

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, also, 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 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 to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or committed other criminal activities. 4.) 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). 5.) 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. 6.) 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, which, further, substantiate Judge Fletcher-Hill's unlawful presiding. 7.) 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 in 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 repeatedly, knowingly, and willfully breached Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18-102.11, Maryland Rule 102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committed Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, interference with Interstate Commerce and/or violating other federal and state laws. 8.) 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 violations of Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18-102.11, substantiate the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges have been able to, for almost 6 years, 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. 9.) 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's Petition. 10.) The evidence of the material fact 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 over her appeal in the In Banc Review of the Petitioner's initial civil litigation have repeatedly and intentionally 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. 11.) The evidence of 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 Carrion, 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. 12.) 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. 13.) The evidence of 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, and 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 the Petitioner's appeal of her initial civil litigation. 14.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner has motioned for the 9<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

denied her right to a hearing by Judge John Nugent, by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all by all of the other presiding judges, except 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. 15.) The evidence of the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill fails to cite in his 4-7-22, 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, 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. 16.) 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. 17.) 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. 18.) The evidence of the material facts that the other former presiding judges, namely, Judge Carrion, 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. 19.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner alleges in her Motions 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. 20.) The evidence of the material fact that, under Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, 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 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 Defendants 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. 22.) 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 of the material fact that the Petitioner 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 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. 23.) The evidence of 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 REPEATEDLY COMMITTED 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 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." 24.) 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. 25.) 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. 26.) The evidence of the material fact that 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. 27.) 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. 28.) 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. 29.) The evidence of 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". 30.) The evidence supports of 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. 31.) The evidence of 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 Statute 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. 32.) The evidence of 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. 33.) The evidence of 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. 34.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she was informed by a female that Ms. Bentley was not available. 35.) The evidence of 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. 36.) The evidence of 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. 37.) The evidence of 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. 38.) The evidence of 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. 39.) The evidence of 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 "6<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" under Federal Statute 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 STATUTE 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 STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON 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. & 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. 40.) The evidence of 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. 41.) The evidence o 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. 42.) The evidence of 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. 43.) The evidence of 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 Hearing of her 12-27-22 Motions was stated on the Circuit Court's website exactly as it is proclaimed in the Hearing of her 12-27-22 Motions. 44.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner asserts that "Ms." assured her that she would make an effort to ensure that the Petitioner's Hearing in her 12-27-22 Motions is entitled "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND VIOLATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 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 STATUTE 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". 45.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner declares that, on 12-28-22, she checked the Circuit Court's website and discovered that the Hearing of her 12-27-22 Motions on the Circuit Court's website is not declared, verbatim, as in the Hearing of her actual 12-27-22 Motions, but is stated as follows: "7<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" Under Federal Statute 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 Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(A) and under MD Rule 18-102.11, Motion for Reconsideration". 46.) The evidence of the Hearing in her 12-27-22 Motions substantiates the material facts, namely, that clerk who posted the Petitioner's Hearing 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 Hearing 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 Hearing 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 Hearing 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". 47.) The evidence of 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. 48.) The evidence of the material fact that the Petitioner alleges that she informed "Ms. P" that "Ms. P" 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. 49.)

The evidence of 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. 50.) The evidence of 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 Conway, 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. Conway's Assistant, and inquired as to why the Petitioner wanted to speak with Mr. Conway. 51.) The evidence of 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. 52.) The evidence of 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. 53.) The evidence of 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. 54.) The evidence of 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. 55.) The evidence of 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. 56.) The evidence of 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. 57.) The evidence of 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. Conway 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. Conway

CC: Hon. President, Hon. Military Tribunal, Ms. Adrienne" 59.) The evidence of the material facts that the Petitioner has sent by certified and regular mail 3 "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITIONS" to the Gov. of Maryland, Wes Moore, with her "4<sup>th</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADINGS" sent by certified and regular mail today, namely, 6-20-23 (Exhibit 1). Exhibits 103, 109, and 140 are copies of the other 3 "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADINGS to the Gov. of Maryland, Wes Moore, which were, also, sent by certified and regular on 1-10-23, 2-17-23, and 4-5-23, respectively. 60.) The evidence of the material

Sincerely,

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.

