

To: Ms. Tanya Bernstein, Director/Investigative Counsel

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams

Re: Emailed-Addendum Complaint to my 4-27-18 Official Complaint, Re: CJD 2018-053 Friedman/Williams

Date: 5-9-18

First of all, I'd like to thank you, Ms. Bernstein, for giving me the opportunity to provide additional information to support my complaint. After praying and seeking DIVINE guidance as to how to respond to your memo dated 4-30-18, I was led to understand that my 4-27-18 complaint to the Commission On Judicial Disabilities State Of Maryland cite material facts that led up to my filing this complaint. However, the 19 Attachments accompanying this emailed addendum complaint to my 4-27-18 complaint sent by certified mail help to substantiate the material facts, starting from the beginning, which I believe is essential to a clearer understanding of the material facts cited in my 4-27-18 complaint. Consequently, below is additional information which I believe constitute "sanctionable" conduct by Judge Karen Friedman.

As can be substantiated by the record in Baltimore City Circuit Court, under case number, 24-C-17-004535, I filed my 2017 Civil Complaint on 9-7-17 which alleges, amongst other things, that Martin O'Malley, former member of the Baltimore City Council, former Mayor of Baltimore City, former Governor of Maryland, and one of the 2016 Candidates for President committed misconduct and potentially criminal acts which contributed to my emotional distress, which is part of the claim and damages in my civil case. The Defendants filed their Motion to dismiss my civil case on 11-16-17. I filed my Motion to dismiss the Defendants' Motion on 11-27-17 (Attachment 1) which cites material facts to substantiate that the Defendants' motions were unfounded and without legal authority. On 12-26-17, Judge Friedman granted the Defendants' Motion. I was truly upset that Judge Friedman failed to give one factual statement to refute the materials facts and laws cited in my Motion which prove that the Defendants' motion to dismiss my complaint were unlawfully grounded. At this time, I did not

know that I could have filed a motion for clarification because I'm certain (and still remain certain) that the reasons cited in my Motion are valid grounds for granting my motion.

Being coerced to be represented Pro Se due to my dire financial hardship and inability to get an attorney to take my case Pro Bono or on a contingency basis and due to the tremendous emotional distress that I've been enduring for over 21 years and continue to endure, I must rely on my HEAVENLY FATHER, JESUS CHRIST, and THE HOLY SPIRIT to reveal to me the material facts to substantiate that Judge Friedman's granting of the Defendants' motion to dismiss my civil case is unlawful. Having 10 days to file a motion for reconsideration before the judgement becomes final, I asked for DIVINE guidance in my prayer and was led to go on line to look for reasons to motion the court for reconsideration. I came across CR 59; and CR 59 (a)(4) which asserts that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have reasonably discovered and produced earlier are grounds for granting Motions. Also, as went on line to study the law of contracts because the Defendants asserted in their Motion that our verbal contract was unenforceable, it was revealed to me the Exceptions to Maryland Rule 5-103, namely, the Uniform Commercial Code and Promissory Estoppel. Therefore, on 1-3-18, I filed my Motion for Reconsideration (Attachment 2) which asserts, amongst other things, that these Exceptions to Maryland Rule 5-103 and the Exhibit, namely, copies of two of my checks paid to the Defendants prove that we had a verbal contract and that the verbal contract was enforceable because the payments of the checks solidified the verbal contract. Also, in this motion, I state the material facts to substantiate that the others reasons cited in the Defendants response to this motion was unlawful and groundless. I was very confident and still remain confident that the reasons cited in this Motion for Reconsideration were valid grounds for granting my motion and for Judge Friedman to reconsider her decision. Moreover, on 1-26-18, in response to the Defendants' response to my motion, I filed my Response to Defendants' Response to Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration, For a New Trial by Jury, to Enter a New New Judgment Because of Additional Evidence, and Granting of the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend the Punitive Damage In Plaintiff's Civil Complaints (Attachment (Attachment 3), which refute, undeniably the Defendants' response and, thus, prove that there response was, again, groundless. Although the material facts and

laws cited in my Motion and Response clearly prove that my motion should be granted and that the reasons cited in the Defendants' motion to dismiss my complaint were unlawful and groundless, on 1-31-18, Judge Friedman denied my Motion. And, for the second time, Judge Friedman failed to cite a single explanation or clarification as to why the grounds cited in my motion and responses were not reasons for granting my motion.

