

IN THE MATTER OF

IN THE

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 D. ROBINSON JR.'S

ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-25-25, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 9TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON HER
 MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN ORDER DETERMINE IF THE EVIDENCE
 SUBSTANTIATE THAT: A.) FOR THE 9TH TIME, AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND AS THE JUDGE-IN-
 CHARGE OF ASSIGNING A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS, JUDGE D.

ROBINSON JR. HAS REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY COMMITTED LAW FARE DUE TO REPETITIOUSLY
 AND WILLINGLY VIOLATING THE DEFENDENT'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
 ALL OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR.'S ORDERS VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND OF NO LEGAL FORCE
 OR EFFECT BECAUSE HE FAILS, FOR THE 9TH TIME, TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND REUSE
 HIMSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE D.

ROBINSON JR. WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED SINCE HE WAS APPOINTED TO HIS ELITE

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN AND IN 2023 BY WES MOORE, BOTH OF
 WHOM, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY AND FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, ARE BEING

ALLEGED IN THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS 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, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE

CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S PLEADS TO OUR 45TH – 47TH HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP. B.) FOR THE
 1ST TIME, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. HAS COMMITTED LAW FARE DUE TO INFRINGING 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 AND HAS ERRED BY FAILING TO
 CONSIDER, DISCLOSE, AND RESOLVE IN HIS FINDINGS AND ORDER A SINGLE MATERIAL FACT OR

LEGAL ARGUMENT IN THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS DOCKETED ON 7-30-25, WHICH INCLUDE THE
 DEFENDANT'S 4TH MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST THE PRESIDING JUDGE, JUDGE S.

BAILEY, DUE TO HER REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATING THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT CIVIL UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE BREACHED THE SAME FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS CITED ABOVE AGAINST JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. AND, THUS, JUDGE D. ROBINSON JR. CITES NO FACTUAL OR LEGAL BASIS IN HIS FINDINGS AND ORDER FOR HIS DENIAL OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS. 2.) 5TH MOTION FOR A STAY ON JUDGE GLASS' ORDER TO EXECUTE EXPUNGEMENT OF THE DEFENDANT'S RECORD UNTIL THE CRIMINAL CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS

ENTIRETY

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 D. Robinson, Jr.'s Order Docketed On 8-11-25, Which Is The Defendant's 9TH Motion For A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That: A.) As The Presiding Judge And As The Judge-In-Charge Of 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 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 ALL Of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because He Fails, For The 9TH Time, To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge Because There Is An Appearance That Judge D. Robinson Jr. Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since He Was Appointed To His Elite Administrative Positions In 2016 By Larry Hogan And In 2023 By Wes, Both Of Whom, Along With Martin O'Malley and Former Chief Judge Barbera, Are 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, and these violations Are Cited In The Defendant's Pleads To Our 45TH – 47TH Hon. President Trump. B.) For The 1ST Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has Committed Law Fare Due To Repeatedly And Deliberately Violating 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 And Has Erred By Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In His Findings And Order A Single Material Fact Or Legal Argument In The Defendant's Motions Docketed on 7-30-25, Which include The Defendant's 4TH Motion For Disqualification Against The Presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, Due To Her Repeatedly And Deliberately Violating The Defendant's 14TH Amendment Right, 2ND Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Being Alleged To Have Breached The Same Federal And State Laws Cited Above Against Judge D. Robinson Jr. And, Thus, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Cites No Factual Or Legal Basis In His Findings And Order For His Denial Of The Defendant's Motions. 2.) 5TH Motion For A Stay On Judge Glass' Order To Execute Expungement Of The Defendant's Record Until The Criminal Case Is Resolved In Its

