

diligently. Judge Friedman was one of the judges appointed in 2014 to Maryland Eighth Circuit Baltimore City by the Former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley"..... 19.) In her 3-1-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 49 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Karen Friedman denies the Petitioner's 2-15-18 Motions. 20.) The Petitioner alleges that, during her research, she discovered that, in addition to continuing to violate Federal Statute 28. U.S.C & 455(a) and Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Judicial Code of Conduct for Judges (hereinafter "Canons"), Judge Karen Friedman appeared to be breaching other federal and/or state laws and, thus, the Petitioner filed an Official Complaint) against Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 37 on the Petitioner's website), which was completed and mailed to our Hon. President on 3-9-18. 21.) As evidenced by her Court-stamped Motions, the Petitioner, also, filed her 3-9-18 Motions (Exhibit 38 on the Petitioner's website) in response to Judge Karen Friedman's 3-1-18 Findings and Order on this same day, which include the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion for Disqualification against Judge Karen Friedman for violating the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to Judge Karen Friedman breaching Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. & 455 and the Canons in failing to disqualify and recuse herself from presiding over the Petitioner's civil litigation due to the appearance of her being bias and/or impartial as a result of Judge Karen Friedman being appointed by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Petitioner's civil litigation 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. The Heading in the Petitioner's 3-9-18 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN, MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN FOR COMMITTING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION, MOTION FOR ANOTHER SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN'S ORDERS AND TO HAVE ANOTHER JUDGE CONSIDER THE PLAINTIFF'S 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"**. 22.) The evidence of the signature on the 3-30-18 Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 3-9-18 Motions, substantiate that Judge Karen Friedman did not respond to the Petitioner's 3-9-18 Motions, but Judge Fletcher-Hill responds and denies the Petitioner's 3-9-18 Motions in his 3-30-18 Findings and Order(Exhibit 50 on the Petitioner's website). As evidenced in these Findings, there is no written communication in Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings acknowledging and/or confirming that Judge Karen Friedman was disqualified and recused as the presiding Judge. 23.) In responding to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 3-30-18 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 4-6-18 (Exhibit 36 on the Petitioner's website), which include her first Motion for Disqualification and Substitution of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the presiding Judge; and in his 4-16-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 46 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Fletcher-Hill denies the Petitioner's 4-6-18 Motions. 24.) In response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order dated 4-16-18, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 4-27-18 (Exhibit 42 on the Petitioner's website), which include the Petitioner's 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion for Disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill for violating the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due his failure to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding due because of Judge Fletcher-Hill's appointment to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by

Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in my civil litigation to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. Also, the Petitioner alleges in these Motions that the evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill has, too, obstructed justice and violated other federal and/or state laws; and, the Heading in the Petitioner’s 4-27-18 Motions is entitled **“MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION TO HAVE A SPECIAL JUDGE TO DETERMINE IF THE MATERIAL FACTS BELOW SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN NEED TO BE REFERRED FOR IMPEACHMENT BY GOVERNOR HOGAN, SANCTIONED BY THE JUDICIAL COMMISSION, DISQUALIFIED FROM PRESIDING OVER THE PLAINTIFF’S CIVIL CASE, AND BE REFERRED FOR INVESTIGATION BY A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR RELEVANT TO ALLEGATIONS OF CRIMINAL ACTS, JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, AND OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, MOTION TO HAVE ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN DISMISSED, AND A MOTION TO HAVE THE SPECIAL JUDGE FOR A SUBSTITUTION AND/OR JUDGE ALFRED NANCE FOR A SUBSTITUTION TO CONSIDER GRANTING ALL OF THE PLAINTIFF’S MOTIONS.”** 25.) As evidenced from the date on the Petitioner’s 4-27-18 Motions and the date on Judge Fletcher’s 7-23-18 Findings and Order which responds to s the Petitioner’s 4-27-18 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill took almost 3 months to respond to the Petitioner’s 4-27-18 Motions in his denial asserted in his 7-23-18 Findings and Order. 26.) The Petitioner asserts that, after reading over Judge Fletcher-Hill’s 7-23-18 Findings and Order, she believes that the SPIRIT OF GOD led her to understand that the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in all of the Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner’s Motions, substantiate the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill continuously obstructed justice and violated the same federal and state laws as Judge Karen Friedman, and, therefore, on 8-6-18, the Petitioner filed an Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibit 43 on the Petitioner’s website), which includes allegations that he, like Judge Karen Friedman, repeatedly and intentionally committed the federal crimes of misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505 and the federal crimes of breaching of the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and other federal statutes under 18 USC 242. 27.) The evidence of the stamped date by the clerk substantiates the material fact that on 8-6-18, the Petitioner, also, filed her Motions, which respond to Judge Fletcher-Hill’s 7-23-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 41 on the Petitioner’s website). 28.) Prior to receiving Judge Fletcher-Hill’s Findings and Order responding to her 8-6-18 Motions, the Petitioner alleges that she wrote 4 Addendums to her 8-6-18 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill, namely, the Addendums dated 8-9-10, 8-10-18, 8-27-18, and 8-31-18, which are Exhibits 44, 45, 54, and 55, respectively, on the Petitioner’s website. 29) Judge Fletcher-Hill denies the Petitioner’s 8-6-18 Motions in his 9-4-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 57 on the Petitioner’s website), and in response to Judge Fletcher-Hill’s 9-4-18 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 9-17-18, (Exhibit 58 on the Petitioner’s website), which include the Petitioner’s 4<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill. Moreover, accompanying the Petitioner’s 9-17-18 Motions as Exhibits are copies of her 8-6-18 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill and her 3<sup>rd</sup> emailed Addendum to her Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibits 43 and 54, respectively, on the Petitioner’s website). 30.) The Petitioner’s 9-17-18 Motions, which respond to Judge Fletcher-Hill’s 9-4-18 Findings and Order were denied on 12-7-18 by another judge, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, who never cited in his Findings that Judge Fletcher-Hill

