

1.)<sup>1st</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 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. 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 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 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

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

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

BALTIMORE CITY

FOR

CIRCUIT COURT

IN THE

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

THE PETITION OF

IN THE MATTER

RECEIVED  
CIRCUIT COURT CLERK  
BALTIMORE CITY

2023 JUN 20 AM 11:05

CIVIL DIVISION



1, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: 1.) 1<sup>ST</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge 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 The Petitioner's 14<sup>TH</sup> Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of His: A.) Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 In Failing To Disqualify And Recuse Himself As A Presiding Judge Due To The Appearance Of Him Being Impartial And/Or Biased Because Of His Appointment By 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 Petitioner's 14<sup>TH</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repeatedly 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, Repeatedly And Deliberately Committing "Fraud Upon The Court", Treason To The Constitution,

**MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311**

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



CR 59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner are that, for the 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, 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 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>

below:

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 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 based on the grounds and authorities cited



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 from her Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation (Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin) due to these Officers' of the Court repitious 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 judgements 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 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. Code 18 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, not just solely Judge John Nugent being the presiding Judge 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 repitiously 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, repitiously 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 repitiously and deliberately violated 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, the Petitioner's 9<sup>TH</sup> Motion for a Hearing on the Motions as Mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311.

## INTRODUCTION

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Petitioner believes that our great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their ruling, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11, "And the LORD spake into Moses face to face as a man 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, 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 States, 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.dionaurwilliams.com](http://www.dionaurwilliams.com), the Exhibits 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, 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, 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 him 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 on 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 and deem all Orders by him 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 from her Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation (Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of 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 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. Code 18 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, not just solely Judge John Nugent being the presiding Judge 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 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 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's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated 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 Order, 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. 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 Exhibits 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 facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders by Judge John Nugent and the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Motions, from which Judge John Nugent rendered his 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders, respectively, support the material facts that Judge John Nugent fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders all of the material facts and legal arguments that substantiate the allegations that



the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and intentionally breached due to: a.) the presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, repeatedly violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), which resulted in his engagements in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce. b.) Judge Fletcher-Hill repeated and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), which resulted in his repetitiously and deliberately engaging in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce. c.) the panel of in Banc Judges, who formerly presided over the Petitioner's in Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation because all of these Officers of the Court repetitiously and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), which resulted in their repeatedly and deliberately engaging 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. Scuito, 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 Exhibits 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 of the facts declared in and/or the lack thereof of facts proclaimed in the 6-8-23 Findings and Order by Judge John Nugent, which respond to the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, substantiate the material facts that the 6-8-23 Findings and Order by Judge John Nugent do not disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in the 6-8-23 Motions, which further include the material facts that substantiate the allegations that Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges, which again include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have repeatedly and intentionally infringed upon the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, violated the Rule of Law by repeatedly and deliberately breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges due to the material facts that Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges were appointed to elite positions by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera,



both of whom are being alleged to have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or committed other criminal activities.

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 Exhibits 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 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, due to the repeated and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges by their failure to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, as well as set aside all of their judgments and deem all of their Orders void as mandated under Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S. due to the material fact that there is an appearance that all of these Officers of the Court could be biased and/or impartial as a result of their special appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or committed other criminal activities.

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 Lilljeborg 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. Ballistreri, 779 F.2d 1191 (7th Cir. 1985). The 7<sup>th</sup> 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 influenced 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." 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 Exhibits 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 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders by Judge John Nugent do not disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and/or legal arguments in the Petitioners 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Motions, from which Judge John Nugent responds in his 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders, respectively, which, further, include the material facts that substantiate 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, have been repeatedly and deliberately violated by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, along with the other previously presiding Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Melissa Phinn, Judge R. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman due to their repetitiously and deliberately breaching Maryland Rule 18-102.11, Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 (c), and/or Maryland Rule 2-311(f).