Because I was and remain confident that the material facts cited in Attachments 2 and 3 are, unequivocally, grounds for granting this motion, I was, again, broken after finding out that Judge Friedman denied my motion and gave no reason for doing so. Even in my distress, frustration, and righteous indignation, I know that I must continue to trust the TRUINE GOD'S WORD which tells me to trust in HIM with all of my heart and lean not to my own understanding. And, as I poured my heart out to the TRINITY to reveal to me what material facts I needed to substantiate that Judge Friedman unlawfully denied my motion, I was led to go on line to find out about how Friedman became a judge. After I entered her name, the first thing that popped up on the screen was that, in 2014, Judge Friedman was appointed to the privileged position as one of the judges to the Eighth Circuit in Baltimore City by O'Malley who was the Governor of Maryland at this time. A reasonable- minded person would presume that, being appointed as a judge by O'Malley and not selected by the constituents as a judge is indicative of working at the pleasure of O'Malley and could suggest a certain amount of loyalty, friendship, and a relationship with O'Malley who, also, has the power to terminate any judge appointed by him. Consequently, I, being a rational being, questioned the impartiality of Judge Friedman as a result of having such a relationship with O'Malley and that such a relationship would make it difficult for Judge Friedman to be impartial as the presiding judge, knowing that granting my lawful motion to dismiss the Defendants' motion would mean that the allegation that O'Malley committed misconduct and possibly crimes would be made public at a public hearing. Also, Judge Friedman knows that O'Malley will be called to testify during the trial. Further, I believe that, due to Judge Friedman's special relationship with O'Malley, allowing Judge Friedman to remain the presiding judge would pose an actual conflict of interest and/or an appearance of a conflict of interest and/or an actual impropriety and/or an appearance of an actual impropriety.

As I continued searching on line for reasons to have Judge Friedman removed from being the presiding over my civil case, I discovered that I could file a Motion for Substitution. Therefore, on 2-1-18, I filed my timely Motions for Substitution, To Dismiss Judge Friedman's Orders, and To Have another Judge Consider the Plaintiff's Motions For Reconsideration, For a New Trial By Jury, To Enter a New Judgement Because of Additional Evidence, and Granting Of The Plaintiff's Motion to Amend the Punitive damage in The Plaintiff's Civil Complaints (Attachment 4). Again, grounds for filing my Motions were premised on CR 59 (a)(4). Amongst other things, I stated in this motion that Judge Karen should have recused herself from my civil case due to an actual conflict of interest and/or the appearance of a conflict of interest and/or actual impropriety and/or the appearance of impropriety and cited that her remaining as the presiding judge would be in breach of Canons 1 and 2 in the Judicial Code of Conduct for Judges. Canon 1 stipulates that a judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety. And, Canon 2 cites that a judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently. Canon 3 states that a judge shall disqualify himself/herself in a proceeding in which his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Moreover, a Substitution for cause can be for any bias a judge may have in the case, such as an association with a party; also, a substitution with cause may be moved for at any time after a party realizes a bias exists. Under Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 455, recusal of a judge is appropriate where "a reasonable person", knowing all the facts, would conclude that the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned and requires judges to recuse sua sponte where appropriate. Judge Friedman never informed the parties of her special relationship with O'Malley as a result of being appointed to the special position as one of the judges to the Eighth Circuit in Baltimore City so that the parties could decide whether they wanted her to remain as the presiding judge as cited in the rules for substitution. I stated these facts and other material facts as causes for motioning for a substitution. Still too, the American Bar Association's Model Code of Judicial Conduct prescribes disqualification for judges who encounter allegations of a conflict of interest in a motion to disqualify. Again, I was very confident and still remain confident that the grounds cited in these motions were absolutely grounds for having Judge Friedman be recused from presiding over my civil complaint. At this time, I did not know that I had an

absolute right to motion for a substitution with or without a cause, but I stated my causes for motioning Judge Friedman's removal in these motions and in my 2-15-18 Response to the Defendants' response to my motions (Attachment 5). However, on 3-2-18, Judge Friedman denied my Motions, and for the third time, gave no clarification or reasons for her denial. Furthermore, although I requested in my motions that, amongst other things, another judge determine whether Judge Friedman should recuse herself from my civil case premised on the causes cited in Attachments 4 and 5, it was Judge Friedman who decided that she would be the judge to determine whether she should recuse herself from presiding over my civil case. Again, a reasonable-minded person like me could see straight through such an action, namely, that it's an obvious conflict of interest to have Judge Friedman to determine if she should remove herself from presiding over my civil case.

