

1.) 1ST MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE J. GELLER FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. 2.) 1ST MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE 8-29-23 JUDGMENT OF JUDGE J. GELLER DUE TO HIS VIOLATIONS OF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH 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 MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - GENOCIDE . B.) VIOLATING ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 6-20-23 MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 8-29-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 6-20-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 8-29-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 6-20-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN

*****1*****

IN THE MATTER

THE PETITION OF

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE CITY

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

RECEIVED
 2024 SEP -8 AM 11:14
 CIVIL DIVISION

1, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: 1.) 1st Motion For Disqualification Against Judge J. Geller For Violating The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To His Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18,102.11 And, Also, Committing "Fraud Upon The Court, Treason To The Constitution, And Interference With Interstate Commerce. 2.) 1st Motion To Set Aside The Judgments Of Judge J. Geller On 8-29-23 Due To His Violations Of The Petitioner's 14th 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 Martin O'Malley, Who Is Being Alleged To Have Breached Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide And/Or Have Attempted To And/ Or Have Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide . B.) Violating Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution In Failing To Have A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside over the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motion From Her Appeal In The In Banc Review. C.) Failing To Disclose, Consider, And Resolve In His 8-29-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, If The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repeatedly And Deliberately Violated By Judge

PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM

BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. E.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 8-29-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 6-20-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH 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 RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 6TH MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ASSIGN A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. 4.) 8TH MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A). 5.) 10TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 6.) 6TH MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 2ND MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE 3-21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 8.) 3RD MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ORDER THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE

John Nugent, 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, Also, 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 8-29-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repeatedly Violated by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review Due To Their Repeated And Intentional 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 8-29-23 Findings And Order, Which Respond To The Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, If The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repeatedly And Deliberately Violated by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill Due To His Repeated And Deliberate Violations Of Maryland 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 6th Motion To Have The Judge-In-Charge Of The Civil Division, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Assign A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside Over The Petitioner' In Banc Review Who Were Not Appointed By 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 Infringe Upon Federal U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 4.) 8th 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). 5.) 10th Motion For A Hearing On The Motions As Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311. 6.) 6th Motion For Reconsideration. 7.) 2nd Motion To Set Aside The Judgment Of Judge John Nugent Filed On 3-23-23 Since There Is No Written Or Stamped Signature Of Judge John Nugent On The 3-21-23 Findings And Order. 8.) 3rd Motion To Have The Judge-In-Charge Of The Civil Division, Judge Fletcher-Hill, ORDER The Clerk To File On The Circuit Court's Website The Heading Of The Petitioner's Motions Verbatim based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

CR 59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner are that, for the first time, Judge J. Geller has violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law by: 1.) breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11 and have, also, committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with Interstate Commerce by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the appearance of Judge J. Geller being impartial and/or biased because of his appointment by the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, 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 8-29-23 and to deem his Order as void as a matter law due to his infringing upon Federal Statute

28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 3.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a Panel of 3 in Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions from her in Banc Review, instead of having himself as the only presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions from her in Banc Review. 4.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's 9th Motion for her right to an oral Hearing because the previous presiding Judges, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the 3 panel of in Banc Judges repeatedly denied the Petitioner's right to an oral Hearing as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 5.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve the 6-20-23 Petitioner's Motion to set aside the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, due to the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature, which indicate what Judge wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the 8 Motions cited in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, which include Motions alleging repeated and deliberate violations of the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, breaching the Rule of Law, by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher, and by all of the other Judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation from her Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the in Banc Review of her initial civil litigation (Judge Fletcher-Hill) and the panel of 3 in Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin) due to these Officers' of the Court repetitious and intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, interference with Interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws. 7.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve the 6-20-23 Petitioner's Motions to set aside the judgments of the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the judgments of the other former presiding Judges and to deem all of their Orders void as a matter of law due to their continuous and deliberate breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by not voluntarily disqualifying and recusing themselves due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as a result of their appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are 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 and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide. 8.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order whether and, for the 5th time, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division of the Circuit Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill, breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his failure, as the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, who represents the Court, to grant the Petitioner's Motion to assign Judges to preside over her civil litigation who were not appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief

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 unto 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 judgment is GOD'S: and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it." Moreover, also, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Jeremiah 9:23-25, the Scripture states "Thus, saith the LORD, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches:

INTRODUCTION

Judge Barbera because these former government officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 9.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order if the presiding Judge, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the panel of 3 in Banc Judges breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because these Judges repeatedly violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to have an oral Hearing before deciding to deny the Petitioner's Petition. 10.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th 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). 11.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and intentional failure to grant the Petitioner's 6th Motion For Reconsideration. 12.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repeatedly and deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the failure to grant the Petitioner's 10th Motion for a Hearing on the Motions as mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311.