The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on her website, the Exhibits accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts declared in the section below and entitled **“STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND”** will substantiate that the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders by Judge John Nugent do not disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s 4-5-23 and 2-27-23, from which Judge John Nugent rendered his 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders, respectively, which include the allegations that 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, have been repetitiously and intentionally violated Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the panel of In Banc Judges due to their having repeatedly and deliberately infringing upon Article IV § 22 of the Maryland Constitution by failing to have a panel of 3 Judges preside over the Petitioner’s In Banc Review and granting the Petitioner her right as mandated by Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution to have an oral hearing before the panel of In Banc Judges decides to accept or deny the Petitioner’s Petition.

## **STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

As evidenced by the 6-8-23 filing on the Circuit Court’s website, the Heading of the Petitioner’s 4-5-23 Motions, an official document on the Circuit Court’s publicly viewed website, is cited as **“Motions”**. As evidenced by the Petitioner’s 4-5-23 Motions filed in the Circuit on 4-5-23 which is Exhibit 142 on her website, the Heading of the Petitioner’s 4-5-23 Motions is entitled **“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 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 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 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."

The evidence of the Heading in the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions cited above substantiates the material fact the Petitioner pleads 7 Motions in her 4-5-23 Motions (Exhibit 139 on the Petitioner's website). The evidence of a copy of the 6-8-23 Findings and Order by Judge John Nugent, a copy of which the Petitioner alleges that she received in the mail on 6-14-23, our Hon. President Trump's birthday (Exhibit 143 on the Petitioner's website). The Petitioner's copy of the 6-8-23 Findings and Order substantiates that Judge John Nugent's Order only responds to the Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> Motion in her 4-5-23 Motions. Furthermore, as evidenced by the copy of the 6-8-23 Findings the Petitioner alleges she received in the mail (Exhibit 1), the clerk states Judge John Nugent's Findings and Order verbatim, namely, "On Consideration of the "9th Motion for Disqualification" filed by Plaintiff, Diana R. Williams (Paper No. 44), the motion being frivolous and lacking merit, it is this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June 2023, hereby ORDERED that the Motion (Paper No. 44) is DENIED. Judge J. Nugent." Since the clerk rightly recorded the legal document of Judge John Nugent, the Petitioner is motioning, for the second time, that Judge John Nugent would mandate that the clerks rightly record, verbatim, the Petitioner's legal document, namely, the Heading of her 4-5-23 Motions, her instant Motions, and all other Motions filed by the Petitioner.

The Petitioner alleges that, after she read on the Circuit Court's website on 6-8-23 that the presiding Judge over her 4-5-23 Motions from her In Banc Review was Judge J. Nugent, she did some background research on Judge John Nugent and other issues and discovered some very material facts. The Petitioner is alleging that she is only presuming that Judge John Nugent is the judge that presided over her 2-27-23 Motions since the initial on the Circuit Court's website of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order is



“N.J.” and since she has yet to receive a copy of the 3-21-23 Findings and Order that has the judge’s signature stamped on the 3-21-23 Finding and Order. Moreover, the Petitioner asserts that, during her research, she discovered that she could file a “Motion to set aside judgment”, which is a request for the court to nullify or vacate a judgment or verdict that had previously been reached in the case after a judgment or verdict in a case has been delivered. Further, the Petitioner proclaims that during her research on 6-8-23, she discovered that a Motion to set aside a judgment is generally filed if new evidence comes to light after the case has ended that may cast doubt on the original verdict. Still too, the Petitioner alleges that, during her research, she discovered that a unique aspect of a Motion to set aside judgment is that it can be filed long after a verdict or judgment has been issued, even years afterward.

