

RECEIVED

2026 JAN 14 AM 10:06

CIRCUIT COURT
BALTIMORE CITY
CIVIL DIVISION

IN THE

IN THE MATTER

THE PETITION OF

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE CITY

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

1.) MOTION, FOR THE 1ST TIME, THAT JUDGE CARRION, THE ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE AND CHIEF JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY, TO ASSIGN A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FILED ON 5-21-25, WHICH INCLUDE A HEARING ON HER MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE J. NUGENT'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 5-12-25, WHICH INCLUDE THE PETITIONER'S 3RD MOTION FOR REINSTATEMENT OF HER CIVIL CASE BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT: A.) FOR THE 3RD TIME, JUDGE J. NUGENT HAS, INDISPUTABLY, INTENTIONALLY VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY ERRING AND COMMITTING THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY BY CITING IN HIS FINDINGS THAT THE PETITIONER DECLARES NO LEGAL OR FACTUAL BASIS FOR HER REQUESTED RELIEF, ALTHOUGH THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE PETITIONER HAS REDUNDANTLY MOTIONED FOR A REINSTATEMENT OF HER CIVIL CASE BECAUSE HER CIVIL CASE IS STILL ONGOING AS SUBSTANTIATED BY THE PETITIONER'S 4TH OTHER MOTIONS THAT ARE AWAITING TO BE PRESIDED OVER, NAMELY, HER 3RD SEPARATE MOTIONS FILED ON 12-26-24 AND HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-23, BY HAVING A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE PRESIDING JUDGES, NAMELY, JUDGE J. NUGENT, JUDGE DORSEY CHARLES III AND JUDGE SCHREIBER II AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE ENGAGED IN LAW FARE BY REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO INFRINGING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C), MARYLAND RULE 2-311, ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND/OR HAVE, AS BEING ALLEGED FOR THE 1ST TIME IN THE PETITIONER'S INSTANT MOTIONS, COMMITTED THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY AND HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL COMMITTING THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY, AND BREACHING FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091-GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO VIOLATE FEDERAL U.S.CODE, U.S.C. & 1091 ("CRIMES

AGAINST HUMANITY"), HAVE COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMES. B.) COLLECTIVELY AND/OR FOR OVER 38 TIMES, JUDGE J. NUGENT, THE OTHER 2 PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE INVADED UPON THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO CONTINUALLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) AND COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND, THUS, DEEMING JUDGE J. NUGENT'S ORDER, THE ORDERS OF THE OTHER 2 PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE ORDERS OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT BECAUSE JUDGE J. NUGENT, THE OTHER 2 PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE THEMSELVES AS PRESIDING JUDGES BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE J. NUGENT, THE OTHER 2 PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED SINCE JUDGE J. NUGENT, THE OTHER 2 PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES WERE APPOINTED TO THEIR PRIVILEGED POSITIONS BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, MARTIN O'MALLEY, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR BY WES MOORE, ALL OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE PETITIONER'S 5-21-25 MOTIONS, IN OTHER MOTIONS, AND/OR IN HER COMPLAINTS AND/OR ADDENDUMS TO OUR HON. 45TH - 47TH PRESIDENT TRUMP TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO VIOLATE FEDERAL U.S. CODE, U.S.C. & 1091 ("CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY"), HAVE COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMINAL ACTS. C.) COLLECTIVELY AND/OR FOR OVER 38 TIMES, JUDGE J. NUGENT, THE OTHER 2 PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE DELIBERATELY INVADED UPON THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO WILLINGLY ERRING TO AND COMMITTING THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY DUE TO JUDGE J. NUGENT FAILING TO CONSIDER, DISCLOSE, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 6-8-23 AND IN HIS 3-23-23 FINDINGS AND ORDERS AND THE 2 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES AND THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES FAILING TO CONSIDER, DISCLOSE, AND RESOLVE IN THEIR FINDINGS AND ORDERS ANY OF THE MATERIAL FACTS OR LEGAL ARGUMENTS IN THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FILED ON 4-10-25, 2-18-25, 4-5-23, 2-27-23, AND/OR IN THE PETITIONER'S OVER 34 OTHER MOTIONS WHICH SUBSTANTIATE THE PETITIONER'S LEGAL AND FACTUAL BASIS FOR HER REQUESTED RELIEF, NAMELY, TO HAVE A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS TO DETERMINE IF JUDGE J. NUGENT, THE OTHER 2 PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE KNOWINGLY VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (c), MARYLAND RULE 2-311, ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND/OR HAVE, AS BEING ALLEGED FOR THE 1ST TIME IN THE PETITIONER'S INSTANT MOTIONS, COMMITTED THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY AND HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO VIOLATE FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY"), HAVE COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMES. D.) FOR THE 1ST TIME, THE PETITIONER IS MOTIONING JUDGE

