

IN THE MATTER OF  
STATE OF MARYLAND

VS.

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

\* IN THE  
\*  
\* CIRCUIT COURT  
\*  
\* FOR  
\*  
\* BALTIMORE COUNTY  
\* Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995

\*\*\*\*\*

- 1.) FOR THE 1<sup>ST</sup> TIME, THE DEFENDANT IS MOTIONING JUDGE M. FINIFTER, CHIEF JUDGE FOR THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY, TO ASSIGN ANOTHER JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR.'S FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 1-15-26 AND ON 1-16-26 AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT:
- A.) FOR THE 16<sup>TH</sup> TIME, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. HAS REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTED LAW FARE DUE TO REPETIOUSLY AND WILLINGLY VIOLATING THE DEFENDENT'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY INVADING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND, THUS, DEEMING ALL OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR.'S ORDERS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT BECAUSE HE FAILS, FOR THE 16<sup>TH</sup> TIME, TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED SINCE HE WAS APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN AND IN 2023 BY WES MOORE, BOTH OF WHOM, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY AND FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS MAILED ON 1-9-26 AND IN OTHER 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. B.) COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 39 TIMES, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE INFRINGED UPON THE DEFENDANT'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF:
- I.) JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DELIBERATELY AND/OR REPEATEDLY ERRING AND COMMITTING THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY DUE TO JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. FAILING TO CONSIDER, DISCLOSE, AND RESOLVE IN HIS 1-15-26 AND 1-16-26 FINDINGS AND ORDERS AND IN HIS 14 OTHER FINDINGS AND ORDERS AND ALL OF 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 DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS MAILED ON 1-9-26, 12-27-25, 12-18-25, AND ON 12-6-25, AND/OR IN ANY OF HER OTHER MOTIONS WHICH, UNEQUIVOCALLY, CITE THE DEFENDANT'S LEGAL AND FACTUAL BASIS FOR HER REQUESTED RELIEF AND, THEREBY, CONTRADICT JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR.'S FINDINGS AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES' FINDINGS WHICH ASSERT THAT THERE IS NO FACTUAL OR LEGAL BASIS FOR THE DEFENDANT'S REQUESTED RELIEF. ii.) JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES KNOWINGLY AND/OR REPETITIOUSLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 2-311, COMMITTING THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY AND/OR VIOLATING 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. c.) COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 39 TIMES, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF JUDGE CAHILL, HAVE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REDUNTANLY AND/OR WILLINGLY INVADING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND, THUS, DEEMING JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR.'S ORDERS AND ALL OF THE ORDERS OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT BECAUSE JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. 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 D. ROBINSON JR. AND THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED SINCE JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. AND ALL OF THESE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES WERE APPOINTED TO THEIR PRIVILEGED POSITIONS BY LARRY HOGAN, MARTIN O'MALLEY, WES MOORE, AND/OR BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, ALL OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE DEFENDANT'S 1-9-26 MOTIONS, OTHER MOTIONS, AND/OR IN HER ADDENDUMS TO HER OFFICIAL COMPLAINT SENT BY CERTIFIED MAIL TO OUR HON. 45<sup>TH</sup> – 47<sup>TH</sup> PRESIDENT TRUMPTO 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 CRIMINAL ACTS. d.) FOR THE 2<sup>ND</sup> TIME, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR., JUDGE WENDY EPSTEIN, AND/OR JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER HAVE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANTS' 14<sup>TH</sup> AMEMDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF FRAUD BEING COMMITTED BY JUDGE D. ROBISON JR., JUDGE WENDY EPSTEIN, AND/OR BY JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER. 2.) FOR THE 2<sup>ND</sup> TIME, THE DEFENDANT IS MOTIONING JUDGE M. FINIFTER, CHIEF JUDGE FOR THE CIRCUIT COURT WHO WAS APPOINTED BY WES MOORE, TO ASSIGN TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS A JUDGE: A.) 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 JUDGE CHIEF BARBERA, ALL OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS MAILED ON 1-9-26, IN OTHER MOTIONS, AND/OR IN HER ADDENDUMS TO HER OFFICIAL COMPLAINT TO OUR



HON. 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> 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. B.) WHO WILL GRANT THE DEFENDANT’S 14<sup>th</sup> 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 SINCE THE DEFENDANT HAS BEEN DENIED A HEARING ON ALL OF HER MOTIONS SINCE INCLUDING IN HER MOTIONS DOCKETED ON 7-10-24 AND, THEREAFTER, A PLEA FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS AND, ALSO, DUE TO THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATING THAT JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR., JUDGE WENDY EPSTEIN, JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE REPEATEDLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY COMMITTED THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY IN CITING IN THEIR FINDINGS THAT THE DEFENDANT ASSERTS NO LEGAL OR FACTUAL BASIS FOR HER REQUESTED RELIEF. C.) WHO WILL GRANT THE DEFENDANT’S 14<sup>th</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT, COLLECTIVELY AND FOR AT LEAST THE 39<sup>TH</sup> TIME, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR., JUDGE WENY EPSTEIN, JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT’S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> 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. & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 2-311, COMMITTING THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY, AND/OR VIOLATING 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. D.) WHO WILL NOT DENY, FOR THE 7<sup>TH</sup> TIME, THE DEFENDANT’S AND/OR THE STATE OF MARYLAND’S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT AND THEIR CIVIL AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 TO ALLOW THE STATE OF MARYLAND THEIR 15 DAYS TO RESPOND TO THE DEFENDANT’S MOTIONS BEFORE THE PRESIDING JUDGE ISSUES HIS/HER FINDINGS AND