was disqualified and recused as the presiding Judge. 31.) In his 12-7-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 59 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions, Judge Michel Pierson simply ordered that the "Plaintiff's Motion (No. 27) is STRICKEN", that the "Defendants shall not be required to respond to any future Filings by Plaintiff in this case unless expressly ordered by this Court", and that the "Clerk shall close this case." 32.) The Petitioner alleges that, during her research on the issue of whether written Motions can be "Stricken" from the record of the court as ordered by Judge Michel Pierson in his 12-7-18 Findings and Order, she believes that, again, through DIVINE guidance, she came across other very critical material facts, namely, that Judge Michel Pierson was appointed by Chief Judge Barbera in 2013 and that she could file a Motion for a hearing on my Motions. 33.) In her 12-17-18 Motions (Exhibit 60 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to Judge Michel Pierson's 12-7-18 Findings and Order, the Petitioner pleads her 1<sup>st</sup> Motion for a Hearing on her Motions and she, also, Motions for a removal of Judge Michel Pierson as the presiding Judge because she questions whether there is an appearance of a bias and/or impartiality due to his appointment by Chief Judge Barbera who is being alleged to have deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury and that the first 5 Exhibits on her website accompany the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions as "Exhibits" in order to substantiate the allegation that Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in 2015. The Heading in the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR HON. GOV. HOGAN TO EXPEDITIOUSLY APPOINT A JUDGE TO HAVE A HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON'S 12-7-18 DECISION AND ORDERS, BUT IF THIS MOTION IS DENIED, MOTION TO STILL HAVE A HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE MICHEL'S PIERSON'S 12-7-18 DECISION AND ORDERS, MOTION TO HAVE HON. GOV. HOGAN TO EXPEDITIOUSLY APPOINT A JUDGE TO DETERMINE IF THE MATERIAL FACTS CITED IN THESE MOTIONS SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, THE ADMINISTRATOR OVER THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY CIRUCIT COURT: (1.) INTENTIONALLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND HAS DELIBERATELY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING THE PLAINTIFF'S 7<sup>TH</sup> AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242. (2.) NEEDS TO BE REFERRED TO BE INVESTIGATED BY A SPECIAL STATE PROSECTOR DUE TO PLAINTIFF'S SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS OF HIS DELIBERATELY COMMITTING THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505 AND OF HIS DELIBERATELY COMMITTING THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING THE PLAINTIFF'S 7<sup>TH</sup> AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242, AND MOTION TO HAVE APPOINTED JUDGE BY HON. GOV. HOGAN TO RECONSIDER GRANTING ALL OF THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS"**. 34.) On 12-20-18, the Petitioner filed her Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson and mailed the original copy to your office, Hon. President (Exhibit 61 on the Petitioner's website). Amongst other material facts, the Petitioner alleges in her Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson that the evidence in the record substantiate that Judge Michel Pierson has repeatedly and intentionally violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), committed misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505, and, therefore, infringed upon the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under 18 USC 242. 35.) The Petitioner alleges that, on 1-4-19, she mailed her 1<sup>st</sup> emailed Addendum to her 12-20-18 Official Complaint against Judge Michel Pierson (Exhibit

