

IN THE MATTER OF  
STATE OF MARYLAND

VS.

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

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

\*\*\*\*\*

MOTION FOR A HEARING ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE S. BAILEY'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 7-14-25, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S: 1.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) 4<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE S. BAILEY AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO HER BREACHING, FOR THE 4<sup>TH</sup> TIME, THE DEFENDANT'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242, AND ENGAGING IN LAW FARE BECAUSE JUDGE S. BAILEY HAS NOT ONLY REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY VIOLATED MARYLAND RULE 2-311 BUT HAS, ALSO, REPETITIOUSLY AND KNOWINGLY INVADED UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), AND, THUS, COMMITTED FRAUD UPON THE COURT AND, WHEREBY, DEEMING ALL OF HER ORDERS VOID, AS A MATTER OF LAW, AND OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT SINCE JUDGE S. BAILEY FAILS TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HERSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO THERE BEING AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE S. BAILEY WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED BECAUSE SHE WAS APPOINTED TO HER ELITE ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION IN 2009 BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO, ALONG WITH WES MOORE, LARRY HOGAN, 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 AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S PLEADS TO OUR 45<sup>TH</sup> – 47<sup>TH</sup> HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP. 3.) 4<sup>TH</sup> 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: Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge S. Bailey Order

Docketed On 7-14-25, Which Is The Defendant's: 1.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For A Hearing On Her Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Of Judge S. Bailey As The Presiding Judge Due To Her Breaching, For The 4<sup>th</sup> Time, The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, And Engaging In Law Fare Because Judge S. Bailey Has Not Only Repeatedly And Deliberately Violated Maryland Rule 2-311 But Has, Also, Repetitiously and Knowingly Invaded Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), And, Thus, Committed Fraud Upon The Court , And, Whereby, Deeming All Of Her Orders Void, As A Matter Of Law, And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Since Judge S. Bailey Fails To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Herself As The Presiding Judge Due To There Being An Appearance That Judge S. Bailey Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Because She Was Appointed To Her Elite Administrative Position In 2009 By Martin O'Malley, Who, Along With Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, 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 And These Violations Are Cited IN The Defendant's Pleds To Our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump. 3.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For A Stay On Judge Glass' Order To Execute Expungement Of The Defendants Record Until The Criminal Case I Resolved In Its Entirety 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 4<sup>th</sup> time, the Defendant is motioning for a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, which include the Defendant's instant Motion for a hearing on her Motion For Reconsideration of Judge S. Bailey's Order docketed on 7-14-25, which is the Defendant's 4<sup>th</sup> Motion for Disqualification of Judge s. Bailey. 2.) For the 4<sup>th</sup> time, Judge S. Bailey has engaged in Law fare by infringing upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Maryland Rule Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge S. Bailey would be biased and/or impartial since: a.) As alleged in the Defendant's Motions mailed and/or docketed on 4-28-25, 4-11-25, in her 12-26-24 Official Complaint to the Judicial Commission, and/or in the Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleds to our Hon. 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> President Trump (Exhibits 241, 236, 194, and 195 thru 199, respectively, on the Defendant's website), 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 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, since the Defendant's Motions were docketed on 7-10-24, total access to the Defendant's



website which details in her Motions the alleged Crimes Against Humanity against Martin O'Malley. **b.)** 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 since she was appointed to her distinct position by Martin O'Malley, who is being asserted in these 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. **c.)** Judge S. Bailey is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's instant Motions, in her 4-28-25 Motions, and in her other Motions, which are cited as Exhibits the Defendant's website, to have invaded upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. **3.)** For the 4<sup>th</sup> time, Judge S. Bailey is being alleged to have engaged in Law fare in impinging upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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. **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 4<sup>th</sup> time, erred in her Findings and Orders and justifies her denial of the Defendant's Motions by simply citing "**Once Again, these motions are respectfully DENIED**, thereby, not asserting one shred of evidence or a material fact to substantiate her Order. **4.)** For the 4<sup>th</sup> time, the evidence of the fact stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Order docketed on 7-14-25, which finally respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-28-25, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's 4-28-25 Motions substantiate that Judge S. Bailey continues to deliberately engage in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and the Defendant's 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 material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions substantiate sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's being granted her "Relief Requested" as afforded her under the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions. **5.)** For the 4<sup>th</sup> time, the Defendant is informing Judge S. Bailey that, on 1-21-25, she sent by certified mail her "Pleads" to our 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, which, amongst other things, request 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 Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities mailed on 12-16-24 and stated, again, in her "Pleads", namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the assertions that Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, and Judge Alexander have been engaged in Law fare by repetitiously and/or deliberately breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to committing "Fraud Upon the



Court" by infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and due to breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Maryland Rule 2-311.

## **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, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in 2nd Chronicles 19: 6-7, king Jehoshaphat, one of the kings of Judah, pronounces to judges why they should not be impartial and/or biased in their judgment, "And said to the Judges, Take heed what ye do: for ye judge not for man, but for the LORD, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of the LORD be upon you; take heed and do it; for there is no iniquity with the LORD our GOD, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts."