Again, I was saddened and righteously indignant over Judge Friedman's unsubstantiated denial and the obvious conflict of interest in having Judge Friedman to be the judge to determine if she should be removed from presiding over my civil case. By this time, I was convinced that Judge Friedman was acting corruptly, violating my 7th and 14th Amendment rights, Canons 1, 2, and 3, committing judicial misconduct, and obstructing justice. Also, although I went to the website of the Circuit Court to find out that Judge Friedman had denied my motions, I didn't know why and the 10-day time period was getting close and I had not received Judge Friedman's Order; therefore, I spoke with a person from the clerk's office and informed him that I had not received my denial in writing and time was of the essence. He read Judge Friedman's denial which, again, gave no explanation for denying my motions. The clerk informed me that, in my motion, I could request for clarification which meant that the Judge Friedman had to give her reasons for the denial. Moreover, as I was led by the TRINITY to go on line and learn more about motions for substitutions, I found out that a party has a RIGHT to motion the court for substitution with or without a cause and can motion for a substitution with a cause until a neutral judge can be found. Moreover, I learned about motioning for disqualification of a judge. Consequently, again using CR 59 (a)(4) as grounds for filing my motions, I cited the material facts in my 3-9-18 Motion For Judicial Disqualification of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion for Sanctions against Judge Karen Friedman For Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion for Clarification, Motion for Another Substitution, Motion to Dismiss

Judge Karen Friedman's Orders' and to Have Another Judge Consider the Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration, For a New Trial By Jury, To Enter a New Judgment Because of Additional Evidence, and Granting of the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend the Punitive Damage in the Plaintiff's Civil Complaints (Attachment 6) that, amongst other things, substantiate that Judge Friedman should be sanctioned due to her violating Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. &455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3 by failing to disqualify and/or recuse herself from my civil case as motioned in Attachments 5 and 6. Further, I substantiated the material facts that Judge Friedman needed to be disqualified from presiding over my civil complaint and sanctioned because, under Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363, Judge Friedman committed judicial misconduct by infringing upon Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3, and has, further, obstructed justice by violating Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. &455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3, which prevented me from exercising my 7th and 14th Amendment Rights as stipulated in the Constitution of the U.S. Also, on this same date, namely, 3-9-18, I mailed my Official Complaint of Judicial Misconduct and Obstruction of Justice against Judge Friedman to Hon. President Trump, Congress, and others (Attachment 7) due to Judge Friedman repeatedly committing judicial misconduct and obstructions of justices in unlawfully denying my motions and providing no justification or grounds for doing so. In my 3-9-18 motions and in my 3-9-18 Official Complaint of Judicial Misconduct and Obstruction of Justice against Judge Friedman, I cite the following material facts about Judge Friedman and Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Chief Judge in Baltimore City who presided over my 2014 Civil Complaint of Constructive Fraud, namely, ...**"Ms. Williams is alleging that Judge Friedman's unlawful denial of her Motions and Responses in order to grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss Ms. Williams 2017 Civil Complaint is similar to Judge Fletcher-Hill's 2015 unlawful denial of her Motions and Responses order to grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss her 2014 Civil Complaint of Constructive Fraud (hereinafter 2014 Civil Complaint")**. In both Civil Complaints, the allegations that O'Malley and other government intentionally committed misconduct and likely criminal acts are raised as relevant and material facts to the civil cases. Moreover, Ms. Williams alleges that, in both Civil Complaints, Judge Friedman and Judge Fletcher-Hill violated her 14th Amendment right and/or other state and/or federal laws in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss her civil cases, knowing