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 9th time, the Defendant is motioning for a hearing as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and at this time, a Motion For Reconsideration of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 8-25-25, which include the Defendant's 9th Motion for Disqualification of Judge D. Robinson Jr. because, for the 9th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has engaged in Law fare by infringing 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 D. Robinson, Jr. would be biased and/or impartial 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 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. 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 Motions docketed on 7-30-25 Motions 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. c.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-15-25 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. 2.) For the 1st time, the evidence of the fact stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 8-25-25, where his only justification for denying the Defendant's Motions is the repetitiously and unsubstantiated phrase, "Ordered that the motion for a hearing regarding the motion for reconsideration is denied because there is not a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested" and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's approximate 12-page Motions substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. deliberately engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under 18 U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to grant the Defendants her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's approximately 12-page Motions substantiate: a.) sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's being granted her "Relief Requested" as afforded her under the 2nd Amendment, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her right to

repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunition. b.) the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judge, has intentionally 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 his refusal to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order, which responds to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25, if the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were repeatedly and/or deliberately violated by the previous presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25 to have repeatedly and intentionally breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 252 due to infringing upon the same Federal and State laws as being alleged in these instant Motions against Judge D. Robinson Jr, namely, that of violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. As evidenced in the facts declared in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in his Findings and Order docketed on 8-25-25 and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to and that were docketed on 7-30-25, Judge D. Robinson cites no factual Or Legal Basis in his Findings and Order for denying the Defendant's Motions. 3.) For the 5th time, the Defendant is motioning for a Stay on Judge Glass' Order to execute the expungement of the Defendant's criminal case until it is resolved in its entirety.

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 unto Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend", and Moses informed the judges in Israel of GOD'S law and employed the judges over the various tribes in Israel in Judges 6:16-17, saying, "And, I charged your judges at that time, saying. Hear the causes between 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 FACTUAL BACKGROUND

According to online research, Law fare includes an attempt to damage or delegitimize an opponent or to deter an individual's usage of his/her legal rights. In her letter that was sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads, amongst other things, that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, or the U.S. Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes, to conduct an investigation into

the allegations cited in the Defendant's 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website, *www.diamond.com*) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 "Pleads" namely, that of determining whether the evidence substantiate the assertions that the Defendant is being redundantly and/or deliberately denied her 2nd Amendment Right to possess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunition because Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, which prevent the Defendant from being granted her relief requested, namely, that of being granted her 2nd Amendment to possess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets. For the 9th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr., has denied the Defendant's Motions, including her Motion for a hearing on the Motions, but continues to simply state at the top of the Defendant's Motions that "Ordered that this motion is denied because there is not a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested", although the evidence in the Defendant's Motions, unequivocally, substantiate that the material facts that Judge D. Robinson provides no sufficient legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's relief requested, namely, that of granting the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to possess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition.

The Defendant declares that the evidence in the record of the Court, which are cited in these instant Motions as Exhibit Numbers from the Defendant's website, the evidence of facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in his Findings and Orders docketed on 8-25-25 (Exhibit 263 on the Defendant's website) and in his other Findings and Orders (Exhibits 192, 219, 220, 223, 224, 240, 252, 257, and 261, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and the evidence in the material facts and legal arguments proclamed in the Defendant's docketed on 7-30-25 (Exhibit 260 on the Defendant's website) and in her other Motions (Exhibits 193, 193', 220, 221, 223, 224, 238, 239, 250, 253, 256, 258, and 262, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. has, deliberately and for the 9th time, 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 9th 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 9th 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 willfully violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by invading upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and 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 9th 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 7-30-25 Motions and/or in other Motions, as well as in the Defendant's present

Motions in her civil litigation in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted 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 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 6 separate Motions docketed since 7-10-24 Motions (Exhibits 188, 189-193, 219-220, 231-232, 233-234, 235, and 260, respectively, on the Defendant’s website) substantiate that Judge S. Bailey, 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 recognize that that Martin O’Malley, Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged in the Defendant’s present civil litigation in Baltimore City to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to impinge upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts as a result of knowingly and willingly: 1.) allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades. 2.) 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 Schott, 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. 3.) 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 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 other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. 4.) 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 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.