CARRION, WHO WAS APPOINTED BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BERBARA IN 2020, TO ASSIGN TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS A JUDGE: !.) WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, LARRY HOGAN, WES MOORE, AND/OR BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT THE PRESIDING JUDGE WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO HIS/HER ELITE APPOINTMENT BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, LARRY HOGAN, WES MOORE, AND/OR BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BERBARA, ALL OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FILED ON 5-21-25, IN OTHER MOTIONS, AND/OR IN HER ADDENDUMS TO HER OFFICIAL COMPLAINT TO OUR HON. 45th – 47th PRESIDENT TRUMP TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091- GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO VIOLATE FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY"), HAVE COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMES. !!.) WHO WILL GRANT THE PETITIONER'S 14th AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 TO HAVE A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 BY A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION BECAUSE THE PETITIONER'S APPEAL IS BEFORE AN IN BANC REVIEW. 2.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THESE

MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311.

!., Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: 1.) Motion, For the 1st time, That Judge Carrion, The Administrative Judge And Chief Judge Of The Circuit Court For Baltimore City, To Assign A Judge To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions Filed On 5-21-25, Which Include A Hearing On Her Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge J. Nugent Order Docketed on 5-12-25, Which Include The Petitioner's 3rd Motion For Reinstatement Of Her Civil Case Because The Evidence Substantiate that: A.) For The 3rd Time, Judge J. Nugent Has, Indisputably, Intentionally Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Repeatedly And Deliberately Erring And Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury By Citing In His Findings That The Petitioner Declares No Legal Or Factual Basis For Her Requested Relief, Although The Evidence Substantiate That The Petitioner Has Redundantly Motioned For A Reinstatement Of Her Civil Case Because Her Civil Case Is Still Ongoing As Substantiated By The Petitioner's 4th Other Motions That Are Awaiting To Be Presided Over, Namely, Her 3rd Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24 And Her Motions Filed On 11-1-23, By Having A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions In Order To Determine If The Presiding Judges, Namely, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey Charles III, And Judge Schreiber II And ALL Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Engaged In Law Fare By Repetitiously And/OR Intentionally Breaching The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Infringing Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, And/OR, As Being Alleged For The 1st Time In The Petitioner's Instant Motion, Committed The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury And Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, And/OR Have Attempted To And/OR Have Conspired To Violate

Federal U.S. Code, U.S.C. & 1091 (Crimes Against Humanity"), Have Committed Misconduct In Office, And/OR Have committed Other Crimes. B.) Collectively And/OR For Over 38 Times, Judge J. Nugent, The Other 2 Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Deliberately Invaded Upon The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Continually Violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming Judge J. Nugent's Orders, The Orders Of The Other 2 Presiding Judges, And All Of The Orders Of The Former Presiding Judges As Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because Judge J. Nugent, The Other 2 Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Failed To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Themselves As Presiding Judges Because There Is An Appearance That Judge J. Nugent, The Other 2 Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Would Be Impartial And/OR Biased Since Judge J. Nugent, The Other 2 Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Were Appointed To Their Privileged Positions By Former Chief Judge Barbera, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, And/OR By Wes Moore, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In The Petitioner's 5-21-25 Motions, In Other Motions, And/OR In Her Complaints And/OR Addendums To Our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump 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 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Have Committed Misconduct In Office, And/OR Have committed Other Criminal Acts. C.) Collectively And/OR For Over 38 Times, Judge J. Nugent, The Other 2 Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Deliberately Invaded Upon The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Willingly Erring And Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury Due To Judge J. Nugent Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In His 6-6-23 And 3-23-23 Findings And Orders And The 2 Other Presiding Judges And The Former Presiding Judges Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In Their Findings And Orders Any Of The Material Facts Or Legal Arguments In The Petitioner's Motions Filed On 4-10-25, 2-18-25, 4-5-23, 2-27-23, And/OR In The Petitioner's Over 34 Other Motions Which Substantiate The Petitioner's Legal And Factual Basis For Her Requested Relief, Namely, To Have A Hearing On Her Motions To Determine If Judge J. Nugent, The Other 2 Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Knowingly Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, And/OR, As Being Alleged For The 1st Time In The Petitioner's Instant Motion, Committed The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury And Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, And/OR Have Attempted To And/OR Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, U.S.C. & 1091 (Crimes Against Humanity"), Have Committed Misconduct In Office, And/OR Have committed Other Crimes. D.) For The 1st Time, The Petitioner Is Motioning Judge Carrion, Who Was Appointed By Former Chief Judge Barbera In 2020, To Assign To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions A Judge: I.) Who Was Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, And/OR By Former Chief Judge Barbera Because There Is An Appearance That The Presiding Judge Would Be Impartial And/OR Biased Due To His/Her Elite Appointment by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, And/OR By Former Chief Judge Barbera, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In The Petitioner's Motions Filed On 5-21-25, In Other Motions, And/OR In Her Addendums To Our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump To Have Breached

Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Have Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Crimes. iii.) Who Will Grant The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section To Have A Hearing On Her Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 By A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution Because The Petitioner's Appeal Is Before An In Banc Review. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On These Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below.

CR59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner, is that: 1.) For the 3rd Time, the presiding Judge, Judge J. Nugent has, indisputably, intentionally violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to repeatedly and deliberately erring and committing the prejudicial error of perjury by erroneously citing in his Findings that the Petitioner declares no legal or factual basis for her requested relief, although the evidence substantiate that the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-21-25, which respond to Judge J. Nugent's Findings and Order docketed on 5-12-25, and/or in these instant Motions, substantiate that the Petitioner has redundantly motioned for a Reinstatement of her civil case because her civil case is still ongoing as substantiated by the Petitioner's 4th other Motions that re waiting to be presided over, namely, her 3rd separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 and her Motions filed on 11-1-23 by having a panel of 3 In Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution to preside over the Petitioner's Motions in order to determine if the presiding Judges, namely, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, Judge Schreiber II and all of the former presiding Judges have engaged in Law Fare by repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have, as being alleged for the 1st time in the Petitioner's instant Motions, committed the prejudicial error of perjury and have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. B.) Collectively and/or for Over 38 Times, Judge J. Nugent, the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges have deliberately invaded upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to continually violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming Judge J. Nugent's Orders, the Orders of the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the Orders of the former presiding Judges as void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge J. Nugent, the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges have failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges because there is an appearance that Judge J. Nugent, the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of

the former presiding judges would be impartial and/or biased since Judge J. Nugent, the other 2 presiding judges, and all of the former presiding judges were appointed to their privileged positions by former Chief Judge Barbera, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, And/Or by Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 5-21-25 Motions, in other Motions, and/or in her Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed other criminal acts. C.) Collectively and/or for over 38 times, Judge J. Nugent, the other 2 presiding judges, and all of the former presiding judges have deliberately invaded upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to willfully erring and committing the prejudicial error of perjury due to Judge J. Nugent failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in his 6-6-23 and 3-23-23 Findings and Orders and the 2 other presiding judges and the former presiding judges failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders any of the material facts or legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 4-10-25, 2-18-25, 4-5-23, 2-27-23, and/or in the Petitioner's over 34 other Motions which substantiate the Petitioner's legal and factual basis for her requested relief, namely, to have a hearing on her Motions to determine if Judge J. Nugent, the other 2 presiding judges, and all of the former presiding judges have knowingly violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have, as being alleged for the 1st time in the Petitioner's instant Motions, committed the prejudicial error of perjury and have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. D.) For the 1st time, the Petitioner is motioning Judge Carrion, who was appointed by former Chief Judge Barbera in 2020, to assign to preside over the Petitioner's Motions a Judge: i.) who was not appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera because there is an appearance that the presiding Judge would be impartial and/or biased due to his/her elite appointment by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-21-25, in other Motions, and/or in her Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. ii.) who will grant the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 and by a panel of 3 in Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution who grant the Petitioner requested relief as cited in her most recent 5 Motions that, in other Motions, and/or in her Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th -

47th President Trump, her requested relief, namely, that the Petitioner is granted her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were breached due to: 1.) the presiding Judge, Judge J. Nugent erring in his Findings and Orders in denying the Petitioner's Motions for a Reinstatement of her civil case. 2.) Judge Nugent, the 2 other presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey Charles III and Judge Schreiber II, and all of the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman have, collectively, and/or for over 38 times, breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have, as being alleged for the 1st time in the Petitioner's instant Motions, committed the prejudicial error of perjury and have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. 2.) 1st Motion for a hearing on these Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311

INTRODUCTION

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Defendant 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 spoke 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 you brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD'S: and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it:"