#### ORDER

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant’s: 1.) For The 1<sup>st</sup> Time, The Defendant Is Motioning Judge M. Finifter, Chief Judge For The Circuit Court For Baltimore County, To Assign Another Judge To Preside Over The Defendant’s Motion For A Hearing On Her Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge D. Robinson Jr.’s Findings And Orders Docketed On 1-15-26 And On 1-16-26 As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That: A.) For The 16<sup>th</sup> Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has Repeatedly And Deliberately Committed Law Fare Due To Repetitiously And Willingly Violating The Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Invading Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming All Of Judge D. Robinson Jr.’s Orders Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal For Or Effect Because He Fails, For The 16<sup>th</sup> Time, To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge Because There Is An Appearance That Judge D. Robinson Jr. Would



Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since He Was Appointed In 2016 By Larry Hogan And In 2023 By Wes Moore, Both Of Whom, Along With Martin O'Malley And Former Chief Judge Barbera, Are Being Alleged In The Defendant's Motions Mailed On 1-9-26 And In Other 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. B.) Collectively And For Over 39 Times, Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of The former Presiding Judges Have Infringed Upon The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment right, And Her Civil right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of: i.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Deliberately And/Or Repeatedly Erring And Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury Due To Judge D. Robinson Jr. Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In His 1-15-26 And 1-16-25 Findings And Orders And In His 14 Other Findings And Orders And All Of 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 Defendant's Motions Mailed On 1-9-26, 12-27-25, 12-18-25, And On 12-6-25, And/Or In Any Of Her Other Motions Which, Unequivocally, Cite The Defendant's Legal And Factual Basis For Her Requested Relief, And, Thereby, Contradict Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings And All Of The Former Presiding Judges' Findings Which Assert That There Is No Factual Or Legal Basis For The Defendant's Requested Relief. ii.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Knowingly And/Or Repetitiously Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury And/Or Violating 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. C.) Collectively And For Over 39 Times, Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of The Former Presiding Judges, With The Exception Of Judge Cahill, Have Violated The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 By Redundantly And/Or Willingly Invading Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders And All Of The Orders Of The Former Presiding Judges Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because Judge D. Robinson Jr. 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 D. Robinson Jr. And The Former Presiding Judges Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of These Former Presiding Judges Were Appointed To Their Privileged Positions By Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, And/Or By Former Chief Judge Barbera, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In The Defendant's 1-9-26 Motions, In Other Motions, And/Or In Her Addendums To Her Official Complaint Sent By Certified Mail To Our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To 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. D.) For The 2<sup>nd</sup> Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. , Judge Wendy Epstein, And/Or Judge Keith R. Truffer Have Violated The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Due To The Appearance Of Fraud Being Committed By Judge D. Robinson Jr. Judge Wendy



Epstein, And/Or by Judge Keith R. Truffer. 2.) For The 2<sup>nd</sup> Time, The Defendant Is Motioning Judge M. Finifter, Chief Judge For The Circuit Court Who Was Appointed By Wes Moore, To Assign To Preside Over The Defendant's Motions A Judge: A.) 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 Defendant's Motions Mailed On 1-9-26, In Other Motions, And/Or In Her Addendums To Her Official Complaint To Our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> President Trump To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, 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.) Who Will Grant The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 Since The Defendant Has Been Denied A Hearing On All Of Her Motions Since Including In Her Motions Docketed On 7-10-24 And, Thereafter, A Plea For A Hearing On Her Motions And, Also, Due To The Evidence Substantiating That Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer., And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Have Repeatedly And/Or Deliberately Committed The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury In Citing In Their Findings That The Defendant Asserts No Legal Or Factual Basis For Her Requested Relief. C.) Who Will Grant The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That, Collectively And For At Least The 39<sup>th</sup> Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Have Repetitiously And/Or Deliberately Violated The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> 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. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury, And/Or Violating Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, 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. D.) Who Will Not Deny, For The 7<sup>th</sup> Time, The Defendant's And/Or The State Of Maryland's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Their Civil Right As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 To Allow The State Of Maryland Their 15 Days To Respond To The Defendant's Motions Before The Presiding Judge Issues His/Her Findings And Order 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 Defendant, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Defendant, is that: 1.) For the 1<sup>st</sup> time, the Defendant is motioning Judge M. Finifter, Chief Judge for the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, to assign another Judge to preside over the Defendant's Motion for a hearing on her Motion for Reconsideration of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings ad Orders docketed on 1-15-26 and on 1-16-26 as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate that: A.) For the 16<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has repeatedly and deliberately committed Law Fare due to repetitiously and willingly violating the



Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by invading upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming all of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because he fails, for the 16<sup>th</sup> time, to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson Jr. would be impartial and/or biased since he was appointed in 2016 by Larry Hogan and in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom, along with Martin O'Malley and former Chief Judge Barbera, are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26 and in other 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. B.) Collectively and for over 39 times, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges have infringed upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of: i.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges deliberately and/or repeatedly erring and committing the prejudicial error of perjury due to Judge D. Robinson Jr. failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in his 1-15-26 And 1-16-25 Findings and Orders and in his 14 other Findings and Orders and all of 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 Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, 12-27-25, 12-18-25, and on 12-6-25, and/or in any of her other Motions which, unequivocally, cite the Defendant's legal and factual basis for her requested relief, and, thereby, contradict Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and all of the former presiding Judges' Findings which assert that there is no factual or legal basis for the Defendant's requested relief. ii.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges knowingly and/or repetitiously breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, committing Fraud, committing the prejudicial error of perjury, and/or violating 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. C.) Collectively and for over 39 times, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges, with the exception of Judge Cahill, have violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by redundantly and/or willingly invading upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders and all of the Orders of the former presiding Judges void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge D. Robinson Jr. 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 D. Robinson Jr. and the former presiding Judges would be impartial and/or biased since Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of these former presiding Judges were appointed to their privileged positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbara, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's 1-9-26 Motions and/or in her Addendums to her Official Complaint sent by certified mail to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to 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. D.) For the 2<sup>nd</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. , Judge Wendy Epstein, and/or Judge Keith R. Truffer have violated



the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to the appearance of Fraud being committed by Judge D. Robinson Jr. Judge Wendy Epstein, and/or by Judge Keith R. Truffer. 2.) For the 2<sup>nd</sup> time, the Defendant is motioning Judge M. Finifter, Chief Judge for the Circuit Court who Was appointed by Wes Moore, to assign to preside over the Defendant's Motions a judge: A.) 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 Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, in other Motions, and/or in her Addendums to her Official Complaint to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, 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.) who will grant the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 since the Defendant has been denied a hearing on all of her Motions since including in her Motions docketed on 7-10-24 and, thereafter, a plea for a hearing on her Motions and, also, due to the evidence substantiating that Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer., and all of the other former presiding Judges have repeatedly and/or deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in citing in their Findings that the Defendant asserts no legal or factual basis for her requested relief. C.) who will grant the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate that, collectively and for at least the 39<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, and all of the other former presiding Judges have repetitiously and/or deliberately violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> 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. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, Committing the prejudicial error of perjury, and/or violating Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, 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. D.) who will not deny, for the 7<sup>th</sup> time, the Defendant's and/or the State Of Maryland's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and their Civil Right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to allow the State Of Maryland their 15 days to respond to the Defendant's Motions before the presiding Judge issues his/her Findings and Order.

## INTRODUCTION

*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."*

#### STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

As declared by our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump on TRUTH SOCIAL on 1-5-26, "NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW!" The Rule of Law mandates that a presiding Judge's Findings and Order be premised on the fact and the law. The evidence in the record, whose documents are assigned as Exhibit Numbers on the Defendant's website, [www.dianarwilliams.com](http://www.dianarwilliams.com), and in her Motions, substantiate, unequivocally, the material facts and legal arguments stated below and aid in further substantiating the Defendant's allegations in these instant Motions, in her Motions mailed on 1-9-26, 12-27-25, 12-18-25, 12-6-25, 11-14-25, in her other Motions (Exhibits 187, 188, 189, 190, 190', 191, 192, 193, 193', 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 235, 236, 238, 239, 241, 245, 246, 253, 256, 258, 260, 262, 268, 270, 272, 274, 276, 278, 281, 283, 285, 288, and counting, respectively, on the Defendant's website, and/or in the Defendant's Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, namely, that, collectively and for over 39 times, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, the Original Finder of Fact, have deliberately and/or redundantly violated the Defendants 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by intentionally and/or repeatedly breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, committing Fraud, committing the prejudicial error of perjury, and/or infringing upon 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 by the facts cited in the Findings and Orders issued on 1-15-26 and 1-16-26 by the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson Jr, (Exhibit 287 on the Defendant's website) and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26 (Exhibit 285 on the Defendant's website) and from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his Findings and Order, substantiate that Judge D. Robinson erred and committed the prejudicial error of perjury, fail to cite a single fact or legal basis for denying the Defendant's 19-page Motions) and from which his Findings and Orders respond to. And fails to consider, disclose, and resolve a single material fact or legal argument in the Defendant's Motions. At the top of one of the 1<sup>st</sup> page of my Motions mailed on 1-9-26 is Judge D. Robinson Jr. Findings and Order dated 1-15-26, he simply justifies his denial of the Defendant's 19-page Motions mailed on 1-9-26, by his usual statement, namely, "Denied – not a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested", and at the top of one of the 1<sup>st</sup> page of another copy of my Motions mailed on 1-9-26 is Judge D. Robinson Jr. Findings dated 1-16 in which he responds to my Motions by just declaring "DENIED". Further, as evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of cited in all of the other Findings and Orders by Judge D. Robinson Jr. and by all of the former presiding Judges (Exhibits, 187, 219, 220, 230, 323, 235, 237, 240, 244, 252, 254, 257, 259, 261, 267, 269, 271, 273, 279, 280, 282, 284, 287, and counting on the Defendant's website), Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the presiding Judges failed to state one true legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's Motions in their Findings and