During her research on Judge John Nugent, the Petitioner alleges that it was revealed to her that, although his term expired in 2019, Judge John Nugent was appointed as one of the judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera, who is being alleged by the Petitioner to have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed misconduct in office, and/or committed other criminal activities. Still too, the Petitioner asserts that she discovered during her research on 6-8-23 on the background of Judge John Nugent that he was appointed Chair, Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee, Judicial Council, 2022 – chair of the Alternative Dispute Resolution for the Maryland Rules subcommittee, 2022-” by the new Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Joseph M. Getty. Moreover, the Petitioner declares that she researched the background of Judge Joseph M. Getty and discovered that he was appointed on September 2021 as the new Chief Judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals by Chief Judge Barbera and that Chief Judge Barbera became the former Chief Judge of the Court of Maryland when she retired in September 2021.

Since the evidence substantiate that Judge John Nugent was appointed to the privileged position as one of the judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera, the Petitioner is alleging in these instant Motions (Exhibit 142 on the Petitioner’s website) that her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were violated by Judge John Nugent due to his failing to disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge since there is an appearance that he could be impartial and/or biased due to his appointment to the privileged position as one of the judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera, who is being alleged 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.

Moreover, the Petitioner is alleging in her instant Motions that Judge John Nugent has, also, breached her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right due to violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 because Judge John Nugent has failed to disqualify, recuse himself as the presiding Judge, set aside his judgments, and deem his all of his ORDERS void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) due to their being an appearance that he could be impartial and/or biased because of special appointment to the privileged position as one of the judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera, who is being alleged to have attempted to and/or conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, committed



misconduct in office, and/or committed other criminal activities.

Presuming that Judge John Nugent is the judge who wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, the

Petitioner is alleging in these instant Motions that the evidence of the facts cited in and/or lack thereof of fact declared in the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders by Judge John Nugent (Exhibits 143 and 138, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) and the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Motions (Exhibit 139 and Exhibits 113 and 114 which are the Petitioner's 2-27-23

Motions on the Petitioner's website), from which Judge John Nugent respond to in his the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders, substantiate that, 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 by: 1.)

breaching 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 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 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 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. Code 18 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 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. 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 repeatedly 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 repeatedly 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. On 4-6-23, the Petitioner alleges that she called the Circuit Court, asked to speak to "Mr." (whose name the Petitioner will not disclose unless compelled to do so), and, amongst other things, informed "Mr." that, as of 4-6-23, she had not received her copy of the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Order but was still able to file her Motions in a timely manner on 4-5-23 in response to the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Order premised on the statement on the Circuit Court's website, which cites "Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. -N, J.," Moreover, the Petitioner asserts that she informed "Mr." that she knew that it was possible that their conversation would be recorded, that she didn't care because she was only speaking the truth, informed him that he is cited in her 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Motions, gave him her website address, and told "Mr." that he could read her "filed" Motions that are posted on her website because some of the material facts in her 4-5-23 and in her 2-27-23 Motions include their past telephone conversations. The Petitioner alleges that "Mr." assured her that he would forward her a copy of the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Order. The Petitioner is alleging that she intentionally did not speak to "Mr." about the Heading of her 2-27-23 Motions not being recorded on the Circuit Court's publicly viewing website because she believes that it would be to no avail because no changes were made from her earlier requests to state the Heading of her Motions as it is clearly delineated in her actual Motions. The Petitioner declares that on the Circuit Court's website, the Heading of her 2-27-23 Motions, an official document that can be publicly viewed, is cited as "Motion for the Court to Stay Motions, with Exhibits". As evidenced by her filed 2-27-23 Motions (Exhibits 113 and 114 on the Petitioner's website) in the Circuit, the actual Heading of the Petitioner's 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."