As evidenced by the material facts stated in the Defendant's 7-30-25 (Exhibit 260 on the Defendant's website), prior to Judge D. Robinson Jr. assigning himself to preside over the Defendant's 7-30-25 Motions, Judge S. Bailey was the presiding Judge, the original Finder of Fact over the Defendant's criminal case, and is the Judge whose 7-14-25 Findings and Order (Exhibit 259 on the Defendant's website) the Defendant respond to in her Motions docketed on 7-30-25. Moreover, as evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the Findings and Order of Judge D. Robinson docketed on 8-25-25 (Exhibit 266 on the Defendant's website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his Findings and Order, although the presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey was recused by Judge D. Robinson Jr. from presiding over the Defendant's Motions docketed 7-30-25, Judge D. Robinson Jr. fails to consider, disclose, and resolve any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 12-page Motions, and Judge Robinson Jr.'s only justification for denying the Defendant's Motions is the phrase, "**Ordered that the motion is denied because there is no sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested**". As evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions, Judge D. Robinson Jr. fails to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order if the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant's Motions substantiate the allegations that the Defendant's 14th Amendment, 2nd Amendment, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were redundantly and intentionally breached by Judge S. Bailey, the presiding Judge, because the evidence substantiate the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25, namely, that: 1.) Judge S. Bailey has, for the 4th time, erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 7-14-25, 4-2-25 and 3-19-25, and 6-25-24, which respond to the Defendants Motions docketed on 4-28-25, 4-11-25, 7-11-25, 6-1-23 because Judge S. Bailey fails to abide by her own 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21, and therefore, continues to engage in Law fare due to repeatedly and/or intentionally violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because the evidence substantiate the material facts that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant has successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 5-20-21

Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey. 2.) For the 4th time, Judge S. Bailey failed to grant the Defendant's right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland 2-311, knowing that without hearing on the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass' 6-13-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record as pleaded in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist. 3.) As evidenced by the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the Findings and Order of Judge D. Robinson docketed on 8-25-25 (Exhibit 266 on the Defendant's website) and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25 (Exhibit 260 on the Defendant's website), from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his Findings and Order, Judge D. Robinson Jr. fails to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order whether Judge S. Bailey has, for the 4th time, breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Judge S. Bailey has committed Fraud upon the Court and all of her Orders are

deemed void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge S. Bailey has failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding Judge since there is an appearance that S. Bailey, Judge would be impartial and/or biased because: a.) Judge S. Bailey was appointed to her privileged Administrative position in 2009 by the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, who, along with another former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, the present Governor of Maryland, Wes More, and former Chief Judge Barbera, is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25 and/or in her 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, and Judge S. Bailey have had access to the Defendant's website since the Defendant's Motions were docketed on 7-10-24. b.) Being appointed to her distinct position by Martin O'Malley, who is being asserted in these Motions to have committed Crimes against Humanity, it appears that Judge S. Bailey would have an interest in the outcome of the Defendant's Motions that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the criminal proceeding. c.) Judge S. Bailey is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's 7-30-25 Motions and in these instant Motions 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. 4.) Relative to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), the Supreme Court has ruled and reaffirmed that Disqualification of a Judge is mandatory if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the Judge's impartiality (*Litky v. U.S.*, 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). The Court has, too, affirmed that, should a Judge not disqualify himself/herself as required by law, then the Judge has given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which could potentially further disqualify the Judge. Further, the Court have determined that, if a Judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that Judge has acted in the Judge's personal capacity and not in the Judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. 5.) The revised section of Federal Statute 28 U.S. Code & 455(a), which occurred in 1974 under Public Law 93-512, is made applicable to all Justices and Judges of the United States, and, therefore, under 28 U.S. Code § 455, any Justice, Judge, or magistrate Judge of the U.S. shall disqualify himself/herself in any proceeding in which his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. 6.) Also, the revised section of Federal Statute 28 U.S. Code & 455(a) cites that, if it known by the Judge to have an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding, then the Judge must voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself/herself from the proceedings. 7.) The Supreme Court has held that, if a Judge wars against the Constitution in breaching the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution or if he/she acts without jurisdiction, then that Judge has engaged in treason to the Constitution, which suggest that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce. Since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no Judge has immunity to engage in such acts. 8.) Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court has already established that the violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) constitutes disqualification of the Judge and a Judge who fails to disqualify himself/herself is committing "Fraud upon the Court" which makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a Judge, cannot be

made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Supreme Court has decided that, should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by law.

