

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 Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner is that: 1.) Under Maryland Rule 2-507, the Petitioner can file, before 30 days, a Motion for Reinstatement of her civil case and articulate reasons why dismissal should be set aside, and the Court, for good cause shown, may reinstate the party's civil case. The Petitioner's 3 most

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: 1.) 1st Motion To Reinstate The Petitioner's Civil Case, Namely, Continuing With Having A Judge Preside Over The Petitioner's 3 Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24 And Over Her Motions Filed On 11-1-23. 2.) Motion To Compel Another Administrative Judge, Not Appointed By Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, And/Or By Former Chief Judge Barbera, To Preside Over Assigning A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, And Not Appointed By Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24 And Over Her Motions Filed On 11-1-23. 3.) Motion For A Hearing On Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 based on the grounds and authorities cited below:

23. 3.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311

1.) 1st MOTION TO REINSTATE THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL CASE, NAMELY, CONTINUING WITH HAVING A JUDGE PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 3 SEPARATE MOTIONS FILED ON 12-26-24 AND OVER HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-23. 2.) MOTION TO COMPEL ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, NOT APPOINTED BY WES MOORE, LARRY HOGAN, MARTIN O'MALLEY, AND/OR BY FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND NOT APPOINTED BY WES MOORE, LARRY HOGAN, MARTIN O'MALLEY, AND/OR BY JUDGE BARBERA, TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 3 SEPARATE MOTIONS FILED ON 12-26-24 AND OVER HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

BALTIMORE CITY

FOR

CIRCUIT COURT

IN THE

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

THE PETITION OF

IN THE MATTER

2025 FEB 18 AM 10:55

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

INTRODUCTION

recent Motions filed on 12-26-24 substantiates that the Petitioner's civil litigation is still ongoing, which are the Petitioner's latest docket entries, which were filed in response to Judge Dorsey, Charles III's 12-5-24 Findings and Orders. 2.) The Petitioner has been waiting for a new Administrative Judge, who is not appointed to his/her elite Administrative position by the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore ("Wes Moore"), by the two former Governors of Maryland, Larry Hogan and Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, to preside over assigning a panel of 3 in Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution for appeals in an in Banc Review, and who are, also, not appointed by these present and/or past government officials, to preside over her in Banc Review because Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged in the Petitioner's 12-26-24 Motions, in her other Motions, and in her 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission to have infringed upon 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. 3.) For the 3rd time, the Petitioner is motioning for the Disqualification of Judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over her civil case, as well as motioning for the Disqualification of the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge Schreiber, II, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, due to allegations that these Officers of the Court have redundantly and/or intentionally breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 since, in addition to repeatedly and/or deliberately violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311, they have, also, repetitiously and/or willingly infringed upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, and all of the presiding Judges would be biased and/or impartial due to their distinguished appointments to Administrative positions by Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 12-26-24 Motions, in other Motions, and in her 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission to have infringed upon 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. 4.) For the 1st time, the Petitioner is motioning for a hearing on her Motions.

the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD'S: and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it."

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying the bill to maintain her website, www.danarwiliams.com, so that the Petitioner can continue to post Motions, Findings and Orders from the presiding Judges, and other relevant Exhibits in the Petitioner's civil litigation, which began in 2017. Although she is on a fixed income, the Petitioner is now able to make her monthly payments, but can't afford to, at this time, make copies of all of the pages of all of the Exhibits that need to be included with these Motions. Thus, it is the Petitioner's request that, since she gives the Exhibit Number on her website to each of my signed and dated Motions and other documents when citing the document, copies of these Exhibits be made and that all of these documents be submitted as more evidence into the record of the Clerk of the Court, namely, Mr. X. Conaway.