62 on the Petitioner's website) to our Hon. President. **36.)** In Judge Michel Pierson's Findings and Order dated 2-6-19 (Exhibit 63 on the Petitioner's website), he denies the Petitioner's 12-17-18 Motions, and, in response to Judge Michel Pierson's Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 2-15-19 (Exhibit 64 on the Petitioner's website), which include another Motion to have another judge preside over her civil litigation. Moreover, the Petitioner asserts that, although she does not actually cite the phrase, "Motion for Disqualification" in her 2-15-19 Motions, she does declare in her 2-15-19 Motions that she questions Judge Michel Pierson's impartiality and/or bias as the presiding Judge due to his being appointed by Chief Judge Barbera, who is being alleged in my civil litigation and in other Motions to have committed the prejudicial error of perjury, a very material fact. **37.)** The Petitioner alleges that, included in her 2-15-19 Motions is another Motion for a hearing on the Motions as afforded under Maryland Rule 2-311. **38.)** Judge Michel Pierson denies the Petitioner's 2-15-19 Motions in his Findings and Order dated 8-8-19 (Exhibit 66 on the Petitioner's website), and, in response to Judge Michel Pierson's 8-8-19 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 8-22-19 (Exhibits 67 and 67' on the Petitioner's website), which include another Motion for Disqualification of Judge Michel Pierson. **39.)** The Petitioner asserts that, on 8-29-19, she emailed copies of her second plea to Gov. Hogan (Exhibit 69 on the Petitioner's website) to the Whitehouse and to other governmental agencies. **40.)** Although in his 1-2-20 Findings and Order, Judge Michel Pierson denies the Petitioner's 8-22-19 Motions and ordered that the "Clerk shall not accept any further filings in this action other than a Order of Appeal accompanied by the filing fee and further ORDERED the clerk to close this case.", in her appeal of the 1-2-20 Findings and Order by Judge Michel Pierson, on 1-14-20, the Petitioner petitioned that a panel of 3 In Banc Judges preside over her In Banc Review in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City by filing her Petition and Memorandum (Exhibits 72 and 71, respectively, on the Petitioner's website). The Petitioner alleges that, in her Memorandum, she states "9 Questions for Review" and/or legal arguments, along with the supporting material facts, that she wanted the panel of In Banc judges to disclose, consider, and resolve before deciding to grant or deny the Petitioner's Petition. **41.)** In her Order dated 1-24-20, Judge Carrion, the "Administrative & Chief Judge", assigned three "designated judges to preside over the Petitioner's In Banc Review as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. **42.)** The Petitioner alleges that her 1-14-20 Memorandum is lengthy due to the fact that she traces the material facts and legal arguments that substantiate the repeated allegations of how her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were being repetitiously violated, starting in 2018 with her first Motion for Disqualification against Judge Karen Friedman, the first judge to preside over her 2017 Civil Complaint and then the repeated Motions of Disqualification against Judge Karen Friedman, against Judge Fletcher-Hill, and against Judge Michel Pierson due to their repeated and intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) as a result of their repeated and intentional refusals to disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges as a result of there being an appearance of their being bias and/or impartial because all of these Officers of the Court were appointed to the privileged positions as Administrative Judges by O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **43.)** The Petitioner alleges that, in her 1-14-20 Memorandum, she, also, declares that the evidence support the material fact that, due to the 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera,

the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court intentionally committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill deliberately violated her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that Martin O'Malley is being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **44.)** On 1-24-20, the Administrative & Chief Judge presiding over the 3 panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Carrión, designated herself, along with 2 other judges to make up the panel of 3 In Banc Judges, namely, Judge Melissa Phinn and Judge R. Rubin. **45.)** In the 1-24-20 Order by Judge Carrion (Exhibit 73 on the Petitioner's website), there is no disclosure of the filing of the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Memorandum), nor is does the Circuit Court's website reveals the material fact that the Petitioner filed her Memorandum on the same day that she filed her Petition, namely, on 1-14-20 and as evidenced by the Circuit Court's stamp of the filing date of the Petitioner's Petition and on her Memorandum as 1-14-20 (Exhibits 71 and 72 on the Petitioner's website). **46.)** The Petitioner alleges that, shortly after filing her Petition and Memorandum 1-14-20, she did some research on the panel of In Banc Judges and discovered that panel of In Banc Judges presiding over her Petition were appointed by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera and that there was public acknowledgement in a local newspaper of the close relationship among the panel of In Banc judges, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and/or Judge Karen Friedman. **47.)** The Petitioner asserts that she filed her first Motions against the panel of In Banc Judges on 1-29-20 (Exhibit 74 on the Petitioner's website), which include the Petitioner's first Motion for Disqualification of the panel of In Banc judges as the presiding Judges due to the material facts that her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under 18 U.S.C., Section 242 were being violated by the panel of In Banc judges because the evidence support the allegation that the panel of In Banc judges were obstructing justice and violating federal and/or state laws, which include failing to disqualify and recuse themselves, voluntarily, as mandated by Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) due to the material facts that the Petitioner question the impartiality and/or bias of the panel as the presiding Judges because: **a.)** The panel of In Banc Judges were appointed 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 conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **b.)** There was public acknowledgement in a local newspaper of the close relationship among the panel of In Banc judges and the former presiding Judges over my civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. **48.)** On 2-4-20, the Defendant filed a Motion (Exhibit 76 on the Petitioner's website), in which the Defendant pleads for the In Banc panel to dismiss the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Petition. **49.)** On 2-6-20, the panel of In Banc Judges issued two separate Orders (Exhibit 75 on the Petitioner's website). In their first 2-6-20 Findings Order, the panel of In Banc Judges dismissed the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Petition without allowing the Petitioner to have an

