

IN THE MATTER OF

STATE OF MARYLAND

VS.

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

BALTIMORE COUNTY

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

Case No. C-03-CR-20-0022995

1.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN'S FINDINGS AND ORDER DOCKETED ON 12-29-25, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 1ST MOTION FOR A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT: A.) FOR THE 1ST TIME, THE PRESIDING JUDGE, JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN, AND FOR OVER 38 TIMES, COLLECTIVELY, JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE INFRINGED UPON THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF: I.) JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES DELIBERATELY AND/OR REPEATEDLY ERRING AND COMMITTING THE PREJUDICIAL ERROR OF PERJURY DUE TO JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN FAILING TO CONSIDER, DISCLOSE, AND RESOLVE IN HER 12-29-25 FINDINGS AND ORDER 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 DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS MAILED ON 12-27-25, ON 12-18-25, 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 WENDY S. EPSTEIN'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 WENDY S. EPSTEIN AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES KNOWINGLY AND/OR REPETITOUSLY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND/OR MARYLAND RULE 2-311. B.) FOR THE 1ST TIME, JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN, AND FOR OVER 38 TIMES, COLLECTIVELY, ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF JUDGE CAHILL, HAVE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY REDUNTANTLY AND/OR WILLINGLY INVADING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) AND COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND, THUS, DEEMING JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN'S ORDER 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 WENDY S. EPSTEIN AND ALL OF

THESE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND REFUSE THEMSELVES AS PRESIDING JUDGE BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN AND THESE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED SINCE JUDGE WENDY S. BAILEY WAS APPOINTED TO HER ELITE ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION AS AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE ON THE BALTIMORE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT ON AUGUST 21, 2021 BY LARRY HOGAN 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 WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS AND/OR IN HER ADDENDUMS TO HER OFFICIAL COMPLAINT TO OUR HON. 45th - 47th 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. C.) FOR THE 1ST TIME, THE DEFENDANT IS MOTIONING JUDGE M. FINIFFER, CHIEF JUDGE FOR THE CIRCUIT COURT WHO WAS APPOINTED BY WES MOORE, TO ASSIGN TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS A JUDGE: I.) WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, LARRY HOGAN, WES MOORE, AND/OR BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT THE PRESIDING JUDGE WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO HIS/HER ELITE APPOINTMENT BY O'MALLEY, LARRY HOGAN, WES MOORE, AND/OR BY FORMER JUDGE CHIEF BARBERA, ALL OF WHOM ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS AND/OR IN HER ADDENDUMS TO HER OFFICIAL COMPLAINT TO OUR HON. 45th - 47th PRESIDENT TRUMP TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 - GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO VIOLATE FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY"), HAVE COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE SUBSTANTIATING THAT JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN, JUDGE KEITH TRUFFER, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR., 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. D.) FOR THE 1ST TIME, JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN HAS FAILED TO CONSIDER, DISCLOSE, AND RESOLVE IN HER FINDINGS AND ORDER IF THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER HAS FOR THE 1ST TIME, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. HAS FOR THE 14TH TIME, AND ALL OF THE OTHER FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE REPEATEDLY AND/OR DELIBERATELY VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND 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, AND/OR MARYLAND RULE 2-311. E.) FOR THE 1ST TIME, JUDGE WENDY S. EPSTEIN, JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER, AND JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. HAVE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANTS' 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO THE APPEARANCE OF FRAUD BEING COMMITTED BY JUDGE WENDY S.