The Petitioner's civil case, which is on appeal in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court, is still ongoing as evidenced by the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 (Exhibits 215, 216, and 217, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), of which the Petitioner mailed copies of to the Clerk of the Court on 12-26-24, as evidenced by the Findings and Orders docketed on 12-5-24 from the presiding Judge, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III (Exhibit 213 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24 (Exhibits 180, 181, 182, and 183, respectively on the Petitioner's website), and as evidenced by her Motions filed on 11-14-24, which include the Petitioner's 1st Motion for Disqualification of Judge Dorsey (Exhibit 187 on the Petitioner's website). Also, as evidenced by the material facts stated in these Motions, prior to receiving the Notice Of Contemplated Dismissal (Lack Of Prosecution) in September of 2024 and the ORDER that deferred the Order of Dismissal from the Clerk of the Court (Exhibits 184 and 185, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner was waiting for Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, to assign a Judge to preside over her 11-1-23 Motions (Exhibits 155 and 156, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Findings and Order of the presiding Judge at the time, namely, Judge M. Schreiber, II (Exhibit 154 on the Petitioner's website), whose Findings and Order respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions (Exhibits 147 and 148, respectively, on the Petitioner's website). As cited in the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, as stated in her 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24, as declared in her 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities, and/or as asserted in the Petitioner's Pleads to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump in the Attachment of additional facts as supported by the evidence to the Commission for Judicial Disabilities ("Commission"), the evidence of the facts stated in and/or the lack thereof of facts asserted in the Findings and Order of the presiding Judge, Judge Schreiber, II docketed on 10-20-23 (Exhibit 154 on the Petitioner's website) and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions substantiate the allegations that Judge M. Schreiber fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Findings and Order, which respond to the Petitioner's 9-8-23 Motions (Exhibits 147 and 148, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), any of the

material facts and legal arguments that support the Petitioner's allegations in her 9-8-23 Motions. Moreover, as stated in these documents, the material facts and legal arguments substantiate that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, the Petitioner's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 were breached by Judge Fletcher-Hill as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to civil cases and as one of the presiding Judges in her initial civil litigation and in the Petitioner's present appeal in the In Banc Review, and by the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge Schreiber, II, and by all of the other former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge Karen Friedman, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge J. Rubin, and by Judge J. Nugent. The Heading in one of the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 is entitled "1.) 1st MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND THAT HIS 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 BE DEEMED VOID AND OF NO EFFECT UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE. 2.) MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311".

As evidenced in second of the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, the Heading is entitled "1.) 1st MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE PETITIONER'S 2ND MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT AND 1st HER MOTION TO DETERMINE IF THE PETITIONER SHOULD BE GRANTED ALL OF HER MOTIONS BECAUSE: A.) THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III'S 4 SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 MUST BE DEEMED AS VOID AND OF NO EFFECT AS MANDATED UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) DUE TO: 1.) JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III FAILING TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AS DECREED UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE

SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT HE HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR BY WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE. B.) THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATING THAT JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL HAS INFRINGED UPON THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 SINCE 2018 DUE TO HIS REPETITIOUSLY AND INTENTIONALLY BREACHING: I.) FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(A), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND HAS

As evidenced in third of the Petitioner's 3rd separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, the Hearing is entitled "1.) 1ST MOTION TO HAVE ANOTHER ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE, WHO WAS NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER ASSIGNING AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, AND TO, ALSO, ASSIGN JUDGES WHO WERE NOT APPOINTED BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, LARRY HOGAN, AND/OR WES MOORE TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 1ST MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE IMMEDIATE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL CASE, WHICH INCLUDE DISQUALIFICATION FROM PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER HER INSTANT MOTIONS, HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-14-24, 10-15-24, AND ON 11-1-23 DUE TO: A.) THE DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III AND HIS 4TH SEPARATE FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 12-16-24 BEING DEEMED AS VOID AND OF NO EFFECT AS MANDATED UNDER FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) SINCE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III HAS VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNTIL 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE, AMONGST OTHER THINGS, THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III WOULD BE BIASED AND/OR IMPARTIAL AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE DUE TO BEING APPOINTED IN 2016 BY LARRY HOGAN, WHO, ALONG WITH MARTIN O'MALLEY, FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, AND/OR BY WES MOORE, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THESE INSTANT MOTIONS AND OTHER MOTIONS TO HAVE IMPINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO TRESPASS FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE. III) THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 WERE INFRINGED UPON SINCE SHE ATTENDED THE REMOTE HEARING OVER THE TELEPHONE AND WAS DISCONNECTED TWICE AFTER WAITING FOR NEARLY 3 HOURS FOR THE 12-6-24-SCHEDULED HEARING ON HER 11-1-23 MOTIONS, ON HER 3RD SEPARATE 10-15-24 MOTIONS, AND ON HER 12-14-24 MOTIONS. B.) THE DEFENDANT FAILED TO ATTEND THE 12-6-24 REMOTE-SCHEDULED HEARING ON THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS. C.) THE PETITIONER DID ATTEND THE 12-6-24 REMOTE-SCHEDULED HEARING BY TELEPHONE. 2.) MOTIONS FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311".