oral Hearing as mandated by Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution and, also, without disclosing, considering, and resolving any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Memorandum which substantiate why the Petitioner's Petition should be granted. 50.) The evidence of the two 2-6-20 Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges substantiate that the panel of In Banc Judges failed to disclose in their 2-6-20 Findings and Order the material facts that the Petitioner filed her 1-14-20 Memorandum along with the Petitioner's Petition on 1-14-20. 51.) In one of their two 2-6-20 Findings Orders, the panel of In Banc Judges denies the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions (Exhibit 74 on the Petitioner's website). 52.) In their two 2-6-20 Findings Orders, the panel of In Banc Judges, also, fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Memorandum, which, again, justify the granting of the Petitioner's Petition. 53.) In responding to the Defendant's Motion filed on 2-4-20 and the denial of her 1-29-20 Motions in the 2-6-20 Findings and Orders by the panel of In Banc judges, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 2-13-20 (Exhibit 77 on the Petitioner's website), in which, amongst other things, the Petitioner alleges the material facts stated above, which include the material fact that the panel of In Banc Judges breached Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution and, thus, declares that..... *"The Maryland Constitution cites that, upon the decision or determination of any point, or question, by the Court, it shall be competent to the party, against whom the ruling or decision is made, upon motion, to have the point, or question reserved for the consideration of the three Judges of the Circuit, who shall constitute a court in banc for such purpose. Moreover, when review by a court in banc is permitted by the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner may have a judgment or determination of any point or question reviewed by a court in banc by filing a notice for in banc review. Issues are reserved for in banc review by making an objection in the manner set forth in Rules 2-517 and 2-520. Again, the Court of Appeals set out the details of in banc practice in rule 2-551 of the Maryland Rules of Civil Procedure. A "hearing," as opposed to an argument, is automatically scheduled, but may be waived by consent of all parties. Since the Petitioner did not waive her right to a hearing, the consent by all parties to waive the hearing was not given. Thus, according Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution, the Petitioner had a right to a hearing before the In Banc panel once she was granted her Petition for Review on 1-24-20 before the panel of judges and then the panel of judges may decide at the hearing to dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for In Banc Review and Memorandum in Support of an In Banc Review. The Petitioner has yet to have a hearing before the panel of In Banc judges as required by Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution,*

instead of the panel of In Banc judges deciding on 2-6-20 to unlawfully dismiss the Petitioner's Petition for an In Banc Review. Furthermore, Article IV, §22 of the Maryland Constitution requires the banc panel to file a brief statement of the reasons for the decision or shall dictate the reasons into the record.' ..... 54.) The Petitioner alleges that, after reading over the facts proclaimed in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the two sets of 2-6-20 Findings and Orders of the panel of In Banc Judges which respond to her 1-29-20 Motions, she believes that the HOLY GHOST led her to understand that the panel of In Banc Judges was breaching the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by infringing upon the Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and other federal and/or state laws and that the Petitioner needed to file an Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges. 55.) The Petitioner alleges that, on 2-18-20, she mailed the original copy of her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges (Exhibit 78 on the Petitioner's website) to our Hon. President and sent a copy to another governmental official, and in her Official Complaint, the Petitioner alleges that, amongst other things, she asserted that the panel of In Banc Judges committed the federal crimes of: a.) violating the Petitioner's right to have them disqualified and recused from presiding over my In Banc Review of my initial civil litigation as mandated under Federal Statute U.S.C & 455 (a) due to there being an appearance of panel of In Banc judges being bias and/or impartial as a result of their appointments to the distinct positions of Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. b.) misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance under U.S Code Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 & 1505. c.) depriving the Petitioner of her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and breaching other federal statutes and laws. d.) tampering with evidence under U.S. Code Title 18, Part1, Chapter 73 & 1512. e.) and/or committing the federal crimes of concealment, removal, or mutilation under 18 U.S. Code & 2071. 56.) The Petitioner alleges that, after re-reading her 2-13-20 Motions, she believes that the SPIRIT OF GOD led her to recognize that her 2-13-20 Motions did not respond to the panel of In Banc Judges' 2-6-20 Findings and Order, which denies the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motion for Disqualification. 57.) The Petitioner alleges that, on 2-19-20, she filed another set of Motions, which includes her 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion for Disqualification of the panel of In Banc Judges as the presiding Judges over her appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation. 58.) The Heading in the Petitioner 2-19-20 Motions is entitled **"MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES' 2-6-20 ORDER TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR AN IMMEDIATE "SUBSTITUTION" AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, MOTION FOR "SUBSTITUTION" IN BANC PANEL OF JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE HEARING BECAUSE THE PRESIDING IN BANC PANEL OF JUDGES ARE ONE OF THE JUDGES IN THE PETITIONER'S 2-17-20 OFFICIAL COMPLAINT TO THE FBI, HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP, HON. GOV. HOGAN, CONGRESS, AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES WHO ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INTENTIONALLY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 &1505, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF BREACHING**