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

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams

Conaway, Clerk of the Court for Baltimore City

(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. 58.) The evidence of 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

facts that, amongst other things, the Petitioner pleads in her "4<sup>th</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADING to Gov. Moore that was sent by certified and regular mail on 6-23-23 and in "Re:" section of the Petitioner's 4<sup>th</sup> missive, it states "1.) "4<sup>th</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES, THAT IS, FOR YOU, GOV. MOORE, to exercise your Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland, representing a GOVERNMENT OF WE THE PEOPLE, BY WE THE PEOPLE, AND FOR WE THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND, WHO WILL UPHOLD OUR 1<sup>st</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY APPOINT A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR to investigate, disclose, and resolve if the allegations that the presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over my initial civil litigation and over my appeal in the In Banc Review have repeatedly and deliberately violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and thus, violated the Rule of Law because Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the former presiding Judges repeatedly and intentionally: a.) breached Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11 and have, thus, violated the Rule of Law and committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with Interstate Commerce by repeatedly and intentionally refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the appearance of these Officers of the Court being impartial and/or biased because of their elite appointments by the former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and/or by the former Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. b.) failed to set aside their judgments and deem all Orders by them as void as a matter law due to their infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11. c.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders all of the Motions cited in my Motions, which include Motions alleging repeated and deliberate violations of my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, breaching the Rule of Law, by Judge John Nugent, by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other judges who presided over my initial civil litigation in my Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation ( Judge John Nugent, 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 repeatedly and intentionally breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) , Maryland Rule 18,102.11), Maryland Rule 18,102.11 5 (c) , Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, interference with Interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws d.) breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a Panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over my Motions from my In Banc Review, instead of him being the only judge to preside over my Motions from the In Banc Review. e.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the In Banc Review due to their repeated and intentional violations Of Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution by failing to grant me an oral Hearing before the Panel decided to deny my

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 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders of Judge John Nugent and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Petitioner's instant Motions, (some of which are, too, alleged in the Petitioner's 4-5-23, 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, for the second time, Judge John Nugent Court has violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law by: 1.) breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11 and have, thus, violating the Rule of Law and committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and Interference with Interstate Commerce by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the appearance of Judge John Nugent being impartial and/or biased because of his appointment by Former Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Chief Judge Barbera, who is being alleged to have violated Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 2.) failing to set aside his judgments filed 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 and deem all Orders by him

## ARGUMENT

committed misconduct in office, and/or violated other federal and state laws." – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 also, being alleged in my Civil Complaint filed in 2017, in my Motions, and in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to my an Intern and/or was mentored in by former Mayor of Baltimore City, Kurt Schmoke because he is, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, and a special prosecutor who has not, in the past, worked as 2.) Request to appoint a Special Prosecutor that was not appointed by former Martin O'Malley violating Maryland Rule 2-311 by refusing to grant my repeated Motions for a Hearing on my Motion. Hill, and, with the exception of Judge Karen Friedman, all of the other former presiding Judges were repeatedly and deliberately breached due to the failures of Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Findings and Orders if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 grant my repetitious Motions For Reconsideration. i.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges due their repeated failures to under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and intentionally infringed upon by Judge John consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right signature indicating who wrote the Findings and Order filed on 3-23-23. h.) failed to disclose, which responds to my 2-27-23 Motions, due to the material fact that there is no written or stamped deliberate violations of Maryland 18.102.11 5(c). g.) failed to set aside the judgment filed on 3-23-23, repetitiously and intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill due to his repeated and Orders if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were Petition for an In Banc Review. f.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and

as void as a matter law due to his infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 3.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the 8 Motions cited in the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, 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, breaching 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 breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, interference with interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws . 4.) failing disclose, consider, and resolve the Petitioner's Motions to set aside the judgments of Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the judgments of the previously presiding Judges and deem all of their Orders void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) due to their continuous and deliberate breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by not voluntarily disqualifying and recusing themselves due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as a result of their appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 5.) breaching Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a Panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions from her In Banc Review, instead of him being the only judge to preside over the Petitioner's Motions from her In Banc Review. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 6-8-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges due to their repeatedly and intentionally breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and, thus, repetitiously and deliberately committing "Fraud Upon The Court", Treason to the Constitution, and/or interference with interstate Commerce. 7.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 6-8-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated by Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and intentional violations of Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution by failing to grant the Petitioner an oral Hearing before the Panel decided to deny the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review. 8.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 6-8-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill due to his repeated and deliberate violations of Maryland 18.102.11 5(c). 9.) failing to set aside his judgment filed on 3-23-23, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, due to the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature indicating that Judge John Nugent wrote the Findings and

Order filed on 3-23-23. **10.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 6-8-23 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, namely, the Petitioner's 5<sup>th</sup> Motion for Reconsideration. **11.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 6-8-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, namely, her 9<sup>th</sup> Motion for a Hearing on the Motions as Mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311.


