

IN THE MATTER OF

STATE OF MARYLAND

VS.

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

BALTIMORE COUNTY

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR

Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995

1.) MOTION TO HAVE A RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE S. BAILEY'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 3-19-25, WHICH INCLUDE THE DEFENDANT'S 2ND MOTION TO JUDGE S. BAILEY FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTION FOR A STAY ON JUDGE GLASS' ORDERS TO EXECUTE EXPUNGEMENT OF THE DEFENDANT'S RECORD UNTIL THE CRIMINAL CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY, OTHERWISE JUDGE S. BAILEY IS, FOR THE 2ND TIME, ENGAGING IN LAW FARE BY CONTINUING TO BREACH THE DEFENDANT'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242, MARYLAND RULE 2-311, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, AND FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a), AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S 1-21-25 "PLEADS: TO OUR 45TH - 47TH HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP AGAINST JUDGE S. BAILEY. 2.) MOTION TO HAVE A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311, WHICH IS

THE DEFENDANT'S 2ND MOTION TO JUDGE S. BAILEY FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant's: 1.) Motion To Have A Reconsideration of Judge S. Bailey's Order Docketed On 3-19-25, Which Include The Defendant's 2nd Motion to Judge S. Bailey For A Hearing On Her Motion For A Stay On Judge Glass' Orders To Execute Expungement Of The Defendant's Record Until The Criminal Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, Judge S. Bailey Is, For The 2nd Time, Engaging In Law Far by Continuing To Breach the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), And These Violations Are Cited In the Defendant's 1-21-25 "Pleads" To Our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump Against Judge S. Bailey. 2.) Motion to Have A Hearing On the Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Which is The Defendant's 2nd Motion To Judge S. Bailey For A Hearing On Her Motions based on the grounds and authorities cited below.

As a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, the Defendant believes that our Great Country is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Thus, in terms of judges being impartial in their ruling, in the WORD OF GOD, namely, in 2nd Chronicles 19: 6-7, king Jehoshaphat, one of the kings of

INTRODUCTION

CR59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Defendant, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Defendant, is that: 1.) For first time, the Defendant is informing Judge S. Bailey that, on 1-21-25, she sent by certified mail her "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, which, amongst other things, request that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S. Attorney for Maryland, to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's Official Complaint to the Maryland Commission on Judicial Disabilities mailed on 12-16-24 and stated, again, in her "Pleads", namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the allegations that Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and all of the former presiding judges, namely, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, and Judge Alexander have engaged in Law fare due to repetitiously and/or deliberately impeding upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. Moreover, our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the newly appointed U.S. Attorney for Maryland have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, have access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges. 2.) For the 2nd time, Judge S. Bailey has engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to grant the Defendant her right to a hearing on her 2nd Motion to Stay the execution of Expungement in Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety, otherwise, the Judge S. Bailey is further engaging in Law Fare by violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of breaching Maryland Rule 2-311. 3.) For the 2nd time, Judge S. Bailey is being alleged to have engaged in Law fare by violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title U.S.C., Section 242 due to failing to grant the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate that Judge S. Bailey has, for the 2nd time, erred in her Findings and Orders and failed to adhere to her own 4-page 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 and because there is no legal and factual basis for denying the Defendant her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition. 4.) For the 2nd time, Judge S. Bailey is being alleged to have engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to invading Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a).

Judah, pronounces to judges why they should not be impartial and/or biased in their judgment, "And said to the judges, Take heed what ye do: for ye judge not for man, but for the LORD, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of the LORD be upon you; take heed and do it; for there is no iniquity with the LORD our GOD, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts."

STATEMENT OF FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As stated in the Defendant's 2 separate Motions mailed on 3-21-25 and in her other Motions, because of the Defendant's financial hardship at this time, she is unable to afford the cost of printing copies of all of her numerous Official Complaints, Addendums to her Official Complaints, and other material evidence on her website, www.diorawilliams.com that need to be submitted into the record as evidence to further substantiate the allegations that the Defendant'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, and Maryland Rule 2-311 have been repetitiously and/or intentionally violated by Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and all of the former presiding. Thus, it is the Defendant's request that, since she give the Exhibit Number on her website to each of her signed and dated Motions, her Official Complaints, and other documents when citing the document in these Motions, that all of these documents be submitted as more evidence into the record of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County.