EPSTEIN, BY JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER, AND BY JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. 2.) MOTION TO HAVE THE DEFENDANT'S 5 OTHER MOTIONS RESUBMITTED, WHICH ARE ENCLOSED, NAMELY, 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 DEC 09, 2025" BY THE CLERK, AND THE DEFENDANT'S 2 SEPARATE MOTIONS ORIGINALLY MAILED ON 11-14-25 BUT STAMPED "FILED ON DEC 09, 2025" BY THE CLERK. 3.) AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND FOR THE 6TH TIME, MOTION TO ALLOW THE STATE OF MARYLAND THEIR 15 DAYS TO RESPOND TO THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS BEFORE THE PRESIDING JUDGE SUES HIS/HER FINDINGS AND ORDER

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant's: 1.) Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Wendy S. Epstein Findings and Order Docketed On 12-29-25, Which Is The Defendant's 1st Motion For A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That: A.) For The 1st Time, The Presiding Judge, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, And For Over 38 times, Collectively, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., And All Of The Other Forming Presiding Judges Have, Collectively, Infringed Upon The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of: i.) Judge Wendy S. Epstein And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Deliberately And/Or Repeatedly Erring And Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury Due To Judge Wendy S. Epstein Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In Her 12-29-25 Findings And Order 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 Defendant's Motions Mailed On 12-27-25, On 12-18-25, 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 In Her Motions, And Thereby, Contradict Judge Wendy S. Epstein'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 Wendy S. Epstein And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Knowingly And/Or Repeatedly Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 102.11 And/Or Maryland Rule 2-311. B.) For The 1st Time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, And For Over 38 Times, Collectively, All Of The Former Presiding Judges, With The Exception Of Judge Cahill, Have Violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd 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 Wendy S. Epstein's Order 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 Wendy S. Epstein And All Of These Former Presiding Judges Have Failed To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Themselves As Presiding Judges Because There Is An Appearance That Judge Wendy S. Epstein And These Presiding Judges Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since She Was Appointed To Her Elite Administrative Position On August 21, 2021 By Larry Hogan And All Of These Former Presiding Judges Were Appointed To Their Privileged Positions by Larry Hogan, Who, Along With Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, And Former Chief Judge Barbera, Is Being Alleged In

The Defendant's Motions And/Or In Her Addendums To Her Official Complaint To Our 45th-47th Hon. 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. C.) For The 1st 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: i.) Who Was Not Appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or By Former Chief Judge Barbara Because There Is An Appearance That The Presiding Judge Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Due To His/Her Elite Appointment by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or By Former Chief Judge Barbara, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In The Defendant's Motions And/Or In her Addendums To Her Official Complaint To Our Hon. 45th - 47th President Trump To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 - Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (Crimes Against Humanity"), Have Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Crimes. ii.) Who Will Grant The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 To Have A Hearing On Her Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 Since The Defendant Has Been Denied A Hearing On All Of Her Motion Since Including In Her Motions Docketed Since 7-10-24 And, Thereafter, A Plea For A Hearing On Her Motion And Due To The Evidence Substantiating That Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., And All Of The 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. D.) For The 1st Time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein Has Failed To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In Her Findings And Order If The Evidence Substantiate That Judge Keith R. Truffer Has For The 1st Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has For The 14th Time, And All Of The Other Former Presiding Judges Have Repeatedly And/Or Deliberately Violated The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of Breaching Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Due To The Appearance Of Fraud Being Committed By Judge Wendy S. Epstein, By Judge Keith R. Truffer, And By Judge D. Robinson Jr. 2.) Motion To Have The Defendant's 5 Other Motions Resubmitted, Which Are Enclosed, Namely, 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 DEC 09, 2025" By The Clerk, And The Defendant's 2 Separate Motions Originally Mailed On 11-14-25 But Stamped "FILED ON DEC 09, 2025" By The Clerk. 3.) As Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311, And For The 6th Time, Motion 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 1st time, the presiding Judge, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, and for over 38 times, collectively, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey have infringed upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of: a.) Judge Wendy S. Epstein and all of the former presiding Judges deliberately and/or Repeatedly erring and committing the prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Wendy S. Epstein failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in her 12-29-25 Findings and Order 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 Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-27-25, on 12-18-25, on 12-6-25, or in any of her other colossal Motions, which unequivocally, cite the Defendant's legal and factual basis for the requested relief in her Motions and, thereby, contradict Judge Wendy S. Epstein'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. b.) Judge Wendy S. Epstein and all of the former presiding Judges knowingly and/or repetitiously breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) For the 1st time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, and, collectively, for over 38 times, all of the former presiding Judges, with the exception of Judge Cahill, have violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 Wendy S. Epstein's Order and the Orders of Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge Wendy S. Epstein and all of these former presiding Judges have failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges because there is an appearance that Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey would be impartial and/or biased since Judge Wendy S. Epstein was appointed to her elite Administrative position on August 21, 2021 by Larry Hogan and, as substantiate in some of Defendant's over 38 other Motions, all of the former presiding Judges were appointed to their privileged positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions 12-27-25, in other Motions, and/or in her Addendums to her Official Complaint to our 45th-47 Hon. 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. 3.) For the 1st time, the Defendant is motioning Judge M. Finifter, the Chief Judge for the Baltimore County Circuit Court who was appointed by Wes Moore, to: a.) assign a Judge to preside over the Defendant's Motions 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: i.) 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 and/or in her Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18