Orders, nor do Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges consider, disclose, and resolve any of the colossal material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's numerous Motions which, undeniable, substantiate the Defendants legal and factual basis for her requested relief. The material facts and legal arguments cited below, which have been redundantly cited in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, 12-27-25, 12-18-25, 12-6-25, 11-14-25, in her other Motions, and/or in the Defendant's Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, unequivocally, substantiate that, collectively and for over 39 times, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, the Original Finder of Fact, have deliberately and/or redundantly violated the Defendants 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by intentionally and/or repeatedly breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, committing Fraud, committing the prejudicial error of perjury, and/or infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes, the Defendant is pleading, for the 1<sup>st</sup> time, that Judge M. Finifter, Chief Judge for the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, with whom the Defendant mailed a copies of her 1-9-26 and 1-23-26 Motions, to assign another Judge to preside over the Defendant's Motion for a hearing on her Motion for Reconsideration of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings ad Orders docketed on 1-15-26 and on 1-16-26 as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate that: A.) For the 16<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has repeatedly and deliberately committed Law Fare due to repetitiously and willingly violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by invading upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming all of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because he fails, for the 16<sup>th</sup> time, to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson Jr. would be impartial and/or biased since he was appointed in 2016 by Larry Hogan and in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom, along with Martin O'Malley and former Chief Judge Barbera, are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26 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. B.) Collectively and for over 39 times, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges have infringed upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of: i.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges deliberately and/or repeatedly erring and committing the prejudicial error of perjury due to Judge D. Robinson Jr. failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in his 1-15-26 and 1-16-25 Findings and Orders and in his 14 other Findings and Orders and all of 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 Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, 12-27-25, 12-18-25, and on 12-6-25, and/or in any of her other Motions which, unequivocally, cite the Defendant's legal and factual basis for her requested relief, and, thereby, contradict Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and all of the former presiding Judges' Findings which assert that there is no factual or legal basis for the Defendant's requested relief. ii.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges knowingly and/or repetitiously breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule



18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, committing the prejudicial error of perjury and/or violating 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. C.) Collectively and **for over 39 times**, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges, with the exception of Judge Cahill, have violated the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by redundantly and/or willingly invading upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming Judge D. Robinson Jr.’s Orders and all of the Orders of the former presiding Judges void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge D. Robinson Jr. 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 D. Robinson Jr. and the former presiding Judges would be impartial and/or biased since Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of these former presiding Judges were appointed to their privileged positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O’Malley, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbara, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant’s 1-9-26 Motions, in her other Motions, and/or in her Addendums to her Official Complaint sent by certified mail to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to 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. D.) For the 2<sup>nd</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. , Judge Wendy Epstein, and/or Judge Keith R. Truffer have violated the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to the appearance of Fraud being committed by Judge D. Robinson Jr. Judge Wendy Epstein, and/or by Judge Keith R. Truffer.

The material facts and legal arguments cited below, which have been redundantly cited in the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 1-9-26, 12-27-25, 12-18-25, 12-6-25, 11-14-25, in her other Motions, and/or in the Defendant’s Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, and which, unequivocally, substantiate that, collectively and for over 39 times, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson Jr., and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, the Original Finder of Fact, have deliberately and/or continuously violated the Defendants 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by intentionally and/or repeatedly breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, committing Fraud, committing the prejudicial error of perjury, and/or infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes include the following: 1.) As evidenced from the material facts and legal arguments asserted the Defendant’s Motions docketed on 7-10-24 (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant’s website) and/or in all of her numerous Motions filed by the Defendant thereafter) and as evidenced by the facts stated in the Findings and Orders of Judge Wendy S. Bailey, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the other former presiding Judges (Exhibits, 187, 219, 220, 230, 323, 235, 237, 240, 244, 252, 254, 257, 259, 261, 267, 269, 271, 273, 279, 280, 282, 284, 287, and counting on the Defendant’s website), collectively, and for at least 39 times, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and



Judge S. Bailey have collectively and for over 39 times have committed the prejudicial error of perjury in declaring in their Findings and Orders that the Defendant cites no legal or factual basis for her requested relief because these presiding judges are erroneously stating the facts, and, for the first time being stated in the Defendant's instant Motions, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges have, collectively, and for over 39 times, have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. 2.) As evidenced by the facts cited in the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges, with the exclusion of Judge Cahill, namely, Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, have, collectively and for over 39 times, infringed upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by impeding upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S. C., & 455 (a) and, thus, committing Fraud upon the Court and, thereby, deeming Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Order and the Orders of Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge D. Robinson Jr. and the former presiding Judges failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as the presiding Judges because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey would be impartial and/or biased since: a.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges were appointed to their illustrious positions by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, 12-27-25, on 12-18-25 on 12-6-25, on 11-14-25, and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. b.) There is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions since Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the former presiding Judges were appointed to their distinct positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, 12-27-2, on 12-18-25, on 12-6-25, on 11-14-25, and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> President Trump to have committed “Crimes against Humanity”, have committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes. c.) Judge Dr. Robinson Jr. and the presiding Judges being appointed to her superlative positions by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions and/or in the her Official Complaints and Addendums to our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump to have committed “Crimes Against Humanity”, it, also, appears that Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey would attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public exposure of the material facts that Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions and/or in the her Official Complaints and Addendums to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> 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. d.) Since Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, are being alleged in these instant Motions to have infringed upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by committed the prejudicial error of perjury due to erroneously citing in their Findings and Orders that there is no factual or legal basis stated in the Defendant's colossal Motions for her requested relief and have repeatedly and/or have deliberately violated Federal Statue 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102, and Maryland Rule 2-311, it would appear that Judge these in order to attempt to cover up and prevent the public exposure of the material facts that, in the Defendant's Motions and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums and/or in the her Official Complaints and Addendums to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> President Trump, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Judge Chief Berbara, are being alleged to have committed "Crimes against Humanity" because Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey were appointed to their privileged Administrative positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and/or former Judge Chief Berbara. e.) Being appointed to their distinguished positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and/or former Judge Chief Berbara and/or being alleged in the Defendant's instant Motions to have breached the her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by committing the prejudicial error of perjury due to erroneously citing in their Findings and Orders that there is no factual or legal basis stated in the Defendant's colossal Motions for her requested relief and/or by having repeatedly and/or deliberately violated Federal Statue 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to attempt to cover up and prevent the public exposure of the material facts that, in the Defendant's Motions and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump , Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Judge Chief Berbara, are being alleged to have committed "Crimes against Humanity" , it does appear that Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's criminal proceeding and/or would attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public exposure of the material facts that Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Berbara are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47 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. 3.) The Defendant is testifying that, on 1-20-26, instead of receiving a copy of her 19-page Motions mailed on 1-9-26 (Exhibit 285) which contains Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Orders stamped at the top of the Defendant's 1<sup>st</sup> page of her Motions, she receive 2 envelopes from the Clerk of the Court, Ms. Ensor, with each envelope containing a copy of only the first page of the Defendant's 19-page Motions mailed on 1-9-26 (Exhibit 187 on the Defendant's website). 4.) As evidenced by the documents assigned as Exhibit 287 on the Defendant's website, there is no date stamped by the clerk of the court on the copy of the 1<sup>st</sup> page of the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, which would indicate the date in which the Defendant's Motions were entered into the record of the court. 5.) The Defendant is, also, testifying that the Clerk did not return the 5 enclosures which