that the reasons cited by the Defendants for dismissing her Civil Complaints had no legal grounds or authorities. Ms. Williams asserts that the material facts cited in her 1st Motion, in her 2nd Motion, in her 1st Response, and in her 2nd Response substantiate that Judge Friedman unlawfully granted the Defendants' motions to dismiss her 2017 Civil Complaint, and, the material facts asserted in her Motions and Responses in the Circuit Court in 2015 support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill unlawfully granted the Defendants' motions to dismiss her 2014 Civil Complaint. Ms. Williams is stating that, unless transparency is prevalent, her 2017 Civil Complaint will continue to follow the same illegal and unlawful acts by the Officers of the Court as her 2014 Civil Complaint. Ms. Williams asserts that the Defendants' motions to dismiss her 2014 Civil Complaint were upheld by Judge Fletcher-Hill, although Judge Fletcher-Hill knew that the evidence substantiated the fact that the Defendants' grounds for dismissal not only breached Ms. Williams' 14th Amendment right but, also, violated 2 other federal laws, namely, Federal Law, 42 U.S.C & 1983 and Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, which are asserted in Ms. Williams' May 2015 Motion for Reconsideration or a New Trial to the In Banc judges from the Circuit Court "...

On 3-16-18, I filed my response to the Defendants' motion and response to my 3-9-18 motion entitled "Response To Defendants' Motion For Sanctions and the Plaintiff's Response to the Defendants' Response To Plaintiff's Motion Filed March 18, 2018 Styled Motion For Judicial Disqualification of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion for Sanctions against Judge Karen Friedman For Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion for Clarification, Motion for Another Substitution, Motion to Dismiss Judge Karen Friedman's Orders' and to Have Another Judge Consider the Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration, For a New Trial By Jury, To Enter a New Judgment Because of Additional Evidence, and Granting of the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend the Punitive Damage in the Plaintiff's Civil Complaints (Attachment 8). In this response, again, I provided the material facts that substantiate that the Defendants' reasons for making their motions and their response to my motion were unsubstantiated and groundless. However, on 3-30-18, Judge Fletcher-Hill, the Chief Judge In Baltimore City Circuit Court denied my Motions and justified his decision by erroneously stating in his Order that I did not state any reason to disqualify Judge Friedman or to re-open any of Judge

Friedman's rulings in my civil case. Attachments 6 and 8 clearly state numerous causes why Judge Friedman should have been disqualified from presiding over my civil case.

Although I was still enduring horrific grief from the injustices that continued in this civil complaint, I continued to pour my heart out to the TRINITY and to seek HIS DIVINE guidance and was led to file a motion of disqualification against Judge Fletcher-Hill, namely, my timely filed 4-6-18 Motion For Judicial Disqualification Of Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion, Motion Sanction Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion To Have Judge Nance For A Substitution, Motion To Disqualify The Judges Listed Below, and Motion To Dismiss Judge Fletcher-Hill's Orders to Deny Deny The Plaintiff's Motion For Judicial Disqualification Of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion For Sanctions Against Judge Karen Friedman For Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion For Clarification, Motion For Another Substitution, Motion To Dismiss Judge Karen Friedman's Orders, And To Have Another Judge Consider The Plaintiff's Motions For Reconsideration, For a New Trial By Jury, To Enter A New Judgment Because Of Additional Evidence, And Granting Of The Plaintiff's Motion To Amend the Punitive Damage In the Plaintiff's Civil Complaints (Attachment 9). In this motion and my previous motion, I requested that Judge A. Nance who was not appointed by O'Malley to preside over my civil complaint because I certainly did believe that Judge Fletcher-Hill would be impartial in presiding over my civil case. In fact, in my 3-9-18 Complaint of Judicial Misconduct and Obstruction of Justice to President Trump, Congress, and others, against Judge Friedman, I state the following: ... "Ms. Williams pleads to to the Circuit Court that the Hon. Judge Alfred Nance be assigned to preside over her civil case and consider all of motions and her responses to the Defendants' responses to her motions as well as the Defendants' motions and their responses to her responses to their motions in order to determine whether her 2017 Civil Complaint should be dismissed, since Ms. Williams questions the impartiality of the chief Judge in the Circuit Court, Judge Fletcher-Hill, because he is one of the judges from the Circuit Court with whom Ms. Williams is requesting in her 5-6-16 official complaint of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice and/or email addendums to the President and Congress to be included in the approximate 35 other Officers of the Court in her requested investigation by a Special Counsel of the

