

IN THE MATTER
THE PETITION OF
DIANA R. WILLIAMS

* IN THE
*
* CIRCUIT COURT
*
* FOR
*
* BALTIMORE CITY
* Case No. 24-C-17-004535

2025 APR 10 11:13:33

- 1.) MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE J. NUGENT'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 4-10-25, WHICH MEANS THE PETITIONER'S: A.) 2ND MOTION TO REINSTATE HER CIVIL CASE BECAUSE THE EVIDENCE SUBSTANTIATE THAT JUDGE J. NUGENT HAS, UNEQUIVOCALLY, ERRED IN HIS FINDINGS AND ORDER IN THAT THERE IS NO LEGAL OR FACTUAL BASIS FOR HIS DENIAL OF THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR A REINSTATEMENT OF HER CIVIL CASE, WHICH INCLUDES HAVING A PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES AS MANDATED UNDER ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION TO PRESIDE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 3 SEPARATE MOTIONS FILED ON 12-26-24 AND OVER HER MOTIONS FILED ON 11-1-23 IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF JUDGE J. NUGENT, JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, JUDGE DORSEY, CHARLES, III, JUDGE SCHREIBER, II, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES HAVE ENGAGED IN LAW FARE BY REPETITIOUSLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY BREACHING THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO INFRINGING UPON ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5(C), AND/OR MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE PETITIONER'S 1-28-25 "PLEADS" TO OUR 45TH - 47TH HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP. B.) 2ND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311. 2.) 1ST MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE J. NUGENT AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE OVER THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION DUE TO HIS BEING ALLEGED IN THE PETITIONER'S INSTANT MOTIONS AND IN HER 4 SEPARATE MOTIONS TO HAVE BREACHED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 BY ENGAGING IN LAW FARE DUE TO REPEATEDLY AND/OR INTENTIONALLY INFRINGING UPON MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), THE FEDERAL LAW THAT MANDATES JUDGE J. NUGENT VOLUNTARILY DISQUALIFY AND RECUSE HIMSELF AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND THAT HIS ORDERS BE DEEMED VOID AS A MATTER OF LAW AND, THUS, OF NO LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT DUE TO THERE BEING AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE J. NUGENT WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIASED AS A RESULT OF BEING APPOINTED TO HIS ELITE ADMINISTRATIVE POSITION IN 2017 BY

FORMER CHIEF JUDGE BARBERA, WHO, ALONG WITH THE PRESENT GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND, WES MOORE, AND THE FORMER GOVERNORS OF MARYLAND, NAMELY, MARTIN O'MALLEY AND LARRY HOGAN, IS BEING ALLEGED IN THE PETITIONER'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