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying the bill to maintain her website, ~~www.dianarwi.com~~, so that the Petitioner can continue to post Motions, Findings and Orders from the presiding Judges, and other relevant Exhibits in the Petitioner's civil and/or criminal litigations, which began in 2017 and 2020, respectively. Although she is on a fixed income, the Petitioner is now able to make her monthly payments, but can't afford to, at this time, make copies of all of the pages of

all of the Exhibits that need to be included with these Motions. Although as the SPIRIT OF GOD continues to lead and guide the Petitioner to assign an Exhibit Numbers to any other Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges and her Motions responding to their Findings and Orders, the Petitioner will be obedient, it is my plea that the Hon. Judge Carrion would ensure that the presiding Judge, Judge J. Nugent, each of the other 2 presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey Charles III and Judge Schreiber, and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman have access to a copy of these Motions (and all of the Petitioner's Motions filed, thus, far) which are assigned as Exhibit 286 on the Petitioner's website.

The evidence in the record, whose documents are, again, assigned as Exhibit Numbers on the Petitioner's website, substantiate the material facts and legal arguments stated below and aid in further substantiating the allegations that, collectively, and/or for over 38 times, the presiding Judge, Judge J. Nugent (who, also, presided over 2 of the Petitioner's Motions from the In Banc Review, has presided over the Petitioner's 2 prior Motions for Reinstatement, and could potentially preside over the Petitioner's 3rd Motion for Reinstatement), Judge Dorsey, Charles III, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill (who violated Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c) on several occasions due to presiding over Motions from the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and over her Motions from the appeal in the In Banc Review), Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman have violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have, as being alleged for the 1st time in the Petitioner's instant Motions, committed the prejudicial error of perjury and have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. The detailed material facts and legal arguments to substantiate these serious allegations are evidenced in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 5-21-25 Motions (Exhibit 250 on the Petitioner's website) , which include the Petitioner's 3rd Motion for Reinstatement of her civil case and which have yet to be presided over although these Motions were filed over 7 months ago, and in the Petitioner's 4 other Motions that were filed before the Petitioner filed her 1st Motion for Reinstatement, namely, her 3 separate Motions filed 12-26-25, and in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 11-1-23, all of which are, too, still awaiting a panel of 3 In Banc Judges to preside over (Exhibits 215, 216, 217, and 155-156, respectively, on the Petitioner's website). Since the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions are summarized in her Headings of her Motions, the Petitioner will cite as evidence the Exhibit Numbers on her website assigned to her Motions and in which give the detailed material facts and legal arguments, and will declare, verbatim, the Headings in her present Motions filed on 5-21-25 Motions, in her 3 separate Motions filed 12-26-25, and in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 11-1-23 which, again will substantiate, amongst other things, that the Petitioner, since been providential guided to Maryland Rule 2-311 in 2018, has pleaded for a hearing on her Motions, but have yet to be granted her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence in the record substantiate the Petitioner's assertions that that, collectively, and/or for over 38 times, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge

Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman have repeatedly violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have, as being alleged for the 1st time in the Petitioner's instant Motions, committed the prejudicial error of perjury and have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes.

As stated in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-21-25, in her 3rd separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23, and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump, thus far, the 3rd presiding Judges, namely, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey Charles III and Judge Schreiber II and all of the former presiding Judges were appointed to their distinguished appointments by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan and/or by Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged have invaded 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 crimes. 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 in 2017. One of the 2nd other presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles II was appointed to his prestige position Larry Hogan in 2016, and the other presiding Judge, namely, Judge M. Schreiber II, was, also, appointed to the honored position as an Administrative Judge 2022 by Larry Hogan. Judge J. Geller was, also, appointed by Martin O'Malley to the elite position of an Administrative Judge in May of 2012. Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed to his distinct position in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. 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. Judge Michel Pierson was appointed in 2013 by Chief Judge Barbera who is being proclaimed in the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions, in other Motions, and in her 2017 Civil Complaint to have willingly fractured the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of her deliberately committing the prejudicial error of perjury. Judge Melissa Phinn was appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore City in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. 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. Judge Karen Friedman, the first presiding Judge over the Petitioner's civil litigation, was appointed to her illustrious position, also, by Martin O'Malley in 2014.