allegations of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice, which now has the addition of Judge Friedman as another Officer of the Court whose being alleged by the Plaintiff to, also, have committed judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice. Moreover, Ms. Williams is requesting that, since Judge Fletcher-Hill is one of the judges from the Circuit Court with whom she is requesting the President and Congress to investigate relative to allegations of judicial misconduct and obstruction and, thus, Judge Fletcher-Hill may be impartial to presiding over the allegations of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice by Judge Friedman, the Circuit Court have the Hon. Judge Alfred Nance to oversee the Circuit Court's investigation of her assertion of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice by Judge Friedman. Along with questioning the impartiality of Judge Fletcher Hill presiding over any aspect of her civil case, Ms. Williams is asserting that she questions the impartiality of the following other Circuit Court judges presiding over her 2017 Civil Complaint, because of the alleged judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice against them as asserted in Ms. Williams' 5-6-16 official complaint of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice and/or email addendums to the President and Congress, namely, Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Edward Hargadon, Judge Videtta Brown, Judge Lawrence Fletcher-Hill, Judge Yolanda Tanner, Judge Shannon Avery, and Judge Sylvester Cox.".... Moreover, in this motion, I cite 16 material facts that caused me to question Judge Fletcher-Hill's impartiality, which includes the following: 1. In my appeals of Judge Fletcher-Hill's 2015 decision to grant the Defendants' motions to dismiss the Plaintiff's 2014 Civil Complaint of Constructive Fraud (hereinafter "2014 Civil Complaint"), I state that Judge Fletcher-Hill breached my 14th Amendment right, violated 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 Plaintiff's 2014 Civil Complaint which, amongst other things, exposed the material fact that O'Malley and the 6 Defendants intentionally committed misconduct and potentially criminal acts by deliberately exposing our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at 1993, and have yet to test or compensate all the children that have been exposed to this potentially fatal toxic. 2. Judge Fletcher-Hill knew that, amongst other things, in my 2014 civil case, I cited that O'Malley and the Defendants, 5 of whom are state agencies in Maryland

which O'Malley, when he was the Governor of Maryland, exercised executive power over, namely, the Maryland State Board of Education, the Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation of Maryland, the Maryland State Board of Education, the Board of Education of Baltimore County, and the Maryland State Education Association intentionally committed misconduct and potential criminal acts as well. 3. I alleged that, in my 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the In Banc judges in the Circuit Court (Attachment 10), in my 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals of Maryland (Attachment 11), and/or in my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court (Attachment 12), I provided the irrefutable evidence to support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, the Federal Supremacy Clause of the U.S., and my 14th Amendment Right by unlawfully granting the Defendants' motions to dismiss my 2014 Civil complaint in order to cover up the relevant and material facts that O'Malley and other government officials intentionally committed misconduct and possibly criminal activities. 4. I state that, of all of my appeals that led up to my filing 3 Petitions to the Supreme Court in 2006, 2015, and 2016, it is my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court that would have taken the Justice of the Supreme Court less than 10 minutes to read in order to determine that the Court of Appeals of Maryland deliberately committed perjury which caused the issues raised in my appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland never to be addressed or resolved by this court, which includes the assertion that the In Banc judges committed perjury, breached my 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 Judge Fletcher-Hill violated my 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 my 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that O'Malley and other government officials intentionally committed misconduct and possibly criminal activities. 5. The deliberate perjury by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, which caused the issues raised in my Petition to the Court of Appeals of Maryland never to be addressed or resolved, is that the evidence support the allegation that the Court of Appeals of Maryland lied under oath in their Order dated 9-21-15 by citing that the Plaintiff's Writ to their court was denied because it was filed late, and the Court of Appeals of Maryland deliberately lied under oath after refusing to correct their lie after being

