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**MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO SANCTION JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL, MOTION TO HAVE JUDGE NANCE FOR A SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISQUALIFY THE JUDGES LISTED BELOW, AND MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE FLETCHER-HILL’S ORDERS TO DENY THE PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR JUDICIAL DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN, MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AGAINST JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN FOR COMMITTING JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT, MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION, MOTION FOR ANOTHER SUBSTITUTION, MOTION TO DISMISS JUDGE KAREN FRIEDMAN’S ORDERS AND TO HAVE ANOTHER JUDGE CONSIDER THE PLAINTIFF’S MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION, FOR A NEW TRIAL BY JURY, TO ENTER A NEW JUDGMENT BECAUSE OF ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE, AND GRANTING OF THE PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO AMEND THE PUNITIVE**

**DAMAGE IN THE PLAINTIFF’S CIVIL COMPLAINTS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| I, Diana R. Williams, the Plaintiff who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that the Plaintiff’s Motion For Judicial Disqualification Of Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion, Motion Sanction Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion To Have Judge Nance For A Substitution, Motion To Disqualify The Judges Listed Below, and Motion To Dismiss Judge Fletcher-Hill’s Orders to Deny The Plaintiff’s Motion For Judicial Disqualification Of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion For Sanctions Against Judge Karen Friedman For Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion For Clarification, Motion For Another Substitution, Motion To Dismiss Judge Karen Friedman’s Orders, And To Have Another Judge Consider The Plaintiff’s Motions For Reconsideration, For a New Trial By Jury, To Enter A New Judgment Because Of Additional Evidence, And Granting Of The Plaintiff’s Motion To Amend the Punitive Damage In the Plaintiff’s Civil Complaints (hereinafter “1st Motions”) be granted based on the grounds and authorities cited below: |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | 1. **CR 59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have reasonably discovered and produced earlier are grounds for granting the Plaintiff’s Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Plaintiff making the application which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced by the Plaintiff earlier, is that the Chief Judge of the Baltimore City Circuit Court (hereinafter “Circuit Court”), Judge Fletcher-Hill, should be sanctioned because he has violated Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. &455, Canons 1, 2, and 3 of the Judicial Code of Conduct for Judges (hereinafter “Canons”), and infringed upon the Plaintiff’s 7th and 14th Amendment Rights by failing to disqualify and/or recuse himself from presiding over the Plaintiff’s Motion For Judicial Disqualification of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion for Sanctions against Judge Karen Friedman For Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion for Clarification, Motion for Another Substitution, Motion to Dismiss Judge Karen Friedman’s Orders, and to Have Another Judge Consider the Plaintiff’s Motions for Reconsideration, For a New Trial By Jury, To Enter a New Judgment Because of Additional Evidence, and Granting of the Plaintiff’s Motion to Amend the Punitive Damage in the Plaintiff’s Civil Complaints (hereinafter “2nd Motions”), and, therefore, Judge Fletcher-Hill’s Orders dated 4-2-18 should be dismissed and all of the Plaintiff’s other Motions should be granted.** Under Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 455, recusal of a judge is appropriate where "a reasonable person”, knowing all the facts, would conclude that the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned and requires judges to recuse sua sponte where appropriate. Canon 1 stipulates that a judge shall uphold and promote the independence, integrity, and impartiality of the judiciary, and shall avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety. Canon 2 cites that a judge shall perform the duties of judicial office impartially, competently, and diligently. Canon 3 states, in relevant to “Disqualification”, that a judge shall disqualify himself/herself in a proceeding in which his/her impartiality might reasonably be questioned. Judicial impartiality is a significant element of justice. The American Bar Association's (hereinafter ABA) Model Code of Judicial Conduct prescribes disqualification for judges who encounter allegations of a conflict of interest in a motion to disqualify. The Plaintiff clearly alleges in her 2nd Motions filed on 3-9-18 that she questions Judge Fletcher-Hill’s impartiality as presiding over her civil case. Moreover, in the Plaintiff’s 3-9-18 Official Complaint of Judicial Misconduct and Obstruction of Justice by Judge Karen Friedman (hereinafter 1st Judicial Complaint”) **(Exhibit 1)** and/or in her 5-6-16 Official Complaint of Judicial Misconduct by the 8 Justices of the Supreme Court, by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, and by the Circuit Court (Exhibit 6 on website), and/or in her email addendums (Exhibit 16 on website), the Plaintiff alleges the following **16 material facts**, which causes the Plaintiff to question Judge Fletcher-Hill’s impartiality and question how, given the **16 material facts** cited below, Judge Fletcher-Hill’s presiding over her 2nd Motions would not be an actual conflict of interest and/or an appearance of a conflict of interest and/or an actual impropriety and/or an appearance of an impropriety, namely,: **1.