U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (Crimes against Humanity”), have committed other crimes. ii.) there being an appearance that the presiding Judge would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant’s Motions since he/she was appointed to her privileged Administrative position by Martin O’Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Berbara, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 12-27-25 but not stamped “Filed”, in her Motions mailed on 12-18-25 but not stamped “Filed”, in her Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped “FILED ON DEC 09, 2025” by the clerk, in the Defendant’s 2 separate Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped “FILED ON DEC 09, 2025” by the clerk and/or in the Defendant’s other 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 criminal acts. b.) to assign a Judge to preside over the Motions who will not commit law fare and deprived the Defendant of her 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C. & Section, 242 to have a hearing on her Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C. & Section, 242 to have a hearing on all 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 since 7-10-24 and, thereafter, a plea for a hearing on her Motion and due to the evidence in the record, whose documents are cited as Exhibit Numbers on the Defendant’s website, www.chenwar.com, that Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., and all of the 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 and/or by declaring that is no legal or factual basis for relief requested, although the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant’s Motions mailed on 12-27-25, on 12-18-25, on 12-6-25, on 11-14-25, in other Motions, and/or in her Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, indisputably, substantiate that the Defendant has redundantly in most of her over 38 Motions pleaded that the presiding Judge, including the Original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, would simply grant the Defendant her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition because the evidence substantiate that, since 2023, the Defendant had successfully complied with all of the mandates in Judge S. Bailey 2-year, 4-page Probation/Supervision Order dated 5-21-20. c.) to assign a Judge to preside over the Motions who will not commit law fare and repeatedly and/or intentionally deprived the Defendant of her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C. & Section in failing to determine if Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Alexander, Judge Glass, and Judge S. Bailey redundantly and/or knowingly violated the Defendant’s 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C. & Section due to repetitiously and/or willingly breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311. 4.) For the 1st time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein has failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in her Findings and Order if the evidence substantiate that Judge Keith R. Truffer has for the 1st time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has for the 14th time, and all of the other former presiding Judges have repetitiously and/or deliberately violated the Defendant’s 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.012.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311. 5.) For the 1st time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, and

Judge D. Robinson Jr. have violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to the appearance of fraud being committed by Judge Wendy S. Epstein, by Judge Keith R. Truffer, and by Judge D. Robinson Jr. 6.) For the 2nd time, the Defendant is motioning to have her Motions mailed 12-27-25 but not stamped "filed", and for the 3rd time, her 4th other Motions resubmitted, which are enclosed, namely, 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, and the Defendant's 2nd separate Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "filed" on 12-9-25 by the clerk. 7.) As mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311, and for the 6th time, Motion 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.