accompanied the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, which include the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-27-25 but not stamped "Filed", her Motions mailed on 12-18-25 but not stamped "Filed", her Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped "Filed" on 12-9-25, on the Defendant's 2 separate Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "Filed on 12-9-25 by the clerk, which are the Defendant's 2 separate Motions (Exhibit 274 and 276, respectively, on the Defendant's website) which respond to Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 11-6-25 (Exhibit 273 and 275, respectively, on the Defendant's website). 6.) The Defendant is declaring that, since she did not receive a copy of at least the 1<sup>st</sup> page of her Motions mailed on 12-27-25 but not stamped "Filed" or her Motions mailed on 12-18-25 but not stamped "Filed", she has no evidence to substantiate that these Motions are in the record. Further, the Defendant is asserting that she has yet to receive a copy of the presiding Judge's Findings and Order to substantiate that these Motions were presiding over by a Judge. 7.) The Defendant is, too, asserting that she received a **"REJECTED AND RETURNED PAPER FILING STATUS NOTICE"** from the Clerk, Ms. Ensor, which is dated 11-18-25 (Exhibit 277 on the Defendant's website) and was accompanied with the original copies of the Defendant's 2 separate Motions mailed on 11-14-25. 8.) As evidenced by the Defendant's letter dated 11-22-25 (Exhibit 277 on the Defendant's website), this missive responds to Ms. Ensor' **"REJECTED AND RETURNED PAPER FILING STATUS NOTICE"**, and in the Defendant's memo, she asserts, amongst other things, that ".... Exhibits 1 and 2 are attached to this letter as evidence to substantiate my Criminal Case Number, C-03-CR-20-002995, which I've used as my criminal case number in filing all of my Motions, ....Also, in my Motions 7-10-24 and in all of my Motions filed thereafter, I've motioned for a hearing on my Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, which would give Judge S. Bailey and all of the presiding Judges, which include Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, and Judge Alexander the opportunity to provide tangible evidence to substantiate to evidence Amendment 14th my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, Rule Maryland and, thus, the Rule of Rule the not continually being invaded upon by each of these presiding Judges, beginning with Judge S. Bailey and ending with judge D. Robinson Jr." 9.) In Clerk Ensor's **"NOTICE OF REJECTED SUBMISSION"** which is dated 12-1-25 (Exhibit 278), she informed the Defendant that, in order to have her 2 separate Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 resubmitted to the court for filing, the Defendant must file a **"motion to unexpunge"** to the court. 10.) As evidenced by the material facts declared in Exhibit 278 on the Defendant's website, in response to Ms. Ensor's recommendation for resubmission of the Defendant's 2 separate Motions mailed on 11-14-25, the Defendant mailed her Motions on 12-6-25, which include a Motion to "Unexpunge" her criminal case. Also, included in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 is a Motion to have the Defendant's Motions mailed on 11-14-25 to be resubmitted and filed in the Court. 11.) Included in the mailing of the Findings and Order of Judge D. Robinson Jr. docketed on 12-11-25, which respond to the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 were the original copy of the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 and stamped by the clerk "Filed" on 12-9-25, although protocol mandates that the original copy of the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 remains in the record of the court, especially in light of the material fact that Judge D. Robinson Jr. 's Findings and Order docketed on 12-11-25 respond to the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 (Exhibit 227 on the Defendant's website). Also, accompanying mailing of the Findings and Order of Judge D. Robinson Jr. were the original copies of the 2 separate Motions of the Defendant mailed on 11-14-25 which were, also, stamped by the clerk as "Filed" on 12-9-25 (Exhibit 280 on the Defendant's website). Moreover, the evidence in the Heading of the Defendant's



