

1.) MOTION TO HAVE A JUDGE WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'WALLEY, LARRY HOGAN, WES MOORE, AND/OR BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE CARRION'S FINDINGS AND ORDER DOCKETED ON 2-2-26, WHICH IS THE PETITIONER'S 1ST MOTION FOR A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 HAVE BEEN CONTINUOUSLY VIOLATED BY THE 3 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES, NAMELY, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES III, AND JUDGE SCHREIBER II AND BY ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, WHICH INCLUDE JUDGE CARRION, DUE TO THEIR INVADING 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”), COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMINAL ACTS, IMPEDING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), FEDERAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C & 1621, FEDERAL STATUTE 18, U.S.C & 1623, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND/OR ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION. B.) FOR THE 2ND TIME, JUDGE CARRION HAS FAILED TO ASSIGN A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FILED OVER 7 MONTHS AGO, NAMELY, HER MOTIONS FILED ON 5-21-25 AND WHICH INCLUDE THE PETITIONER'S 3RD MOTION FOR REINSTATEMENT OF HER CIVIL CASE BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT, FOR THE 3RD TIME, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, THE PRESIDING JUDGE, HAS, INDISPUTABLY, VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO REPEATEDLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C.

Motion for Reconsideration/Request Hearing

IN THE MATTER *
THE PETITION OF *
DIANA R. WILLIAMS *
CIRCUIT COURT *
FOR *
BALTIMORE CITY *
Case No. 24-C-17-004535 *

RECEIVED
FEB 25 2026
CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE CITY

IN THE MATTER

IN THE

THE PETITION OF

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

BALTIMORE CITY

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

1.) MOTION TO HAVE A JUDGE WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, LARRY HOGAN, WES MOORE, AND/OR BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE CARRION'S FINDINGS AND ORDER DOCKETED ON 2-2-26, WHICH IS THE PETITIONER'S 1ST MOTION FOR A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 HAVE BEEN CONTINUOUSLY VIOLATED BY THE 3 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES, NAMELY, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES III, AND JUDGE SCHREIBER II AND BY ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, WHICH INCLUDE JUDGE CARRION, DUE TO THEIR INVADING 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"), COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMINAL ACTS, IMPEDING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), FEDERAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C. & 1621, FEDERAL STATUTE 18, U.S.C. & 1623, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND/OR ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION. B.) FOR THE 2ND TIME, JUDGE CARRION HAS FAILED TO ASSIGN A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FILED OVER 7 MONTHS AGO, NAMELY, HER MOTIONS FILED ON 5-21-25 AND WHICH INCLUDE THE PETITIONER'S 3RD MOTION FOR REINSTATEMENT OF HER CIVIL CASE BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT, FOR THE 3RD TIME, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, THE PRESIDING JUDGE, HAS, INDISPUTABLY, VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO REPEATEDLY VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C.

8.1621 AND/OR FEDERAL STATUTE 18, U.S.C & 1623 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 EVIDENT BY THE PETITIONER'S 4 OTHER MOTIONS WHICH ARE STILL AWAITING A PRESIDING JUDGE AND WHICH WERE FILED BEFORE THE ORDER TO DISMISS HER CIVIL CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE WAS ISSUED. C.) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE, UNDENIABLY, THAT THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL CASE SHOULD BE REINSTATED, FOR THE 2ND TIME, JUDGE CARRION FAILED TO ASSIGN 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 HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-23 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE PRESIDING JUDGES, NAMELY, JUDGE JOHN NUGENT, JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES III, AND JUDGE SCHREIBER II, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, WHICH INCLUDE JUDGE CARRION, HAVE ENGAGED IN LAW FARE BY REPETITIOUSLY 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), FEDERAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C & 1621, FEDERAL STATUTE 18, U.S.C & 1623, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 2-311, ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND/OR 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 D.) COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 39 TIMES, JUDGE CARRION, AS THE JUDGE IN CHARGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY AND AS ONE OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, THE 3 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE IMPEDED UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (c), MARYLAND RULE 2-311, ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, FEDERAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C & 1621, FEDERAL STATUTE 18, U.S.C & 1623, AND/OR 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. E.) COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 39 TIMES, JUDGE CARRION, THE 3 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, WHICH INCLUDE JUDGE CARRION, HAVE INFRINGED UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) AND COMMITTED FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND, THUS, DEEMING JUDGE CARRION'S ORDERS AND ALL OF THE ORDERS OF THE 3 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES AND THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT BECAUSE ALL OF THESE OFFICERS OF THE COURT HAVE FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE THEMSELVES AS PRESIDING JUDGES SINCE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE CARRION, THE 3 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, WHICH INCLUDE JUDGE CARRION, WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO JUDGE CARRION, THE 3 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES BEING APPOINTED TO THEIR PRIVILEGED POSITIONS 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 1-14-26, 5-21-25, 4-18-25, 2-18-25, IN HER 3 SEPARATE MOTIONS FILED ON 12-26-24, IN HER 11-1-23