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

The evidence in the record, whose documents are assigned as Exhibit Numbers on the Defendant's website, substantiate the material facts and legal arguments stated below and aid in further substantiating the allegations that, for the 1st time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, and Judge D. Robinson Jr. have violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.22, Maryland Rule 2-311, committing the prejudicial error of perjury, and because there is an appearance of deception and/or fraud being committed by Judge Wendy S. Epstein, by Judge Keith R. Truffer, and by Judge D. Robinson Jr. The material facts and legal arguments" are as follows: 1.) The Defendant's Motions mailed on 11-14-25 and stamped by the clerk as "filed" on 12-9-25 are the Defendant's 2nd 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). 2.) The Defendant 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 2nd separate Motions mailed on 11-14-25. 3.) 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 2nd 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." 4.) 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 2nd 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. 5.) 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. 6.) 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. 7.) The Defendant is alleging that there 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. or any. 8.) 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 1st 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. 9.) 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”. 10.) 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 Findings and Order docketed 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. 11.) 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. 12.) In response to Judge Keith R. Truffer Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25, the Defendant mailed her Motions on 12-27-25 (Exhibit 283 on the Defendant's website). 13.) A new presiding Judge by the name of Judge Wendy S. Epstein responded in her Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25, who fails to state in that her Findings and Order docketed on 12-27-25 were the original copy of the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-18-25, 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. Moreover, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, also, fails to send the Defendant a copy of the document indicating that the opposing party, namely, the State of Maryland, also, received a copy of her Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25. Thus, for the 2nd time the Defendant's original copy of her Motions mailed on 12-18-25 along with her Motions mailed on 12-27-25 were returned to the Defendant in the mailing that accompanied Judge Wendy S. Epstein's Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25, both of which were not stamped by the clerk as "Filed". Also, and, for the 3rd time, the Defendant's original Motions mailed on 11-14-25 and her original Motions mailed on 12-6-25, both of which were stamped by the clerk as filed on 12-9-25 were sent back to the Defendant in the mailing that accompanied Judge Wendy S. Epstein's Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25. 14.) The Defendant's instant Motions were mailed on 1-9-26 and respond to Judge Wendy S. Epstein's Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25, which are accompanied with 5 enclosures, namely, 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 originally mailed on 11-14-25 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. 15.) As evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant's 12-27-25, Motions which respond to the facts cited in the Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25 of

the former presiding Judge, namely, Judge Keith R. Truffer and as evidenced by the facts declared in the Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25 Judge Keith R. Truffer, the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were violated as a result of Judge Keith R. Truffer erring in failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in his 12-22-25 Findings and Order any of the material facts or legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-18-25 but not stamped by the clerk as "filed" in the court but were returned to the Defendant in the mailing of Judge Keith R. Truffer's Findings and Order. Judge Keith R. Truffer does not state a single legal or factual basis for his denial but simply proclaims in his Findings and Order that "The Defendant's Motion To 'Unexpunge' her criminal case is DENIED. There is no factual or legal basis to support the requested relief." In fact, in the Defendant's 12-27-25 Motions which respond to Judge Keith R. Truffer's Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25 and which along with the Defendant's 12-18-25 Motions were not stamped by the clerk as "filed" but were returned in the mailing of the 12-29-25 Findings and Order of Judge Wendy S. Epstein, proclaim many legal and factual basis for the Defendant's requested relief and, amongst other things, alleges 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 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition 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 ammunition 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 repossession of her firearm and 15 ammunition. Also, during the 6-9-24 hearing, Judge Glass stated that she would put a Stay on her Order so that the issue of repossession of the Defendant's firearm and 15 ammunition 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 1st 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 ammunition.

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 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 filling her Motions in 2023, which included a Motion to grant the Defendant's 2nd 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." 16.) As evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the he Defendant's 12-18-25 Motions which respond to Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 12-11-25 and which along with the Defendant's 12-6-25 Motions were not stamped by the clerk as "Filed" but were returned in the mailing of the 12-29-25 Findings and Order of Judge Wendy S. Epstein, proclaim many legal and factual basis for her requested relief and, amongst other things, asserts thatThe 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 14th Amendment

Right, her 2nd 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 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition 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 ammunition 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 ammunition 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 ammunition 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 1st 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 ammunition."....