2 separate Motions mailed on 11-14-25 substantiate that the Defendant did not plead to “unexpunge” her criminal case in these Motions. 12.) As cited in her Motions mailed on 1-9-26, the Defendant alleges that here is an appearance of deceptiveness and fraud in having the original copy of the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 12-6-25, returned back to the Defendant after her Motions are responded to by Judge D. Robinson Jr. in Findings and Order docketed on 12-11-25. Moreover, the original copy of the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 12-6-25 is essential because the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped by the clerk as “Filed” on 12-9-25 are the Motions to which Judge D. Robinson Jr.’s Findings and Order docketed on 12-11-25 respond to. Also, the Defendant is alleging that it appears to be deceptive and fraudulent to have the original copies of the Defendant’s 11-14-25 Motions (Exhibits 274 and 276, respectively, on the Defendant’s website), which respond to the Findings and Orders of Judge D. Robinson Jr. docketed on 11-6-25 (Exhibits 273 and 275, respectively, or the original copy of any of the Defendant’s Motions stamped by the clerk as “Filed” and then return the original copies of the Defendant’s 11-14-25 Motions or any other Motions stamped by the clerk as “Filed” in the mailing of the Findings of Judge D. Robinson Jr. docketed on 12-11-25 or in the mailing of any presiding Judge’s Findings and Order. 13.) As evidenced in the from the paper on which Judge D. Robinson Jr. wrote his 12-11-25 Findings and Order, Judge D. Robinson Jr. did not follow in his normal routine of having his Findings and Orders stamped at the top of the 1<sup>st</sup> page of the Defendant’s Motions as attested in his Findings and Orders docketed on 11-6-25 (Exhibits 274 and 275, respectively, on the Defendant’s website). Still too, Judge D. Robinson Jr. failed include in the mailing of his Findings and Order a copy the document to the Defendant which would indicate that the opposing party, namely, the State of Maryland, also, received a copy of his Findings and Order docketed on 12-11-25. 14.) As evidenced by the facts declared in his Findings and Order docketed on 12-11-25 (Exhibit 279 on the Defendant’s website), Judge D. Robinson Jr. provide no legal or factual basis in his Findings and Order for denying the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped filed by the clerk on 12-9-25 by simply states that “On December 9, 2025 Defendant filed the attached motions. It is ordered that the motions are denied”. 15.) In response to Judge D. Robinson’s Findings and Order docketed on 12-11-25, the Defendant mailed her Motions on 12-18-25 (Exhibit 281 on the Defendant’s website). Accompanying the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 12-18-25 were the original copies of the 2 separate Motions mailed on 11-14-25, which were being motioned, again, for resubmission and the original copy of the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped “Filed” by the clerk on 12-9-25 that should have remained in the record of the Court since these are the Motions from which Judge D. Robinson Jr.’s 12-11-25 Findings and Order respond to. Also, as evidenced by Exhibits 279 and 280 on the Defendant’s website, the Defendant, included a copy of Judge D. Robinson Jr.’s Findings and Order docketed 12-11-25, a copy of Ms. Ensor’s “NOTICE OF REJECTED SUBMISSION”, copies of the Defendant’s Motions mailed and 12-6-25 and her 2 separate Motions that were mailed on 11-14-25 but are not stamped by the clerk as “Filed” on 12-9-25 and which were resubmitted for filing and which accompanied the Defendant’s 12-18-25 Motions. 16.) A new presiding Judge by the name of Judge Keith R Truffer responded in his Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25. As evidenced by the facts cited in his Findings, Judge Keith R. Truffer fails to declare that he was responding to the Defendant’s 12-18-25. Also, as asserted in the Defendant’s 12-27-25 Motions is that the Defendant’s 12-18-25 Motions were not stamped by the clerk as “Filed” which accompanied the mailing of Judge Keith R. Truffer’s Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25, along with the original copies of the Defendant’s 2 separate Motions



mailed on 11-14-25 and the original copy of the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25, both of which were stamped by the clerk as Filed" on 12-9-25, but Judge Keith R. Truffer failed to send the Defendant a copy of the document indicating that the opposing party, namely, the State of Maryland, also, received a copy of his Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25. 17.) Moreover, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, and Judge Keith R. Truffer have to send the Defendant a copy of the document indicating that the opposing party, namely, the State of Maryland, also, received a copy of their Findings and Orders. 18.) As evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, which respond to the former presiding Judge's, namely, Judge Wendy Epstein's Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25, the Defendant clearly states her requested relief citing in these Motions that "The primary reasons for the Defendant pleading in her Motions mailed on 12-6-25 and stamped "filed" on 12-9-25 and which respond to the Clerk's, Ms. Ensor's NOTICE OF REJECTED SUBMISSION" and in all of her Motions docketed since 7-10-25 for a continuation of the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 and for a hearing on her Motions are to determine if the evidence substantiate the allegations that the original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, has repetitiously and/or deliberately breached the Defendant's ' 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in her Findings and Orders if the evidence substantiate the allegations that, Judge S. Bailey has repetitiously breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 and repeatedly erred by failing to adhere to her own Probation/Supervision Order because there is no legal or factual basis for Judge S. Bailey's redundant denials in her Findings and Orders of the Defendant's 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions since the evidence substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully completed all of the mandates in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website). As cited in the Defendant's Motions mailed 11-14-25 (Exhibits 274 and 276, respectively, on the Defendant's website) which respond to Judge Robinson Jr. Findings and Order docketed 11-6-25 (Exhibits 273 and 275, respectively, on the Defendant's website), in her Motions docketed on 10-10-25 (Exhibit 272 on the Defendant's website) which respond to Judge Robinson Jr. Findings and docketed on 10-1-25 (Exhibit 271 on the Defendant's website), and/or as stated in other Motions. In fact, during the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass, the presiding Judge, where the Defendant was, again, the Defendant, the evidence was presented to substantiate that, by 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully complied to all of requirements of Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order was confirmed during the 6-9-24 hearing before the presiding Judge, Judge Glass. The transcript of the 6-9-24 hearing will substantiate that the State of Maryland, the opposing party, testified that the State of Maryland would not oppose the Defendant repossessing her firearm and 15 bullets since the Defendant had fulfilled the State of Maryland's requirement of waiting 3 years before being granted an expungement of her records. At the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's Motions, after granting the Defendant's Motion to have her record expunged, Judge Glass informed the Defendant that she has to Order a Stay on the granting of the Defendant's expungement in order to allow the Motion for the granting of the Defendant's legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions to be resolved before Judge S. Bailey, otherwise, without the Stay on her Order for expungement of the Defendant's record, the Defendant would not be able to have a hearing on Motion for repossessing her firearm and 15 ammunitions or file any other Motion because