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: 1.) Motion To Have A Judge Who Was Not Appointed By Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, And/Or By Former Chief Judge Barbera To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motion For A Hearing On Her Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Carrion's Findings And Order Docketed on 2-2-26, Which Is The Petitioner's 1st Motion For A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland 2-311 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Have Been Continuously Violated By The 3rd Other Presiding Judges, Namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, And Judge Schreiber II And By All Of The Former Presiding Judges, Which Include Judge Carrion, Due To Their Invading Upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Committed Other Criminal Acts, Impeding Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, Maryland Rule 2-311, And/Or Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution. B.) For The 2nd Time, Judge Carrion Has Failed To Assign A Judge To Preside Over The Petitioner's Motions Filed Over 7 Months Ago, Namely, Her Motion Filed On 5-21-25 And Which Include The Petitioner's 3rd Motion For Reinstatement Of Her Civil Case Because The Evidence Substantiate That, For The 3rd Time, Judge John Nugent, The Presiding Judge, Has, Indisputably, Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Repeatedly Violating Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621 And/Or Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623 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 Evident By The Petitioner's 4th Other Motions Which Are Still Awaiting A Presiding Judge And Which Were Filed Before The Order To Dismiss Her Civil Case Without Prejudice Was Issued. C.) Since The Evidence Substantiate, Undeniably, That The Petitioner's

MOTIONS, IN OTHER MOTIONS, AND/OR IN THE PETITIONER'S 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, U.S.C. & 1091 ("CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY"), HAVE COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMINAL ACTS. F.) COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 39 TIMES, JUDGE CARRION, AS THE JUDGE IN CHARGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY AND AS ONE OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, THE 3rd OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE VIOLATED FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), FEDERAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C & 1621, FEDERAL STATUTE 18 U.S.C & 1623, AND/OR 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") AND, THEREBY, HAVE COMMITTED FEDERAL OFFENSES, COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 39 TIMES.

Civil Case Should Be Reinstated, For The 2nd Time, Judge Carrion Failed To Assign 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 Her Motions Filed On 11-1-23 In Order To Determine If The Presiding Judges, Namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, And Judge Schreiber II, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges, Which Include Judge Carrion, Have Engaged In Law Fare By Repetitiously 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), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland, And/Or 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. D.) Collectively And For Over 39 Times, Judge Carrion, As The Judge In Charge Of The Circuit Court For Baltimore City And As One Of The Former Presiding Judges, The 3 Other Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Impeded Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, And/Or 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. E.) Collectively And For Over 39 Times, Judge Carrion, The 3 Other Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges, Which Include Judge Carrion, Have Infringed Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) And Committed Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming Judge Carrion's Orders And All Of The Orders Of The 3 Other Presiding Judges And The Former Presiding Judges Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because All Of These Officers Of The Court Have Failed To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Themselves As Presiding Judges Since There Is An Appearance That Judge Carrion, The 3 Other Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges, Which Include Judge Carrion, Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Due To Judge Carrion, The Other Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Being Appointed To Their Privileged Positions 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 1-14-26, 5-21-25, 4-18-25, 2-18-25, In Her 3 Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24, In Her 11-1-23 Motions, In Other Motions, And/Or In The Petitioner's Complaints And/Or Addendums To Our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091("Crimes Against Humanity"), Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Committed Other Criminal Acts. F.) Collectively And For Over 39 Times, Judge Carrion, As The Judge In Charge Of The Circuit Court For Baltimore City And As One Of the Former Presiding Judges, The 3 Other Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, And/Or 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 & 1091("Crimes Against Humanity") And, Thereby, Have Committed Federal Offenses, Collectively And For Over 39 Times based on the grounds and authorities cited below.