But, let him that glorieth, glory in this. That he understandeth and knoweth ME, that I am the LORD which exercises loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the LORD. Behold the days come saith the LORD that I will punish all them which are circumcised with the uncircumcised." In the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Proverbs 6:16-19, it states that "These six things doth the LORD hate, yea, seven are an abomination to HIM, a proud look, a lying tongue, 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?"

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

The United States Constitution uses the phrase in the 5th and 14th Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5th Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14th protects them from actions by state and local government. Moreover, the written Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution, namely, the 5th and 14th Amendments, require judges to recuse themselves from cases in two situations, namely, where the judge has a financial interest in the case's outcome and where there is otherwise a strong possibility that the judge's decision will be biased.

Federal Statute, Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §455(a), which is applicable for all judges in all states, holds that, if there is even an appearance in impartiality, then the judges must recuse themselves voluntarily, and a party does not have to file a Motion for Disqualification because the judges are required by this federal law to recuse themselves in any proceeding in which their impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Judges do not have discretion not to disqualify themselves, and by law, judges are bound to follow the law. Moreover, the written Statute, Federal Statute 28, U.S.C. & 455(a), cites that any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself/herself in any proceeding in which his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Further, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) declares that, if proper grounds for recusal exist and the judge is aware of the grounds but still refuse to recuse himself/herself, then there may be penalties levied against the judge for not recusing himself/herself.

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

The Supreme Court has ruled and reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", *Levine v. United States*, 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960), citing *Offutt v. United States*, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13 (1954). In 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held that disqualification of a judge is mandatory if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality (*Litky v. U.S.*, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). Also, the Supreme Court has decided that should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by law.

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

The Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, the Exhibits accompanying the instant Motions, and/or the material facts cited in the section below and entitled "**STATEMENTS OF UNDISPUTED FACTS**" will substantiate the allegations that, for the first time, Judge J. Geller has violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 and, thus, the Rule of Law, by: 1.)) breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18,102.11 and have, also, committed "Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with Interstate Commerce by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the appearance of Judge J. Geller being impartial and/or biased because of his appointment by the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, 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 8-29-23 and to deem his Order as void as a matter law due to his infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11. 3.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a Panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions from her in Banc Review, instead of having himself as the only presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions from her in Banc Review. 4.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's 9th Motion for her right to an oral Hearing because the judges repeatedly denied the Petitioner's right to an oral Hearing as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 5.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve the 6-20-23 Petitioner's Motion to set aside the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions, due to

the material fact that there is no written or stamped signature, which indicate what Judge wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the 8 Motions cited in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, which include Motions alleging repeated and deliberate violations of the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, breaching the Rule of Law, by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher, and by all of the other judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation from her Civil Complaint that was filed in 2017 (namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman) and/or who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation (Judge Fletcher-Hill and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Carrion, Judge Phinn, and Judge Rubin) due to these Officers' of the Court repetitious and intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311 (f), Article IV of the Maryland Constitution, committing "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, interference with Interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws. 7.) failing disclose, consider, and resolve the 6-20-23 Petitioner's Motions to set aside the judgments of the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the judgments of the other former presiding Judges and to deem all of their Orders void as a matter of law due to their continuous and deliberate breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by not voluntarily disqualifying and recusing themselves due to the appearance of their being impartial and/or biased as a result of their appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 8.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order whether and, for the 5th time, the Judge-in-Charge of the Circuit Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill, breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his failure, as the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, who represents the Court, to grant the Petitioner's Motion to assign judges to presided over her civil litigation who were not appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera because these former government officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 9.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order if the presiding Judge, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the panel of 3 In Banc Judges breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because these judges repeatedly violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to have an oral Hearing before deciding to deny the Petitioner's Petition. 10.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and intentionally infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill due to his repeated and deliberate violations of

Maryland 18.102.11 5(c). 11.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's In Banc Review due to their repeated and intentional failure to grant the Petitioner's 6th Motion For Reconsideration. 12.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated by the presiding Judge, John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's 10th Motion for a Hearing on the Motions as mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311.

Moreover, the Petitioner alleges that the evidence that will be submitted during Discovery and revealed during her requested jury trial, the evidence on the Petitioner's website, the Exhibit accompanying her instant Motions, and/or the material facts stated in the section below and entitled "STATEMENTS OF UNDISPUTED FACTS" will substantiate the allegations that: 1.) The Petitioner continues to undergo more financial loss, more loss of property, and more tremendous emotional distress as a result of repetitiously and deliberately having her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 violated and, thus, the Rule of Law, due to the repeated and intentional infringements of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by Judge J. Geller, 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 have committed other criminal activities. 2.) The facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the 8-29-23 Findings and Order by Judge J. Geller and the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, from which Judge J. Geller rendered his Findings and Order support the material facts that Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, from which his 8-29-23 Findings and Order respond to and which substantiate the allegations that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and intentionally breached due to: a.) the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which further resulted in his engagements in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce. b.) Judge John Nugent and Judge Fletcher-Hill repeated and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which further resulted in their repetitiously and deliberately engaging in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce. c.) the panel of 3 in Banc Judges, who initially presided over the Petitioner's appeal in her In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman who presided over

As defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, the Rule of Law is "The authority and influence of law in society, especially when viewed as a constraint on individual and institutional behavior; (hence) the principle whereby all members of a society (including those in government) are considered equally subject to the Rule of Law." Further, under the Rule of Law, government authority may only be

In the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Leviticus 19: 15, the LORD spoke to Moses and said "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor." Also, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in Ephesians 6:10-18, it declares, "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the LORD, and in the power of HIS might: Put on the whole armour of GOD that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of GOD that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness. And, your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And, take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the SPIRIT, and watching therewith with all perseverance and supplication for all saints." Moreover, in the HOLY BIBLE, namely, in Revelation 21:7-8, it cites that "He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his GOD, and he shall be MY son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death."

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

the Petitioner's initial civil litigation because all of these Officers of the Court repetitiously and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), which further resulted in their repeatedly and deliberately engaging in the acts of treason to the Constitution and interference with interstate commerce.

exercised as afforded in our great Constitution in accordance with written Statutes, Laws, Regulations, Rules, etc., which were adopted through an established procedure.

The written Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution require judges to recuse themselves from cases in two situations, namely, where the judge has a financial interest in the case's outcome and where there is otherwise a strong possibility that the judge's decision will be biased. In the United States Constitutional Law, a Due Process Clause is found in both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Constitution uses the phrase in the 5th and 14th Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5th Amendment protects people from actions of the federal government, and the 14th protects them from actions by state and local government.

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

According to the facts stated on the website, "Corrupt Judges", the Supreme Court has held that, if a judge wars against the Constitution in breaching the Due Process Clause of the U.S Constitution or if he/she acts without jurisdiction, then that judge has engaged in treason to the Constitution, which suggests that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce, and, also, since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts. The Court has, too, affirmed that, should a judge not disqualify himself/herself as required by law, then the judge has given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which could potentially further disqualify the judge. Further, as stated on this website, the Court have determined that, should another judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance of partiality" and has possibly disqualified himself/herself. Moreover, the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. Wherefore, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio."

Moreover, on the website, "Corrupt Judges, it states that the Appellant Courts have, also, affirmed that Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. "is directed against the appearance of partiality, whether or not the judge is actually biased," and that "Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. 5455(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 7th 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 *Liljeborg 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). Still too, the 7th Circuit declares that "a decision produced by fraud upon the court is not in essence a decision at all, and never becomes final." Further, the 7th Circuit has determined that "Fraud upon the Court" immediately removes jurisdiction from that Court as well as vititates (makes ineffective - invalidates) every decision or Order from that point on.

Also, the Rule of Law is applicable in Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 and 242, and on the website, "Corrupt Judges", it asserts that under the Federal Statute, Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241, Conspiracy Against Rights that "This statute makes it unlawful for two or more persons to conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person of any state, territory or district in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him/her by the Constitution or the laws of the United States, (or because of his/her having exercised the same)...."

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

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

The Rule of Law is, too, applicable to the written Maryland Rules in Civil and Criminal proceedings and in the written Maryland Constitution. Maryland Rule 18-102.11 asserts that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Maryland Rule 18-102.11 5 (c) states that a judge shall disqualify himself or herself in any proceeding in which the judge previously presided as a judge over the matter in another court. Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) Hearing--Other Motions states that "A party desiring a hearing on a motion, other than a motion filed pursuant to Rule 2-532, 2-533, or 2-534, shall request the hearing in the motion or response

under the heading "Request for Hearing." The title of the motion or response shall state that a hearing is requested. Except when a rule expressly provides for a hearing, the court shall determine in each case whether a hearing will be held, but the court may not render a decision that is dispositive of a claim or defense without a hearing if one was requested as provided in this section." Moreover, Article IV §22 of the Maryland Constitution mandates that a panel of three judges are mandated to preside over an In Banc Review, and the Petitioner has a right to an oral hearing before the 3-panel member of the Banc Review prior to the panel rendering their decision.

As asserted in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions from which the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller responds to in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, and/or as declared in the Petitioner's 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, Judge J. Geller, the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court since January of 2018, Judge Fletcher-Hill, who was, also, the presiding Judge prior to Judge John Nugent presiding, the panel of the 3 In Banc Judges who originally presided over the Petitioner's Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, and the presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, were all 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 violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. In terms of appointments by Martin O'Malley and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, the evidence substantiate the material facts that: 1.) Judge J. Geller was appointed to the 8th Judicial Circuit for Baltimore City in Maryland by the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and assumed office on May 18, 2012. 2.) Judge John Nugent, 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. 3.) Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. 4.) Judge Carrion's appointment by Chief Judge Barbera as an Administrative Judge for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City became effective on January 12, 2020. 5.) Judge Mellissa Phinn was appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. 6.) Judge Julie Rubin was, also, appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. 7.) Judge Michel Pierson was appointed by Chief Judge Barbera in 2013 as an Administrative Judge. 8.) Judge Karen Friedman was appointed by Martin O'Malley in 2014.