referenced to the two exhibits in their record which, undeniably, support the fact that YES, the Court of Appeals of Maryland committed perjury. 6. I state that the Justices of the Supreme Court, excluding Justice Gorsuch who was not yet appointed as one of the Justices to the Supreme Court, were obligated by Rule 10 in the manual of the Supreme Court to exercise their supervisory power and take corrective actions against the Court of Appeals because intentional perjury is not the accepted and usual judicial proceedings by any court. 7. In order to determine that the first 5 exhibits on the my website, which accompanied my 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court, and which the 8 Justices of the Supreme Court could have read in less than 10 minutes in order to determine that the Court of Appeals of Maryland deliberately committed perjury, it's essential to know that Maryland Rule 7-104 allows 30 days to file an appeal to the Court of Appeals, with the first day starting on the day that the last judgment of the Circuit Court is filed in the record by the clerk. The first exhibit (Attachment 13), which is on my website as Exhibit 1, is copy of the document that gives the date of the In Banc judges' last judgment, which was their denial on July 6, 2015 of my Motion for Reconsideration and a New Trial. The second exhibit (Attachment 14), which is on my website as Exhibit 2 is a copy of the docket receipt from the clerk of the Court of Appeals which gives the date that my 2015 Petition for a Writ to the Court of Appeals was filed in the record of this court, namely, on August 3, 2015. The third exhibit (Attachment 15) which is on my website as Exhibit 3 is a copy of the Court of Appeals' Order dated 9-21-15 which declares that my Writ was denied because it was filed late to the Court of Appeals of Maryland. The fourth exhibit (Attachment 16) which is on my website as Exhibit 4 is a copy of my Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland which asserts that, amongst other things, the evidence in the record of this court, namely, Exhibits 1 and 2, support the fact that my Writ was filed in the Court of Appeals of Maryland prior to the 30-day expiration. The fifth exhibit (Attachment 17) which is on my website as Exhibit 5 is the second denial of my Writ by the Court of Appeals of Maryland. Consequently, the second denial by the Court of Appeals of Maryland is indicative of the fact that this court refused to correct their prejudicial error, even after receiving my Motion for Reconsideration which references Exhibits 1 and 2 in their record to prove that my Writ was filed on time. 8. I cite that, because of the intentional judicial misconduct by the Courts and/or deliberate misconduct by O'Malley and other government officials, all of my civil litigations were

unlawfully dismissed and, thus, I have yet to receive justice for the 21 years of injustices and emotional distress she has endured, and that I continue to endure emotional distress as I consider the possible negative health effects of thousands of children in Maryland public schools that have been exposed to lead poisoning since 1993 by O'Malley and by other government officials, who are responsible for the health and safety of children in public schools, but have intentionally exposed our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards and have yet to test or compensate all the children that have been exposed to this potentially fatal toxic.

Moreover, in this motions, I declare that, because of failing to recuse himself as the presiding judge over my motions, Judge Fletcher Hill, the Chief Judge of Baltimore City Circuit Court: 1. needs to be sanctioned because he violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. &455, Canons 1, 2, and 3, and infringed upon my 7th and 14th Amendment Rights by failing to disqualify and/or recuse himself from presiding over my Motion For Judicial Disqualification of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion for Sanctions against Judge Karen Friedman For Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion for Clarification, Motion for Another Substitution, Motion to Dismiss Judge Karen Friedman's Orders, and to Have Another Judge Consider the Plaintiff's Motions for Reconsideration, For a New Trial By Jury, To Enter a New Judgment Because of Additional Evidence, and Granting of the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend the Punitive Damage in the Plaintiff's Civil Complaints. 2. under Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363, Judge Fletcher-Hill committed judicial misconduct as a result of failing to disqualify himself from presiding over the Plaintiff's 2nd Motions but choosing to infringe upon Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3, and obstruct justice by violating Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. &455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3, which have prevent the Plaintiff from exercising my 7th and 14th Amendment Rights as stipulated in the Constitution of the U.S.

On 4-19-18, Judge Fletcher-Hill denied my Motion and, amongst other things, threatened me if I continued filing what he considered frivolous motions. My heart pained after finding out that I was, again, denied justice, but I continue to pray and seek the TRIUNE GOD'S DIVINE guidance. Again, like Judge Friedman, Judge Fletcher-Hill determined that he would decide whether he should remove himself