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying the bill to maintain her website, www.douglaswilliams.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

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

Moses informed the Judges in Israel of GOD'S law and employed the Judges over the various tribes in Israel of the importance of judging righteously because their office of ordained of the TRIUNE, and in Deuteronomy 1:16-17, Moses declares "And, I charged your judges at that time, saying. Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD'S: and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it."

INTRODUCTION

Motion to have a hearing on these Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule thereby, have committed Federal offenses, collectively and for over 39 times. 2.) For the 2nd time, a to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity") and, Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, and/or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted Judges have violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal as one of the former presiding Judges, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding and for over 39 Times, Judge Carrion, as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or committed other criminal acts. F.) Collectively 45th-47th President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against 23 Motions, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. Petitioner's 1-14-26, 5-21-25, 4-18-25, 2-18-25, in her 3 Separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in her 11-1-1- Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the and all of the former presiding Judges being appointed to their privileged positions by Martin O'Malley, Judge Carrion, would be impartial and/or biased due to Judge Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, that Judge Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges since there is an appearance void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because all of these Officers of the Court have Carrion's Orders and all of the Orders of the 3 other presiding Judges and the former presiding Judges upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and committed Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming Judge presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion, have infringed have committed other criminal acts. D.) Collectively And For Over 39 Times, Judge Carrion, the 3 other U.S. Code, U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23, and/or her Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 1-14-26, 5-21-25, in 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.

As declared by our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump on TRUTH SOCIAL on 1-5-26, "NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW!" As evidenced by the fact declared in the Findings and Order by Judge Carrion (Exhibit 291), as evidenced by the facts stated in the Findings and Order of the other present and former presiding Judges, which include the Findings and Orders of Judge Carrion and the 2 other presiding in Banc Judges [*], (Exhibits 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 57, 59, 63, 65, 70, 73*, 74*, 75*, 93*, 95, 97, 99, 112, 138, 141, 146, 154, 185, 214, 233, 249, 291, and counting, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's colossal Motions (Exhibits 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 53, 58, 60, 64, 67, 67*, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 80, 94, 96, 98, 100, 113, 114, 139, 142, 143, 147, 148, 149, 155, 156, 180, 181, 182, 187, 215, 216, 217, 218, 234, 250, 286, 292, and counting, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 have been violated because Judge Carrion, for the 1st time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, the 3 other presiding Judges, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, and Judge Schreiber II, and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen have, collectively and for over 39 times, due to Judge Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, and/or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violated Federal U.S. Code & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity") and, thereby, have committed Federal offenses, collectively and for over 39 times.

Also, as evidenced by the fact declared in the 2-2-26 Findings and Order by Judge Carrion, as evidenced by the facts stated in the Findings and Order of the other present and former presiding Judges, which include the Findings and Orders of Judge Carrion and the 2 other presiding in Banc Judges and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 1-14-26 Motions, from which Judge Carrion respond to, and from the Petitioner's other voluminous Motions, the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 have been violated because Judge Carrion, for the 1st time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and one of the former presiding Judges and the 3 other presiding Judges, and the other former presiding Judges, have, collectively and over 39 times, violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, and/or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violated Federal U.S. Code & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity") and, thereby, have committed Federal offenses, collectively and for over 40 times. Since the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 1-14-26 Motions, in her other numerous Motions, and/or in her Addendums and the evidence of the facts stated and and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in 2-2-26 Findings and Order of Judge Carrion and facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in the Findings and Orders of all the presiding Judges substantiate that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 have been violated by Judge Carrion, for the 1st time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit

Court for Baltimore City and as one of former presiding Judges, along with the other present and former presiding Judges, collectively and over 39 times due to their invading 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”), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts, breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, and/or Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, the Petitioner is pleading to our Hon. 45th-47th Hon. President Trump to have the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, and/or the U.S. Attorney for Maryland, Attorney M. Hayes, to investigate the substantiated violations and, if the evidence prove that the presiding Judge is guilty of violating a federal offense, then each time the presiding Judge has breached the Federal Statute, then, he/she should be charged and assigned the penalty issued in the Federal Statute. As the Administrative and Judge-in-Charge of the Circuit Court in Baltimore City and/or as one of the former presiding Judges in the Defendant’s civil proceeding, Judge Carrion and all of the other presiding and former presiding Judges, as Officers of the Court, know and/or should be cognizant of the material facts that in Maryland, that violation of a Federal Statute constitutes committing a Federal offense, there is no statute of limitations of prosecution for impeding upon Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621 and/or Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623. Also, in Maryland, violating Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623 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”) is a felony which carries a penalty of jail time.