The Supreme Court has held that, if a judge wars against the Constitution in breaching the Due Process Clause of the U.S Constitution or if he/she acts without jurisdiction, then that judge has engaged in treason to the Constitution, which suggest that he/she is engaging in criminal acts of treason and may be engaging in extortion and/or in interference with interstate commerce. Since both treason and the interference with interstate commerce are criminal acts, no judge has immunity to engage in such acts.

Relative to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), the Supreme Court has ruled and reaffirmed that disqualification of a judge is mandatory if an objective observer would entertain reasonable questions about the judge's impartiality (Liteky v. U.S., 114 S.Ct. 1147, 1162 (1994). The Court has, too, affirmed that, should a judge not disqualify himself/herself as required by law, then the judge has given another example of his/her "appearance of partiality" which could potentially further disqualify the judge. Further, the Court have determined that, if a judge issues any Order after he/she has been disqualified by law, then that judge has acted in the judge's personal capacity and not in the judge's judicial capacity and has, further, violated his/her oath of office. Wherefore, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that "Fraud upon the Court" makes the Orders and Judgments of the Court void and that "a void Order is void at all times, does not have to be reversed or vacated by a judge, cannot be made valid by any judge, nor does it gain validity by the passage of time. The Order is void ab initio." The Supreme Court has decided that, should a judge issue any Order after he/she has been disqualified by Section 455(a) of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S., and if the party has been denied of any of his/her property, then the judge could be engaging in the federal crime of "interference with interstate commerce" because the judge is, again, disqualified by law. Moreover, on 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that there was an appearance of an Officer of the Court, the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial and, removed the Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against our 45th - 47th Hon. President Donald Trump

and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an “appearance of impropriety” and declared that “this is the rare case in which disqualification is mandated and no other remedy will suffice to restore public confidence in the integrity of these proceedings.” ...

According to online research, Law fare includes an attempt to damage or delegitimize an opponent or to deter an individual's usage of his/her legal rights. In her letter that was sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on the Defendant's website), the Defendant pleads, amongst other things, that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed DOJ, the Director of the FBI, or the newly appointed U.S. Attorney for Maryland to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Maryland Commission on Judicial Disabilities (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 “Pleads” namely, that of determining whether the evidence substantiate the assertions that the Defendant is being redundantly and/or deliberately denied her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions because Judge S Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, and all of the former presiding Judges have engaged in Law fare by repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, which prevents the Defendant from being granted her relief requested, namely, that of being granted her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets. Moreover, as cited in these instant Motions, as declared in the Defendant's 2 sets of Motions mailed on 3-21-25, in her Motions docketed on 7-11-24, in her other Motions, and/or as proclaimed in the Defendant's “Pleads” sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, Judge S. Bailey, the presiding Judge, continues to intentionally engage in Law fare by redundantly and willingly invading upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311 as substantiated by the following material facts and legal arguments: 1.) At the Defendant's hearing on 5-20-21 germane to her criminal proceedings, Judge S. Bailey was the presiding Judge. 2.) The evidence of the Defendant being in attendance during the criminal proceedings held on 5-20-21 as the Defendant substantiates the Defendant's assertion that the only witness for the State of Maryland, the Complainant, did not appear for the hearing. 3.) The Defendant alleges that, although the Complainant was a “no show” at the 5-20-21 criminal proceedings, neither the Attorney representing the State of Maryland or the Defendant's Public Defender motioned to Judge S. Bailey for a dismissal of the charges against the Defendant as permissible. 4.) The Defendant is proclaiming that, at the beginning of the hearing held on 5-20-21, the Defendant's Public Defender motioned for “Probation before Judgment”, which is a disposition where Judge S. Bailey deferred judgment, placed the Defendant on probation, and, thus, the Defendant did not plead guilty to a lesser charge or receiving a lighter sentence in exchange for avoiding trial. 5.) The Defendant is asserting that, after the Defendant was granted the Motion for a “Probation before Judgment” by Judge S. Bailey, a few minutes later, the Defendant was given a document, which was the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order signed by Judge S. Bailey, and was told that it was necessary for the Defendant to read and sign the Probation/Supervision Order. 6.) Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21, 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order, which is “Exhibit I” that accompanies the Defendant's 2-28-25 Motions, is cited as Exhibit 210 on the