Moreover, as asserted in the Petitioner's 1-28-25 Plead to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump and/or as declared in her 2nd Addendum to the Petitioner's 2-18-20 Official Complaint, the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 and/or declared in her 11-1-23 Motions, 4 Motions which have yet to be presided over, also, substantiate that: 1.) The Petitioner's civil case is still ongoing and should be reinstated. 2.) The material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions substantiate the allegations that Judge-Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over civil cases, should be disqualified from presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation. 3.) A panel of 3 Judges must preside over the Petitioner's in Banc Review as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 4.) As repeatedly motioned by the Petitioner, only Judges who are not appointed to their privileged positions by Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera be assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil case because the present and/or former government officials are being alleged in the Petitioner's 12-26-24 Motions, in her other Motions, and in her 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission to have infringed upon 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. 5.) Judge Fletcher-Hill, the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge Schreiber II, and all of the other former presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, have repeatedly and/or deliberately breached the Petitioner's 14th 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, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311. 6.) Thus far, all of the presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill himself, were assigned by Judge Fletcher-Hill to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation, although as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Petitioner's civil case (who assigned himself as a presiding Judge over 8 of the

COMMITTED “FRAUD UPON THE COURT”, TREASON TO THE CONSTITUTION, AND INTERFERENCE WITH INTERSTATE COMMERCE BECAUSE JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL FAILED TO VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S CIVIL LITIGATION AS A RESULT OF THERE BEING AN APPEARANCE THAT HE WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED DUE TO HIS ELITE APPOINTMENT IN 2009 BY MARTIN O'MALLEY, WHO IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE INFRINGED UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE AND/OR HAS ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAS CONSPIRED TO INFRINGE UPON FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE. !!!) MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (c) IN PRESIDING OVER 4 MOTIONS IN THE PETITIONER'S APPEAL IN THE IN BANC REVIEW ALTHOUGH JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL WAS ONE OF THE PRESIDING JUDGES OVER THE PETITIONER'S INITIAL CIVIL LITIGATION. !!!) ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION IN FAILING TO HAVE A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS FROM HER APPEAL IN THE BANC REVIEW AND TO GRANT THE PETITIONER AN ORAL HEARING BEFORE THE PANEL DECIDED TO DENY THE PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR AN IN BANC REVIEW. iv.) MARYLAND RULE 2-311 IN FAILING TO GRANT THE PETITIONER HER RIGHT TO HAVE A HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) MOTION TO HAVE HEARING ON THE INSTANT MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311”.

Petitioner's Motions) and all of the other presiding Judges, as Officers of the Court, knew and/or should have known upon reading the Petitioner's Motions, that, under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), they should have voluntarily disqualified and recused themselves because there is an appearance that Judge Fletcher-Hill, as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to the Petitioner's civil litigation, and all of the other presiding Judges he assigned to preside over my civil litigation, which includes assigning himself twice as one of the presiding Judges, would be impartial and/or biased due to their distinguished appointments by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan

and/or by Wes Moore because these present and/or former government officials are being alleged to have invaded 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. Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed to the elite position as an Administrative Judge in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. Judge John Nugent was appointed to his distinctive position in the Circuit Court in Baltimore City in 2016 and, although his term expired in 2019, Judge John Nugent was appointed as one of the Judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera in 2017. Judge J. Geller was, also, appointed by Martin O'Malley to the elite position of an Administrative Judge in May of 2012. One of the two presiding Judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation, Judge M. Schreiber II, was appointed to the honored position as an Administrative Judge 2022 by another former Governor of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan. And, the other presiding Judge over the Petitioner's present appeal in the In Banc Review, Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III, was, too, appointed to the superlative Administrative position by Larry Hogan in 2016. Judge Michel Pierson was appointed in 2013 by Chief Judge Barbera, who is being proclaimed in the Petitioner's 9-17-18 Motions, in other Motions, and in her 2017 Civil Complaint to have willingly fractured the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of her deliberately committing the prejudicial error of perjury. Judge Carrion's appointment by Chief Judge Barbera as an Administrative Judge for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City became effective on January 12, 2020. Judge Mellissa Phinn was appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore City in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. Judge Julie Rubin was, also, appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O'Malley on December 28, 2012. As stated in the Petitioner's Motions, there was public acknowledgement in a local newspaper of the close relationship among the panel of In Banc Judges and the former presiding Judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman. The first presiding Judge over my 2017 Civil Complaint, namely, Judge Karen Friedman was appointed to her privileged position as an Administrative Judge in 2014 by Martin O'Malley. 7.) In their Opinion, 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 Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an "appearance of impartiality" 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." 8.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in over all appeal in the In Banc Review knew and/or should have known that he/she should have set aside his/her judgment and deem his/her Findings and Order void and of no effect as a matter of law, namely,

under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a.) because there is an appearance that he/she would be biased and/or impartial as a result of being appointed to the prestige Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley, former Chief Judge Barbera, Larry Hogan, and/or Wes Moore, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in her other Motions filed on 12-23-24, in her Motions filed on 12-14-24, in the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions dated 10-15-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint to have infringed upon 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. 9.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or over her appeal in the In Banc Review knew and/or should have known that, in the Petitioner's instant Motions, in her 3 individual Motions filed on 10-15-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23 in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities against Judge Fletcher-Hill, against Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, and against all of the 8 other presiding, she has alleged that, due to the 2015 intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Judge Barbera, the issues raised in the Petitioner's 2015 appeal to the Court of Appeals have yet to be disclosed, considered, and resolved, which include the allegations that, in 2014, the In Banc Judges from the Circuit Court intentionally committed perjury, violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that, in 2014, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of assigning Judges to preside over my present civil litigation, as the presiding Judge during this time deliberately violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C. & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' Motions to dismiss the Petitioner's 2014 Civil Complaint. 10.) The Petitioner asserts that each of these presiding Judges, which include Judge Fletcher-Hill, knew and/or should have known that denying, unlawfully, the Petitioner's Motions, especially the Petitioner's Motion to dismiss the Defendant's Motion to dismiss her Civil complaint, he/she would prevent the Petitioner from having the opportunity to move forward to Discovery in her civil litigation, which include the evidence to substantiate the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions and/or Civil Complaint and that would be revealed during her requested jury trial, namely, that the evidence would substantiate, unequivocally, that Martin O'Malley, Kurk Schmoke, Larry Hogan, former Chief Judge Barbera, Wes Moore, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 11.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other Judges he assigned to preside over the Petitioner's civil litigation, from Judge Michel Pierson to the presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber II, knew and/or should have known that they were deliberately and/or continuously impinging upon Maryland Rule 2-311 because each of these Judges failed to grant the Petitioner's right to a hearing as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, but have deprived the Petitioner of her right to a hearing on the Motions, even though the Petitioner pleaded for hearing on her Motions in all of her Motions filed since 12-17-18. 12.) Judge Fletcher-Hill, the two presiding Judges, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III and Judge M. Schreiber II, and all of the former presiding Judges Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned to preside over the Petitioner's appeal in the In Banc Review of her initial civil litigation, knew and/or

The Heading in the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions is entitled "1st MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION AGAINST JUDGE M. SCHREIBER II FOR VIOLATING THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND

such acts.