THE PETITIONER'S 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENTS RIGHTS AND OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242, TO HAVE DELIBERATELY AND REPEATEDLY TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512, HAVE CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071, AND, IN DECIDING THE PETITIONER'S 1-14-20 PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW, HER 1-14-20 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AN IN BANC REVIEW, AND IN HER 1-29-20 MOTIONS, WHICH INCLUDES THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION AND DISQUALIFICATION OF THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, TO HAVE REPEATEDLY, DELIBERATELY, EXCESSIVELY, AND EGREGIOUSLY: 1.) ABUSED THEIR POWER. 2.) DISPLAYED TOTAL CONTEMPT FOR THE RULE OF LAW. 3.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF MISFEASANCE, MALFEASANCE, AND NONFEASANCE IN THE CONDUCT OF THE OFFICE UNDER US CODE, TITLE 18, PART 1, CHAPTER 73 & 1505. 4.) COMMITTED THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF DEPRIVING THE PETITIONER OF HER 6<sup>TH</sup>, 7<sup>TH</sup>, AND 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENTS RIGHTS, AND BY VIOLATING OTHER FEDERAL STATUTES, LAWS, AND CANONS UNDER 18 USC 242. 5.) TAMPERED WITH EVIDENCE UNDER U.S. CODE TITLE 18 PART 1 CHAPTER 73 & 1512. 6.) CONCEALED, REMOVED, AND/OR MUTILATED EVIDENCE UNDER 18 U.S. CODE § 2071. MOTION TO HAVE THE "SUBSTITUTION" PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES APPOINTED BY HON. GOV. HOGAN TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS, AND MOTION TO HAVE THE "SUBSTITUTION" PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO RECONSIDER THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW AND ALL OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS". 59.) The Petitioner alleges that, on 4-3-20, she wrote an Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint) against the panel of In Banc Judges and against other Officers of the Court (Exhibit 81 on the Petitioner's website), and her Addendum has four "Re" sections and that the section entitled "Re: 1" is the Petitioner's 1<sup>st</sup> Addendum to her 2-18-20 Official Complaint against the panel of In Banc Judges, which includes the new allegations of federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001; and, the section entitled "Re: 2" is the Petitioner's Addendum to her "925<sup>th</sup> Addendum and counting to my 5-6-16 Official Complaint" (Exhibit 11 on the Petitioner's website), which includes these same allegations of federal crimes of Conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. §1621, 18 U.S.C. § 1623, and under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 against the Justices of the Supreme Court, against Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals, against Judge Michel Pierson, against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Karen, against the former Gov. of Maryland and former Mayor of Baltimore City, namely, Martin O'Malley, and/or against the other governmental officials declared in the Petitioner's 925<sup>th</sup> Addendum to her 5-6-16 Official Complaint. 60.) After taking over two years, the panel of In Banc judges denies the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions in their 3-30-22 Findings and Orders (Exhibit 93 on the Petitioner's website). 61.) In response to the 3-30-22 Findings and Orders from the panel of In Banc Judges, the Petitioner filed her 4-7-22 Motions (Exhibit 94 on the Petitioner's website), which, amongst other things, disclose the material facts that the panel of In Banc Judges responded to the Defendant's 2-4-20 Motion on 2-13-20, but allowed over two years to lapse before responding to the Petitioner's 2-13-20 and 2-19-20 Motions. Also, within the Petitioner's 4-7-22 Motions is her 3<sup>rd</sup> Motion for Disqualification of the panel of In Banc Judges under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and a Motion to have all the Orders by the panel of In Banc Judges, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman deemed void due to breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), and the Heading in the Petitioner's 4-7-22 Motions is entitled "3<sup>rd</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AGAINST THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS



**BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS” 62.)** The panel of In Banc Judges did not respond to the Petitioner’s 4-7-22 Motions, but Judge Fletcher-Hill responds and denies the Petitioner’s Motions in his 6-17-22 Findings and Order (Exhibit 95 on the Petitioner’s website), which are Motions from the Petitioner’s appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation. **63.)** Judge Fletcher-Hill knows that he is one of the judges who presided over the Petitioner’s Motions from her initial civil litigation and, therefore, under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), he is disqualified and recused from presiding over the Petitioner’s appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation. **64.)** The Petitioner alleges that, when she filed her Motions dated 6-24-22 (Exhibit 96 on Petitioner’s website), which respond to Judge Fletcher-Hill’s 6-17-22 Findings and Order, she didn’t know about Maryland Rule 18. 102.11 5(c), but the Petitioner does state, amongst other material facts and legal arguments, that Judge Fletcher-Hill should know that Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 require that he voluntarily disqualifies and recuses himself as the presiding Judge since there is an appearance of his being bias and/or impartial due to his being appointed in 2009 as an Administrative Judge by Martin O’Malley, who is being alleged to have repetitiously and intentionally breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **65.)** The Petitioner alleges that, also, in her 6-24-23 Motions, she asserts that Judge Fletcher-Hill should be aware of the material facts that all of his Findings and Orders are deemed void as a matter of law under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), as well as every decision or Order from him thereafter; the Heading in the Petitioner’s 6-24-22 Motions is entitled **“5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR “FRAUD UPON THE COURT” UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11 AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WHO WAS RECUSED IN 2018 AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE, 2ND MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS”.** **66.)** The Petitioner alleges that, as a result of her doing some research on the judges that were appointed by Martin O’Malley, she believes that it was through DIVINE revelation that it was revealed to her during her research that: **a.)** Judge Carrion and the Petitioner completed their undergraduate study and graduated from the College of Notre Dame in Maryland in 1981. **b.)** Judge Karen Friedman was appointed by the Biden’s Administration on November 16, 2021 to serve as the Director of Criminal Justice Innovation, Development, and Engagement at the Department of Justice. **c.)** Judge Rubin was nominated by the Biden’s Administration on November 3, 2021 and confirmed on March 23, 2022 to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. **67.)** In his 8-1-22 Findings and Order, Judge Fletcher-Hill denies the Petitioner’s 6-24-22 Motions, and in responding to Judge Fletcher-Hill’s 8-1-22 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her Motions dated 8-11-22 (Exhibit 98 on the Petitioner’s website), whose Heading is entitled **“5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR “FRAUD UPON THE COURT” UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11 AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WHO WAS RECUSED IN 2018 AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE, 2ND MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC**

**JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS". 68.)** The Petitioner alleges that, amongst other things, in her 8-11-22 Motions, she asserts that is she aware of the fact that, when calling the Circuit Court, the recording informs the individual of the likelihood that his/her conversation will be recorded for quality control purposes, and, therefore, she knows that was possible that her conversations would be recorded prior to my speaking to the clerk and the supervisor on 8-18-22, before talking with another clerk on 8-22-22, even before conversing with the young lady who refuse to give the Petitioner her name on 8-22-22, and/or prior to having a conversation with "Ms." on 8-22-22. In these conversations, the Petitioner declares that one and/or more of the material facts, namely, that: a.) When she checked the Circuit Court's website on 8-18-22, her Motions dated 8-11-22 were entered on the Circuit Court's website as "Motion" and "Request for Hearing on Selection Motion", and when she checked the Circuit Court's website just prior to calling the Circuit Court on the morning of 8-22-22, her 8-11-22 Motions were entered on the Circuit Court's website as "6<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification for "Fraud Upon the Court" under Federal Statue 28 U,S,C, & 455(a)" and "Request for Hearing on Selected Motion". b.) The Petitioner did not file "a Motion", but she filed "Motions" and proceeded to read, verbatim, the Heading in her 8-11-22 Motions to the supervisor on 8-18-22, whose Heading is entitled "6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, 3<sup>rd</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18-102.11, MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARINGON THE MOTIONS". c.) The Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions should be stated, verbatim, as they are declared in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions. d.) The clerk/s should not attempt to hide the facts in the Heading of the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions from the public's view on the Circuit Court's website, namely, that it is being alleged in the Heading of my Motions that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the "Judge-in-Charge" over the Civil division in the Circuit Court, has committed "Fraud upon the Court" under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and under Maryland Rule 18.102.11 for the sixth time, has breached Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5( c) for the second time, has breached Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for the second time, has violated the "Rule of Law" for the sixth time, and that a Motion for a hearing on the Petitioner's Motions has been requested for the fifth time. e.) No Officer of the Court, which includes Judge Fletcher-Hill, is above the Rule of Law. f.) Judge Fletcher-Hill should knows that Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 require his voluntary disqualification and recusal since there is an appearance of his being bias and/or impartial as a result of Judge Fletcher-Hill being appointed as an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in my Motions to have committed misconduct in office and/or other federal crimes. g.) According to Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Judge Fletcher-Hill should not have presided over the Petitioner's 4-7-22 and 6-24-22 Motions, should not

preside over her 8-11-22 Motions, nor should Judge Fletcher-Hill preside over any other Motions in my appeal in the In Banc Review because Judge Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges who presided over my initial civil litigation. 69.) Judge Fletcher-Hill denies the Petitioner's 8-11-22 Motions in his 12-16-22 Findings and Order (Exhibit 99 on the Petitioner's website), and in response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her 12-27-22 Motions (Exhibit 100 on the Petitioner's website), which include the Petitioner's 7<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill, and the Heading in Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions is entitled "**7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND VIOLATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND UNDER "THE RULE OF LAW" AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION FOR "FRAUD UPON THE COURT" UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, JUDGES NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE COMMITTED FEDERAL CRIMES, 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311".** 70.) In responding to the Petitioner's 12-27-22 Motions, Judge Fletcher-Hill denies her Motions in his 2-16-23 Findings and Order (Exhibit 112 on the Petitioner's website). 71.) In response to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 2-16-23 Findings and Order, the Petitioner filed her 2-27-23 Motions (Exhibits 113 and 114 on the Petitioner's website), and the Heading in the Petitioner's 2-27-23 Motions is entitled "**1. MOTION FOR THE COURT TO STAY THE OTHER MOTIONS CITED BELOW UNTIL GOV. MOORE RESPONDS TO THE PETITIONER'S 2-17-23 CERTIFIED LETTER, WHICH PLEADS THAT GOV. MOORE EXERCISES HIS EXECUTIVE POWER AND ORDER AN IMMEDIATE STAY ON JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL BEING THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND ORDER AN IMMEDIATE RECUSAL OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO HIS BREACHING FOR THE EIGHTH TIME FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND FOR THE FOURTH TIME VIOLATING MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (C) . 2.) 8<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, FOR THE EIGHTH TIME, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REPETITIOUSLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11. 3.) 4<sup>th</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AND, THUS, FOR THE FOURTH TIME, COMMITTING" FRAUD UPON THE COURT" AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY CONTINUOUSLY INFRINGING UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 4.) 3<sup>rd</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES TO CONTINUE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND TO SELECT JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL**

