

IN THE MATTER OF
STATE OF MARYLAND
VS.
DIANA R. WILLIAMS
BALTIMORE COUNTY
CIRCUIT COURT
FOR
IN THE
Case No. C-03-CR-20-002995

1.) 1ST MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-27-24, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 10TH MOTION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND/OR TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY, OTHERWISE, THE PRESIDING JUDGE, JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. IS CONTINUING TO ENGAGE IN LAW FARE AND, FOR THE 5TH TIME, HAS BREACHED 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 COMMITTING FRAUD UPON THE COURT BY INFRINGING UPON FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455(a) AND DUE TO VIOLATING 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 45TH-47TH HON. PRESIDENT TRUMP AGAINST JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. 2.) MOTION TO ALLOW THE STATE OF MARYLAND ITS 15 DAYS TO RESPOND TO THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS AND TO HAVE A HEARING ON THE MOTIONS AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANT'S 5TH 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 To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed on 8-27-24, Which Is The Defendant's 10th Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And/Or To Continue The Stay On The Expungement Of Judge Glass' Order Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case Is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, The Presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. Is Continuing To Engage In Law Fare And, For The 5th Time, Has Breached 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 Committing fraud Upon The

Court By Infringing Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Due To Violating Maryland Rule 18.102.11 And Maryland Rule 2-311, And These Violations Are Cited In The Defendant's 1-21-25 Pleadings To Our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion to Allow the State Of Maryland Its 15 Days To Respond To The Defendant's Motions And To Have A Hearing On The Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Which Is The Defendant's 5th 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 third time, the Defendant is informing Judge D. Robinson Jr. 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 Commission mailed on 12-16-24 on Judicial Disabilities and stated, again, in her "Pleads", namely, that the evidence, indisputably, substantiate the allegations 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 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, 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. 2.) For the 10th time, the Defendant is motioning a Stay on the execution of Judge Glass' Order issued on 8-27-24 and/or to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order docketed on June 12, 2024 until this Criminal Case is resolved in its entirety, with the legal and factual basis being that, without the Stay on the expungement, the Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist. 3.) For the 5th time, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 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 not only breaching Maryland Rule 2-311 but, also, Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a). 4.) For the 5th time, the presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr., has engaged in Law fare in breaching the Defendant's 14th 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

Section 242 as a result of infringing upon the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally own firearm and her 15 ammunition because the evidence substantiate the following material facts and legal arguments, which are cited in the last 6 separate Motions from which Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is the presiding Judge and are declared in the Defendant's other Motions, and/or are asserted in the "Pleads" to our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, namely, that: 1.) The Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the requirements in the 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order that issued on 5-20-21 by Judge S. Bailey and there is no statement in her Probation/Supervision Order 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. 2.) In all of the Defendant's Motions, from which Judge D. Robinson Jr. responds to in his Findings and Orders, the Defendant states the material facts and legal arguments in her Motions substantiate the allegations that there is no legal or factual basis for Judge S. Bailey, the original Finder of Fact, denying the Defendant's relief requested, namely, that of granting the Defendant's her 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition because: a.) The evidence in the record 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). b.) Also, the evidence of the testimony cited during the 6-9-24 hearing before Judge Glass 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. c.) Moreover, the Attorney representing the State of Maryland testified during the hearing before Judge Glass on 6-9-24 that, in the Probation/Supervision Order signed on 5-20-21 by 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 2-year Probation/Supervision Order; then, the Attorney representing the State of Maryland, walked over to the Defendant's table to show the Defendant a copy of the Probation/Supervision Order, although she wasn't aware that the Defendant had own her copy of the same document until she saw the Defendant looking at the same Order. d.) 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. 3.) The Defendant alleges that evidence before Judge D. Robinson, Jr., presiding Judge, and that was before all of the former presiding Judges substantiate that Judge D. Robinson Jr. and all of the other presiding Judges erred in failing to determine if the evidence support the material facts that the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd 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 repetitiously and/or intentionally violated by Judge D. Robinson and all of the former presiding Judges because these Officers of the Court repeatedly and/or