Moreover, 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 John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and the judges who presided over her initial litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have continued to deliberately and unlawfully deny the Petitioner's Motions, which include repeated Motions for Disqualification against Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other formerly presiding Judges for deliberately and repetitiously violating the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, infringing upon the Rule of Law due to their repetitiously and deliberately breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a), Maryland Rule, Maryland Rule 5(c), and/or violating other federal and/or state laws. 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.

### 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 20th day of June 2023, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's: 1.) 1<sup>st</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge John Nugent For Violating The Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To His Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18,102.11 And, Thereby, Committing "Fraud Upon The Court,



Treason To The Constitution, And Interference With Interstate Commerce. 2.) 1<sup>ST</sup> Motion To Set Aside The Judgments Of Judge John Nugent Rendered On 6-6-23 And on 3-23-23 Due To His Violations Of Of His: A.) Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 In Failing To Disqualify And Recuse Himself As A Presiding Judge Due To The Appearance Of Him Being Impartial And/Or Biased Because Of His Appointment By Chief Judge Barbera, Who Is Being Alleged To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide And/Or Have Attempted To And/ Or Have Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide . B.) Violating Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution In Failing To Have A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside over the Petitioner's Motion, Motions From Her In Banc Review. C.) Failing To Disclose, Consider, And Resolve In His 6-8-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, If The 14<sup>TH</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repeatedly Violated By Judge Fletcher-Hill And ALL Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Due To Their Repeatedly And Intentionally Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And, Thus, Repeatedly And Deliberately Committing "Fraud Upon The Court", Treason To The Constitution, And/Or Interference With Interstate Commerce. D.) Failing To Disclose, Consider, And Resolve In His 6-8-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, If The Petitioner's 14<sup>TH</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repeatedly Violated By Judge Fletcher-Hill And The Other Former Presiding Judges Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review Due To Their Repeated And intentional Violation Of Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution In Failing To Grant The Petitioner An Oral Hearing Before The Panel Decided To Deny The Petitioner's Petition For An In Banc Review. E.) Failing To Disclose, Consider, And Resolve In His 6-8-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, If The Petitioner's 14<sup>TH</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repeatedly And Intentionally Infringed Upon By Judge Fletcher-Hill Due To His Repeated And Deliberate Violations Of Maryland 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 1<sup>ST</sup> Motion To Set Aside The Judgment Of Judge John Nugent Filed On 3-23-23 Since There Is No Written Or Stamped Signature Of Judge John Nugent On The 3-21-23 Findings And Order. 4.) 2<sup>ND</sup> Motion That Judge John Nugent Orders The Clerk To File On The Circuit Court's Website The Heading Of The Petitioner's Motions Verbatim. 5.) 5<sup>TH</sup> Motion To Have A Panel Of In Banc Judges To Preside Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review Who Were Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley And/Or By Chief Judge Barbera, Both Of Whom Are Being Alleged To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 6.) 7<sup>TH</sup> Motion For All Judgments By Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, The Panel Of In Banc Judges, Judge Michel Pierson, And By Judge Karen Friedman Be Set Aside And Their Orders And Deem All Of Their Orders As A Matter Of Law Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). 7.) 5<sup>TH</sup> Motion For Reconsideration. 8.) 9<sup>TH</sup> Motion For A Hearing On The Motions As Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd., Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.

Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Diana R. Williams", written over a horizontal line.

**REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

Petitioner is requesting a hearing on her Motions.

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

Exhibit 1

<p>IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY Case No. 24-C-17-004535</p>	<p>DIANA R. WILLIAMS, <i>Plaintiff,</i> v. HAMEEDULLAH VIRK, et al., <i>Defendants.</i></p>
--	---

ORDER

On consideration of the "motion for Court to stay motions" filed by Plaintiff Diana R. Williams (Paper No. 43), the motion being frivolous and lacking merit, it is this <sup>21<sup>st</sup></sup> day of March 2023, hereby

ORDERED that the motion (Paper No. 43) is DENIED.

