

IN THE MATTER OF
STATE OF MARYLAND
CIRCUIT COURT
VS.
FOR
BALTIMORE COUNTY
Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995

1.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER'S
ORDER DOCKETED ON 12-22-25, 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, AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S
MOTIONS DOCKETED ON 12-9-25, JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER, HAS VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH
AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND 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 HIS ORDER VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND OF NO LEGAL
FORCE OR EFFECT BECAUSE JUDGE KEITH R. TRUFFER FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND
RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE KEITH

R. TRUFFER WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED SINCE HE WAS APPOINTED TO HIS ELITE
ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY,
WES MOORE, AND FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THE DEFENDANT'S
MOTIONS TO HAVE BREACHED FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE
ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO VIOLATE FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091
(CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY), COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE
COMMITTED OTHER CRIMINAL ACTS. B.) FOR THE 2ND TIME, ANOTHER PRESIDING JUDGE OVER
THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS TO UNEXPIRE THE DEFENDANT'S CRIMINAL CASE, NAMELY, JUDGE
KEITH R. TRUFFER, HAS INFRINGED UPON THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND

AMENDMENT RIGHT, CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 AS A RESULT OF: I.)
BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.012.11, AND MARYLAND
RULE 2-311. II.) 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 DOCKETED ON 12-09-25 AND FROM WHICH HIS FINDINGS AND ORDER RESPOND TO. 2.)
MOTION TO HAVE THE DEFENDANT'S 4 OTHER MOTIONS, NAMELY, 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 MOTIONS ORIGINALLY MAILED ON 11-14-25 BUT STAMPED

"FILED" ON 12-9-25, WHICH ARE ENCLOSED, RESUBMITTED. 3.) AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND FOR THE 5TH TIME, MOTION TO ALLOW THE STATE OF MARYLAND THEIR 15 DAYS TO RESPOND TO THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS BEFORE THE PRESIDING JUDGE

ISSUES HIS FINDINGS AND ORDER

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendants: 1.) Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Keith R. Truffer's Findings and Order Docketed On 12-22-25, 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, As The Presiding Judge Over The Defendant's Motions Docketed on 12-9-25, Judge Keith R. Truffer Has Violated The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C. & 455 (a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming His Order Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because Judge Keith R. Truffer Failed To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge Because There Is An Appearance That Judge Keith R. Truffer Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since He Was Appointed To His Elite Administrative Position In 2016 By Larry Hogan, Who, Along With Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and Former Chief Judge Barbera, Is Being Alleged In The Defendant's Motions To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S Code, U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Criminal Acts. B.) For The 2nd Time, Another Presiding Judge Over The Defendant's Motions To Unexpunge The Defendant's Criminal Case, Namely, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Has 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.) Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland Rule 2-311. iii.) 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 Docketed On 12-9-25 And From Which His Findings And Order Respond To. 2.) Motion To Have The Defendant's 4 Other Motions, Namely, 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 Her Motions Originally Mailed On 11-14-25 But Stamped "Filed On 12-9-25, Which Are Enclosed, Resubmitted. 3.) As Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311, And For The 5th Time, Motion To Allow The State Of Maryland Their 15 Days To Respond To The Defendant's Motions Before The Presiding Judge Issues His 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 Defendant is pleading for a hearing

on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 because the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's instant Motions mailed on 12-27-25 substantiate that Judge Keith R. Truffer has, for the 1st time, 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 violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge Keith R. Truffer would be biased and/or impartial since: a.) Judge Keith R. Truffer was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, who, along with Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions stamped "filed on Dec 09 2025" and from which Judge Keith R. Truffer's Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25 respond to, has 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"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant's Motions. b.) There is an appearance that Judge Keith R. Truffer would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions since Judge Keith R. Truffer was appointed to his privileged Administrative position by Larry Hogan in 2016, whom is being alleged in the Defendant Motions stamped "filed on Dec 09 2025", in her Motions docketed on 10-13-25, 9-8-25, on 7-30-25, and/or in her 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"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. 2.) For the 2nd time, Judge Keith R. Truffer, another presiding Judge over the Defendant's Motions to unexpunge her Criminal Case, has, too, 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.) breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. ii.) 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 docketed on 12-9-25 and from which his Findings and Order respond to. 3.) For the 1st time, Judge Keith F. Truffer has violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under 18 U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25, which respond to the Defendant's Motions stamped 12-9-25, if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions substantiate a sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's being granted her "Relief Requested" as afforded her under Maryland Rule 2-311 and under the 2nd Amendment, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her right to have a hearing on her Motions in order to determine if the Defendant's Motion to unexpunge her criminal case, whose case number is C-03-CR-20-002995 should be resubmitted. 4.) For the 1st time, the Defendant is motioning to have her 4 other motions, namely, 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 Her Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "Filed" on 12-9-25, which are enclosed, resubmitted. 5.) As mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311, and for the 5th 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 Findings and Order.