17.) 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 (Exhibits 187, 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, and counting, respectively, on the Defendant's website) 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, 284, 282, 280, 279, 275, 273, 271, 269, 267, 261, 259, 257, 254, 252, 244, 240, 237, 235, 232, 230, 220, 219, 187, and counting on the

Defendant's website), collectively, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr. have **for over 38 times**, 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 the material facts and legal arguments being proclaimed in the Defendant's instant Motions. Further, the evidence of the facts stated in the Findings and Orders of these presiding Judges substantiate the allegations that Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., and all of the Judges who presided over the Defendant's colossal Motions filed since 7-10-24 and thereafter, continued to violate the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to repeatedly and/or intentionally denying the Defendants Motion for her requested relief of repossessing her legally owned firearm and her 15 bullets, cite no legal or factual basis for their denials, and then commit the prejudicial error of perjury in citing in their Findings that there is no legal or factual basis for the requested relief declared in the Defendant's Motions. 18.) In terms of breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to impeding upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, as evidenced by the facts cited in Judge Wendy S. Epstein's Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25 (Exhibit 284 on the Defendant's website), Judge Wendy S. Epstein fails to disclose in her Findings and Order the material fact that on August 21, 2021 she was appointed to her Administrative position by Larry Hogan, the former Governor of Maryland, who, along with Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-27-25, 12-18-25, on 12-6-25, on 11-14-25, and/or is being alleged in the Defendant's Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump to have infringed upon 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. 19.)

As evidenced by the facts cited in Judge Wendy S. Epstein's Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's instant Motions, in her Motions mailed on 12-27-25, on 12-18-25, on 12-6-25, on 11-14-25, and/or in her Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the other former presiding Judges, with the exclusion of Judge Cahill, namely, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, have infringed upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 Wendy S. Epstein's Order and the Orders of 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 Wendy S. Epstein and the former presiding Judges failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as the presiding Judges because there is an appearance that Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey would be impartial and/or biased since: a.) Judge Wendy S.

Epstein was appointed to her privileged Administrative position in 2021 by the former Governor of

Maryland, Larry Hogan and Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey were appointed to their privileged Administrative positions by Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-27-25, on 12-18-25, on 11-14-25, and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our 45th-47th 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 Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions since Judge Wendy S. Epstein were appointed to her privileged Administrative position by Larry Hogan in 2021 and all of the former presiding Judges cited above were appointed to their distinct positions by Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbery, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-27-25, on 12-18-25, on 11-14-25, and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump to have committed “Crimes against Humanity”, have committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes. **c.)** Judge Wendy S. Epstein being appointed to her superlative in 2021 position by Larry Hogan, and Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the other former presiding Judges declared above being appointed to their unique Administrative 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 45th-47th Hon. President Trump to have committed “Crimes Against Humanity”, it, also, appears that Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., 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. 45th – 47th President Trump to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. **d.)** Since Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, are being alleged in these instant Motions to have infringed upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102, and 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 and/or in the her Official Complaints and Addendums to our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, are being alleged to have committed “Crimes against Humanity” because Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., 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 Barbera. **e.)** Being appointed to their distinguished positions by Larry Hogan, Martin