## **STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

As stated in the Defendant's Motions mailed and/or docketed on 4-28-25, 3-28-25, and on 7-11-24 (Exhibits 241, 236, and 188, respectively, on the Defendant's website) she is, because of financial hardship at this time, unable to afford the cost of printing copies of all of her numerous Official Complaints, Addendums to her Official Complaints, and other material evidence on her website that need to be submitted into the record as evidence to further substantiate the allegations that the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 have been repetitiously and/or intentionally violated by Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and by all of the former presiding Judges. Thus, it is the Defendant's request that, since she give the Exhibit Number on her website, www.dianarwilliams.com, to each of her signed and dated Motions, her Official Complaints, and other documents when citing the document in these Motions, that all of these documents be submitted as more evidence into the record of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County.

Relative to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), 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. 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 because there is an appearance that the presiding Judge would be bias and/or impartial.

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. Further, 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 ( *Liteky 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. Wherefore, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" 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 Order is void ab initio." 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. Moreover, on 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that there was an appearance of an Officer of the Court, the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial and, removed the Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an "appearance of impropriety" and declared that "this is the rare case in which disqualification is mandated and no other remedy will suffice to restore public confidence in the integrity of these proceedings."...

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 letters that were sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 to our 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump (Exhibits 195'-199, respectively, on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads, amongst other things, that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General of 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 to the Maryland Commission on Judicial Disabilities (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) 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 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions because Judge S Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and all of the former presiding Judges have engaged in Law fare by repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 prevents the Defendant from being granted her relief requested, namely, that of being granted her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets. Moreover, as cited in these instant Motions, as declared in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-28-25 and on 4-1-25, in her other Motions, and/or as proclaimed in the Defendant's "Pleads" to our 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, Judge S. Bailey, the presiding Judge, continues to intentionally engage in Law fare by redundantly and willingly invading upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 as substantiated by the following material facts and/or legal arguments: 1.) At the Defendant's hearing on 5-20-21 germane to her criminal proceedings, Judge S. Bailey was the presiding Judge. 2.) The Defendant asserts that at the criminal proceedings held on 5-20-21, the Complainant and only witness for the opposing party, the State of Maryland, did not appear for the hearing. 3.) The Defendant alleges that, although the Complainant was a "no show" at the 5-20-21 criminal proceedings, 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. 4.) 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. 5.) 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. 6.) Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21, 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order, which is "Exhibit 1" that accompanies the Defendant's 2-28-25 Motions, is cited as Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website. 7.) The Defendant is alleging that the 2 Exhibits accompanying her Motions to Judge S. Bailey docketed on 7-11-24 include a copies 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 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, which are Exhibits 85 and 86 on the Defendant's website. 8.) 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. 9.) 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 Defendants bullets on the ground after the Defendant was taken to the Police station. 10.) The Defendant is declaring that the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders docketed on 7-14-25, 4-2-25, 3-19-25, and on 6-25-24, (Exhibits 259, 237, 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) and substantiate the Defendant's allegations that Judge S. Bailey continues to use Law fare because she has, for the 4<sup>th</sup> time, refused 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 substantiate the allegations that 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 ammunitions since the evidence substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully completed all of the mandates in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order. **11.)** 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 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump include the following: **a.)** 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. **b.)** 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. **c.)** At the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's Motions, after granting the Defendant's Motion to have her record expunged, Judge Glass informed the Defendant that she has to Order a Stay on the granting of the Defendant's expungement in order to allow the Motion for the granting of the Defendant's legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions to be resolved before Judge S. Bailey, otherwise, without the Stay on her Order for expungement of the Defendant's record, the Defendant would not be able to have a hearing on Motion for repossessing her firearm and 15 ammunitions or file any other Motion because an expungement implies that the case no longer exists. **d.)** During the 6-9-24 hearing, Judge Glass stated that she would put a Stay on her Order so that the issue of repossessing the Defendant's firearm and 15 ammunitions could be brought before Judge S. Bailey. **12.)** As evidenced by the Defendant's Motions which were docketed on 7-10-24 (Exhibit 188 on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads her 1<sup>st</sup> Motion to Stay the 30-day Stay on Judge Glass' 6-13-24 Order prior to the expiration of Judge Glass' 30 day Stay on the Defendant's expungement of her record. **13.)** The evidence of Judge S. Bailey's 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order dated 5-20-21, the evidence 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 4-28-25, 3-28-25, 7-11-24 and 6-1-23 Motions substantiate that, for the 4<sup>th</sup> 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 Motions mailed and/or docketed on 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. **14.)** 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. **15.)** For the 4<sup>th</sup> time, Judge S. Bailey has engaged in Law fare by infringing upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Maryland Rule Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge S. Bailey would be biased and/or impartial since: **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 4-28-25 and in her other Motions, and/or in the Defendant's Motions displayed as "Exhibits" on the Petitioner's website from her present 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 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.)** Judge S. Bailey was 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 Motions, which are cited as Exhibits her website, to have invaded upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. **16.)** For the 4<sup>th</sup> time, Judge S. Bailey is being alleged to have engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 bullets, the Defendant had completely and successfully complied to Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order. **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 4<sup>th</sup> time, erred in her Findings and Orders and justifies her denial of the Defendant's Motions by simply citing "Once Again, these motions are respectfully DENIED, thereby, not asserting one shred of evidence or material fact to substantiate her Order. **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 ammunitions. **18.)** For the 4<sup>th</sup> time, Judge S. Bailey has engaged in Law fare by violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching Maryland Rule 2-311 by failing to grant the Defendant's her right to a hearing on her Motions. **19.)** The Defendant's 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. **b.)** Judge S. Bailey, the presiding Judge, should be knowledgeable of the material fact that she should voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding judge over the Defendant’s Motions docketed on „4-1-25, on 7-11-24, and over these instant Motions because Judge S. Bailey is the Judge who is being alleged in all of these Motions to have invaded upon the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, the Defendant’s Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 2-18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). **20.)** On 12-13-24, after researching the background of Judge S. Bailey, the Defendant discovered that she was appointed to an elite position as a Circuit Court Judge for Baltimore County in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. After researching the background of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. it was revealed that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his elite Administrative position in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, and was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore. Moreover, Judge Glass, one of the former presiding Judges, was appointed to her superlative Administrative by Martin O'Malley in 2014. Still too, another of the former presiding Judges, Judge Alexander was, too, appointed by Martin O'Malley in 2010. **21.)** 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,,,,, 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: **i.)** allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades. **ii.)** 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. **iii.)** 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/ other criminal acts and, in some