an expungement implies that the case no longer exists. Also, during the 6-9-24 hearing, Judge Glass stated that she would put a Stay on her Order so that the issue of repossessing the Defendant's firearm and 15 ammunitions could be brought before Judge S. Bailey. As evidenced by the Defendant's Motions which were docketed on 7-10-24 (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads her 1<sup>st</sup> Motion to Stay the 30-day Stay on Judge Glass' 6-13-24 Order prior to the expiration of Judge Glass' 30 day Stay on the Defendant's expungement of her record. Although the Defendant continues to forward a copy of all of her Motions to the State of Maryland as evidenced by the Certificate of Service in the Defendant's Motions, the Defendant is aware that the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified at the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass that the State of Maryland would not object to the Defendant having repossession of her firearm and ammunitions.

Moreover, the evidence in the record and on the Defendant's website substantiate the allegations that the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, and all of the other former presiding Judges have, also, repeatedly and/or intentionally impeded upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 by failing grant the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge S. Bailey continuously erred in her Findings and Orders by: 1.) failing to adhere to her own 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 because the evidence in the record and on the Defendant's website substantiate that, before filing her Motions in 2023, which included a Motion to grant the Defendant's 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 bullets, the Defendant had completely and successfully complied to Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order. 2.) failing give sufficient legal and factual basis for not adhering to her own 2-year, 4-page Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 because the material facts in the Defendant's instant Motion sand in her Motions mailed and/or docketed 7-30-25 4-28-25, 4-1-25, 7-11-24 , and/or on 6-1-23, unequivocally, substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully complied with all of the requirements in Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order." 19.) The evidence of the Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26, 12-27-25, on 12-18-25, and mailed on 12-6-25 and the corresponding dates responding her Motions in the 1-15-26, 1-16-26, 12-29-25, 12-22-25, and 12-11-25 Findings and Orders by Judge D. Robinson, Judge Wendy Epstein, and by Judge Keith R. Truffer, substantiate the material fact that the presiding Judges have failed to adhere to Maryland Rule 2-311 in allowing the opposing party, the State of Maryland. Thus, for the 7<sup>th</sup> time, the Defendant is pleading to allow the State of Maryland their 15 days to respond to the Defendant's Motions before the presiding Judge issues his/her Findings and Order. 20.) The Defendant is pleading, for the 2<sup>nd</sup> time, that Judge M. Finifter, the Chief Judge for the Baltimore County Circuit Court who was appointed by Wes Moore, to assign to preside over the Defendant's Motions a judge: A.) 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 Defendant's Motions mailed on 1-9-26 and/or in her Addendums to her Official Complaint to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, 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.) who will grant the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 since the Defendant has been denied a hearing on all of her Motions since including in her Motions docketed on 7-10-24 and, thereafter, a plea for a hearing on her Motions and due to the evidence substantiating that Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge and all of the other former presiding Judges have repeatedly and/or deliberately committed the prejudicial error of perjury in citing in their Findings that the Defendant asserts no legal or factual basis for her requested relief. C.) who will grant the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate that, collectively and for at least the 39<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson, and all of the former presiding Judges have repetitiously and/or deliberately violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> 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. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, Committing the prejudicial error of perjury, and/or violating Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, 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. D.) who will not deny, for the 7<sup>th</sup> time, the Defendant's and/or the State Of Maryland's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and their Civil Right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to allow the State Of Maryland their 15 days to respond to the Defendant's Motions before the presiding Judge issues his/her Findings and Order.

#### 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 23<sup>rd</sup> day of January 2026, a copy of the foregoing: 1.) For The 1<sup>st</sup> Time, The Defendant is Motioning Judge M. Finifter, Chief Judge For The Circuit Court For Baltimore County, To Assign Another Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motion For A Hearing On Her Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings And Orders Docketed On 1-15-26 And On 1-16-26 As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That: A.) For The 16<sup>th</sup> Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has Repeatedly And Deliberately Committed Law Fare Due To Repetitiously And Willingly Violating The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right,