In terms of the allegations against Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division whose responsibilities include assigning Judges to civil case, the evidence of the 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, 9-4-18 Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation which respond to the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, 8-6-18 Motions from her initial civil litigation, which include Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the evidence of the 6-21-22, 8-4-22, 12-16-22, and 2-16-23 Findings and Orders, which respond to the Petitioner's 4-7-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, 12-27-22 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review which, also, include Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the evidence of the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions,

which, too, include a Motion for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, substantiate the material facts that the Petitioner has filed 9 separate Motions for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill for violating her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to his reputation and intentionally infringing Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 by refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding judge because of the appearance of his being impartial and/or biased as a result of being appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions and in her Civil Complaint filed in 2017 to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091, committed in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. Still too, although the evidence of her 6-20-23 Motions substantiate that the Petitioner has filed her 6th Motion to have the Court assign judges who were not appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera because the former government officials are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091, committed in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities, Judge J. Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division, has assigned not only the presiding Judge, Judge Geller, who was appointed by Martin O'Malley, but has, also assigned the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, the three former presiding judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill assigning himself twice as the presiding judge, namely, as one of the presiding judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation and as one of the presiding judges over the Petitioner's appeal in her In Banc Review. Further, although Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) prohibits a judge from presiding over a party's appeal in a civil litigation after the judge has been a presiding judge in the initial civil litigation, the evidence of the 3-30-18, 4-16-18, 7-23-18, 9-4-18 Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding judge over the Petitioner's 3-9-18, 4-6-18, 4-27-18, 8-6-18 Motions from her initial civil litigation and the evidence of his 6-21-22, 8-4-22, 12-16-22, and 2-16-23 Findings and Orders as the presiding judge over the Petitioner's 4-7-22, 6-24-22, 8-11-22, 12-27-22 Motions, substantiate that Judge Fletcher-Hill was one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner's her initial civil litigation who, also, was one of the presiding judges over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation.

In the Petitioner's instant Motions, she has attached as Exhibit 1 her "5th URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION" to the Governor of Maryland, Gov. Moore, in which the Petitioner alleges in the Hearing "Re: 1.) "5th 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 1ST AMENDMENT RIGHT AND IMMEDIATELY ORDER THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF BALTIMORE CITY, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL to: a.) assign a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over my 9-8-23 Motions and to grant my right to an oral Hearing before the panel of 3 Judges deny or grant my Petition as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for In Banc proceedings. b.) assign only judges who were not appointed by the former Governor of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland because both of these former

government officials are being alleged in my 9-8-23 Motions and in my initial Civil Complaint filed in 2017 to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted and conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. 2.) REQUEST THAT THE U.S ATTORNEY OF MARYLAND, EREK L. BARRON, AND THE STATE ATTORNEY FOR BALTIMORE CITY, IVAN BATES, investigate, disclose, and resolve the allegations that indictments need to brought against the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, the former presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, the former presiding, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of In Banc Judges who initial presided over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation and all of the other judges who initial presided over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation, which also, include Judge Fletcher-Hill, because the evidence substantiate the material facts that, except for Judge J. Geller who has, thus far, presided over only my 6-20-23 Motions, the other Judges that presided over my appeal in the In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation, namely, the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, and all of the other judges who presided over my initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have repeatedly and deliberately: a.) committed the Federal crimes of violating Federal Statute Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and the federal crimes of “Fraud upon the Court, Treason to the Constitution, and interference with Interstate Commerce due to their repetitious and intentional violations of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) in refusing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and/or 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 my 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 have committed other federal criminal activities. b.) committed the same other federal and/or state crimes alleged in my 3-9-18 Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 37 on my website), in my 8-6-18 Official Complaint Exhibit 43 on my website, the first Judge that presided over my initial civil litigation and/or the Addendums against Judge Fletcher-Hill, in my 12-20-18 Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson (Exhibit 61 on my website) and/or the Addendums, in my Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges on 2-18-20 (Exhibit 78 on my website), and/or in my Addendums, include repetitiously and deliberately committing the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1512, concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071, Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001.”