For the first time, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in the

evidence of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 8-25-25 (Exhibit 266 on the Defendant's website), the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 7-30-25 Motions (Exhibit 265 on the Defendant's website), from which Judge, respond to in his Findings and Order, the evidence of the Findings and Order of the presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey docketed on 7-14-25 (Exhibit 259 on the Defendant's website), from which the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25 respond to, and the evidence Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders docketed on 7-14-25, 4-2-25, 3-19-25, and on 6-25-24, (Exhibits 235, 230, and 187', respectively, on the Defendant's website) and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in her Motions mailed and/or docketed on 7-25-25, 4-28-25, 3-28-25, 7-11-24, and on 6-1-23 (Exhibits 260, 241, 236, 188, and 187', respectively, on the Defendant's website), which respond to these Findings and Orders of Judge S. Bailey, substantiate the Defendant's allegations that Judge D. Robinson Jr., indisputably, erred in his Findings and Order docketed on 8-25-25 because Judge D. Robinson Jr. doesn't cite a single legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-30-25 but continue to engage in Law Fare in breaching the same federal and state laws as Judge S. Bailey, the presiding Judge whose 7-14-25 Findings and Order the Defendant responds to in her 7-30-25 Motions, namely, that of breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by repeatedly and deliberately invading upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Maryland Rule 2-311.

For the 1st time, the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 8-25-25 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 7-30-25 Motions, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Findings and Order respond to, substantiate the allegations that Judge D. Robinson has erred in his Findings and Order in failing to consider, disclose, and resolve these material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions which substantiate that Judge S. Bailey has repeatedly and deliberately breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, namely, that: 1.) For the 4th time, Judge S. Bailey failed to consider, disclose, and resolve if the evidence substantiate Judge S. Bailey has 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 docketed on 7-14-25 any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-28-25, which include the allegations that Honorable Judge S. Bailey has repeatedly erred in failing to adhere to own Probation/Supervision Order and which further substantiate there is no legal or

factual basis for Judge S. Bailey's 7-14-25 denial in her Order of the Defendant's Motion 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. 2.) Judge S. Bailey is being alleged to have engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by: a.) failing to grant the Defendant her right, as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, to a hearing on her 4th Motion to Stay the execution of Expungement in Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety. b.) failing to 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 that Judge S. Bailey has, for the 4th time, erred in her Findings and Orders by 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. c.) failing to 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 that Judge S. Bailey has, for the 4th time, erred in her Findings and Orders by failing to adhere to her own 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 because the evidence of Judge S. Bailey's 4-page, 2-year

material fact to substantiate her Order. 3.) The evidence of Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders Again, these motions are respectfully DENIED, thereby, not asserting one shred of evidence or material fact to substantiate her Order. 3.) The evidence of Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders docketed on 7-14-25, 4-28-25, 4-2-25, 3-19-25, and on 6-24-25, and the evidence of the material facts asserted and legal arguments in the Defendant's the instant Motions, in her 7-30-25, 4-28-25, 3-28-25, 7-11-24 and in the Defendant's 6-1-23 Motions substantiate that, for the 4th time, Judge S. Bailey has erred in her Findings and Orders by 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 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. 4.) According to the Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 by Judge Bailey, the Defendant was ordered Probation before Judgment (Criminal Procedure Article & 6-220) for two years, with no supervision, to have no contact with the victim, Amy Penn, to surrender firearms, and could not own or possess a firearm during her probationary period. 5.) At

the Defendant's hearing on 5-20-21 germane to her criminal proceedings, Judge S. Bailey was the presiding Judge and the evidence in the record and the Defendant's testimony substantiate that the Complainant, the only witness for the opposing party, the State of Maryland, did not appear. Although the Complainant was a "no show", neither the Attorney representing the State of Maryland or the Defendant's Public Defender motioned to Judge S. Bailey for a dismissal of the charges against the Defendant. 6.) The Defendant is proclaiming that, at the beginning of the hearing held on 5-20-21, the Defendant's Public Defender motioned for "Probation before Judgment", which is a disposition where Judge S. Bailey deferred judgment, placed the Defendant on probation, and, thus, the Defendant did not plead guilty to a lesser charge or receiving a lighter