As evidenced by the facts asserted in and/or the lack thereof of facts proclaimed in her 2-2-26 Findings and Orders (Exhibit 291 on the Petitioner website), the presiding Judge and Judge-in-Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, Judge Carrion, denied the Petitioner’s Motions filed on 1-14-26 (Exhibit 286 on the Petitioner’s website). As evidenced by the Certificate of Service, Exhibit 286 on the Petitioner’s website is a copy of the Petitioner’s 1-14-26 Motions, which is not a “Letter” as asserted by Judge Carrion, but are Motions that include 2 separate Motions and all of the essentials that define a Motion, namely, the case caption, the heading, material facts and legal arguments in the body of the Motion, a Conclusion, and a Certificate of Service. Judge Carrion cites her justification for denying the Petitioner’s 19-page Motions by stating “Upon consideration of Diana R. Williams’ (“Petitioner”) letter dated January 14, 2026, which the undersigned construes as a Motion for Special Assignment, and the contents of the record herein, it is this 2nd day of February 2026, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 23, hereby ORDERED that Petitioner’s Motion for Special Assignment be, and the same is, hereby DENIED.”

As evidenced by the fact declared in the Findings and Order by Judge Carrion (Exhibit 291), as evidenced by the facts stated in the Findings and Order of the other present and former presiding Judges, which include the Findings and Orders of Judge Carrion and the 2 other presiding in Banc Judges, and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s 1-14-26 Motions, from which Judge Carrion responds to, and in her other Motions, the Petitioner’s 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 have been violated because Judge Carrion, for the 1st time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and the present and former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion, have, collectively and over 39 times, failed to consider, disclose,

and resolve in their Findings if the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions substantiate the allegations that her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 have been violated by Judge Carrion, for the 1st time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and as one of former presiding Judges, by the 3rd other present presiding Judges, and by the former presiding Judges due to their breaching Maryland Rule 2-311. As evidenced by the material facts in the Petitioner's 1-14-26, 5-21-25 Motions, and in her other Motions, the names of the other 3 present presiding Judges are Judge John Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, and Judge Schreiber, and the names of the former presiding Judges are Judge Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman. As evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 1-14-26 Motions and/or in her other Motions cited above and as evidenced by the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in the Findings and Orders of Judge Carrion docketed on 2-2-26 and in all of the Findings and Orders the other present and former presiding Judges cited above, which, again, include Judge Carrion, collectively and for over 39 times, Judge Carrion, the 3rd other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges have invaded upon Maryland Rule 2-311 by not permitting the Petitioner's right to have a hearing on her Motions.

On 2-3-26, in the criminal case, Utah v. Robinson, portions of a Motion's hearing was televised on Fox News, and the presiding Judge was Judge Graf from 4th District Court in Utah. Although in this criminal case the Defendant is being alleged an "accused assassin", Judge Graf cited that there are "Constitution Rights of all parties involved". As evidenced in the Heading of the Petitioner's Motions filed on 1-14-26, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the body of her Motions, and as evidenced by the facts asserted in Judge Carrion's Findings and Order, Judge Carrion still denied the Petitioner's Motions and failed to cite a single legal or factual basis for denying the Petitioner right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 although the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 1-14-26 Motions and in her other Motions substantiate that, collectively and for over 39 times, the Petitioner has been denied her plea for a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 by all of the other present and former presiding Judges.

Further, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions filed on 1-14-26, a copy of which was sent by certified to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump, and the evidence of the facts cited in Judge Carrion's 2-2-26 Findings and Order that respond to the Petitioner's Motion substantiate the allegations that the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 have been breached by Judge Carrion due to her failing, for the 1st time, to consider, disclose, and resolve in her 2-2-26 Findings and Order any of the material facts or legal arguments in the Petitioner's 19-page Motions which substantiate that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 have been continuously violated by the other 3 other present presiding Judges, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, Judge Schreiber, and by all of the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill (who was, also, one of the presiding Judges over the Petitioner's Motions in her initial civil litigation and in her present appeal in the In Banc Review), Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen due to their invading 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"), committed misconduct in office, and/or committed other criminal acts, impeding upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, and/or Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution.

