

IN THE MATTER OF  
STATE OF MARYLAND

\* IN THE  
\*  
\* CIRCUIT COURT  
\*

VS.

\* FOR  
\*

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

\* BALTIMORE COUNTY  
\*  
\* Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995

\*\*\*\*\*

1.) 1<sup>ST</sup> MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND AS THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OF PRESIDING OVER ASSIGNING A JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR AS A RESULT OF HIS CONTINUOUS LAW FARE IN REPEATEDLY AND DELIBERATELY BREACHING THE DEFENDANT'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY INFRINGING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND DUE TO BREACING MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 AND MARYLAND RULE 2-311, AND THESE VIOLATIONS ARE CITED IN THE DEFENDANT'S 1-21-25 PLEADS TO OUR 45<sup>TH</sup> – 47<sup>TH</sup> HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP AGAINST JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. 2.) AS MANDATED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311, MOTION TO ALLOW THE STATE OF MARYLAND THEIR 15 DAYS TO RESPOND AND TO HAVE A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S

5<sup>TH</sup> MOTION FOR A HEARING ON HER MOTIONS TO JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR

I, Diana R. Williams, the Defendant who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Defendant's: 1.) 1st Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion For Disqualification Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. As The Presiding Judge And As The Judge-In-Charge Of Presiding Over Assigning A Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 5<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. As A Result Of His Continuous Law Fare In Repeatedly And Deliberately Breaching Of The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Committing Fraud Upon The Court By Infringing Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Due To Breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleads To our 45<sup>th</sup>- 47<sup>th</sup> Hon.

President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) As mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Motion To Allow The State Of Maryland Their 15 Days To Respond And To Have A hearing On The Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 5<sup>th</sup> Motion For A Hearing On Her Motions To Judge D. Robinson, Jr based on the grounds and authorities cited below.

CR59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have been reasonably discovered and produced earlier, are grounds for granting the Petitioner's Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Defendant, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Defendant, is that, for the first time: 1.) For 3<sup>rd</sup> time, the Defendant is informing Judge D. Robinson Jr. that, on 1-21-25, she sent by certified mail her "Pleads" to our 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, which, amongst other things, requests that he would assign the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, or the U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes, to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's Official Complaint to the Commission on Judicial Disabilities mailed on 12-16-24 and stated, again, in her "Pleads", namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the assertions that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or deliberately breaching the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to committing "Fraud Upon the Court" by infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) and due to breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Maryland Rule 2-311. 2.) For the 5<sup>th</sup> time, the evidence of the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Findings and Order docketed on 4-28-25, which respond to one of the Defendant's 2 separate Motions docketed 4-23-25, and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. continues to deliberately engage in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to failing to: a.) consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions substantiate sufficient legal and factual basis for the Defendant's being granted her "**Relief Requested**" as afforded her under the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions. b.) consider, disclose, and resolve if the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-23-25 support the allegations that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding Judges, has redundantly and intentionally violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to his refusal to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Order if the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and the Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were repeatedly and/or deliberately violated by the previous presiding Judges. 3.) For the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare by infringing upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Maryland Rule Maryland Rule 18.102.11 and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C &



455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would be biased and/or impartial since: a.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his privileged 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, both of whom 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 intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant’s Motions from her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, and Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has access to the material facts and legal arguments in the Motions that are cited as “Exhibits” on the Defendant’s website. b.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant’s Motions docketed on 4-23-25, 3-25-25, 2-28-25, and on 12-26-24 to have invaded upon the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. 4.) For the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare in breaching the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to invading upon Maryland Rule 2-311 in failing to allow the opposing party, the State of Maryland, a time limit of 15 days to respond to the Defendant’s Motion before issuing his Findings and Order. 5.) For the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare in infringing upon the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by denying the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311.