As evidenced the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 5-21-24, 4-10-25, 2-18-25, in her 3rd separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23 and as evidenced in her numerous other Motions (Exhibits 250, 234, 218, 217, 216, 215, and 155-156, 187, 182, 181, 180, 147-149, 142-143, 139, 113-114, 100, 98, 96, 94, 80, 77, 76, 74, 72, 71, 67", 67, 64, 60, 58, 53, 42, 39, 38, 36, 35, 34, 33, and 32, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner has redundantly cited the material facts and legal arguments for her requested relief, namely, that the

Petitioner is granted her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge J. Nugent, the presiding Judge, the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges have, collectively, and/or for over 38 times, have breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to Judge J. Nugent repeatedly failing to grant the Petitioner's her right to have her civil case reinstated and due to Judge J. Nugent, the presiding Judge, the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have, as being alleged for the 1st time in the Petitioner's instant Motions, committed the prejudicial error of perjury and have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes.

Moreover, as evidenced by the facts stated in the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judge, Judge J. Nugent (Exhibits 249, 233, 141, and 138, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), in the Findings and Orders of other 2 presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, and Judge Schreiber II (Exhibits 214 and 154, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), and/or as evidenced by the facts stated in the Findings and Orders of all of the former presiding Judges (146, 112, 99, 97, 95, 93, 75, 73, 70, 66, 63, 59, 57, 52, 50, 49, 48, 47, and 46, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), Judge J. Nugent, the 2 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges fail to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders any of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Petitioner's Motions, which include the Petitioner's legal and factual basis for her requested relief and which declared in the Petitioner's 5 separate Motions awaiting to be presided over, her other colossal Motions cited above, and/or are proclaimed in the Petitioner's Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump .

Still too, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's most 5 recent Motions filed on 5-21-24, 4-10-25, 2-18-25, in her 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23, all of which are awaiting a presiding Judge, as evidenced in her other Motions, and as evidenced by the facts stated in Findings and Order of Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles II, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman, all of these present and former presiding Judges have repetitiously and/or knowingly violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment and her Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by committing the prejudicial error of perjury stating in their Findings and Order that the Petitioner cites no legal or factual basis for her requested relief, when on the contrary, the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-21-24, 4-10-25, 2-18-25, in her 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23, unequivocally, assert the legal and factual basis for Petitioner's requested relief (Exhibits 250, 234, 218, 217, 216, 215, and 155-156, respectively, on the Petitioner's website).

In these instant Motions, the presiding Judge, namely, Judge J. Nugent, and the other 2 presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey Charles III and Judge Schreiber II, and all of the former presiding Judges,

namely, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman are not only being alleged to have infringed upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to, collectively, and/or for over 38 times, violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, and Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, but, also, due to committing the prejudicial error of perjury and for impeding upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed other crimes by attempting to cover up and prevent the public exposure of the material facts that, in the Petitioner's Motions and Addendums and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums and/or in the her Official Complaints and Addendums to our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and former Judge Barbara are being alleged to have committed "Crimes against Humanity". Still too, it does appear that Judge J. Nugent, and the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges would have an interest in the outcome of the Petitioner's civil litigation and/or would attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public exposure of the material facts that Judge J. Nugent and all of the other presiding Judges cited above, along with Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbara, are being alleged in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in other Motions, and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have violated 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"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts.

Collectively, and/or for Over 38 Times, Judge J. Nugent, the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges have deliberately invaded upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to continually violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming Judge J. Nugent's Orders, the Orders of the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the Orders of the former presiding Judges as void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge J. Nugent, the other 2 presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges have failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges because there is an appearance that Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman would be impartial and/or biased since: 1.) Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman who were appointed to their privileged positions by former Chief Judge Barbara, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, and/or by Wes Moore, are being alleged, for the 1st time in these instant Motions, to have breached the same Federal U.S. Code as the government official who appointed these presiding Judges to their privileged positions, namely, that of having impeded upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 2.) Being appointed to their distinct positions by former Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by Chief Judge Barbara, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 5-21-25 Motions, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil

Complaint to have committed "Crimes Against Humanity", it does appear that Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Karen Friedman would have an interest in the outcome of the Petitioner's civil litigation. 3.) Being appointed to their privileged positions by for Chief Judge Barbera, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, And/Or by Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged to have committed "Crimes Against Humanity", it, also, appears that Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Karen Friedman would attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public from being cognizant of the material facts that former Chief Judge Barbera, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, and Wes Moore are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-21-25, 4-10-25, 2-18-25, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's Official Complaints and Addendums to our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump to have violated 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. 4.) Moreover, it does appear that, as a result of Judge J. Nugent and all of the other present and former presiding Judges cited above 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"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes, Judge. Nugent and all of the other present and former presiding Judges would have an interest in the outcome of the Petitioner's present civil proceeding and/or would attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public exposure of the material facts that Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Karen Friedman, as well as former Chief Judge Barbera, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, and/or Wes Moore are being alleged in the Petitioner's instant Motions in her present civil litigation to have violated 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"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts.