and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce. Since both treason engaged in treason to the Constitution, which suggests that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution or if he/she acts without jurisdiction, then that judge has law. Still too, the Supreme Court has held that, if a judge wars against the Constitution in breaching the the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio." Further, the Supreme Court has decided that, have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not of office. Wherefore, the U.S. Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the of partiality" and has possibly disqualified himself/herself. Moreover, the Courts have affirmed that, if a judge not accept the disqualification of the judge, then the second judge has evidenced an "appearance could potentially further disqualify the judge. Further, the Court have determined that, should another required by law, then the judge has given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which 1147, 1162 (1994). The Court has, too, affirmed that, should a judge not disqualify himself/herself as observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality (Liteky v. U.S., 114 S.Ct. in 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court held that disqualification of a judge is mandatory if an objective 362 U.S. 610, 80 S.Ct. 1038 (1960), citing Offutt v. United States, 348 U.S. 11, 14, 75 S.Ct. 11, 13 (1954). reaffirmed the principle that "justice must satisfy the appearance of justice", Levine v. United States, have known that, germane to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), the Supreme Court has ruled and Petitioner's initial civil litigation and/or in over her appeal in the In Banc Review knew and/or should government. 14.) Judge Fletcher-Hill and all of the other judges he assigned to preside over the of the federal government, and the 14th Amendment protects them from actions by state and local life, liberty, or property, without due process of law. The 5th Amendment protects people from actions the phrase in the 5th and 14th Amendments, declaring that the government shall not deprive anyone of in both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The Constitution uses judge's decision will be biased. In the United States Constitutional Law, a Due Process Clause is found financial interest in the case's outcome and where there is otherwise a strong possibility that the require judges to recuse themselves from cases in two situations, namely, where the judge has a 22 of the Maryland Constitution. 13.) The written Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution b.) her right to have 3 judges presiding over the Petitioner's In Banc Review as stipulated in Article IV & Maryland Constitution, to: a.) an oral hearing before deciding to deny or grant the Petitioner's Petition. Maryland Constitution in failing to grant the Petitioner's right, as permitted under Article IV & 22 of the should have known that they were intentionally and/or repetitiously breaching Article IV & 22 of the

FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(A). 5.) 1TH MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 6.) 7TH MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION. 7.) 3RD MOTION TO SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT FILED ON 3-23-23 SINCE THERE IS NO WRITTEN OR STAMPED SIGNATURE OF JUDGE JOHN NUGENT ON THE 3-21-23 FINDINGS AND ORDER. 8.) 4TH MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF THE CIVIL DIVISION, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, ORDER THE CLERK TO FILE ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE THE HEADING OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS VERBATIM".

Moreover, as proclaimed in the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, as declared in her 3 separate Motions filed on 10-15-24, as declared in her 12-23-24 Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities, and/or as asserted in the Petitioner's Pleads to our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump in the Attachment of additional material facts as supported by the evidence to the Commission for Judicial Disabilities ("Commission"), since filing his Motion on 2-4-20 (Exhibit 76 on the Petitioner's website), the Defendant has remained acquiescence in relation to responding to any of the Petitioner's colossal Motions filed since 2-13-20, which, again, include the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 12-26-24. However, on 12-5-24, Judge Dorsey, Charles, II denied the Petitioner's 1st Motion for Default Judgment against the Defendant filed on 10-15-24, although the Defendant did not respond to the Petitioner's 10-15-24 Motions, nor has the Defendant responded to the Petitioner's 12-26-24 Motions, which includes the Petitioner's 2nd Motion for Default Judgment against the Defendant. Further, the evidence substantiates the material facts that Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Judge-in-Charge of the Civil Division in the Circuit Court: a.) has not assigned a Judge to preside over the Petitioner's 3 separate and most recently filed Motions dated 12-26-24, nor has Judge Fletcher-Hill assigned a Judge to preside over the Petitioner's 11-1-23 Motions. b.) has not once ORDERED the Defendant to respond to the any of the Petitioner's numerous Motions filed in the Circuit Court since the Petitioner filed her 2-13-20 Motions.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Petitioner is pleading that her Motions be granted, otherwise she motions to be granted her right to a hearing on her Motions

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

20 FEB 18 AM 10:59

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 18th day of February 2025, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner's: 1.) 1st Motion To Reinstate The Petitioner's Civil Case, Namely, Continuing With Having A Judge Preside Over The Petitioner's 3 Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24 And Over Her Motions Filed On 11-1-23, 2.) Motion To Compel Another Administrative Judge, Not Appointed By Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, And/Or by Former Chief Judge Barbera, To Preside Over Assigning A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, And Not Appointed By Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, Martin O'Malley, And/Or By Judge Barbera, To Preside Over The Petitioner's 3 Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24 And Over Her Motions Filed On 11-1-23, 3.) Motion For A Hearing On Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311 was mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd., Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.

Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

2025 FEB 18 AM 10:55

Cc: 45th-47th Hon. President Trump and the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney for the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, and the newly appointed U.S Attorney for Maryland