## **INTRODUCTION**

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

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 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> 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 Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, or the U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes, to conduct an investigation into the allegations cited in the Defendant's 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 "Pleads" namely, that of determining whether the evidence substantiate the assertions that the Defendant is being redundantly and/or deliberately denied her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions because Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare in repetitiously and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, which prevent the Defendant from being granted her relief requested, namely, that of being granted her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets. For the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson Jr., has denied the Defendant's Motions, including her Motion for a hearing on the Motions, but continues to simply state at the top of the Defendant's Motions that "Based on this Court's consideration of this motion, the motion is denied because it does not present a sufficient legal or factual basis for the relief requested", although the evidence in the Defendant's Motions, unequivocally, substantiate that the material fact that Judge D. Robinson provides no sufficient legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's relief requested, namely, that of granting the Defendant's 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions. Moreover, the following are more material facts and legal arguments which substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr., the presiding Judge, continues to intentionally engage in Law fare by redundantly and willingly invading upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, namely, that: **1.)** The evidence of the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Order docketed on 4-28-25 and written at the top of the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-23-25 ( Exhibits 236 and 237, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions, from which Judge D. Robinson, Jr. responds to in his Findings and Orders, substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was obligated to determine if the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were infringed upon as alleged in the Defendant's Motions since the evidence substantiate the material facts that Judge R. Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders, which respond to the Defendant's Motions (Exhibits, 190, 190', 191, 189, and 187', respectively, on the Defendant's website) if the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 were breached due to Judge S. Bailey violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 as a result of Judge S. Bailey's refusal to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets. **2.)** On 12-19-24, the Georgia Appellant Court recognized that there was an appearance of an Officer of the Court, the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial and, removed the Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellant Court cited an "appearance of 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.”... 3.) For the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare by violating the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to not only breaching Maryland Rule 2-311 and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, but, also, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). 4.) Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), Judge D. Robinson Jr. should voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge and/or as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning judges to preside over the Defendant’s case and all of Judge D. Robinson Jr.’s Orders should be deemed void as a matter of law and ,thus, be of no legal force or effect because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would be biased and/or impartial since: a.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his privileged 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, both of whom 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 intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant’s Motions from her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, and Judge D. Robinson , Jr., has access to the material facts and legal arguments in these Motions that are cited as “Exhibits” on the Defendant’s website. b.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr., the presiding Judge and who is the Judge-in-Charge of assigning himself to be the presiding Judge over the Defendant’s 6 separate Motions is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant’s Motions to have invaded upon her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, the Defendant’s Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 2-18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). 5.) 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. 6.) The Supreme Court has, also, 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. 7.) Moreover, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that the violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) constitutes disqualification of the judge and a Judge who fails to disqualify himself/herself is committing “Fraud upon the Court” which 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 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. 8.) The



evidence of a copy postage and receipt from the local Post Office substantiate that the Defendant sent a certified document sent to our 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump on 1-21-25, in which the Defendant pleads, amongst other things, that our 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump assigns the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General for the DOJ, the Director of the FBI, or U.S Attorney for Maryland to conduct an investigation into the proclamations declared in the Defendant's 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 194 on the Defendant's website) and stated, again, in her 1-21-25 "Pleads" namely, that the evidence substantiate the allegations that the Defendant is being repetitiously and/or deliberately denied her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and her 15 ammunitions because Judge D. Robinson, Jr., Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey are engaging in Law fare by continuously and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to prevent the Defendant from being granted her relief requested in her numerous Motions, namely, that of being granted her right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets. Moreover, our 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes, 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. 9.) The evidence of the testimony given by the Defendant during the 6-9-24 hearing on the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-23 (Exhibit 187' on the Defendant's website) before Judge Glass, the presiding Judge, substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully completed the requirements mandated in the 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey dated 5-20-21 (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 2-28-25 and is Exhibit 210 on the Defendant's website). 10.) Also, during the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass, the evidence of the testimony cited by the State of Maryland, the opposing party, namely, 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 substantiate that the Defendant has successfully completed the requirements mandated in the 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued by Judge S. Bailey on 5-20-21. 11.) Moreover, the Attorney representing the State of Maryland, also, testified at the hearing before Judge Glass on 6-9-24 that, in the Probation/Supervision Order signed on 5-20-21 by the presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, the Order does not declare that the Defendant could not repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets after successfully completing the mandates in Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order 12.) Although the Defendant continues to forward a copy of all of her Motions to the State of Maryland as evidenced by the Certificate of Service in the Defendant's Motions, the Defendant is aware that the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified at the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass that the State of Maryland would not object to the Defendant having repossession of her firearm and ammunitions. 13.) Further, during the 6-9-24 hearing, the evidence of Judge Glass verbally granting the Defendant's plea to have her record expunge substantiate that the Defendant has successfully completed the requirements mandated in the Probation/Supervision Order by Judge S. Bailey dated 5-20-21. 14.) Although during the hearing, the Defendant's Motion for expungement of her criminal record was granted, Judge Glass informed the Defendant that she would have to Order a Stay on the granting of the Defendant's expungement in order to allow the Defendant's Motion for the granting of her legally owned firearm



