-Hill are in the record and/or can be located on my 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, , and/or 116. My 2-27-23 Motions, which include my 8<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualifications against Judge Fletcher-Hill, can be located on my website as Exhibits 113 and 114. The 3-23-23 Finding and Order by the Court responding to my 2-27-23 Motions can be located on my website as Exhibit 115. The Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill can be viewed on my website as Exhibits 50, 51, 52, 67, 95, 97, 99, and 112. My Motions, which include my Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions against the panel of In Banc Judges and/or in other Official Complaints and/or in other Addendums which include allegations against the panel of In Banc Judges are in the record and/or can be viewed from my website, namely, Exhibits 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 my website as Exhibits, 73, 75, and 93. My Motions, which include Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions against Judge Michel Pierson, my Official Complaint, and/or Addendums to my 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 my website. The Findings and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson can be viewed on my website as Exhibits 59, 63, 66, and 70. My Motions, which include Motions for Disqualification and/or Substitution against Judge Karen Friedman, my Official Complaint, and/or my Addendums to my Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman are in the record and/or can be viewed on my website as 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 my website as Exhibits 47, 48, and 49. My Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, my Addendums to my 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 my website.

The evidence of my 2-27-23 Motions substantiate the allegation that the clerk fraudulently declared on the Circuit Court's public-viewing website on 3-6-23 as "Doc. No./Seq. No. 43/0" that the Heading in my 2-27-23 Motions, a legal document, states "**Motion for the Court to Stay Motions, with Exhibits**". The evidence of my actual 2-27-23 Motions substantiate that the Heading of my 2-27-23 Motions is entitled "**1.) MOTION FOR THE COURT TO STAY THE OTHER MOTIONS CITED BELOW UNTIL GOV. MOORE RESPONDS TO THE PETITIONER'S 2-17-23 CERTIFIED LETTER, WHICH PLEADS THAT GOV. MOORE EXERCISES HIS EXECUTIVE POWER AND ORDER AN IMMEDIATE STAY ON JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL BEING THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND ORDER AN IMMEDIATE RECUSAL OF JUDGE**

FLETCHER-HILL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO HIS BREACHING FOR THE EIGHTH TIME FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND FOR THE FOURTH TIME VIOLATING MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (C). 2.) 8<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, FOR THE EIGHTH TIME, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REPETITIOUSLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11. 3.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AND, THUS, FOR THE FOURTH TIME, COMMITTING " FRAUD UPON THE COURT" AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY CONTINUOUSLY INFRINGING UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 4.) 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND TO SELECT JUDGES 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 AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - GENOCIDE. 5.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11. 6.) 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311"

My other two "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADINGS" to you, Gov. Moore, were, also, sent by certified and/or regular mail on 1-10-23 and 2-17-23, respectively. As declared in these two URGENT PLEADINGS, in my new 4-5-23 Motions, in my 2-27-23 Motions, in other Motions, and in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, the evidence in the record of the court, on my website, and/or that will be admitted into evidence during Discovery and/or during my requested jury trial will substantiate the allegations that the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and Brandon Scott and every member of the City Council of Baltimore from 1993 to the present, Chief Judge Barbera, Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other presiding Judges over my initial civil litigation and on the appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation, other Officers of the Court, former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan and Martin O'Malley, our present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore, and/or other governmental officials have: 1.) allowed our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at least 1993 and are, thereby, being alleged to have since 1993 intentionally 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, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws. 2.) for almost 3 decades ignored the alleged heinous crimes of infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempt and conspiracy to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18

U.S.C & 1091, commit misconduct in office, and/or other possible criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. 3.) refused for over a quarter of a century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials whose being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 3 decades. 4.) and/or 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 who have been 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 other criminal acts.

Governor Moore, your response to this 3<sup>rd</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADING AND/OR PETITION” which was sent by certified mail to you on 4-5-23 and was sent by regular mail on this same day is critical. My 2<sup>nd</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADING AND/OR PETITION” was sent by certified mail to you on 2-17-23 and was sent by regular mail on the same day. Thus, again, I’m submitting my 3<sup>rd</sup> PETITION FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES AS STIPULATED IN OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT, NAMELY, THAT YOU, GOV. MOORE, exercise your Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland, representing a GOVERNMENT OF WE THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE, AND FOR THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND WHO WILL UPHOLD OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY ORDER: 1.) a disqualification and recusal of Judge Fletcher-Hill from unlawfully presiding over my new Motions as a result of his repeatedly and intentionally infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 ( c ) and, thus, repetitiously and intentionally violating my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and the Rule of Law. 2.) a Stay on Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding on my new 4-5-23 Motions 3.) the enforcement of Article IV of the Maryland Constitution which mandates the appointment of a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over my In Banc Review and that I have an oral hearing before the panel of In Banc Judges decides to grant or deny my Petition. 4.) the appointment of 3 judges who were not appointed by Martin O’Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera to preside over my new Motions, since both of these individuals are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide.

The evidence of the letter sent to the Clerk of the Court, which is Exhibit 105 on my website, substantiates the material fact that I’ve sent by certified mail and regular mail letters to the Clerk of the Court, Mr. Xavier Conaway, informing him, amongst other things, that a legal document, namely, the Heading in my Motions should be stated, verbatim, on the Circuit Court’s website, which is publicly viewed, and I, also, requested his assistance in mandating that the clerk file my Heading, verbatim, as proclaimed in my Motions in order to prevent the Clerk of the Court and the other clerks from being alleged to deliberately and repeatedly commit fraud. Moreover, in my new 4-5-23 Motions, I plead that the Court ORDERS the clerk to file, verbatim, the Heading in my 4-5-23 Motions, a legal document that is publicly viewed on the Circuit Court’s website.

If it’s the TRIUNE GOD’S will, my new Motions dated 4-5-23 shall be posted as Exhibit 116 on my website, no later than 4-5-23, although as of 12:00 p.m. on 4-4-23, I have yet to receive my copy of



the 3-21-23 Finding and Order by the Court that the clerk has posted on the Circuit Court's website as being mailed to me on 3-23-23. I will post as Exhibit 115 the Court's 3-23-23 Finding and Order on my website as soon I receive my copy.

Sincerely,

Cc: Hon. President, Military Tribunal, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Clerk of the Court, Pubic