as presiding over my motions, although a rational being would certainly view such as an undeniable conflict of interest and impropriety. Further, like Judge Friedman, Judge Fletcher-Hill did [SHOULD BE "DID NOT"] inform the parties that he, too, was appointed in 2009 as one of the Associate judges to the Eighth Circuit of Baltimore City by O'Malley and, thus, had a relationship, friendship, and and a certain amount of loyalty as a result of being appointed to such a privileged position by O'Malley, which would likely cause me to question his ability to be impartial. Thus, even facing the written threat by Judge Fletcher-Hill if I filed another motion, I was led to file my 4-27 Motion For Substitution To Have A Special Judge To Determine If The Material Facts Below Substantiate That Judge Fletcher-Hill And Judge Karen Friedman Need To Be Referred For Impeachment By Governor Hogan, Sanctioned By The Judicial Commission, Disqualified From Presiding Over The Plaintiff's Civil Case, And Be Referred For Investigation By A Special Prosecutor Relevant to Allegations Of Criminal, Judicial Misconduct, And Obstruction Of Justice, Motion To Have All Orders By Judge Fletcher-Hill And Judge Karen Friedman Dismissed, And A Motion To Have The Special Judge For A Substitution And/or Judge Alfred Nance For A Substitution To Consider Granting All Of The Plaintiff's Motions. In these Motions, I provide the material facts that substantiate how and why Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen Friedman have acted corruptly and criminally by violating U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 § 1505 (Attachment 18 of which a copy accompanied this complaint). Moreover, the motions included an exhibit, namely, my 3-9-18 Complaint of Judicial Misconduct and Obstruction of Justice against Judge Friedman to substantiate that I've requested the Hon. President Trump and Congress to include Judge Friedman into my requested investigation by a Special Prosecutor of the allegations of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice of the approximate 35 other judges as cited in my 5-6-16 complaint of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice and/or in my 490TH email addendum (Attachment 19) and counting; thus, the judges from the Supreme Court (excluding Justice Gorsuch), the Court of Appeals of Maryland, the Court of Special Appeals, the In Banc judges, and other judges from the Baltimore City Circuit Court, including Judge Fletcher-Hill who presided over by 2014 and 2015 civil complaints. Also, I've requested that the Special Prosecutor investigate the misconduct and possibly criminal activities of O'Malley and other government officials. And, in the investigation into my complaint and emailed-addendum complaint to the Judicial

Commission that every judge from the Court of Appeals in Maryland and in the Circuit Court that acted corruptly in my 2014 civil case be sanctioned as well.

Although Judge Fletcher-Hill cited threatening penalties if I continued to file what he perceived as frivolous motions and failed to disqualify him, I still filed my 4-27-18 Motions and even requested that the “Substitution Judge” and/or the Special Prosecutor investigate my allegation of conspiracy to pervert justice by Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Friedman and, thus, cite that ...“ Moreover, antithetical to Judge Fletcher-Hill’s threatening penalties in his communication docketed on 4-19-18 and 4-6-18 because of the Plaintiff’s numerous Motions and Responses, it’s due to the material facts cited in the Plaintiff’s Motions and Responses that that Plaintiff is able to reveal an appearance of a conspiracy on the part of Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen Friedman to pervert justice in that a reasonable mind would question how is it that both of these Officers of the Court: 1. acted corruptly and criminally by violating the same federal crime, namely, U.S. Code, Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 73 § 1505. 2. committed the same judicial misconduct as a result of failing to disqualify themselves from presiding over the Plaintiff’s Civil Complaint. 3. chose to breach the same Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 455 and same Canons, namely, Canons 1, 2, and 3, 4. obstructed justice in the same manner, namely, by infringing upon Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. &455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3. 5. prevented the Plaintiff from exercising the same Amendment Rights, namely, the Plaintiff’s 7th and 14th Amendment Rights as stipulated in the Constitution of the U.S. 6. failed to inform the parties in the Plaintiff’s civil case that both of them were appointed to the special position of judge by O’Malley and, thus, they both had a relationship with O’Malley which would be viewed by the Plaintiff as a conflict of interest if they remained as presiding judges. 7. chose to be the judge to determine if he/she should have disqualified himself/herself as the presiding judges despite the Plaintiff motioning that another judge determine the disqualifications.”.... Still too, in my 4-27-18 complaint to this Judicial Commission I assert that ...“ Moreover, antithetical to Judge Fletcher-Hill’s threatening penalties in his communication dated 4-19-18 because of my numerous Motions and Responses, it’s because of the material facts cited in my Motions and Responses that I’m able to reveal an appearance of a conspiracy on the part of

Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen Friedman to pervert justice in that both Officers of the Court committed the same judicial misconduct, breached the same federal statutes and Canons, obstructed justice in the same manner, and both judges failed to inform the parties in my civil case that due to their personal relationship with O'Malley who is an attorney, who will be called as a witness, and who intentionally committed misconduct and possibly criminal activities, decided to take it upon themselves to determine whether they should recuse themselves from my civil case, although I requested another judge to determine if recusal was appropriate.”... These statements are cited in the attachment that accompanied by 4-27-18 complaint to this office.

I believe that the information above and the 19 supporting “Attachments’ will, indeed, help to determine whether Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Friedman, and the judges from the Court of Appeals of Maryland and the Circuit Court committed “sanctionable” conduct.

Sincerely,