Judge's Signature appears  
on the original document

Re: 1.) "4<sup>TH</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES, THAT IS, FOR YOU, GOV. MOORE, to exercise your Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland, representing a GOVERNMENT OF WE THE PEOPLE, AND FOR WE THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND, WHO WILL UPHOLD OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY APPOINT A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR to investigate, disclose, and resolve if the allegations that the presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and appeal in the In Banc Review have repeatedly and deliberately violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thus, violated the Rule of Law because Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the former presiding Judges repeatedly and intentionally: a.) breached Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11 and have, thus, violated the Rule of Law and committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with Interstate Commerce by repeatedly and intentionally refusing to voluntarily disqualify and refuse themselves as presiding Judges as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) due to the appearance of these Officers of the Court being impartial and/or biased because of their elite appointments by the former Gov. of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and/or by the former Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide. b.) failed to set aside their judgments and deem all Orders by them as void as a matter law due to their infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11. c.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders all of the Motions cited in my Motions, which include Motions alleging repeated and deliberate violations of my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, breaching the Rule of Law, by Judge John Nugent, by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other Judges who presided over my initial civil litigation in my Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation ( Judge John Nugent, 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 breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) ), Maryland Rule 18,102.11), Maryland Rule 18,102.11 5 (c) , Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing of "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, interference with Interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws d.) breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a Panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over my Motions from my In Banc Review, instead of him being the only Judge to preside over my Motions from the In Banc Review. e.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill , and all of the other former presiding Judges over the In Banc Review due to their repeated and intentional violations Of Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution by failing to grant me an oral Hearing before the Panel decided to deny my

To: Gov. of Maryland, Mr. Wes Moore  
 From: Ms. Diana R. Williams



I'm righteously indignant due to material facts that, since I sent my first "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" by certified and regular mail on 1-10-23, followed by my 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> "URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PLEADINGS" on 2-17-23 and 4-5-23, respectively, I have yet to hear and/or receive any response to my PETITIONS FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES, THAT IS, FOR YOU, GOV. MOORE, to exercise your Executive Powers as Gov. of Maryland, representing a GOVERNMENT OF WE THE PEOPLE, BY WE THE PEOPLE, AND FOR WE THE PEOPLE OF MARYLAND, WHO WILL UPHOLD OUR 1<sup>ST</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY appoint a Special Prosecutor to investigate, disclose, and resolve the allegations that the presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges who have presided over my initial civil litigation and/or over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation in the Circuit Court, whose Civil Complaint was filed in 2017, have repeatedly and deliberately since 2018 violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thus, breached the Rule of Law, because the voluminous evidence in the record and on my website, ~~my website~~, ~~the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders of the presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, the evidence of the facts declared in and/or the lack thereof facts cited in the 2-16-23, 12-16-22, 8-4-22, and 6-21-22 Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibits 141, 138, 112, 99, 97, and 95, respectively, on my website), and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments stated in the my 6-19-23 Motions (Exhibit 142 on my website) and in my 4-5-23, 2-~~

Date: 6-20-23

violated other federal and state laws.

conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or President to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and filed in 2017, in my Motions, and in my 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to my 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. by former Mayor of Baltimore City, Kurt Schmoke because he is, also, being alleged in my Civil Complaint by Barbera, and a special prosecutor who has not, in the past, worked as an intern and/or was mentored in Special Prosecutor that was not appointed by former Martin O'Malley and/or by former Chief Judge 311 by refusing to grant my repeated Motions for a Hearing on my Motion. 2.) Request to appoint a exception of Judge Karen Friedman, all of the other former presiding Judges violating Maryland Rule 2-27-23 Motions, due to the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature indicating who intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill due to his repeated and deliberate violations of my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and Reconsideration. i.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and the other former presiding Judges due their repeated failures to grant my repetitious Motions for Findings and Orders if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and intentionally infringed upon by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of wrote the Findings and Order filed on 3-23-23. h.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their 27-23 Motions, due to the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature indicating who Maryland 18.102.11 5(c). g.) failed to set aside the judgment filed on 3-23-23, which responds to my 2- intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill due to his repeated and deliberate violations of Petition for an In Banc Review. f.) failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and

27-23, 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions (Exhibits 139, [113 and 114 are my 2-27-23 Motions], 100, 98, 96, and 94, respectively, from which Judge John Nugent and Judge Fletcher-Hill respond to in their Findings and Orders cited above, substantiate the material facts, namely, that these Officers of the Court repetitiously and intentionally violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, therefore, the Rule of Law due to their repetitious and intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. Moreover, since the evidence, indisputably, substantiate that Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges have repeatedly and deliberately infringed upon my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law due to their repetitious and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a), these Officers of the Court are mandated under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and to deem each of their Orders as void due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as presiding Judges as a result of being appointed to the elite positions by Martin O'Malley and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged in my Civil Complaint and in the appeal to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws.