Moreover, in their Opinion written on 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that there was an appearance of the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial and removed the Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against our 45th – 47th Hon. Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an "appearance of impropriety" and declared that "this is the rare case in which disqualification is mandated and no other remedy will suffice to restore public confidence in the integrity of these proceedings."

As evidenced in the Petitioner's 5-21-25 Motions which respond to Judge J. Nugent's Findings and Order docketed on 5-12-25, her civil case is motioned to be reinstated because the Petitioner's civil case is still ongoing as evidenced in her 4 other Motions from her in Banc Review which are awaiting a panel of 3 presiding Judges to decide and as evidenced by the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibits 215, 216, and 217, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), of which the Petitioner mailed copies of to the Clerk of the Court on 12-26-24. Also, as evidenced by the material facts stated in these Motions, prior to receiving the Notice Of Contemplated Dismissal (Lack Of Prosecution) in September of

2024 and the ORDER that deferred the Order of Dismissal from the Clerk of the Court (Exhibits 184 and 185, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner was waiting for Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, to assign a Judge to preside over her 11-1-23 Motions (Exhibits 155 and 156, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Findings and Order of the presiding Judge at the time, namely, Judge M. Schreiber, II (Exhibit 154 on the Petitioner's website), whose Findings and Order respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions (Exhibits 147 and 148, respectively, on the Petitioner's website).

The Heading in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-21-25 (Exhibit 250 on the Petitioner's website) is entitled "MOTION FOR A HEARING ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE J. NUGENT'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 5-12-25, WHICH IS THE PETITIONER'S: A.) 3rd MOTION FOR A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 ON HER MOTION TO REINSTATE THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL CASE BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE J. NUGENT HAS, UNEQUIVOCALLY, ERRED IN HIS FINDINGS AND ORDER IN THAT THERE IS NO LEGAL OR FACTUAL BASIS FOR HIS DENIAL OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR A REINSTATEMENT OF HER CIVIL CASE BY HAVING A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 3 SEPARATE MOTIONS FILED ON 12-26-24 AND OVER HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-23 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF JUDGE J. NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III, JUDGE SCHREIBER, II, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE ENGAGED IN LAW FARE BY REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO INFRINGING UPON ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C), AND/OR MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE PETITIONER'S 1-28-25 "PLEADS" TO OUR 45TH - 47TH HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP. B.) 2nd MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE J. NUGENT AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION DUE TO HIS BEING ALLEGED IN THE PETITIONER'S INSTANT MOTIONS AND/OR IN HER 4 SEPARATE MOTIONS TO HAVE CONTINUOUSLY ENGAGED IN LAW FARE BY REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY BREACHING THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY INFRINGING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), THE FEDERAL LAW THAT MANDATES JUDGE J. NUGENT VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND REUSE HIMSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND THAT HIS ORDERS BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND, THUS, OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT DUE TO THERE BEING AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE J. NUGENT WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED AS A RESULT OF BEING APPOINTED TO HIS ELITE ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION IN 2017 BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, WHO, ALONG WITH THE PRESENT GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, WES MOORE, AND THE FORMER GOVERNORS OF MARYLAND, NAMELY, MARTIN O'MALLEY AND LARRY HOGAN, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 - GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE 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 one of the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibit 215 on the Petitioner's website) is entitled "1. 1st MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND THAT HIS 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 BE DEEMED VOID AND OF NO EFFECT UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. 2.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311".

As evidenced in second of the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibit 216 on the Petitioner's website), the Heading is entitled "1. 1st MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 2ND MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT AND 1ST HER MOTION TO DETERMINE IF THE PETITIONER SHOULD BE GRANTED ALL OF HER MOTIONS BECAUSE: A.) THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III'S 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 MUST BE DEEMED AS VOID AND OF NO EFFECT AS MANDATED UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) DUE TO: 1.) JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III FAILING TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND REUSE HIMSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AS DECREED UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT HE HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. III) THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE

18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE INFRINGED UPON SINCE SHE ATTENDED THE REMOTE HEARING OVER THE TELEPHONE AND WAS DISCONNECTED TWICE AFTER WAITING FOR NEARLY 3 HOURS FOR THE 12-6-24 SCHEDULED HEARING ON HER 11-1-23 MOTIONS, ON HER 3 SEPARATE 10-15-24 MOTIONS, AND ON HER 12-14-24 MOTIONS. B.) THE DEFENDANT FAILED TO ATTEND THE 12-6-24 REMOTE-SCHEDULED HEARING ON THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS. C.) THE PETITIONER DID ATTEND THE 12-6-24 REMOTE-SCHEDULED HEARING BY TELEPHONE. 2.) MOTIONS FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311".