instances, for over 25 years. iv.) 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.

## **ARGUMENT**

In terms of any Officer of the Court, which includes judges, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11 in relation to judges being impartial and/or biased and, thereby, proclaims , **“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.”**

If Judge S. Bailey would grant the Defendant’s repeated Motions for a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland 2-311, then Judge S. Bailey would have the opportunity to provide tangible evidence to substantiate sufficient legal or factual basis for her repeated denials of the Defendant’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, namely, to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions. The evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge S. Bailey has, for the 4<sup>th</sup> time, has 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, 7-11-24, 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 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> 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’s has successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey. Furthermore, the Defendant is confident that Judge S. Bailey is cognizant of the material facts that, if she denies the Defendant’s 3rd Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass’ 6-13-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant’s record, then: **1.)** Judge S. Bailey would not have to grant the Defendant’s right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland 2-311 because without a Stay on the execution of expungement of the Defendant’s Motion, the Defendant’s criminal case would no longer exist. **2.)** Judge S. Bailey would not have to consider, disclose, and resolve during the hearing on the Defendant’s Motion the issue of whether the evidence of Judge S. Bailey’s 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 substantiate that Judge S. Bailey failed to adhere to her own Probation/Supervision Order and, consequently, erred in that there is no legal or factual basis for Judge S. Bailey denying the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to failing to grant the Defendant’s relief requested, namely, that of granting the Defendant’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions since the evidence in the record, indisputably substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the




Defendant has successfully complied with all of the requirement in Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21 4-page 2-year Probation/Supervision Order. 3.) Judge S. Bailey would have to consider, disclose, and resolve during the hearing whether, for the 4<sup>th</sup> time, she has breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> 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) because under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) it is mandated that Judge S. Bailey voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding Judge and that all of Orders be deemed void as a matter of law and, thus, be of no legal force or effect 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 4-28-25 and in her other Motions, and/or in the Defendant's Motions displayed as "Exhibits" on the Petitioner's website, from her present 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 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.) Judge S. Bailey was 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 Motions, which are cited as Exhibits her website, to have invaded upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311.

### 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 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: Motion For A Hearing On Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge S. Bailey Order Docketed On 7-14-25, Which Is The Defendant's: 1.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For A Hearing On Her Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Of Judge S. Bailey As The Presiding Judge Due To Her Breaching, For The 4<sup>th</sup> Time, The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, And Engaging In Law Fare Because Judge S. Bailey Has Not Only Repeatedly And Deliberately Violated Maryland Rule 2-311 But Has, Also, Repetitiously and Knowingly Invaded Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), And, Thus, Committed Fraud Upon The Court , And, Whereby, Deeming All Of Her Orders Void, As A Matter Of Law, And Of No Legal Force Or Effect Since Judge S. Bailey Fails To Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Herself As The Presiding Judge Due To There Being An Appearance That Judge S. Bailey Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased Because She Was Appointed To Her Elite Administrative Position In 2009 By Martin O'Malley, Who, Along With Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, 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 And These Violations Are Cited IN The Defendant's Pleads To Our 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump. 3.) 4<sup>th</sup> Motion For A Stay On Judge Glass' Order To Execute Expungement Of The Defendants Record Until The Criminal Case I 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 45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, and U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney M. Hayes