And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Invading Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming All Of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because He Fails, For The 16<sup>th</sup> Time, To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge Because There Is An Appearance That Judge D. Robinson Jr. Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since He Was Appointed In 2016 By Larry Hogan And In 2023 By Wes Moore, Both Of Whom, Along With Martin O'Malley And Former Chief Judge Barbera, Are Being Alleged In The Defendant's Motions Mailed On 1-9-26 And In Other 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. B.) Collectively And For Over 39 Times, Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of The former Presiding Judges Have Infringed Upon The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment right, And Her Civil right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of: i.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Deliberately And/Or Repeatedly Erring And Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury Due To Judge D. Robinson Jr. Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In His 1-15-26 And 1-16-25 Findings And Orders And In His 14 Other Findings And Orders And All Of 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 Defendant's Motions Mailed On 1-9-26, 12-27-25, 12-18-25, And On 12-6-25, And/Or In Any Of Her Other Motions Which, Unequivocally, Cite The Defendant's Legal And Factual Basis For Her Requested Relief, And, Thereby, Contradict Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings And All Of The Former Presiding Judges' Findings Which Assert That There Is No Factual Or Legal Basis For The Defendant's Requested Relief. ii.) Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Knowingly And/Or Repetitiously Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury And/Or Violating 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. C.) Collectively And For Over 39 Times, Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of The Former Presiding Judges, With The Exception Of Judge Cahill, Have Violated The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 By Redundantly And/Or Willingly Invading Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders And All Of The Orders Of The Former Presiding Judges Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because Judge D. Robinson Jr. 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 D. Robinson Jr. And The Former Presiding Judges Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since Judge D. Robinson Jr. And All Of These Former Presiding Judges Were Appointed To Their Privileged Positions By Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, And/Or By Former Chief Judge Barbera, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In The Defendant's 1-9-26 Motions, In Other Motions, And/Or In Her Addendums To Her Official Complaint Sent By Certified Mail To Our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To 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. D.) For The 2<sup>nd</sup> Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. , Judge Wendy



Epstein, And/Or Judge Keith R. Truffer Have Violated The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Due To The Appearance Of Fraud Being Committed By Judge D. Robinson Jr. Judge Wendy Epstein, And/Or by Judge Keith R. Truffer. 2.) For The 2<sup>nd</sup> Time, The Defendant Is Motioning Judge M. Finifter, Chief Judge For The Circuit Court Who Was Appointed By Wes Moore, To Assign To Preside Over The Defendant's Motions A Judge: A.) 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 Defendant's Motions Mailed On 1-9-26, In Other Motions, And/Or In Her Addendums To Her Official Complaint To Our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> President Trump To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, 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.) Who Will Grant The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 Since The Defendant Has Been Denied A Hearing On All Of Her Motions Since Including In Her Motions Docketed On 7-10-24 And, Thereafter, A Plea For A Hearing On Her Motions And, Also, Due To The Evidence Substantiating That Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer., And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Have Repeatedly And/Or Deliberately Committed The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury In Citing In Their Findings That The Defendant Asserts No Legal Or Factual Basis For Her Requested Relief. C.) Who Will Grant The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That, Collectively And For At Least The 39<sup>th</sup> Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Wendy Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Have Repetitiously And/Or Deliberately Violated The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> 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. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury, And/Or Violating Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, 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. D.) Who Will Not Deny, For The 7<sup>th</sup> Time, The Defendant's And/Or The State Of Maryland's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right And Their Civil Right As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 To Allow The State Of Maryland Their 15 Days To Respond To The Defendant's Motions Before The Presiding Judge Issues His/Her Findings And Order was mailed, postage paid to: Baltimore County State Attorney, 401 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland, 21204.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

#### **REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

Cc: Our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, and U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney M. Hayes, Judge M. Finifter, Chief Judge for the Circuit Court for Baltimore County



Annie Williams  
131 Calum Hill Ct  
Baltimore, Md. 21216

Julie Enson, Clerk  
Grant County for Balto County  
County Courts Bldg.  
401 Bailey Ave  
Towson, Md. 21285-6754

Mailed on 1-23-76



Arona Williams  
131 Calvin Blvd Ct  
Balto., Md. 21222

Please Read!!  
Mailed on 1-23-26

Arona Williams  
131 Calvin Blvd Ct  
Balto., Md. 21222

Balto. County State Attorney  
401 Belsley Ave.  
Pawson, Md. 21204

Judge W. Fungsten  
Chief Judge in Balto. County  
401 Belsley Ave  
Pawson, Md. 21285-6754

Please Read!!  
Mailed on 1-23-26





DUNDALK SPARROWS POINT  
44 SHIPPING PL  
DUNDALK, MD 21222-9998  
www.usps.com

01/23/2026

09:16 AM

Product	Qty	Unit Price	Price
First-Class Mail® Letter	1		\$1.65

Towson, MD 21204  
Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz  
Estimated Delivery Date  
Mon 01/26/2026  
Non-Machinable

Total \$0.49

First-Class Mail® Letter	1		\$2.14
Towson, MD 21235			\$1.65

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz  
Estimated Delivery Date  
Mon 01/26/2026  
Non-Machinable

Total \$0.49

First-Class Mail® Letter	1		\$2.14
Towson, MD 21235			\$1.65

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz  
Estimated Delivery Date  
Mon 01/26/2026  
Non-Machinable

Total \$0.49

Total: \$2.14

\$6.42

\$6.52

-\$0.10

TO REPORT AN ISSUE  
Visit <https://email.usps.com>

Hazardous labels/markings on reused  
boxes MUST be completely  
voided/obliterated if they no longer  
match the contents.

REVIEW YOUR MAIL AND PACKAGES  
Sign up for FREE at  
<https://informedelivery.usps.com>

Final on stamps and postage.  
For guaranteed services only.  
Thank you for your business.

Customer Service  
1-800-ASK-USPS  
(1-800-275-8777)  
do not have any additional  
other than what is provided on  
USPS.com.

Share about your experience.  
<https://postalexperience.com/Pos>  
code with your mobile device.