As evidenced in third of the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibit 217 on the Petitioner's website), the Heading is entitled "1. 1st MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 1ST MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE IMMEDIATE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL CASE, WHICH INCLUDE DISQUALIFICATION FROM PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER HER INSTANT MOTIONS, HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-14-24, 10-15-24, AND ON 11-1-23 DUE TO: A.) THE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III AND HIS 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 BEING DEEMED AS VOID AND OF NO EFFECT AS MANDATED UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNTIL 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR BY WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. B.) THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATING THAT JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL HAS INFRINGED UPON THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 SINCE 2018 DUE TO HIS REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING: !.) FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND HAS COMMITTED "FRAUD UPON THE COURT", TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL LITIGATION AS A RESULT OF THERE BEING AN APPEARANCE THAT HE WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO HIS ELITE APPOINTMENT IN 2009 BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INFRINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. III.) MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (c) IN PRESIDING OVER 4

MOTIONS IN THE PETITIONER'S APPEAL IN THE IN BANC REVIEW ALTHOUGH JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL

WAS ONE OF THE PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S INITIAL CIVIL LITIGATION. !!!!) 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 APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW AND TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. iv.) MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER HER RIGHT TO HAVE A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) MOTION TO HAVE HEARING ON THE INSTANT MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311".

The Heading in one of the Petitioner's Motions filed on 11-1-23 (Exhibits 255-256, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) is entitled "1ST MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II 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 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 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 10-20-23 JUDGMENT OF JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II 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 THE FORMER GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, LARRY HOGAN, WHO IS, ALSO, 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 9-8-23 MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW. C.) FAILING TO DISCLOSE, CONSIDER, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE J. GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATEDLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, 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 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE J. GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND/OR INTENTIONALLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(A) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND, ALSO, 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 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 MOTIONS, IF THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED BY JUDGE J. GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DUE TO THEIR REPEATED AND/OR 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 10-20-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE PETITIONER'S 9-8-23 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 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 WES MOORE, LARRY HOGAN, MARTIN O'MALLEY, CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, OR BY ANY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO 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 IN THE PETITIONER'S 2-27-23 MOTIONS. 4.) 9TH MOTION FOR ALL JUDGMENTS BY JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II, JUDGE J. GELLER, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, THE PANEL OF IN BANC JUDGES, JUDGE MICHEL PIERSON, AND/OR BY JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN BE SET ASIDE AND DEEM ALL OF THEIR ORDERS AS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW UNDER FEDERAL STATUE 28 U.S.C & 455(A). 5.) 11TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 6.) 7TH MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 3RD 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.) 4TH 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".

Last but not least and for the 1st time, the Petitioner is motioning Judge Carrion, who was appointed by former Chief Judge Barbara in 2020 and with whom was a graduate along the Petitioner in 1981 from the College of Notre Dame (now Notre of Maryland University), to assign to preside over the Petitioner's Motions a Judge: i.) who was not appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbara because there is an appearance that the presiding Judge would be impartial and/or biased due to his/her elite appointment by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbara, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-21-25, in other Motions, and/or in her Addendums to her Official Complaint to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. iii.) who will grant the Petitioner's 14TH Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 and by a panel of 3 in Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution who grant the Petitioner requested relief as cited in her most recent 5TH Motions that, in other Motions, and/or in her Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump, her requested relief, namely, that the Petitioner is granted her 14TH Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the Petitioner's 14TH Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were breached due to: 1.)

the presiding Judge, Judge J. Nugent erring in his Findings and Orders in denying the Petitioner's Motions for a Reinstatement of her civil case. 2.) Judge Nugent, the 2 other presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey Charles III and Judge Schreiber II, and all of the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge


Karen Friedman have, collectively, and/or for over 38 times, breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have, as being alleged for the 1st time in the Petitioner's instant Motions, committed the prejudicial error of perjury and have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes.

As evidenced in the filing, this the Petitioner's 1st Motion for a hearing on these Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to Hon. Judge Carron.

Conclusion

The Defendant pleads that her Motions be granted.