Moreover, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 1-14-26 and the evidence of the facts cited in Judge Carrion's Findings and Order docketed on 2-2-26, which responds to the Petitioner's Motions, substantiate the Petitioner's allegations that her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were violated by Judge Carrion and by all of the present and former presiding Judges because Judge Carrion, for the 1st time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and as one of former presiding Judges, along with the other present and former presiding Judges have, collectively and for over 39 times, infringed upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and committed Fraud Upon the Court and, thus, Judge Carrion's Orders, the Orders of the 3 other presiding Judges, and the Orders of the former presiding Judges are void as a matter of law and of no legal effect or force since Judge Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of former presiding Judge have failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges because there is an appearance that Judge Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, and Judge Schreiber II, and the former presiding Judges, namely, 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 Barbera, 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 Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged to have committed "Crimes Against Humanity", it, also, appears that Judge Carrion, 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 attempt to cover-up and/or prevent Petitioner from having a hearing on her Motions, which are opened to the public who would hear and see that: a.) The evidence substantiate that allegations that Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 1-14-26, 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. b.) The evidence in my Motions filed on 11-27-17, 1-3-18, 2-1-18, 2-15-18, and/or on 3-9-18 substantiate the allegations that presiding Judges and/or the former presiding Judges had unlawfully granted the Defendant's Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint and, thus violated the Petitioner's my 14th Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242. 4.) Moreover, it does appear that, as a result of Judge Carrion, the other 3 presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges being alleged in the Petitioner's instant and/or in her 1-14-26 Motions 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 Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the 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 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 211 which are opened to the public who would hear and see that the evidence substantiate that Judge Carrion, Judge J. Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, Judge Schreiber II, Judge Geller, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman, along with Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, are being alleged in the Petitioner's instant Motions and/or in her Motions filed on 1-14-26 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.

Still too, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 1-14-26 and the evidence of the facts cited in Judge Carrion's Findings and Order docketed on 2-2-26, which responds to the Petitioner's Motions, substantiate the Petitioner's allegations that her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were violated by Judge Carrion and by all of the present and former presiding Judges because Judge Carrion, for the 1st time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and as one of former presiding Judges, along with the other present and former presiding Judges have, collectively and for over 39 times, not only denied the Petitioner her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, impeded upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, 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 and/or have breached Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and committed Fraud Upon the Court but, Judge Carrion, for the 1st time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and as one of former presiding Judges, along with the other present and former presiding Judges have, collectively and for over 39 times, violated Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621 and/or Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623 by asserting in their Findings that the Petitioner cites no legal or factual basis for her requested relief, although the material facts and legal

arguments in the Defendant's 1-14-26 Motions (Exhibit 286 on the Petitioner's website) substantiate that the Petitioner has redundantly asserted her legal and factual basis for her requested relief. As evidenced in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 1-14-26, from which Judge Carrion responds to in her 2-26 Findings and Order (Exhibit 291 on the Petitioner's website), she cites the material facts and legal arguments which substantiate the Petitioner motioning Judge Carrion to assign a Judge to preside over the Petitioner's 5-21-25 Motions, which include the Petitioner's 3rd Motion for a Reinstatement of her civil case because the evidence, indisputably, substantiate that the presiding Judge, Judge John Nugent, has not only infringed upon Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to repeatedly violating Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621 and/or Federal Statute U.S.C. & 1623, but, also, Judge John Nugent as one of the former presiding Judges, along with all of the other presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles III and Judge Schreiber II, and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phin, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman have, collectively and for over 37 times, breached Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute U.S.C. & 1623, 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 committed other criminal acts, impeded 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, and/or Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution.

As asserted in the Petitioner's 1-14-26 Motions, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-21-25, 4-19-25, and 2-18-25 (Exhibits 249, 234, and 218, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) and the evidence of the facts stated in the 5-12-25 and 4-10-25 Findings and Orders of Judge John Nugent, the presiding Judge (Exhibits 250 and 233, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) substantiate the Petitioner's restating in her 1-14-26 Motions the material facts and legal arguments in her 1st, 2nd, and/or 3rd Motions for Reinstatement of her civil case (Exhibits 218, 234, and 249, respectively, on the Petitioner's website) the allegations of breaching Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute U.S.C. & 1623, 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 committed other criminal acts, impeded 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, and/or Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution against Judge John Nugent, against the 2 other presiding Judges cited above, and against all of the former presiding Judges declared above, which include Judge Carrion. In her 1-14-26 Motions, amongst other things, the Petitioner asserts that "... 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 4 other Motions that re waiting 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, 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 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have, as being alleged for the 1st time in the 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... 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 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution [insert the word "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 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... 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..... 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 5th Motions 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' 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 2nd 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...." ..