My approximately 35-page Motions dated 6-20-23, which respond to Judge John Nugent's 6-8-23 Findings and Orders, asserts in detail the material facts and legal arguments which substantiate that Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges have, since I filed my initial Motion for Disqualification in 2018 against the first presiding Judge, Judge Karen Friedman, repeatedly and intentionally violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, breached the Rule of Law, by failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and to deem each of their Orders as void as mandated due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as presiding Judges as a result of being appointed to the elite positions by Martin O'Malley and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged in my Civil Complaint and in the appeal to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or infringed upon other federal and state laws. The Heading of my 6-19-23 Motions is entitled "1. 1<sup>st</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THEREBY, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. 2.) 1<sup>st</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 JUDGMENTS OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT DUE TO HIS VIOLATIONS OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF HIS: A.) VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 IN FAILING TO DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS A PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF HIM BEING IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED BECAUSE OF HIS APPOINTMENT BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, WHO IS BEING

ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE . B.) VIOLATING ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS, MOTIONS FROM HER IN BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPONDS TO THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPONDS TO THE PETITIONER'S 4-5-23 AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND ALL OF THE OTHER AND THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. E.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPONDS TO THE PETITIONER'S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY INFRINGED UPON BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL DUE TO HIS REPEATED AND DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE 21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 4.) 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION THAT JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ORDERS THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM. 5.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. 6.) 7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND/OR BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A). 7.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 8.) 9<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER"

Further, as evidence from my 6-20-23 Motions, which has this 4<sup>th</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE Petition" attached as Exhibit 2, these same allegations cited above and given more detail material facts that substantiate allegations against Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the former presiding judges over my initial civil litigation and in the appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation. Amongst other material facts and legal arguments, in my 6-19-23 Motions, I declare

“Moreover, 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 John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding judges over the Petitioner’s appeal in the Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and the judges who presided over her initial litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have continued to deliberately and unlawfully deny the Petitioner’s Motions, which include repeated Motions for Disqualification against Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other formerly presiding judges for deliberately and repetitiously violating the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, infringing upon the Rule of Law due to their repetitiously and deliberately breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a), Maryland Rule, Maryland Rule 5(c), and/or violating other federal and/or state laws. 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 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



CC: Hon. President, Military Tribunal, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Public

Sincerely,

Governor Moore, your response is critical to my "4th URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION".

O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, and/or Kurt Schmoke. official and the Special Prosecutor have no connection or unique and close relationship to Martin Prosecutor, but another government official appoint the Special Prosecutor and that the government SENSITIVE PETITION. Therefore, I'm not only requesting that you do not appoint the Special Special Prosecutor to investigate, disclose, and resolve the issues raised in my 4th URGENT AND TIME other criminal acts, it appears that you, Gov. Moore, may be impartial and/or biased in appointing a and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted Schmoke was your Mentor. Since there is such a close relationship with you and Kurt Schmoke who is I've discovered that you interned under former Mayor Kurt Schmoke in the late 1990's and that Kurt Governor Moore, I've done some background research on your career and, amongst other things,

criminal activities for several decade. Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or other Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide- and/or have attempted and/or conspired to infringe upon and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S. compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison. f.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or governmental officials, who are being alleged to have deliberately, repeatedly, directly and/or century, to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other criminal acts against the owners of the public schools. e.) having refused, for nearly a quarter of a alleged heinous crimes of misconduct in office, crimes against humanity, and/or other possible children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison. d.) having for decades ignored the it can possibly kill you. c.) failing in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of the days. Lead stays in the bones for nearly 30 years. Lead is a poison, and when it becomes hazardous, lead in the bones because the blood lead testing will not reveal the lead in the blood after about 45