As cited in the Petitioner’s instant Motions, in her 6-20-23 Motions (Exhibit 142 on the Petitioner’s website), in her 4-5-23 (Exhibit 139 on the Petitioner’s website), and/or in her 2nd Addendum to our Hon. President, - the Petitioner alleges that, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments asserted her 6-20-23 Motions and in her other Motions, and as evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the 8-29-23 Findings and Order by Judge J. Geller (Exhibit 146 on the Petitioner’s website), which respond to the Petitioner’s 6-20-23 Motions, and/or as evidenced in the

facts stated and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the Findings and Orders by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or in the Findings and Orders of the other Judges who presided over the Petitioner's Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation and/or who presided over the Petitioner's Motions in her initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge J. Geller and all of the other former presiding Judges used the same unlawful pattern of deceit to repitiously and intentionally violate the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Rights under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 and/or under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in order conceal all of the material facts in the Petitioner's Motions, which include the material facts that the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, the previous presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the Officers of the Court who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review and/or who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation whose Civil Complaint was filed in 2017, repeatedly and deliberately refused to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges, to set aside their judgments, and/or 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 my 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 have committed other federal criminal activities. In her Motions, the Petitioner alleges that the deceit of Judge J. Geller, the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the Officers of the Court who presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review and/or who have committed other federal criminal activities. In her Motions, the Petitioner alleges that the deceit of Judge J. Geller, the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the Officers of the Court who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation includes that of: 1.) misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. 2.) misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my Oral Arguments. 3.) concealing in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court that are contrary to their Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. 4.) concealing in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments declared in my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my Oral Arguments that are contrary to their Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in their Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. 5.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. 6.) failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as declared in my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my Oral Arguments. 7.) concealing in their Findings that the evidence in the record support the allegations that Officers of the Court exhibited judicial misconduct and obstructed justice by, amongst other things, committing the prejudicial error of perjury. 8.) and/or concealing in their Findings that the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court and/or as asserted in my Complaints, Motions, Appeals, and/or in my Oral Arguments substantiate the allegations that other Officers of the Court failed to perform their duties and legal requirements, which include upholding and enforcing: a.) my 14th Amendment Right granted by our great Constitution. b.) my Civil Rights as afforded under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 241 and/or under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242. c.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a).

d.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 4-204, and/or other Maryland Rules governing judicial proceedings. e.) and/or other federal and/or state laws.

The Petitioner alleges that the 8-29-23 Findings and Order by the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, and the Findings and Orders of the other presiding Judges over the Petitioner's Motions in her appeal in the Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, which respond to the Petitioner's Motions are in the record of the Circuit Court and are cited as "Exhibits" on the Petitioner's website. The 8-29-23 Findings and Order by Judge J. Geller (Exhibit 146 on the Petitioner's website) responds to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions (Exhibit 142 on the Petitioner's website). The 6-8-23, 3-23-23 Findings and Order by the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent (Exhibits 141 and 138 on the Petitioner's website) are responses to the Petitioner's 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Motions (Exhibits 149 and Exhibits 113 and 114 [which are the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions] on the Petitioner's website). The 2-16-23, 12-16-22, 8-4-22, 6-21-22 by Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibits 112, 99, 97, and 95 on the Petitioner's website) are responses to the Petitioner's 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions (Exhibits 100, 98, 96, and 94 on the Petitioner's website). The 3-30-22 and the 2-6-20 Findings and Orders by the panel of 3 in Banc Judges (Exhibits 93 and 75 on the Petitioner's website) are responses to the Petitioner's 2-19-20, 2-13-20, 1-29-20 Motions, her 1-14-20 Petition for an In Banc Review and her 1-14-20 Memorandum in Support of the Petitioner's In Banc Review (Exhibits 80, 77, and 74 are the Petitioner's 2-19-20, 2-13-20, 1-29-20 Motions, respectively).

The evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the 8-29-23 Findings and Order of Judge J. Geller, the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in the Findings of the other former presiding Judges, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited above substantiate the material facts that, in Judge J. Geller's 8-29-23 Findings and Order and/or in all of the Findings and Orders of the other former presiding Judges, there is the failure of these Officers of the Court to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and/or the legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions and/or in her other Motions, which include the Petitioner's repeated Motions for Disqualification against Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former presiding Judges, beginning with the Petitioner's 2018 initial Motion for Disqualification against the first presiding Judge over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation in 2018, namely, Judge Karen Friedman. Further, although in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions and in her other Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, the evidence substantiate the material facts that the Petitioner has repeatedly pleaded for a Hearing on her 6-20-23 Motions as well as the evidence of the other former presiding Judges' Findings and Orders, substance that Judge J. Geller and the other former presiding Judges have repeatedly refused to grant the Petitioner her right to have a hearing on the Motions as mandated by Maryland Rule 2-311 (f).

As asserted in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions from which Judge J. Geller responds in his 8-28-23 Findings and Order, as alleged in her other Motions, and/or as alleged in the Petitioner's 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, the Petitioner continues to suffer financial