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Petitioner's: **1.)** Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge J. Nugent's Order Docketed on 4-10-25, Which Means The Petitioner's: **A.)** 2nd Motion To Reinstate The Petitioner's Civil Case Because The Evidence Substantiate That Judge J. Nugent Has, Unequivocally, Erred In His Findings And Order In That There Is No Legal Or Factual Basis For His Basis For His Denial Of The Petitioner's Motion For Reinstatement Of Her Civil Case, Which Include Having A Panel Of **3** In Banc Judges As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution To Preside Over The Petitioner's **3** Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24 And Over Her Motions Filed On 11-1-23 To Determine If Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III Judge Schreiber, II, And **All** Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Engaged In Law Fare By Repetitiously And/Or Intentionally Breaching The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Infringing Upon Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), And/Or Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In The Petitioner's 1-28-25 "Pleads" To Our 45-47th Hon. President Trump. **B.)** 2nd Motion For A Hearing On The Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311. **2.)** 1st Motion For Disqualification Of Judge J. Nugent As The Presiding Judge Over The Petitioner's Motion For Reconsideration Due To His Being Alleged In The Petitioner's Instant Motions And In her **4** Separate Motions To Have Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Engaging In Law Fare Due To Repeatedly And/Or Intentionally Infringing Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, Maryland Rule 2-311, And Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), The Federal Law That Mandates Judge J. Nugent Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge And That His Orders BE Deemed Void As A Matter Of Law And, Thus, Of No Legal Force Or Effect Due To There Being An Appearance That Judge J. Nugent Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased As A Result Of Being Appointed To His Elite Administrative Position In 2017 By Former Chief Judge Barbera, Who, Aong With The Present Governor Of Maryland, Wes Moore, And The Former Governors of Maryland, namely, Martin O'Malley and Larry Hogan, Is Being alleged In The Petitioner'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 Violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Criminal Acts 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 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.)** For the 2nd time, the Petitioner is asserting that the material facts and legal arguments in her 2-19-25 Motion for Reinstatement of her civil case substantiate she has articulated in detail reasons why her dismissal should be set aside, that her civil case should be reinstated according to Maryland Rule 2-507, and, thus, Judge J. Nugent has engaged in Law Fare and deliberately erred in his Findings and Order because there is no legal or factual basis in his Findings docketed on 4-10-25 for denying the Petitioner's Motion For Reinstatement of her civil case, which include a having a panel of **3** In Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution to preside over the Petitioner's **3** separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 and over her Motions filed on 11-1-23 in order to determine if **Judge J. Nugent**, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Dorsey , Judge Schreiber II, and **all** of the other former presiding Judges have engaged in Law Fare by repeatedly and/or deliberately breaching the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to redundantly and/or intentionally 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. **2.)** For the 1st time, the presiding Judge who denied the Petitioner's Motion for Reinstatement of her Civil Case on 4-10-25, namely, Judge J. Nugent, is, also, one of the Judges with whom the Petitioner has motioned for disqualification in her civil case and in these instant Motions since the evidence in the record substantiate that Judge J. Nugent have repetitiously and/or willingly engaged in Law Fare by infringing upon the Petitioner's 14th 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 & 28 455(a) because: **a.) There is an appearance that Judge J. Nugent would be biased and/or impartial due** to his distinguished appointment to his Administrative position by former Chief Judge Barbera , who along with the present Governor, Wes Moore, the two former Governors of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, and Larry Hogan, is being alleged in the Petitioner's 4 Motions, in other Motions, and in her 1-28-24 "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump to have infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes, **and** the dismissal of the Petitioner's civil case against the Defendant would prevent the Petitioner from having the opportunity to move forward to Discovery and, ultimately, to her requested jury trial in her civil litigation, where the evidence would be revealed to the public to substantiate the material facts that the Defendant breached their verbal contract and that, indisputably, substantiate that Martin O'Malley, 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. **b.)** Judge J. Nugent is one of the former presiding Judges in the Petitioner's civil case, the civil case in which Judge J. Nugent has denied reinstatement, that is being alleged to have engaged in Law Fare by repeatedly and/or knowingly violating the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result continuously and willingly invading upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the

Maryland Constitution, Maryland Rule 2-311, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a). **3.)** For the 2nd time, the Petitioner is asserting that her **4** most recent Motions filed on 12-26-24 and 11-1-23 substantiate that the Petitioner's civil litigation is still ongoing, which are the Petitioner's latest docket entries, which were filed in response to Judge Schreiber II's 10-20-23 Findings and Order and Judge Dorsey, Charles III's 12-5-24 Findings and Orders . **4.)** For the 2nd time, the Petitioner is motioning for a hearing on her Motions.

INTRODUCTION

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Defendant believes that our great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their ruling, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11, "And the LORD spake into Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend", and Moses informed the judges in Israel of GOD'S law and employed the judges over the various tribes in Israel in Judges 6:16-17, saying, "And, I charged your judges at that time, saying. Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear the small as well as the great: ye shall not be afraid of the face of man: for the judgement is GOD'S: and, the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it."