Defendant's website. 7.) The Defendant is proclaiming that, on 3-21-25, she received in the mail Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders to her Motions docketed on 7-11-24 and almost a year ago and the Findings and Order are stamped on the top of the 1st page of the Defendant's Motions (Exhibit 330 on the Defendant's website). 8.) The Defendant is alleging that she received only page 1 of her 4-page Motions which are accompanied with 2 Exhibits. 9.) The evidence of the most recent Findings and Orders from Judge D. Robinson Jr. and from all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge S. Bailey, substantiate that the Findings and Orders of all of other presiding Judges were stamped, also, on the first page of the Defendant's Motions, and copies of all of the pages of the Defendant's Motions and the accompanying Exhibits were included (Exhibits 188, 189-193, 219-220, respectively, on the Defendant's website). 10.) The Defendant is alleging that the 2 Exhibits accompanying her Motions docketed on 7-11-24 include a copies of the Defendant's emailed Official Complaint to her Public Defender at the time on 11-7-20 and her 11-10-20 Official Complaint sent by certified mail to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, which are Exhibits 85 and 86 on the Defendant's website. 11.) The evidence of these two Exhibits which accompany the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-11-24 substantiate that Judge S. Bailey had access to the Defendant's Official Complaints against the State of Maryland, the Baltimore County Police Department, and other agencies, which allege, amongst other things, the material facts which substantiate that the Defendant was the victim of brutal verbal assault by the Complainant and was in fear of her life due to the Complainant's dog, who was not on a leash, following her and the Complainant refusing to get her dog away from the Defendant. 12.) Also, in the Defendant's Official Complaints, she asserts against the State of Maryland, the Police Department, and against other agencies fraud, deceit, and tampering with evidence, which include someone moving the Defendant's gun from her gun case, sending the gun case back to the Defendant's residence by a police officer, and having someone place some of the Defendants bullets on the ground after the Defendant was taken to the Police station. 13.) The Defendant is proclaiming that the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in her Motions docketed on 7-11-24 and on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 188 and 187, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and the evidence of the facts stated in Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders docketed on 3-19-25 and on 6-25-24, which respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-11-24 and 6-1-23, respectively, (Exhibits 330 and 187, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate the Defendant's allegations that Judge S. Bailey continues to use Law fare because she has, for the 2nd time, refuse to consider, disclose, and resolve in her Findings and Orders any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-11-24 or any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 which substantiate that Judge S. Bailey has repeatedly erred in failing to adhere to own Probation/Supervision Order and which substantiate there is no legal or factual basis for Judge S. Bailey's 6-25-24 denial of the Defendant's Motion to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition since the evidence substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully completed all of the mandates in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year Probation/Supervision Order. 14.) As stated in her Motions docketed on 7-11-24, from which Judge S. Bailey responds to in her Findings and Order docketed on 3-19-25, as declared in the Defendant's 2 sets of Motions mailed on 3-21-25, and/or as cited in the Defendant's 1-21-25 "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump: a.) During the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass, the presiding Judge, the evidence was presented to o substantiate that, by 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully complied to all of requirements of Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order was confirmed during the 6-9-24

hearing before the presiding Judge, Judge Glass. b.) The transcript of the 6-9-24 hearing will substantiate that the State of Maryland, the opposing party, testified that the State of Maryland would not oppose the Defendant repossessing her firearm and 15 bullets since the Defendant had fulfilled the State of Maryland's requirement of waiting 3 years before being granted an expungement of her records. c.) At the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's Motions, after granting the Defendant's Motion to have her record expunged, Judge Glass informed the Defendant that she has to Order a Stay on the granting of the Defendant's expungement in order to allow the Motion for the granting of the Defendant's legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition to be resolved before Judge S. Bailey, otherwise, without the Stay on her Order for expungement of the Defendant's record, the Defendant would not be able to have file a hearing on her Motion or file any other Motion because an expungement implies that the case no longer exists. d.) During the 6-9-24 hearing, Judge Glass stated that she would put a Stay on her Order so that the issue of repossessing the Defendant's firearm and 15 ammunition could be brought before Judge S. Bailey. e.) As evidenced by the mailing date of 6-28-24 certified in the Defendant's Motions which were docketed on 7-11-24, the Defendant pleads her 1st Motion to Stay the 30-day Stay on Judge Glass' 6-13-24 Order (Exhibit 209 on the Defendant's website) prior to the expiration of Judge Glass' 30 day Stay on the Defendant's expungement of her record. 15.) The evidence of Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order, the evidence Judge S. Bailey's Findings and Orders docketed on 3-19-25 and on 6-24-25, and the evidence of the material facts asserted and legal arguments in the Defendant's 7-11-24 and 6-1-23 Motions substantiate that, for the 2nd time, Judge S. Bailey has erred in her Findings and Orders by failing give sufficient legal and factual basis for not adhering to her own 2-year, 4-page Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 because the material facts in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-11-24 and on 6-1-23, unequivocally, substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant had successfully complied with all of the requirements in Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order. 16.) According to the Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 by Judge Bailey, the Defendant was ordered Probation before Judgment (Criminal Procedure Article & 6-220) for two years, with no supervision, to have no contact with the victim, Amy Penn, to surrender firearms, and could not own or possess a firearm during her probationary period. 17.) Although the Defendant continues to forward a copy of all of her Motions to the State of Maryland as evidenced by the Certificate of Service in the Defendant's Motions, the Defendant is aware that the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified at the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass that the State of Maryland would not object to the Defendant having repossession of her firearm and ammunition. 18.) For the 2nd time, Judge S. Bailey has engaged in Law fare by violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching Maryland Rule 2-311 by failing to grant the Defendant's her right to a hearing on her Motions. 19.) For the 2nd time, Judge S. Bailey has engaged in Law fare by violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching Maryland Rule 2-311 by failing to grant the Defendant's her right to a hearing on 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to infringing upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge S. Bailey would be biased and/or impartial since: a.) Judge S. Bailey was appointed to her elite position as an Administrative Circuit Judge for Baltimore County in 2009 by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions in her present civil litigation in Baltimore City and which are given Exhibit Numbers on the Defendant's website, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C &