hardship and can't afford to make copies of all of the material evidence that could accompany her instant Motions to substantiate her legal arguments in the Petitioner's instant Motions, but through the support of her family, the Petitioner has been able to maintain her website for public access to the Petitioner's instant Motions (Exhibit 147 on the Petitioner's website), to her 6-20-23 Motions, to the Petitioner's other Motions, which include her repeated Motions for Disqualifications against the former presiding Judges, and public access to the Petitioner's Official Complaints and/or the Addendums against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against the 3 original presiding in Banc Judges, against the other former presiding Judges, against other Officers of the Court, and/or against other governmental officials. Again, the 8-29-23 Findings and Order responding to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions (Exhibit 147 on the Petitioner's website) is Exhibit 146 on the Petitioner's website. The 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders by Judge John Nugent which respond to the Petitioner's 4-5-23 and 2-27-23 Motions, respectively, (Exhibits 142 and 139 on the Petitioner's website) are Exhibits 141 and 138, respectively, on the Petitioner's website. The Petitioner's Motions, which include her Motions for Disqualifications against Judge Fletcher-Hill and/or the Addendums to her Official Complaint 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 Addendums which include allegations against the panel of in Banc Judges are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits on her website, namely, 16, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, and/or Exhibit 94. The Findings and Orders by the panel of in Banc Judges can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits, 73, 75, and 93. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualification and/or Substitution against Judge Karen Friedman, her Official Complaint, and/or the Petitioner's Addendums to her Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman are in the record and/or can be viewed from the Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, namely, Exhibits 16, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, 54, 55, 56, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81. The Findings and Orders of Judge Karen Friedman can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 47, 48, and 49. The Petitioner's Motions, which include Motions for Disqualifications and/or Substitutions against Judge Michel Pierson, her Official Complaint, and/or Addendums to the Petitioner's Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson are in the record and/or can be viewed from Exhibits 16, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 77, and/or Exhibit 81 on her website. The Findings and Orders by Judge Michel Pierson can be viewed on the Petitioner's website as Exhibits 59, 63, 66, and 70. The Petitioner's Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, her Addendums to her Official Complaint against Chief Judge Barbera, and/or other Official Complaints and/or Addendums to other Official Complaints which include allegations against Chief Judge Barbera can be viewed from Exhibits 6, 16, 43, 45, 54, 56, 77, and/or Exhibit 81 on the Petitioner's website.

As alleged in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions from which Judge J. Geller responds in his 8-28-23 Findings and Order, as alleged in her other Motions, and/or in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, other critical material facts are that Martin O'Malley, who was Mayor of Baltimore City from 2000 to 2007, along with the other Mayors of Baltimore City from at least 1993 to

the present, which include Kurt Schmoke, every member of the City Council who was a member of the City Council between 1993 until the present, Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts as a result of having: a.) continuously, deliberately, directly, and/or indirectly exposed our children to lead poisoning in Maryland schools since at least 1993. b.) yet to fulfill their duty and obligation to test all of our children that may have been exposed to lead poisoning using the special X-Ray machine to determine the cumulative amount of lead in the bones. c.) and/or as a result of having failed in their duty and obligation to evaluate and compensate all of our children that were exposed to such potentially deadly poison. d.) some of the Officers of the Court and/or by other governmental officials who are responsible for the health and safety of our children having for years ignored the alleged heinous crimes against the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, that of breaching of Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091. e.) other governmental officials who are, also, Officers of the Court having refused to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who have been alleged to have repeatedly and deliberately, directly and/or indirectly exposed our babies to such potential poison for almost 30 years. f.) and/or by some of the Officers of the Court and/or by governmental officials having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free.

As alleged in the Petitioner’s 6-20-23 Motions from which Judge J. Geller responds in his 8-28-23 Findings and Order, as alleged in her other Motions, and/or as asserted in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, the material facts that the evidence of the first 5 Exhibits on the Petitioner’s website, which accompany the her 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on the Petitioner’s website) and which are, also, crucial material evidence in the Petitioner’s Motions and in her 2017 Civil Complaint, prove, unequivocally, and in less than 5 minutes of reading, that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera intentionally committed the alleged prejudicial error of perjury in her 2015 Findings and Order, which, in turn, caused the issues raised in the Petitioner’s 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals (Exhibit 11 on the Petitioner’s website) to have, yet, to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc Judges from Circuit Court breached the Petitioner’s 14th Amendment Right by committing perjury and infringing upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated my 14th Amendment Right in breaching Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants’ Motions to dismiss the Petitioner’s 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that the owners of Baltimore City Public Schools from at least 1993 to the present, which include Kurt Schmoke and Martin O’Malley, every member of the City Council who was a member of the City Council between 1993 until the present, Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged to have repeatedly and deliberately violated 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 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal

acts for decades. Further, the Petitioner asserts in her Motions that the prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera appears to constitute another example of "Fraud upon the Court, and in order to understand how the first 5 Exhibits substantiate that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury and/or Fraud upon the Court, one must know that Maryland Rule 7-104 allows a party 30 days to file an appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, with the first of the 30 days beginning on the day that the last judgment of the Circuit Court is "entered" into the record by the clerk. Exhibit 1 is copy of the document that gives the "entry" date of the 2015 in Banc judges' last judgment from the Circuit Court, namely, the denial of the Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration on July 6, 2015. Exhibit 2 is a copy of the docket receipt from the clerk of the Court of Appeals which gives the date that the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals was filed in the record of this court, namely, on August 3, 2015. Exhibit 3 is a copy of the Court of Appeals' Order dated 9-21-15, which is signed by Chief Judge Barbera and declares that the Petitioner's Writ was denied because it was filed late. Exhibit 4 is a copy of the Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals which asserts, amongst other things, that the evidence in the record of this court, which include Exhibits 1 and 2 support the material fact that the Petitioner's 2015 Writ was filed in the Court of Appeals prior to the 30-day expiration date. Exhibit 5 is Chief Judge Barbera's Order dated 11-23-15, which, again, denies the Petitioner's 2015 Writ, but this time Chief Judge Barbera's denial is without any explanation.

As evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts that are stated in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, which include the material facts that: **1.)** Judge J. Geller was appointed as an Administrative Judge in 2012 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **2.)** Judge J. Geller violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under 18 U.S.C & Section 242 in presiding over the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions because a.) According to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Judge J. Geller is mandated to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding judge and set aside his judgment due to their being an appearance that Judge J. Geller might be biased and/or impartial because he was appointed in 2012 to the 8th Judicial Circuit for Baltimore City in Maryland by the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide and/or have attempted to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other federal criminal activities. **b.)** Due to infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Judge J. Geller, has committed "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, and interference with Interstate Commerce, **c.)** As a result of Judge J. Geller violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and/or Maryland Rule 18.102.11, the Petitioner alleges that she continues to undergo more financial loss, more loss of property, more other financial losses, and more tremendous emotional distress. **d.)** Under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, it is mandated that the Petitioner has a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over the

Petitioner's Motions from her In Banc Review, and, therefore, Judge J. Geller violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution because he was the only presiding over the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review. e.) Under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, it is, too, mandated that the Petitioner have a right to an oral hearing before the panel of 3 in Banc Judges decides to grant or deny the Petitioner's Petition, and, thus, Judge J. Geller, has again, breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution as a result of his failure grant the Petitioner's Motion for an oral hearing because the evidence substantiate the material facts that all of the previous presiding Judges over the Petitioner's Motions in her appeal in the In Banc Review have violated Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in denying the Petitioner her right to an oral hearing prior to deciding to deny the Petitioner's Petition. f.) Under Maryland Rule 2-311, it is mandated that, since the Petitioner's 6-29-23 Motions contains a Motion for a hearing on her Motions, Judge J. Geller infringed upon Maryland Rule 2-311 in failing to grant the Petitioner's Motion for a hearing cited within her 6-20-23 Motions, and represent the Petitioner's 10 time pleading for a hearing on her Motions as afforded under Maryland Rule 2-311.

Moreover, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, substantiate the material facts that Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the 8 Motions cited in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, whose Heading is entitled "1. 1st MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14TH 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.) 1st 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 14TH 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 14TH 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/OR DELIBERATELY COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242

WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S 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 14TH 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.) 1ST 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.) 2ND 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.) 5TH 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.) 7TH MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), 8.) 9TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311".

The evidence of the signature of Judge J. Geller on the 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, substantiate the material facts that Judge J. Geller presided over the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, although Judge J. Geller should know that he violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of his: 1.) breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 because Judge J. Geller failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions because there is an appearance that he would be biased and/or impartial due to his distinguished appointment in 2012 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, in her other Motions on the record, and/or her initial 2017 Civil Complaint to have alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 2.) infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11) and, thereby, committing "Fraud Upon the Court", Treason to the Constitution, interference with Interstate Commerce, and/or committing other federal and/or state laws. 3.) violating Maryland Rule 2-311 (f) as a result of failing to grant the Petitioners Motion for a hearing on her Motions as mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311. 4.) breaching Article IV of the Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's right to have a panel of 3 in Banc Judges preside over her Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review and to grant the Petitioner her right to have an oral Hearing since the previous Judges denied the Petitioner her right to have an oral Hearing before the denial of the Petitioner's Petition.

As alleged in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions from which Judge J. Geller responds in his 8-28-23 Findings and Order, as alleged in her other Motions, and/or as asserted in her 2nd Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint to our Hon. President, the material facts in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, also, substantiate the allegations of repeated and deliberate violations of the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, breaching the Rule of Law, by the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, by Judge Fletcher and by all of the other judges who presided over the Petitioner's Motions in her appeal in the 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) and 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) 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.

The evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order, which responds to the Petitioners 6-20-23, also, substantiates these material facts, namely: that: 1.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve the material fact that, in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, she alleges that her 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under 18 U.S.C. & Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated by: a.) the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other former presiding Judges, like the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, failed to voluntarily disqualify and refuse themselves as presiding Judges as mandated under Federal State, Section 455(a)) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 due to there being an appearance of impartiality and/or bias because each one of these Officers of the Court was appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. b.) the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, by Judge Fletcher-Hill, and by all of the other former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's 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 a panel of 3 presiding Judges because the panel of 3 in Banc Judges who initially presided over the Petitioner's Banc Review denied the Petitioner's Petition before granting the Petitioner's right to an oral Hearing as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution 2.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve whether the evidence substantiate the material facts that, in her 6-20-23 Motions, the Petitioner alleges that her 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under 18 U.S.C. & Section 242 were repetitiously and deliberately violated by the previous presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, due to set aside his judgment filed on 3-23-23, which responds to the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions because of the material

fact that there is no written or stamped signature indicating that Judge John Nugent wrote the Findings and Order filed on 3-23-23. b.) Judge John Nugent's failure to disclose, consider, and resolve the Petitioner's Motions to set aside his 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 the former Mayor of Baltimore City and Governor of Maryland, 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. c.) Judge John Nugent's breaching of Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution in failing to have a Panel of 3 in Banc Judges to preside over the Petitioner's Motions from her in Banc Review, not just solely Judge John Nugent being the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's Motions from her appeal in the In Banc Review. 3.) Judge J. Geller fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's detailed 6-20-23 Motions, which substantiate that the Petitioner is motioning, for the second time, that the Court mandates that the clerks record, verbatim, the Heading of the Petitioner's Motion, a legal document, on the Circuit Court's website, which is viewed by the public. 4.) Although Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution states that the Petitioner is to have 3 Judges presiding over her appeal in the In Banc Review and that the Petitioner has a right to an oral Hearing before the panel of In Banc Judges decides to grant or deny the Petitioner's Petition, only Judge J. Geller's signature is on the Petitioner's copy of his 8-29-23 Finding and Order, only Judge John Nugent's signature is the Petitioner's copies of his 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders, and only Judge John Fletcher-Hill's signature is on the Petitioner's copies of his 12-16-22, 8-4-22, and 6-24-22 Findings and Orders. 5.) The Petitioner asserts in her 6-20-23 and 4-5-23 Motions that her 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 have been repeatedly and deliberately infringed upon by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill and the initial panel of 3 in Banc Judges because all of these Officers of the Court have repetitiously and intentionally failed to grant the Petitioner's her right to an oral hearing as, also, mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 6.) The evidence of a copy of the 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders by Judge John Nugent (Exhibits 141 and 138, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) substantiate that Judge John Nugent's Orders, like Judge J. Geller's Order, only responds to the Petitioner's 1st Motion in her 4-5-23 and in her 2-27-23 Motions. 7.) 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 have committed other crimes. 8.) The Petitioner asserts that, during her research on 6-8-23 on the background of Judge John Nugent, she discovered that Judge John Nugent was appointed Chair, Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee, Judicial Council, 2022 by the new Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Judge Joseph M. Getty.

9.) 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. **10.)** The Petitioner asserts that, during her research on 6-8-23, 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. **11.)** 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 and that it can be filed long after a verdict or judgment has been issued, even years. **12.)** The Petitioner is asserting that she is only presuming that Judge John Nugent is the judge who wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order because there is no signature on her copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order and that the initials "N.J." is not on her copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. **13.)** The Petitioner alleges that she filed her initial Civil Complaint against the Defendant in the Circuit Court on 9-17-17. **14.)** The Petitioner alleges that, after the Defendant filed a Motion on 11-17-17 to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint, she filed her first Motions (Exhibit 39 on the Petitioner's website, which includes her Motions to dismiss the Defendant's Motion and to amend the punitive damages in her Civil Complaint. In her 12-22-17 Findings and Order (Exhibit 47 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Karen Friedman grants the Defendant's Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint. **15.)** The Petitioner alleges that she filed her 1-3-18 Motions (Exhibit 35 on the Petitioner's website) in response to Judge Karen Friedman's 12-22-17 Findings and Order, and the Heading in her 1-3-18 Motions is entitled "MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, AND GRANTING OF THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND THE PUNITIVE DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL COMPLAINTS". **16.)** In her 1-31-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 48 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Karen Friedman denies the Petitioner's 1-3-18 Motions. The Petitioner asserts that, while researching causes for filing her next Motion, she believes that, through DIVINE providence, she was led to the material fact that Judge Karen Friedman was appointed by Martin O'Malley in 2014. **17.)** The Petitioner alleges that, in her 2-15-18 Motions (Exhibit 34 on the Petitioner's website), she include her first Motion for Substitution of Judge Karen Friedman as the presiding Judge over her civil litigation, and the Heading in the Petitioner's 2-15-18 Motions is entitled "MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, AND GRANTING OF THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND THE PUNITIVE DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF'S CIVIL COMPLAINT. **18.)** As substantiated in 2-15-18 Motions, amongst other things, the Petitioner pleads for a substitution of Judge Karen Friedman and states that" due to a conflict of interest and/or the appearance of impartiality and, and/or being impartial and/or having the appearance of impartiality and, thereby, breaching Canons 1 and 2 in the Judicial Code of Conduct for Judges. Canon 1 stipulates that a judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety. And, Canon 2 cites that a judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and