U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 - GENOCIDE. 5.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11. 6.) 3<sup>RD</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". 72.) The Petitioner alleges that, on 3-23-23 when she checked the Circuit Court's website to find out the status of her 2-27-23 Motions, she noticed that, in response to her Motions, it was entered "Ordered that the motion (Paper 43) is DENIED. N, J" (Exhibit 138 on the Petitioner's website). 73.) The Petitioner asserts in her 4-5-23 Motions (Exhibit 139 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, that, although she had not received her copy of the Court's Finding and Order as of the date that she filed her Motions, namely, on 4-5-23, she was able to file her approximately 35-page Motions dated 4-5-23 premised on the citing from the Court's website of the 3-23-23 Finding and Order by the Court and from recognizing for that, for almost 6 years of filing her Motions in this civil litigation, the usual pattern exercised by all of the judges relevant to their Findings, namely, that of continually refusing to grant the Petitioner's Motion for Hearing on the Motions, but instead assert the same unsubstantiated one-line phrase of declaring that the Petitioner's Motions are "frivolous and without merit ". 74.) The Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions, which respond to the 3-23-23 Findings and Order, include as Exhibit 1 a copy of the Petitioner's 3<sup>RD</sup> URGENT AND TIME SENSITIVE PETITION to Gov. Moore, sent by certified and regular mail (Exhibit 140 on the Petitioner's website), and the Heading of the Petitioner's 4-5-23 Motions is entitled "9<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, FOR THE NINTH TIME, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE, AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REPETITIOUSLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 2.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FOR VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) AND, THUS, FOR THE FIFTH TIME, COMMITTING" FRAUD UPON THE COURT" AND BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY CONTINUOUSLY INFRINGING UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C) BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 3.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW AND TO HAVE AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL ACCEPTS OR DENIES THE PETITION AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND TO SELECT JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE, BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 4.) 6<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL ORDERS BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, BY THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, BY JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE

DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND UNDER MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 5.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 6.) MOTION FOR THE COURT TO ORDER THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM AS CITED IN HER MOTIONS. 7.) 8<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 BECAUSE THE COURT'S 3-23-23 ORDER ONLY DENIES THE "STAY" IN THE 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION OF THE PETITIONER'S "7" 2-27-23 MOTIONS" 75.) On 5-1-23, the Petitioner called the Circuit Court, spoke with "Mr.", reminded him that she had spoken to him on 4-14-23 germane to the 5 issues and informed "Mr." that she have yet to receive the copy of the 3-23-23 Court's Finding and Order that has the Judge's signature stamped in the "signature" section in the 3-23-23 Finding and Order of the Court. 76.) The Petitioner is asserting that she have yet to receive a copy of the 3-23-23 Findings and Order of the Court that has the stamped signature of the judge who wrote the 3-23-23 Findings and Order. 77.) The Petitioner alleges that, on 6-8-23, she checked the Circuit Court's website and found out that the clerk entered the Judge's response to her 4-5-23 Motions on this day and mailed her a copy on the same day of the 6-8-23 Findings and Order by Judge John Nugent, the new presiding Judge. 78.) The Petitioner asserts that, after researching the background of Judge John Nugent on 6-8-23 and discovering that, although his termed expired in 2019, Judge John Nugent was appointed as one of the judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera, the Petitioner included in her 6-20-23 Motions (Exhibit 142 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to Judge John Nugent's 6-8-23 Findings and Order and which, amongst other things, cite the material facts that Judge John Nugent, the presiding Judge, the previous presiding Judge, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and all of the other former judges who presided over civil litigation and over my appeal in the In Banc Review, have repeatedly and deliberately breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to their repetitious and intentional violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.1 02.11 due to their refusing to disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges because of an appearance of their being biased and/or impartial because of their appointments to the distinguished positions 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 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide. 79.) The Heading of the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions is entitled "1.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGA INST JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO HIS BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THEREBY, COMMITTING "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. 2.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE 6-8-23 and 3-23-23 JUDGMENTS OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT DUE TO HIS VIOLATIONS OF THE PETITIONER'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C, SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF HIS: A.) VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 IN FAILING TO DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS A PRESIDNG JUDGE DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF HIM BEING IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED BECAUSE OF HIS APPOINTMENT BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S.

**CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE . B.) VIOLATING ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER’S MOTIONS, MOTIONS FROM HER IN BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER’S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER’S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, THUS, REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTING “FRAUD UPON THE COURT”, TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND/OR INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE. D.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER’S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER’S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AND THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER’S IN BANC REVIEW DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND INTENTIONAL VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER’S PETITON FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. E.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER’S 4-5-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER’S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY INFRINGED UPON BY JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL DUE TO HIS REPEATED AND DELIBERATE VIOLATIONS OF MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE 3-21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 4.) 2<sup>ND</sup> MOTION THAT JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ORDERS THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT’S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER’S MOTIONS VERBATIM. 5.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER’S IN BANC REVIEW WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O’MALLEY AND/OR BY CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, BOTH OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. 6.) 7<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A). 7.) 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 8.) 9<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311”. 80.) Judge John Nugent did not respond to the Petitioner’s 6-20-23 Motions, but Judge J. Geller, a new presiding Judge, responded to the Petitioner’s Motions in his 8-29-23 Findings and Order (Exhibit 147 on the Petitioner’s website). 81.) In Judge J. Geller 8-29-23 Findings and Order, he not only fails to cite one reason for denying the Petitioner’s 6-20-23 Motions, but fails disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge and set aside his judgment due to his violating the Petitioner’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 as a result of his infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11 because there is an appearance that he**

could be biased and/or impartial because he was appointed in 2012 by Martin O'Malley , who is being alleged in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in all of her other Motions, in her 2017 Civil Complaint, and in her 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum to our Hon. President 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, committed misconduct in office, and/or violated other federal and state laws.