O'Malley, Wes Moore, and/or former Judge Chief Barbara and/or being alleged in the Defendant's instant Motions to have breached the her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 Statute 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 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, are being alleged to have committed "Crimes against Humanity", it does appear that Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr. 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 Barbara are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions and/or in her Official Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 20.) For the 2nd time, the Defendant is motioning to have her Motions 5 other Motions, namely, her Motions mailed 12-27-25 and her 4 other Motions resubmitted, which are enclosed, namely, 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, and the Defendant's 2 separate Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "Filed" on 12-25 by the clerk. 21.) For the 1st time, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Defendant's Motions and the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in Judge Wendy S. Epstein's Findings and Order docketed on 12-29-25, which respond to the Defendant's Motions, substantiate the allegations that Judge Wendy S. Epstein has breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 due to failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in her Findings and Order if the evidence substantiate that Judge Keith R. Truffer has for the 1st time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has for the 14th time, and all of the other former presiding Judges have repeatedly and/or deliberately violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 18.012.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311. 22.) The evidence of the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-27-25, on 12-18-25, and mailed on 12-6-25 and the corresponding response to her Motions in the 12-29-25, 12-22-25, and 12-11-25 Findings and Orders by Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, and by Judge D. Robinson Jr. 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 6th 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.

ARGUMENT

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 TRIBUNE, 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." And, as stated by our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump on TRUTH SOCIAL on 1-5-26, "NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW!"

Since the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's instant Motions, in her Motions mailed on 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 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, unequivocally, substantiate that the presiding Judge, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, the Original Finder of Fact, have, collectively, for over 38 deliberately and/or redundantly violated the Defendants' 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 and/or committing the prejudicial error of perjury, the Defendant is pleading, for the first time, that Judge M. Fintter, the Chief Judge for the Baltimore County Circuit Court who was appointed by Wes Moore, to: 1.) assign a Judge to preside over the Defendant's Motions who was not appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Berbara because there is an appearance that the presiding Judge would be impartial and/or biased due to: a.) his/her elite


appointment by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Berbara, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions and/or in her Addendums to our 45th-47th Hon. 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.) there being an appearance that the presiding Judge would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions since he/she was appointed to her privileged Administrative position by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Berbara, all of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions and/or in her Official Complaint 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 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.) to assign a Judge to preside over the Motions who will not commit law fare and deprived the Defendant of 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 since the Defendant has been denied a hearing on all of her Motions since including in her Motions docketed since 7-10-24 and, thereafter, a plea for a hearing on her Motion and due to the evidence in the record, whose documents are cited as Exhibit Numbers on the Defendant's website that Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., and all of the 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 by declaring that is no legal or factual basis for relief requested, although the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-27-25, on 12-18-25, on 11-14-25, in other Motions, and/or in her Official Complaint and/or Addendums to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, indisputably, substantiate that the Defendant has redundantly in most of her over 38 Motions pleaded that the presiding Judges, including the Original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, would simply grant the Defendant her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition because the evidence substantiate that, since 2023, the Defendant had successfully complied with all of the mandates in Judge S. Bailey 2-year, 4-page Probation/Supervision Order dated 5-21-20. 3.) to assign a Judge to preside over the Motions who will not commit law fare and repeatedly and/or intentionally deprived the Defendant of her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C. & Section in failing to determine if Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Alexander, Judge Glass, and Judge S. Bailey redundantly and/or knowingly violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right under Title 18 U.S.C. & Section due to repetitiously and/or willingly breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, and/or committing the prejudicial error of perjury.