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

For the second time, the Petitioner is alleging that the evidence in the record, unequivocally, substantiate that her 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, for the 2nd time, the Petitioner is asserting that she should be granted her Motion for Reinstatement of her civil case because she has shown good cause under Maryland Rule 2-507 why her dismissal should be set aside and that her civil case should be reinstated. Further the Petitioner is asserting that the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in her Motion for Reinstatement filed on 2-19-25 and the evidence of the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge J. Nugent's Findings docketed on 4-10-25, which respond to the Petitioner's Motions, substantiate, undeniably, that Judge J. Nugent has deliberately erred in his Findings and Order because there is no legal or factual basis in his Findings for denying the Petitioner's Motion For Reinstatement of her Civil Case, which include having a panel of **3** In Banc Judges as mandated under Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution to preside over the Petitioner's **3** separate Motions filed on 12-26-24 and over her Motions filed on 11-1-23 in order to determine if **Judge**

J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Dorsey , Judge Schreiber II, and all of the other former presiding Judges have redundantly and/or deliberately engaged in Law Fare by repeatedly and/or deliberately breaching the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due 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.

Moreover, as alleged 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, the evidence in the record, undeniably, substantiate that the presiding Judges, Judge J. Nugent has engaged in Law Fare by repeatedly and/or deliberately breaching the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, Maryland Rule 2-311, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) in an attempt to have the Defendant's motion to dismiss the Petitioner's civil case be granted so that the Petitioner would be deprived of a hearing before a jury of her peers as requested by the Petitioner in order to reveal the evidence that substantiates that the Defendant violated the verbal contractual agreement and the evidence to substantiate that Martin O'Malley, 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 due to knowingly and willingly: a.) allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades by the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City (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. b.) having ignored for years the alleged heinous crimes against the Mayor of Baltimore City, owners of the public schools, namely, that of repetitiously and/or intentionally exposing our children to lead poisoning for decades and, thereby, breaching Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other possible criminal acts. c.) refusing to prosecute for over a quarter of a century 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 infringed 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. d.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, 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 violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes.

In terms distinguished appointments, 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, 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 Michel Pierson was appointed in 2013, also, by Chief Judge Barbera. Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed to his Administrative position in 2009 by one of the former Governors of Maryland, namely, Martin O'Malley. Judge J. Geller was, also, appointed by Martin O'Malley to the elite position of an Administrative Judge in May of 2012. Judge Dorsey, Charles Henry, III, was appointed to his superlative Administrative position by another former Governor of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan in 2016. Judge M. Schreiber II was, also, appointed to the honored position as an Administrative Judge 2022 by Larry Hogan. 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 Michel Pierson was, too, 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. 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.

In relation to being impartial and/or biased, in their Opinion written on 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that there was an appearance of 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 45th – 47th Hon. 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."** The Petitioner is asserting that the evidence in the record, unquestionably, substantiate that **Judge J. Nugent**, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the two presiding Judges in the Petitioner's civil case, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles and Judge Schreiber II, and **all** of the other former presiding Judges, have engaged in Law Fare as a result of continuously and/or deliberately violating the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to redundantly and/or willingly breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a) because **1.) There is an appearance that Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hil, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III, Judge Schriber II, and all of the former presiding Judges would be biased and/or impartial due** to their unique 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 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. Moreover, under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Judge J. Nugent and all of the Judges who presided over the Petitioner’s Motions in her civil litigation should have voluntarily disqualified and recused themselves and that their Orders be deemed void and, therefore, of no legal effect because there is an appearance that Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge, Dorsey, Charles, III, Judge Schreiber II, and all of the other former 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. 2.) Judge J. Nugent is one of the former presiding Judges in the Petitioner’s civil case and in these instant Motions who is being alleged to have engaged in Law Fare by repetitiously and/or intentionally violating the Petitioner’s 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result continuously and willingly invading upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, Maryland Rule 2-311, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a).