On 4-14-23, the Petitioner asserts that she called the Circuit Court, spoke with "Mr.", and informed "Mr." that: 1.) On 4-13-23, she received a copy of the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 2.) There is no signature from any judge or a name of the judge stamped on the Court's 3-21-23 Findings and Order which was entered on the Circuit's Court's website on 3-23-23. 3.) She would like for him to send her a copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order that has the judge's signature on it and/or has the "stamped" name of the judge who rendered the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 4.) The Petitioner informed "Mr." that, on the Circuit Court's website, it states "Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. -N, J" and that she thought that the phrase, "N.J," meant "no judge". The Petitioner declares that, when she asked "Mr." who was "N.J", he informed me that didn't know any judge whose initials are N.J. 5.) The Petitioner declares that she told "Mr." that she received a copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order on 4-13-23 and that there is no "-N, J" written after the word "DENIED" on her copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order by the Court (Exhibit 1).

On 5-1-23, the Petitioner declares that she called the Circuit Court, spoke with "Mr.", reminded him that she had spoken to him on 4-14-23 germane to statements cited in the paragraph above, and informed "Mr." that she has yet to receive the copy of the 3-23-23 Court's Findings and Order that has



The Judge's signature stamped on her copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order of the Court. The Petitioner alleges that "Mr." told her that he would send out another copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order by the Court that will have the stamped signature of the Judge who wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. The Petitioner proclaims that, as of the filing of her instant Motions, she has yet to receive a copy of the 3-21-23 Findings and Order by the Court with the Judge's signature "stamped" on her copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. The Petitioner is alleging in these instant Motions that her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right were violated by Court in coercing her to respond to the Court's 3-23-23 Findings and Order without having the official signature of the Judge stamped on the copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order by the Court that she received on 4-13-23.

The Petitioner alleges that the evidence of her voluminous Motions filed in the record of the Circuit Court substantiates the material facts and legal arguments in her instant Motions, in her 4-5-23, 2-27-23, 12-27-23, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and in her 4-7-22 Motions (Exhibit 138, Exhibits 113 and 114 are the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, and Exhibits 100, 98, 96, 94, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), and in all of her other Motions are voluminous and, unequivocally, substantiate that the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges, are erroneous and that her legal arguments as supported by the material facts cited in her Motions are not frivolous and not without merit. Furthermore, the Petitioner continues to assert 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 litigation, which include the Official Complaints and/or the Addendums against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against the other 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, and Exhibits 113 and 114 which are the Petitioner's 227-23 Motions. The Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 50, 51, 52, 67, 95, 97, 99, and 112. The Petitioner's Motions, which include her Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions, her Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges and/or other Official Complaints and other Addendums which include allegations against the panel of In Banc Judges are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits on her website, namely, 16, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, and/or Exhibit 94. The Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits, 73, 75, and 93. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualification and/or Substitution against Judge Karen Friedman, her Official Complaint, and/or the Petitioner's Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman are in the record and/or can be viewed from the Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, namely, Exhibits 16, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 54, 55, 56, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81. The Findings and Orders of Judge Karen Friedman can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 47, 48, and 49. The Petitioner's Motions, which include



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

The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 4-5-23, 2-27-23 Motions (most of which are, also, alleged in her 12-27-22,

8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions, and/or other Motions) substantiate the material facts, namely, that in the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Order by Judge John Nugent substantiate the material facts that Judge John Nugent fail to state all of the material facts and legal arguments in the 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Petitioner's Motions in his 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Petitioner's Motions, and which, also, include the material fact that the Petitioner alleges in these Motions that her 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 former judges who presided over her civil litigation, starting with the Petitioner's first Motion for Disqualification against the first presiding Judge, Judge Karen Friedman in 2018. The Petitioner, too, alleges that the evidence of the facts stated in the and/or the lack of facts declared in the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders of Judge John Nugent and the material facts and legal arguments stated in her 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Motions substantiate that the Findings and Order of Judge John Nugent fail to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts relevant to the background of the Petitioner's filings of her numerous Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other former presiding Judges, again, beginning in with the Petitioner's Motion for Disqualification filed in 2018. The Petitioner alleges that these facts are asserted in her 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Motions and in some of the other Motions cited above and are very material, which include the evidence of the material facts that: 1.) 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. 2.) The evidence of 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. 3.) 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 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.