1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. Moreover, the Defendant's is alleging that in her Motions docketed on 7-11-24 and in her Motions mailed, thereafter, she states her website address in her Motions to substantiate material facts and legal arguments that are in the documents on her website and, thereby, Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson Jr., and the all of the former presiding Judges have had access not only to these documents but also, access to the Defendant's Motions relating to the Defendant's civil litigation in Baltimore City, where the former Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore (herein Wes Moore), the other former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged by the Defendant to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to impinge upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. b.) Judge S. Bailey, the presiding Judge, knows and/or should know that she voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding Judge over the Defendant's instant Motions and in her Motions docketed on 7-11-24 because Judge S. Bailey is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-11-24 to have invaded upon her 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 2-18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a). 20.) The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 4 separate Motions docketed since 7-10-24 Motions (Exhibits 188, 189-193', and 219-220, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate that Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and all of the former presiding Judges have had the opportunity to read the Defendant's Motions and the Findings and Orders by the Judges in her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court in Baltimore City and to recognize that that Martin O'Malley, Wes Moore, Larry Hogan, and former Chief Judge Barbera are being alleged by the Defendant to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to impinge upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 21.) On 12-13-24, after researching the background of Judge S. Bailey, the Defendant discovered that she was, also, appointed to an elite position as a Circuit Court Judge for Baltimore County in 2009 by Martin O'Malley. After researching the background of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. it was revealed that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his elite Administrative position in 2016 by the former Governor of Maryland, Larry Hogan, and was appointed to his privileged Administrative position in 2023 by Wes Moore; Judge Glass was appointed to her supervisory Administrative by Martin O'Malley' and, Judge Alexander was, too, appointed in 2010 by Martin O'Malley. 21.) Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Judge S. Bailey and the other present and/or former presiding Judges should have voluntarily disqualified and recused themselves, and their Orders should be deemed void and of no effect as a matter of law, as have been upheld in cases before the Supreme Court, since there is an appearance that Judge S. Bailey, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., and aa of the former presiding Judges would be impartial and/or biased due to being appointed to their elite Administrative and/or as Circuit Court Judges by Wes Moore, Martin O'Malley and/or by Larry Hogan, all of whom are being asserted in the Defendant's present civil litigation, along with former Chief Judge Barbera and/or other government officials, to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other committed other crimes as a result of knowingly and willingly: i.)

If Judge S. Bailey would grant the Defendant's repeated Motions for a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland 2-311, then Judge S. Bailey would have the opportunity to provide tangible

The Defendant, as a believer in JESUS CHRIST as her LORD and personal SAVIOR, is thoroughly convinced that our America is founded on Judeo-Christian principles, which mean that our laws are patterned after the Commandments and Laws in the WORD OF GOD. Therefore, in terms of any Officer of the Court, which includes judges, the WORD OF GOD states in Exodus 32:11 in relation to judges being impartial and/or biased and, thereby, proclaims, "And the LORD spoke 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."