deliberately failed to consider, disclose, and resolve if Judge S. Bailey, erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24 due to there being no legal or factual basis for denying the Defendant's her legally own firearm and 15 bullets; again, the evidence in the record substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the requirements in her Probation/Supervision Order and, therefore, Judge S. Bailey's denial breached the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242. 4.) For the 5th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. has intentionally denied the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to determine if the Defendant has a legal and factual basis for her relief requested, namely, to Stay Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of the expungement of the Defendants until it's determined if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24, especially in light of the material facts that all of the other presiding judges have failed to consider, disclose, or resolve this issue and have denied the Defendant's her right as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to have a hearing on her Motions. Also, Judge D. Robinson is cognizant of the material fact that his 5th denial of the Defendant's Motions, which include the Defendant's 10th Motion for a Stay on the execution of her Defendant's expungement, would mean that Defendant's criminal case would no longer exist and, therefore, he, the presiding Judge, would not have to have a hearing on the Defendant's Motions to determine if he, the presiding Judge, and all of the other presiding Judges, which include Judge S. Bailey, the original Finder of Fact, erred in their Findings and Orders d because the evidence, unequivocally, substantiate that Judge S. Bailey erred in her Finding and Order docketed on 6-25-24 due to infringing upon the Defendant's 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 in failing to adhere to her 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 because the Defendant had, since 5-23-23 successfully completed Judge S. Bailey Probation/Supervision Order would never have to be consider, disclosed, and resolved by Judge D. Robinson Jr. or any other presiding Judge. 5.) For the 5th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 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 by not only deliberately breaching Maryland Rule 2-311, and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, but by, also, failing to uphold Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) and 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, of which Judge D. Robinson has access to. 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 5 separate Motions is the Judge who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions 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). 6.) 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 suggests 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.) 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. 8.) For the 5th time, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 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 by issuing his Findings and Order before allowing the opposing party, the State of Maryland, 15 days to respond to the Defendant's Motions as ordered under Maryland Rule 2-311. 9.) 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 docketed on 4-28-25 and, thereby, violating Maryland Rule 2-311 due to issuing his Findings and Order before the State of Maryland's 15-day time limit to respond to the Defendant's Motions had expired. 9.) Since the evidence in the record substantiate that Judge D. Robinson, Jr., as the presiding judge and as the judge-in-charge of presiding over assigning judges to criminal cases, has repeatedly and deliberately engaged in Law fare, as well as all of the former presiding judges, in her letter that was sent by certified mail on 1-21-25 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, Attorney P. Bondi, the Director of the FBI, Mr. Patel, or the U.S. Attorney for Maryland, Attorney 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 the evidence, indisputably, 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 D. Robinson, Jr. is engaging in Law fare in 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 by failing to grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to determine if the Defendant has a legal and

factual basis for her relief requested, namely, to Stay Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of the expungement of the Defendants until it's determined if Judge S. Bailey erred in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24. 10.) Our 45th – 47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Attorney General P. Bondi, the FBI Director, Mr. Patel, and the U.S. Attorney for Maryland, Attorney Hayes, have access to the Defendant's website and, therefore, has access to all of the Defendant's past, present, and future Motions and all of the Findings and Orders of the presiding Judges.

ARGUMENT

Judge D. Robinson Jr. should be cognizant of the material fact that, if he denies the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the Judge Glass' 8-27-24 Order for the execution of expungement of the Defendant's record, then there would be an automatic denial of the Defendant's Motion for a hearing on her other Motions, which include a Motion for Disqualification of Judge D. Robinson Jr. as the presiding Judge and the Defendant's Motion for a Stay on the expungement of her records until the Defendant's case has been resolved in its entirety. Judge D. Robinson Jr. knows that a denial of the Defendant's Stay would implicate the Defendant's case no longer exists and, therefore, the issue of determining if Judge D. Robinson and the other 4 other presiding Judges, which include the original Finder of Fact, Judge S. Bailey, have repeatedly breached the Defendant's in failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if Judge S. Bailey erred in failing to adhere to her own 4-page, 2-year Probation/Supervision Order issued on 5-20-21 and has cited no tangible evidence or no legal or factual basis in her Findings and Orders for denying the Defendant's 2nd Amendment Right to repossess her legally owned firearm and 15 ammunition because the evidence in the record, indisputably, substantiate that the Defendant has, since 5-23-23, successfully complied with all of the conditions in Judge S. Bailey's Probation/Supervision Order. Moreover, the evidence, undeniably, substantiates that for the 5th time, Judge D. Robinson Jr. 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 not only breaching Maryland Rule 2-311 and Maryland Rule 18.102.11, but, also, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), which 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 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 14th Amendment Right, her 2nd Amendment Right, the

Defendant's Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Maryland Rule 2-18.102.11, 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 10th day of May 2025, a copy of the Defendant's foregoing: 1st Motion For Reconsideration Of The Defendant's Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed on 8-27-24, which is The Defendant's 10th Motion To Stay The Execution Of Expungement In Judge Glass' Order Docketed On 8-27-24 And/Or To Continue The Stay On The Expungement Of Judge Glass' Order Docketed On June 12, 2024 Until This Case is Resolved In Its Entirety, Otherwise, The Presiding Judge, Judge D. Robinson, Jr. is Continuing To Engage In Law Fare And, For The 5th Time, Has Breached 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 Committing fraud Upon The Court By Infringing Upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) And Due To Violating 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 Hon. 45th-47th President Trump Against Judge D. Robinson, Jr. 2.) Motion to Allow the State Of Maryland its 15 Days To Respond To The Defendant's Motions And To Have A Hearing On The Motions As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311, which is The Defendant's 5th 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: 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General for the DOJ, Attorney P. Bondi, the newly FBI, Mr. K Patel, and U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney K. Hayes