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court


Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 14th day of January 2026, a copy of the foregoing: 1.) Motion, For the 1st time, That Judge Carron, The Administrative Judge And Chief Judge Of The Circuit Court For Baltimore City, To Assign A Judge To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions Filed On 5-21-25, Which Include A Hearing On Her Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge J. Nugent Order Docketed on 5-12-25, Which Include The Petitioner's 3rd Motion For Reinstatement Of Her Civil Case Because The Evidence Substantiate that: A.) For The 3rd Time, Judge J. Nugent Has, Indisputably, Intentionally Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Repeatedly And Deliberately Erring And Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury By Citing In His Findings That The Petitioner Declares No Legal Or Factual Basis For Her Requested Relief, Although The Evidence Substantiate That The Petitioner Has Redundantly Motioned For A Reinstatement Of Her Civil Case Because Her Civil Case Is Still Ongoing As Substantiated By The Petitioner's 4 Other Motions That Are Awaiting To Be Presided Over, Namely, Her 3 Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24 And Her Motions Filed On 11-1-23, By Having A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions In Order To Determine If The Presiding Judges, Namely, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey Charles III, And Judge Schreiber II And All Of the Former

Motions A Judge: i.) Who Was Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, And/Or By Former Chief Judge Berbara Because There Is An Appearance That The Presiding Judge Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Due To His/Her Elite Appointment by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, And/Or By Former Chief Judge Berbara, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In The Petitioner's Motions Filed On 5-21-25, In Other Motions, And/Or In Her Addendums To Her Official Complaint To Our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Have Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Crimes. iii.) Who Will Grant The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section To Have A Hearing On Her Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 By A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution Because The Petitioner's Appeal Is Before An In Banc Review. 2.) Motion For A Hearing On These Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd., Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Cc: 45th-47th Hon. President Trump and the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K. Patel, and the U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney Hayes, Judge Carrion, and the Clerk of the Court, Mr. X. Conaway

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

BALTIMORE
900 E FAYETTE ST RM
BALTIMORE, MD 21233-9
www.usps.com

01/14/2026

TRACKING NUMBERS
9589 0710 5270 0655 325

TRACK STATUS OF ITEMS WITH TR
(UP TO 25 ITEMS)

Send tracking number to 28777 (,
Standard message and data rates m

TRACK STATUS BY TEXT MESSAGE

Visit <https://www.usps.com/trac>
Text and e-mail alerts availab

TRACK STATUS ONLINE

PURCHASE DETAILS

Product	Qty	Unit	Price
First-Class Mail®	1		\$
Letter			
Washington, DC 20500			
Weight: 0 lb 3.50 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Sat 01/17/2026			
Certified Mail®			
Tracking #:			
9589 0710 5270 0655 3254 87			
Return Receipt			
Tracking #:			
9590 9402 8588 3244 0847 50			
Total			\$11
First-Class Mail®	1		\$1.65
Letter			
Baltimore, MD 21202			
Weight: 0 lb 3.40 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Sat 01/17/2026			

U.S. Postal Service®
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com

USPS-MOW

Postmark Here

JAN 14 2026

BALTIMORE MD 21202

Sent To: 1400 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20500
City, State, ZIP+4®

PS Form 3800, January 2008 PSN 7530-02-000-9001 See Reverse for Instructions

Postage and Fees (check box, add fees appropriate)

☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy)

☐ Return Receipt (electronic)

☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery

☐ Adult Signature Required

☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery

Postage \$

Total Postage and Fees \$

PS Form 3800, January 2008 PSN 7530-02-000-9001 See Reverse for Instructions

Grand Total

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Baltimore, MD 21202

Weight: 0 lb 3.40 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Sat 01/17/2026

\$1.65

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Rockville, MD 20850

Weight: 0 lb 3.40 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Sat 01/17/2026

\$1.6

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Baltimore, MD 21202

Weight: 0 lb 3.40 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Sat 01/17/2026

\$1.1

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Washington, DC 20500

Weight: 0 lb 3.50 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Sat 01/17/2026

\$

Arena Milburn
131 Calver Hall
Baltimore, Md. 21221

Larry H. Kusak, Esquire
1803 Research Bend, Suite 125
Rockville, Md. 20850

mailed on 1-14-76

Hon. Judge Cannon
Adm. Judge for Balto. City
Circuit Court for Balto. City
111 North Calvert St. Rm. 200
Balto., Md. 21202

Mailed on 1/14/24

Alicia Williams
131 Calvert Hill Ct
Balto., Md. 21222

Chief of the Court, Mr. V. Conaway
Circuit Court for Balto. City
111 North Calvert St. Rm. 411
Balto., Md. 21202

Mailed on 1/14/24

Arena Mortgage
131 Capitol Hill Dr
Baltimore, MD. 21222

Please, Please, Please
read it!

Due Home 45th - 47th Street Group
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500