sentence in exchange for avoiding trial. 7.) The Defendant is declaring that, after she was granted the Motion for a "Probation before Judgment" by Judge S. Bailey, a few minutes later, the Defendant was given a document, which was the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order signed by Judge S. Bailey, and was told that it was necessary for the Defendant to read and sign the Probation/Supervision Order. 8.) Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21, 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order, which is "Exhibit I" that accompanies the Defendant's 2-28-25 Motions, is cited as Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website. 9.) The Defendant is alleging that the 2 Exhibits accompanying her Motions to Judge S. Bailey docketed on 7-11-24 include a copy of the Defendant's emailed Official Complaint to her Public Defender at the time on 11-7-20 and her 11-10-20 Official Complaint sent by certified mail to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, which are Exhibits 85 and 86 on the Defendant's website. 10.) The evidence of these 2 Exhibits which accompany the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-11-24 substantiate that Judge S. Bailey had access to the Defendant's website address, her Official Complaints against the State of Maryland, against the Baltimore County Police Department, and against other agencies, which allege, amongst other things, that the Defendant was the victim of brutal verbal assault by the Complainant and was in fear of her life due to the Complainant's dog, who was not on a leash, following her and the Complainant refusing to get her dog away from the Defendant. 11.) In the Defendant's Official Complaints, she alleges that the State of Maryland, the Police Department, and/or other agencies committed fraud, deceit, and tampered with evidence, which include someone moving the Defendant's gun from her gun case, sending the gun case back to the Defendant's residence by a police officer, and having someone place some of the Defendant's bullets on the ground after the Defendant was taken to the Police station. 12.) The material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-28-25, from which Judge S. Bailey responds to in her Findings and Order docketed on 7-14-25, and the material facts and legal arguments declared in her other Motions and/or as cited in the Defendant's 1-21-25 "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump include the following: 13.) During the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass, the presiding Judge, 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. 14.) 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. 15.) 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. 16.) 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. 17.) 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. 18.) The Defendant is alleging that, in her Motions docketed on 7-11-24 and in her Motions mailed, thereafter, she gives her website address in her Motions to substantiate material facts and legal arguments that are cited in the documents which are on her website and, thereby, Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson Jr., and the all of the former presiding Judges have access not only to these documents but, also, access to the Defendant's Motions relating to the Defendant's civil litigation in Baltimore City, where the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore (herein Wes Moore), the other former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged by the Defendant to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to impinge upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes.

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 4th day of September of 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1.) Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Order Docketed On 8-11-25, Which Is The Defendant's 9th Motion For A Hearing As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 In Order To Determine If The Evidence Substantiate That: A.) As The Presiding Judge And As The Judge-In-Charge Of 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 Invading Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) And Committing Fraud Upon The Court And, Thus, Deeming All Of

Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders Void As A Matter Of Law And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Because He Fails, For The 9th Time, To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge Because There Is An Appearance That Judge D. Robinson Jr. Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Since He Was Appointed To His Elite Administrative Positions In 2016 By Larry Hogan And In 2023 By Wes, Both Of Whom, Along With Martin O'Malley and Former Chief Judge Barbera, Are 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, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's Pleads To Our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump. B.) For the 1st Time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Has Committed Law Fare Due To Repeatedly And Deliberately Violating 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 And Has Erred By Failing To Consider, Disclose, And Resolve In His Findings And Order A Single Material Fact Or Legal Argument In The Defendant's Motions Docketed on 7-30-25, Which Include The Defendant's 4th Motion For Disqualification Against The Presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, Due To Her Repeatedly And Deliberately Violating The Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, 2nd Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Being Alleged To Have Breached The Same Federal And State Laws Cited Above Against Judge D. Robinson Jr. And, Thus, Judge D. Robinson Jr. Cites No Factual Or Legal Basis In His Findings And Order For His Denial Of The Defendant's Motions. 2.) 5th Motion For A Stay On Judge Glass' order To Execute Expungement Of The Defendant's Record Until The Criminal Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety 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

Diana Williams
131 Calver Hill Ct
Balto. Md. 21222

Circuit Court for Balto. County
County Courts Building
P.O. Box 6754
Rowson, Md. 21285-6754

Attention: Supervisory Clerk: Mrs. V. A.
mailed on 9-8-25



UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE

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

09/04/2025

10:33 AM

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

First-Class Mail®	1		
Letter			
Towson, MD 21235			
Weight: 0 lb 2.30 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Mon 09/08/2025			

First-Class Mail®	1		
Letter			
Towson, MD 21204			
Weight: 0 lb 2.30 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Mon 09/08/2025			

Grand Total: \$2.72

Cash \$20.00

Change -\$17.28

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

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.
to: <https://postalexperience.com/Post>
Scan this code with your mobile device.



or call 1-800-410-7420.

840-52100100-3-5411331-2
5-0013