INTRODUCTION

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Defendant believes that our Great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their ruling, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11, "And the LORD spake into Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend", and Moses informed the judges in Israel of GOD'S law and employed the judges over the various tribes in Israel in Judges 6:16-17, saying, "And, I charged your judges at that time, saying. Hear the causes between 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 evidenced by the facts cited in his Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25, which respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 12-9-25, Judge Keith R. Truffer fails to disclose in his Findings and Order the material fact that in 2016 he was appointed to his 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 12-9-25 Motions, in her Motions mailed on 12-18-25, and in other Motions 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"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. Also, as evidenced by the facts cited in his Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25, which respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 12-9-25, which include the Defendant's Motion resubmitted for the 2nd time, and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant's Motions, Judge Keith R. Truffer has, for the 1st time, 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 committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming his Order void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge Keith R. Truffer fails to voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge because there is an appearance that Judge Keith R. Truffer would be impartial and/or biased since: a.) Judge Keith R. Truffer was

appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, who, along with Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped "file" on 12-9-25 (enclosed) and from which Judge Keith R. Truffer's Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25 respond to, in her 2 separate Motions mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "filed" on 12-9-25 (enclosed), in her Motions mailed on 2-18-25 but not stamped "filed" (enclosed), in her Motions docketed 10-13-25, 9-8-25, and in her 7-30-25 Motions (Exhibits 278, 276, 274, 272, 270, and 268, respectively, on the Defendant's website), and/or in other Motions 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"),

committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant's Motions. Since the Defendant cited her website address in her 12-9-25 Motions and in other Motions, Judge Keith R. Truffer has access to the Defendant's website where these Motions that are cited as "Exhibits". b.) There is an appearance that Judge Keith R. Truffer would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions since Judge Keith R. Truffer was appointed to his privileged Administrative position by Larry Hogan, who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions originally mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped "filed" on 12-9-25, in her Motions docketed on 10-13-25, 9-8-25, on 7-30-25 Motions, and/or in other Motions to have committed "Crimes against Humanity".

Moreover, as evidenced by the facts cited in his Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25, which respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 12-9-25, which include the Defendant's Motion resubmitted for the 2nd time, and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant's Motions, Judge Keith R. Truffer has, for the 1st time, 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 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 docketed on 12-9-25, which are the Motions from which Judge Keith R. Truffer's Findings and Order respond to, but simply states 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." As evidenced from the facts cited in his Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-25 and as evidenced from the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 12-9-25, from which Judge Keith R. Truffer's Findings and Order respond to, Judge clearly erred in failing to state a single legal or factual basis for his denial of the Defendant's Motion because the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 12-9-25 clearly proclaim factual and legal basis for her relief. In fact, in citing verbatim from her 12-9-25 Motions, the Defendants substantiate the factual and legal basis for her requested relief to the previous presiding Judge over her Motions, namely, Judge D. Robinson Jr by asserting, amongst other things, 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 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.

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."

Further, as declared in the Defendant's 12-9-25 Motions, to substantiate the factual and legal basis for her requested relief to Judge D. Robinson Jr., the former presiding Judge, that Defendant alleges that ... "The Defendant declares that, for the 14th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr., has denied the Defendant's Motions, including her Motion for a hearing on the Motions but simply state at the top of the Defendant's Motions and without any legal or factual basis for his denials, other than the citing the redundant phrase, "it is ordered that the motions are denied. There is no legal or factual basis for the relief requested". The evidence of facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in Judge D. Robinson's Findings and Orders docketed on 12-11-25 11-6-25 (Exhibit 279 on the Defendant's website) and in his other Findings and Orders (Exhibits 192, 219, 220, 223, 224, 240, 252, 257, 261, 267, 269, 271, and 277, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and the evidence in the material facts and legal arguments proclained in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but docketed on 12-9-25 (Exhibit 278 on the Defendant's website), from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to, and in her other Motions (Exhibits 193, 193', 220, 221, 223, 224, 238, 239, 250, 253, 256, 258, 260, 262, 268, 270, and 272, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. has, deliberately invaded upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because: 1.) For the 14th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has repetitiously and knowingly engaged in Law Fare as a result of not once allowing the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) For the 14th time, as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge Of Presiding over assigning a Judge to preside over the Defendant's Motions, Judge D. Robinson has repeatedly and deliberately committed Law Fare due to repetitiously and willingly violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by impeding upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, by breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and committing Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming all of his Orders void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge D. Robinson Jr., for the 14th time, fails 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: A.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, and was appointed to his distinguished Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped "file" on 12-9-25, in her Motions docketed 10-13-25, 9-8-25, in her 7-30-25 Motions, and in her 2 separate Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "file" on 12-9-25 (Exhibits 278, 276, 274, 272, 270, and 268, respectively, on the Defendant's website), and/or in other Motions 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"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant's Motions, and Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has access to the Defendant's website where these Motions that are cited as "Exhibits". B.) There is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson Jr. would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions since Judge D. Robinson Jr. was appointed to his privileged Administrative positions by Larry Hogan, and by Wes Moore, both of whom are being alleged in the