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 9th day of January 2026, a copy of the foregoing: 1.) Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Wendy S. Epstein Findings and Order Docketed On 12-29-25, which is The Defendant's 1st Motion For A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 in Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That: A.) For The 1st Time, The Presiding Judge, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, And For Over 38 times, Collectively, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., And All Of The Other Forming Presiding Judges Have, Collectively, Infringed Upon The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 As A Result Of: i.) Judge Wendy S. Epstein And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Deliberately And/OR Repeatedly Erring And Committing The Prejudicial Error Of Perjury Due To Judge Wendy S. Epstein Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In Her 12-29-25 Findings And Order 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 Defendant's Motions Mailed On 12-27-25, On 12-18-25, 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 In Her Motions, And Thereby, Contradict Judge Wendy S. Epstein'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. iii.) Judge Wendy S. Epstein And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Knowingly And/Or Repeatedly Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 102.11 And/Or Maryland Rule 2-311. B.) For The 1st Time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, And For Over 38 Times, Collectively, All Of the Former Presiding Judges, With The Exception Of Judge Cahill, Have Violated the Defendants' 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd 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 Wendy S. Epstein's Order 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 Wendy S. Epstein And All Of These Former Presiding Judges Have Failed To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Themselves As Presiding Judges Because There Is An Appearance That Judge Wendy S. Epstein And These Presiding Judges Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since She Was Appointed To Her Elite Administrative Position On August 21, 2021 By Larry Hogan And All Of These Former Presiding Judges Were Appointed To Their Privileged Positions by Larry Hogan, Who, Along With Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, And Former Chief Judge Barbera, Is Being Alleged In The Defendant's Motions And/Or In Her Addendums To Her Official Complaint To Our 45th-47th Hon. 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. C.) For The 1st 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: i.) Who Was Not Appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or By Former Chief Judge Barbera Because There Is An Appearance That The Presiding Judge Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Due To His/Her Elite Appointment by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or By Former Chief Judge Barbera, All Of Whom Are Being Alleged In the Defendant's Motions And/Or In her Addendums To Her Official Complaint To Our Hon. 45th - 47th President Trump To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 - Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (Crimes Against Humanity"), Have Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Crimes. ii.) Who Will Grant The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 To Have A Hearing On Her Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 Since The Defendant Has Been Denied A Hearing On All Of Her Motion Since Including In Her Motions Docketed Since 7-10-24 And, Thereafter, A Plea For A Hearing On Her Motion And Due To The Evidence Substantiating That Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Judge D. Robinson Jr., And All Of The 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. D.) For The 1st Time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein Has Failed To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In Her Findings And Order If The Evidence Substantiate That Judge Keith R. Truffer Has For The 1st Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has For The 14th Time, And All Of The Other Former

Presiding Judges Have Repeatedly Violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd 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, And Maryland Rule 2-311. E.) For the 1st time, Judge Wendy S. Epstein, Judge Keith R. Truffer, And Judge D. Robinson Jr. Have Violated The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To The Appearance Of Fraud Being Committed By Judge Wendy S. Epstein, By Judge Keith R. Truffer, And By Judge D. Robinson Jr. 2.) Motion To Have The Defendant's 5 Other Motions Resubmitted, Which Are Enclosed, Namely, 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 DEC 09, 2025" By The Clerk, And The Defendant's 2 Separate Motions Originally Mailed On 11-14-25 But Stamped "FILED ON DEC 09, 2025" By The Clerk. 3.) As Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311, And For The 6th Time, Motion 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 45th-47th 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, Judge S. Bailey, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, Judge Cahill, Judge D. Robinson, Judge-In-Charge of the Criminal Division, Ms. Ensor, Clerk of Court

5 Enclosures (copies of these documents are on the Defendant's website)



DUNDALK SPARROWS POINT

44 SHIPPING PL

DUNDALK, MD 21222-9998

www.usps.com

09:50 AM

TRACKING NUMBERS

9589 0710 5270 1815 9958 16

TRACK STATUS OF ITEMS WITH THIS CODE

(UP TO 25 ITEMS)



TRACK STATUS BY TEXT MESSAGE

Send tracking number to 28777 (2USPS)

Standard message and data rates may apply

TRACK STATUS ONLINE

Visit <https://www.usps.com/tracking>

Text and e-mail alerts available

PURCHASE DETAILS

Product	Qty	Unit	Price
---------	-----	------	-------

First-Class Mail®	1		\$4.74
-------------------	---	--	--------

Large Envelope

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 11.60 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 3.30 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

First-Class Mail®

Letter

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz

First-Class Mail® 1
Letter
Towson, MD 21285
Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz
Estimated Delivery Date
Mon 01/12/2026

\$1.65

First-Class Mail® 1

\$1.65

Letter

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 3.30 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