Last but not least, as evidenced in her 4 Motions, the Petitioner has filed her 2nd Motion for Default against the Defendant because since filing his Motion in 2013, the Defendant has failed to respond to any of the Petitioner’s colossal Motions, which include the Defendant’s 2nd Motion for Default.

For the 2nd time, the Petitioner is motioning for a hearing on her 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

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 18th of April 2025, a copy of the foregoing Petitioner’s : : 1.) Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge J. Nugent’s Order Docketed on 4-10-25, Which Means The Petitioner’s: A.) 2nd Motion To Reinstate The Petitioner’s Civil Case Because The Evidence Substantiate That Judge J. Nugent Has, Unequivocally, Erred In His Findings And Order In That There Is No Legal Or Factual Basis For His Basis For His Denial Of The Petitioner’s Motion For Reinstatement Of Her Civil Case, Which Include Having A Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges As Mandated Under Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution To Preside Over The Petitioner’s 3 Separate Motions Filed On 12-26-24 And Over Her

Motions Filed On 11-1-23 To Determine If Judge J. Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Dorsey, Charles, III Judge Schreiber, II, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges Have Engaged In Law Fare By Repetitiously And/Or Intentionally Breaching The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Infringing Upon Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5(c), And/Or Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In The Petitioner's 1-28-25 "Pleads" To Our 45-47th Hon. President Trump. B.) 2nd Motion For A Hearing On The Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) 1st Motion For Disqualification Of Judge J. Nugent As The Presiding Judge Over The Petitioner's Motion For Reconsideration Due To His Being Alleged In The Petitioner's Instant Motions And In her 4 Separate Motions To Have Violated The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Engaging In Law Fare Due To Repeatedly And/Or Intentionally Infringing Upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, Maryland Rule 2-311, And Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), The Federal Law That Mandates Judge J. Nugent Voluntarily Disqualify And Recuse Himself As The Presiding Judge And That His Orders BE Deemed Void As A Matter Of Law And, Thus, Of No Legal Force Or Effect Due To There Being An Appearance That Judge J. Nugent Would Be Impartial And/Or Biased As A Result Of Being Appointed To His Elite Administrative Position In 2017 By Former Chief Judge Barbera, Who, Aong With The Present Governor Of Maryland, Wes Moore, And The Former Governors of Maryland, namely, Martin O'Malley and Larry Hogan, Is Being alleged In The Petitioner'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 Violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"), Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Criminal Acts 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

Cc: 45th-47th Hon. President Trump and the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K. Patel, and the U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney Hayes



**UNITED STATES
POSTAL SERVICE.**

CALVERT
111 N CALVERT ST
BALTIMORE, MD 21202-9997
(800)275-8777

04/18/2025

10:58 AM

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

Other	1		\$0.00
-------	---	--	--------

First-Class Mail® Letter	1		\$1.01
--------------------------	---	--	--------

Baltimore, MD 21202
Weight: 0 lb 1.40 oz
Estimated Delivery Date
Mon 04/21/2025

First-Class Mail® Letter	1		\$1.01
--------------------------	---	--	--------

Rockville, MD 20850
Weight: 0 lb 1.40 oz
Estimated Delivery Date
Mon 04/21/2025

First-Class Mail® Large Envelope	1		\$2.31
----------------------------------	---	--	--------

Towson, MD 21285
Weight: 0 lb 3.30 oz
Estimated Delivery Date
Mon 04/21/2025


Grand Total: \$4.33

Cash \$20.00
Change -\$15.67

Preview your Mail
Track your Packages
Sign up for FREE @
<https://informedelivery.usps.com>

All sales final on stamps and postage.
Refunds for guaranteed services only.
Thank you for your business.

Tell us about your experience.
Go to: <https://postalexperience.com/Pos>
or scan this code with your mobile device.



or call 1-800-410-7420.

UFN: 230400-0008

Receipt #: 840-52100319-1-6451329-1

Clerk: 5