## **ARGUMENT**

An attorney, who has been practicing law for over 45 years, declares “A legal system that does not follow the rule of law and apply it fairly and equally to ALL, is not a legal system at all.” The material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions and in her 4-5-23, 2-27-23, 12-27-22, 8-11-22, 6-24-22, and 4-7-22 Motions , from which the presiding Judge, Judge J. Geller, Judge John Nugent, and Judge Fletcher-Hill respond to in their 8-29-23, 6-8-23, 3-23-23 and 2-16-23 Findings and Orders and the material facts and legal arguments stated in the Petitioner's other Motions, which respond to the other Findings and Orders by Judge Fletcher-Hill, the 3 In Banc Judges who initially presided over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, and the former Judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, substantiate the allegations that Judge J. Geller deliberately violated the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, and, thereby, infringed upon the Rule of Law due to his intentional breaching of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 5(c), and/or violating other federal and/or state laws in order deny the Petitioner's 6-20-23 Motions, which include the material facts and legal arguments to substantiate the allegations that the previous presiding Judge over her Motions, Judge John Nugent, the former presiding who is the Judge-In-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court, whose responsibilities include assigning judges to civil cases, the panel of 3 In Banc Judges who initially presided over the Petitioner's appeal, and all of the other presiding Judges over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill have continued to deliberately and unlawfully deny the Petitioner's repeated Motions for Disqualification against Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other formerly presiding Judges in order to ultimately grant the Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint in order to attempt to continue to conceal the critical material facts which will be revealed during the hearing, which include the allegations that: 1.) In her 2015 Motion for Consideration to the Court of Appeals and in her 2016 Petition to the Supreme that the first 5 Exhibits on the her website, namely, Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 which can be read in about 5 minutes, prove, indisputably, that, in 2015, Chief Judge Barbera deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury, which is “Fraud Upon the Court”. 2.) Due to alleged 2015 prejudicial error of perjury by Chief Judge Barbera, the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which includes the material facts that the Petitioner alleges that the evidence that accompanied her 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals, the evidence on her website, and/or the evidence in the record of the Petitioner's 2014 Civil proceedings in the Circuit Court substantiate the allegations, namely that, in their 2014 the Findings, the In Banc Judges from Baltimore City Circuit Court committed perjury, breached the Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42

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

CONCLUSION

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

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court


Baltimore, Maryland 21222



Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 8th day of September 2023, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's: 1.) 1<sup>st</sup> Motion For Disqualification Against Judge J. Geller For Violating The Petitioner's 14 Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To His Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18,102.11 And, Also, Committing "Fraud Upon The Court, Treason To The Constitution, And Interference With Interstate Commerce. 2.) 1<sup>st</sup> Motion To Set Aside The Judgments Of Judge J. Geller On 8-29-23 Due To His Violations Of The Petitioner's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of His: A.) Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) And Maryland Rule 18.102.11 In Failing To Disqualify And Recuse Himself As A Presiding Judge Due To The Appearance Of Him Being Impartial And/Or Biased Because Of His Appointment By 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 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repetitiously And Deliberately Violated By Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Due To Their Repeatedly And Intentionally Breaching Federal 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 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repetitiously And Deliberately Violated by Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill , And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review Due To Their Repeated And Intentional 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 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Were Repetitiously And Intentionally Infringed Upon By Judge Fletcher-Hill Due To His Repeated And Deliberate Violations Of Maryland 18.102.11 5(C). 3.) 6<sup>th</sup> Motion To Have The Judge-In-Charge Of The Civil Division, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Assign A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges To Preside Over The Petitioner' In Banc Review Who Were Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley And/Or By Chief Judge Barbera, Both Of Whom Are Being Alleged To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Have Conspired To Infringe Upon Federal U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide. 4.) 8<sup>th</sup> Motion For All Judgments By Judge 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.) 10<sup>th</sup> Motion For A Hearing On The Motions As Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311. 6.) 6<sup>th</sup> Motion For Reconsideration. 7.) 2<sup>nd</sup> Motion To Set Aside The Judgment Of Judge John Nugent Filed On 3-23-23 Since There Is No

Written Or Stamped Signature Of Judge John Nugent On The 3-21-23 Findings And Order. 8.) 3<sup>rd</sup> Motion To Have The Judge-In-Charge Of The Civil Division, Judge Fletcher-Hill, ORDER The Clerk To File On The Circuit Court's Website The Heading Of The Petitioner's Motions Verbatim was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd., Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

**REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

Petitioner is requesting a hearing on her Motions.

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

RECEIVED  
2023 SEP -8 AM 11:14  
CIVIL DIVISION