ARGUMENT

allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades. iii.) having ignored the alleged heinous crimes against the owners of the public schools, (the Mayor and Baltimore City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young and Brandon Schott, against all of the present members of the City Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter "City Council"), and against those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993 to repetitiously and/or intentionally expose our children to lead poisoning through lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazard, thereby, infringing upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to traduce Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other possible criminal acts. iii.) refusing to prosecute the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately intruding upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. iv.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Judges, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes.

evidence to substantiate sufficient legal or factual basis for her repeated denials of the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right, namely, to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition. The evidence substantiate the allegations that Judge S. Bailey has, for the 2nd time, erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 3-19-25, which respond to the Defendants Motions docketed on 7-11-24 because Judge S. Bailey failed to abide by her own 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21, and therefore, continues to engage in Law fare due to repeatedly and/or intentionally violating the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because the evidence substantiate the material facts that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant's has successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey and that there is no statement in the Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey that declares that the Defendant can't repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition upon successfully completing Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervisor Order.

Furthermore, the Defendant is confident that Judge S. Bailey is cognizant of the material facts that, if she denies the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass' 6-13-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record, then: 1.) Judge S. Bailey would not have to grant the Defendant's right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland 2-311 because without a Stay on the execution of expungement of the Defendant's Motion, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist. 2.) Judge S. Bailey would not have to consider, disclose, and resolve during the hearing on the Defendant's Motion for a hearing as permitted under Maryland 2-311 the issue of whether the evidence of Judge S. Bailey's 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 substantiate that Judge S. Bailey failed to adhere to her own Probation/Supervision Order and, consequently, erred in that there is no legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to failing to grant the Defendant's relief requested, namely, that of granting the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition since the evidence in the record, indisputably substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant has successfully complied with all of the requirement in Judge S. Bailey's 5-20-21 4-page 2-year Probation/Supervision Order. 3.) Judge S. Bailey would have to consider, disclose, and resolve during the hearing on the Defendant's Motion for a hearing as permitted under Maryland 2-311 whether for the 2nd time, she has breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-33, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) because under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) it is mandated that Judge S. Bailey voluntarily disqualify and recuse herself as the presiding Judge because: a.) There is an appearance that S. Bailey, Judge would be impartial and/or biased due to her distinguished position in 2009 as an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, the former Mayor of Baltimore City and former Governor of Maryland, who is being asserted in the Defendant's present civil litigation in Baltimore City Circuit Court (whose Motions Judge S. Bailey has access to because the Motions of the Defendant's civil proceedings are posted as "Exhibits" on her website) are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other committed other crimes. b.) in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 7-11-24 and in her instant Motions, Judge S. Bailey, the

presiding Judge, is being alleged, for the 2nd time, to have violated the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a).

CONCLUSION

The Defendant pleads that her Motions be granted.

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 28th day of March 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1.)

Motion To Have A Reconsideration of Judge S. Bailey's Order Docketed On 3-19-25, Which Include The Defendant's 2nd Motion to Judge S. Bailey For A Hearing On Her Motion For A Stay On Judge Glass' Orders To Execute Expungement Of The Defendant's Record Until The Criminal Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, Judge S. Bailey Is, For The 2nd Time, Engaging In Law Far by Continuing To Breach the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, Her 2nd Amendment Right, Her Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 18.102.11, And Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), And These Violations Are Cited In the Defendant's 1-21-25 "Pleads" To Our 45th - 47th Hon. President Trump Against Judge S. Bailey. 2.) Motion to Have A Hearing On the Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Which Is The Defendant's 2nd Motion To Judge S. Bailey For A Hearing On Her Motions was mailed, postage paid, to: Baltimore County State Attorney, 401 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland, 21204.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

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



DUNDALK SPARROWS POINT
44 SHIPPING PL
DUNDALK, MD 21222-9998
(800) 275-8777
03/28/2025 10:07 AM

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

First-Class Mail®	1		\$1.01
Letter			
Towson, MD 21204			
Weight: 0 lb 1.70 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Mon 03/31/2025			

First-Class Mail®	1		\$1.01
Letter			
Towson, MD 21285			
Weight: 0 lb 1.80 oz			
Estimated Delivery Date			
Mon 03/31/2025			

Grand Total:	\$2.02
Cash	\$10.00
Change	-\$7.98

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: 230405-0013
Receipt #: 840-52100100-1-5334433-2
Clerk: 24

Annie Sullivan
131 Calver
Balto. Md. 21222

Current Court for Balto. County
County Courthouse Building
P.O. Box 6754
Newcomer, Md. 21285-6754

Attention: Supervisory Clerk, Mr. Kira