Defendant's Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "filed" on 12-9-25, in her Motions docketed on 10-13-25, 9-8-25, on 7-30-25 Motions, and/or in other Motions to have committed "Crimes against Humanity". The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 14 separate Motions docketed since 7-10-24 Motions (Exhibits 188, 189-193, 219-220, 231-232, 233-234, 235, 250, 253, 256, 258, 260, 262, 268, and 270, 274, 276, and 278, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and all of the former presiding Judges have had the opportunity to read the Defendant's Motions and the Findings and Orders by the Judges in her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court in Baltimore City and to be cognizant of the material facts that as evidenced in my most recent Motions in my present civil and criminal litigations and/or in other Motions on my website, there are allegations of violations of Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide and/or the attempting to and/or conspiring to defy Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other criminal acts against Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, and former Chief Judge Barbera as a result of knowingly and willingly: B1.) allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades. B2.) having ignored the alleged heinous crimes against the owners of the public schools, (the Mayor and Baltimore City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young and Brandon Scott, against all of the present members of the City Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter "City Council"), and against those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993 to repetitiously and/or intentionally expose our children to lead poisoning through lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazard, thereby, infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to traduce Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other possible criminal acts. B3.) refusing to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately intruding upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. B4.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Judges, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes. C.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 12-6-25 but stamped "filed" on 12-9-25, in her Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "filed" on 12-9-25, and in other Motions to have invaded upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311." ...

Moreover, for the 2nd Time, another presiding Judge over the Defendant's Motions To Unexpunge The Defendant's Criminal Case, namely, Judge Keith R. Truffer, has 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 breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. § 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311.

For the 1st time, the Defendant is motioning to have her 4 other motions, namely, 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 Her Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "Filed" on 12-9-25, which are enclosed, resubmitted.


Still too, as mandated under Maryland Rule 2-311, and for the 5th 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 Findings and Order.

As evidenced by the enclosures, the original copies of all 4 separate Motions, namely, the Defendant's 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 Her Motions originally mailed on 11-14-25 but stamped "Filed" on 12-9-25, which are enclosed, are being resubmitted for docketing since these are the original copies of the Motions.

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 27th day of December 2025, a copy of the foregoing Defendant's 1.) Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Keith R. Truffer's Findings and Order Docketed On 12-22-25, 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, As

The Presiding Judge Over The Defendant's Motions Docketed on 12-9-25, Judge Keith R. Truffer Has Violated The Defendant's 14th 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 His Order Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because Judge Keith R. Truffer Failed To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge Because There Is An Appearance That Judge Keith R. Truffer Would Be Impartial And/OR Biased Since He Was Appointed To His Elite Administrative Position In 2016 By Larry Hogan, Who, Along With Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, and Former Chief Judge Barbera, Is Being Alleged In The Defendant's Motions To Have Breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, And/OR Have Attempted To And/OR Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"). Committed Misconduct In Office, And/OR Have Committed Other Criminal Acts. B.) For The 2nd Time, Another Presiding Judge Over The Defendant's Motions To Unexpunge The Defendant's Criminal Case, Namely, Judge Keith R. Truffer, Has 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.) Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Maryland Rule 2-311. iii.) 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 Docketed On 12-9-25 And From Which His Findings And Order Respond To. 2.) Motion To Have The Defendant's 4 Other Motions, Namely, 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 Her Motions Originally Mailed On 11-14-25 But Stamped "Filed On 12-9-25, Which Are Enclosed, Resubmitted. 3.) As Mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311, And For The 5th Time, Motion To Allow The State Of Maryland Their 15 Days To Respond To The Defendant's Motions Before The Presiding Judge Issues His 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

4 Enclosures



DUNDALK SPARROWS POINT
44 SHIPPING PL
DUNDALK, MD 21222-9998
www.usps.com
12/27/2025 10:32 AM

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

First-Class Mail®	1		\$1.07
Towson, MD 21204			
Weight: 0 lb 1.80 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Wed 12/31/2025			

US Flag Coil/100	1		\$78.00
First-Class Mail®	1		\$3.84
Large Envelope			
Towson, MD 21235			
Weight: 0 lb 8.50 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Wed 12/31/2025			

Grand Total: \$82.91

Debit Card Remit \$82.91

Card Name: VISA

Account #: XXXXXXXXXX9569

Approval #: 093062

Transaction #: 963

Receipt #: 034083

Debit Card Purchase: \$82.91

AID: A0000000930840

AL: US DEBIT

TO REPORT AN ISSUE

Visit <https://emailus.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://informedelivery.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.