Further, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in her 1st Motion for Reinstatement of her civil case filed on 2-18-25 (Exhibit 218 on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner states her legal and factual basis for her requested relief by declaring, amongst other things that, ".... Under Maryland Rule 2-507, the Petitioner can file, before 30 days, a Motion for Reinstatement of her civil case and articulate reasons why dismissal should be set aside, and the Court, for good cause shown, may reinstate the party's civil case. The Petitioner's 3rd most recent Motions filed on 12-26-24 substantiates that the Petitioner's civil litigation is still ongoing, which are the Petitioner's latest docket entries, which were filed in response to Judge Dorsey, Charles III's 12-5-24 Findings and Orders . 2.) The Petitioner has been waiting for a new Administrative Judge, who is not appointed to his/her elite Administrative position by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore ("Wes Moore"), by the two former Governors of Maryland, Larry Hogan and Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, to preside over assigning a panel of 3 in Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for appeals in an In Banc Review, and who are, also, not appointed by these present and/or past government officials, to preside over her In Banc Review because Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged in the Petitioner's 12-26-24 Motions, in her other Motions, and in her 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide...." ... The Petitioner's civil case, which is on appeal in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court, is still ongoing as evidenced by the Petitioner's 3rd separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibits 215, 216, and 217,

respectively, on the Petitioner's website), ... as evidenced by the Findings and Orders docketed on 12-5-24 from the presiding Judge, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III (Exhibit 213 on the Petitioner's website), ... to the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24 (Exhibits 180, 181, 182, and 183, respectively on the Petitioner's website), and as evidenced by her Motions filed on 11-14-24, which include the Petitioner's 1st Motion for Disqualification of Judge Dorsey (Exhibit 187 on the Petitioner's website). 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 evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in the Findings and Order of the presiding Judge, Judge Schreiber, II docketed on 10-20-23 (Exhibit 154 on the Petitioner's website) and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions substantiate the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions (Exhibits 147 and 148, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), any of the material facts and legal arguments that support the Petitioner's allegations in her 9-8-23 Motions. Moreover, as stated in these documents, the material facts and legal arguments substantiate that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, the Petitioner's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 were breached by Judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to civil cases and as one of the presiding Judges in her initial civil litigation and in the Petitioner's present appeal in the In Banc Review, and by the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge Schreiber, II, and by all of the other former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, and by Judge J. Nugent."

In her 2nd Motion for Reinstatement of her civil case filed on 4-18-25 (Exhibit 234 on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner, in addition to paraphrasing the same legal and factual basis for her requested relief as stated in her 2-18-25 Motion, declares that "For the 1st time, the presiding Judge who denied the Petitioner's Motion for Reinstatement of her Civil Case on 4-10-25, namely, Judge J. Nugent, is, also, one of the Judges with whom the Petitioner has motioned for disqualification in her civil case and in these instant Motions since the evidence in the record substantiate that Judge J. Nugent have repetitiously and/or willingly engaged in Law Fare by infringing upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 as a result of breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a) because: a.) There is an appearance that Judge J. Nugent would be biased and/or impartial due to his distinguished appointment to his Administrative position by former Chief Judge Barbera , who along with the present Governor, Wes Moore, the two former Governors of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and Larry Hogan, is being alleged in the Petitioner's 4


Motions, in other Motions, and in her 1-28-24 "pleads" to our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 - Genocide..." ...

In her 3rd Motion for Reinstatement of her civil case filed on 5-21-25 (Exhibit 249 on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner, again, reiterate the material facts and legal arguments in her 1st and 2nd Motions for Reinstatement of her civil case to substantiate her legal and factual basis for her requested relief by citing, amongst other material facts and legal arguments, that "...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 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, 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..." ...

Conclusion

The Petitioner's 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 25th day of February 2026, a copy of the foregoing: The Petitioner's

Motion For A Hearing On Her Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Carrion's Findings and Order
Docketed on 2-2-26 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