First-Class Mail® 1

\$1.65

Letter

Towson, MD 21285

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

First-Class Mail® 1

\$1.65

Letter

Washington, DC 20500

Weight: 0 lb 3.20 oz

Estimated Delivery Date

Mon 01/12/2026

Certified Mail®

Tracking #:

\$5.30

Return Receipt

Tracking #:

\$4.40

9590 9402 4334 8190 5746 39

Total

\$11.35

Grand Total:

\$30.94

Debit Card Remit

\$30.94

Card Name: VISA

Account #: XXXXXXXXXX9569

Approval #: 044109

Transaction #: 137

Receipt #: 034266

Debit Card Purchase: \$30.94

AID: A0000000930840

AL: US DEBIT

PIN: Verified

chip

Visit <https://email.usps.com>

All hazardous labels/markings on reused

boxes MUST be completely

removed/obliterated if they no longer

match the contents.

PREVIEW YOUR MAIL AND PACKAGES

Sign up for FREE at

<https://informdelivery.usps.com>

All sales final on stamps and postage.

Refunds for guaranteed services only.

Thank you for your business.

Customer Service

1-800-ASK-USPS

(1-800-275-8777)

Agents do not have any additional

information other than what is provided on

USPS.com.

Tell us about your experience.

Go to: <https://postalexperience.com/Pos>

or scan this code with your mobile device.



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

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

PS Form 3800, January 2023 PSN 7530-02-000-9047 See Reverse for Instructions

Postmark Here

Postage and Fees

Postage \$11.00

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)

☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy) \$

☐ Return Receipt (electronic) \$

☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery \$

☐ Adult Signature Required \$

☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery \$

☐ Certified Mail Fee \$3.30

Total Postage and Fees \$14.30

Sent To: Hevlyte Resident Group

Street and Apt. No., or PO Box No. 1600 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.

City, State, ZIP+4® Washington, D.C. 20500

9589 0710 5270 1815 9958 16

Annie Williams
131 Calver Hill Ct
Balto., Md. 21222

Plus Lead!!
marked on 1-9-26

Judge W. Lington
Chief Judge for Balto County
401 Bosley Ave
Towson, Md. 21285-6754

Amaria Williams
131 Calver Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Please Read!!
mailed on 1-9-26

Amaria Williams
131 Calver Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Baltimore County State Attorney
491 Bosley Ave.
Gowson, Md. 21204

Julie L. Enser, Clerk
Circuit Court for Baltimore County
County Court Building
491 Bosley Ave.
Gowson, Md. 21285-6754

Please Read!!
mailed on 1-9-26

Arena Mallon
131 Calver Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Judge K. Truitt
401 Basley Ave
Gowson, Md. 21285-6754

Phoebe Head!!
mailed on 1-9-26

Arena Mallon
131 Calver Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Judge A. Robinson, Jr.
401 Basley Ave.
Gowson, Md. 21285-6754

Phoebe Head!!
mailed on 1-9-25

Arona Williams
131 Calver Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md 21222

Please Read!!!
mailed on 1-9-26

Arona Williams
131 Calver Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Judge Cahiel
401 Bosley Ave.
Pawson, Md. 21285-6754

Judge Alexander
401 Bosley Ave.
Pawson, Md. 21285-6754

Please Read!!!
mailed on 1-9-26

Amarie Williams
131 Calvin Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Please Read!!
mailed on 1-9-26

Amarie Williams
131 Calvin Hill Ct
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Judge ~~21~~1000s
401 Bailey Ave.
Grossen, Md. 21285-6754

Judge ~~5~~ Bailey
401 Bailey Ave.
Grossen, Md. 21285-6754

Please Read!!
mailed on 1-9-26

Arena Wilson
131 Calver Hill Cr
Baltimore, Md. 21222

mailed on 1-9-26

Arena Williams
131 Calver Hill Dr
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Judge K. C. Crippen
401 Bayley Ave.
Gross, Md. 21285-6754

Baltimore County State Attorney
401 Bayley Ave.
Gross, Md. 21206

mailed on 1-9-26