and ammunitions to be resolved before Judge S. Bailey, otherwise 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. 15.) For the 5<sup>th</sup> time, the evidence substantiate the material facts that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare in violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by issuing his Findings and Order before the expiration of the 15-day time limit given to the opposing party, the State of Maryland, to respond to the Defendant's Motions. 16.) In the Defendant's 2 separate Motions docketed on 4-23-25, the evidence substantiate the material facts that Judge Robinson Jr. issued his Findings and Order to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-23-25 before the State of Maryland had been given its 15 days to respond to the Defendant's Motions as mandated in Maryland Rule 2-311. 17.) The Defendant is alleging that the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in all of her Motions from which Judge D. Robinson presided over (Exhibits 223, 219, 192, 231, 232, 236, and 237, respectively, on the Defendant's website) and the evidence of the facts stated in Judge D. Robinson, Jr.'s Findings and Orders, which respond to the Defendant's Motions and which are written on at the top of the first page of the Defendant's Motions, substantiate her allegations that, for the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. has repetitiously and/or deliberately engaged in Law fare by failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings and Orders any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions docketed on 4-23-25 or any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's previous Motions in which Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was the presiding Judge. 18.) The material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 6 separate Motions (Exhibits 223, 219, 192, 231, 232, 236, and 237, respectively, on the Defendant's website) presided over by Judge D. Robinson and the evidence of the lack thereof of facts cited at the top of the 1<sup>st</sup> page of the Defendant's Motions substantiate the allegations that, for the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in his Findings the Defendant's allegations in her Motions that the former presiding Judges have redundantly and/or intentionally violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to their refusing to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings if the evidence substantiate that the Defendant has ,since 5-23-23, successfully been in compliance with all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 2-year, 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21 and, therefore, the Defendant 's 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 bullets must be granted. 19.) The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's 5 separate Motions docketed since 7-10-24 Motions (Exhibits 188, 189-193', 219-220, 231, 232, 236 and 237, respectively, on the Defendant's website) substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge R. Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey, had access to the Defendant's website because the Defendant cited her website address in all of these Motions to substantiate other material facts and evidence asserted in her Motions from other documents on the Defendant's website. Since Judge D. Robinson and each of the former presiding Judges had access to the Defendant's website address, Judge D. Robinson and 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 the present Governor of Maryland, Wes Moore (herein Wes Moore), two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Martin O'Malley and 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. **20.)** After researching the background of Judge Glass and discovered that she was appointed to her superlative Administrative by Martin O'Malley. 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. On 12-14-24, after going on line to research the background of Judge Alexander, it was discovered that Judge Alexander was, too, appointed in 2010 by Martin O'Malley, and Judge Glass was appointed in 2014 by Martin O'Malley, who, along with Wes Moore and Larry Hogan, is being alleged in the Defendant's present civil litigation 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 committed other crimes as a result of: **a.)** allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades. **b.)** 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. **c.)** 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. **d.)** and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Judges, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to transgress Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes.

## **ARGUMENT**

The evidence, undeniably, substantiates that, for the 5<sup>th</sup> time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has engaged in Law fare by violating the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to not only breaching Maryland Rule 2-311 and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, but, also, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) mandates that Judge D. Robinson Jr. voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge and/or as the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning judges to preside over the Defendant's case and all of Judge D. Robinson Jr.'s Orders should be deemed void as a matter of law and ,thus, be of no legal force or effect because there is an appearance that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. would be biased and/or impartial since: **1.)** Judge D. Robinson, Jr. was appointed to his privileged 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, both of whom 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 intrude upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes in the Defendant’s Motions from her present civil litigation in the Circuit Court of Baltimore City, and Judge D. Robinson , Jr., has access to the material facts and legal arguments in these Motions that are cited as “Exhibits” on the Defendant’s website. 2.) Judge D. Robinson, Jr., the presiding Judge and who is the Judge-in-Charge of assigning himself to be the presiding Judge over the Defendant’s 5 separate Motions is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant’s Motions to have invaded upon her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, the Defendant’s Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 2-18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a).

Relative to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), 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. Further, the U.S Supreme Court has already established that the violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) constitutes disqualification of the judge and a Judge who fails to disqualify himself/herself is committing “Fraud upon the Court” which 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.

Still too, the evidence in the record, undeniably, substantiates that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. as the presiding Judge and as the Judge-in-Charge of assigning himself to preside over Defendant’s Motions, and all of the former presiding Judges have engaged in Law fare due to repeatedly and/or intentionally violating the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, the Defendant’s Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of breaching the Defendant’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and her 15 ammunitions and refusal to grant the Defendant a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, although the Defendant has motioned repeatedly for a hearing on her Motions before Judge D. Robinson, Jr. and before all of the other former presiding Judges. Judge D. Robinson Jr. should be cognizant of the material fact that he is engaging in Law fare by redundantly and/or intentionally breaching the Defendant’s 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and the Defendant’s Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 because he is infringing upon the Defendant’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and her 15 ammunitions since the evidence, unequivocally, substantiate that the original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, and all of the other former presiding Judges erred and cite no legal or factual basis in their Findings and Orders for denying the Defendant’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right to repossess or legally owned firearm and 15 ammunitions because the evidence, unequivocally, substantiate that, since 5-23-23, the Defendant has successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 by Judge S. Bailey.

### **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 10<sup>th</sup> day of May 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1.) 1st Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion For Disqualification Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. As The Presiding Judge And As The Judge-In-Charge Of Presiding Over Assigning A Judge To Preside Over The Defendant's Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 5<sup>th</sup> Motion For Disqualification Of Judge D. Robinson, Jr. As A Result Of His Continuous Law Fare In Repeatedly And Deliberately Breaching Of The Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, Her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, And Her Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To Committing Fraud Upon the Court By Infringing Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Due To Breaching Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleads To our 45<sup>th</sup>- 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) As mandated Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Motion To Allow The State Of Maryland Their 15 Days To Respond And To Have A hearing On The Motions, Which Is The Defendant's 5<sup>th</sup> Motion For A Hearing On Her Motions To Judge D. Robinson, Jr was mailed, postage paid, to: Baltimore County State Attorney, 401 Bosley Avenue, Towson, Maryland 21204.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

**REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

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



Angela Williams  
131 Calver Hall St  
Baltimore, Md. 21222

Circuit Court for Baltimore County  
County Courts Building  
P.O. Box 6754  
Baltimore, Md. 21285-6754

Attention: Supervisory Clerk: Ms. Vinea