**  In her appeals of Judge Fletcher-Hill’s 2015 decision to grant the Defendants’ motions to dismiss the Plaintiff’s 2014 Civil Complaint of Constructive Fraud (hereinafter “2014 Civil Complaint”), the Plaintiff asserts that Judge Fletcher-Hill breached her 14th Amendment right, violated Federal Law, 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants’ motions to dismiss the Plaintiff’s 2014 Civil Complaint which, amongst other things, exposed the material fact that Martin O’Malley (hereinafter “O’Malley”) and the 6 Defendants intentionally committed misconduct and potentially criminal acts by deliberately exposing our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards since at 1993, and have yet to test or compensate all the children that have been exposed to this potentially fatal toxic. **2.** Judge Fletcher-Hill, the presiding judge over the Plaintiff ‘s 2014 Civil Complaint, knew that, amongst other things, the Plaintiff stated that O’Malley and the Defendants, 5 of whom are state agencies in Maryland which O’Malley, when he was the Governor of Maryland, exercised executive power over, namely, the Maryland State Board of Education (hereinafter “MSBE”), Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation of Maryland, (DLLR), the Maryland State Board of Education (MSDE), the Board of Education of Baltimore County (School Board), and the Maryland State Education Association (MSEA) intentionally committed misconduct and potential criminal acts. **3.** Judge Fletcher-Hill, along with Judge Julie Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Edward Hargadon, Judge Videtta Brown, Judge Lawrence Fletcher-Hill, Judge Yolanda Tanner, Judge Shannon Avery, and Judge Sylvester Cox is named as one of the approximate 35 judges who is being alleged by the Plaintiff to have intentionally committed judicial misconduct and obstructed justice in order to cover up the fact that O’Malley, the former Governor of Maryland, the former Mayor of Baltimore City, the former member of the Baltimore City Council who was, also, one of the 2016 Candidates for President is alleged by the Plaintiff to have committed deliberate misconduct and potentially criminal acts, and the Plaintiff has requested that the President and Congress appoint a Special Prosecutor to investigate her substantiated allegations of judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice against Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Karen Friedman, the other judges listed above, and, also, to investigate the allegation of deliberate misconduct and possibly crimes against O’Malley and other government officials. **4.** The Plaintiff pleads that, since she questions the impartiality of Judge Fletcher-Hill presiding over her civil case, Judge A. Nance be assigned to preside over her civil case because the Plaintiff cites that, thus far, Judge Nance’s integrity in ruling according to the Rule of Law and without the respect of persons or taking gifts are not in question by the Plaintiff, and the Plaintiff doesn’t believe that Judge A. Nance could identify her in a line-up although Judge A. Nance has ruled on one of the Plaintiff’s civil cases over a decade ago and received a signed copy of the Plaintiff’s Documentary at a public event at or around 2013 or 2014. **5.** The Plaintiff alleges that Judge Fletcher-Hill’s 2015 unlawful denial of her Motions and Responses in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants’ motions to dismiss her 2014 Civil Complaint is similar to Judge Karen Friedman’s unlawful denial of her Motions and Responses in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants’ motions to dismiss her 2017 Civil Complaint in that, in both Civil Complaints, Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen Friedman violated federal laws and/or statutes, including the Plaintiff’s 7th and 14th Amendment Rights, in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants’ motions to dismiss the Plaintiff’s Civil Complaints and, thereby, prevent the Plaintiff from having her civil cases heard before a jury of her peers which would expose, amongst other things, the material facts that O’Malley and other government officials intentionally committed misconduct and potentially criminal acts. **6**. The Plaintiff declares that, unless transparency is prevalent, her 2017 Civil Complaint will continue to follow the same illegal and unlawful acts committed by Judge Fletcher-Hill and other Officers of the Court in her 2014 Civil Complaint. **7.** In the Plaintiff’s May 2015 Motion for Reconsideration or a New Trial to the In Banc judges from the Circuit Court (Exhibit 32 on website), the Plaintiff details and substantiates how Judge Fletcher-Hill breached her 14th Amendment right and violated Federal Law, 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants’ motions to dismiss her 2014 Civil Complaint. **8.** The Plaintiff pleads to Hon. President Trump and Hon. Chuck Grassley, and the public that **“….unless transparency is prevalent, her 2017 Civil Complaint will continue to follow the same illegal and unlawful acts by the Officers of the Court as her 2014 Civil Complaint. Ms. Williams asserts that the Defendants’ motions to dismiss her 2014 Civil Complaint [Civil Complaint of Constructive Fraud] were upheld by Judge Fletcher-Hill, although Judge Fletcher-Hill knew that the evidence substantiated the fact that the Defendants’ grounds for dismissal not only breached Ms. Williams’ 14th Amendment right but, also, violated 2 other federal laws, namely, Federal Law, 42 U.S.C & 1983 and Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985…..even though the evidence before these appellant Officers of the Court proved that the Federal Supremacy Clause of the U.S., Federal Law, 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and Ms. Williams’ 14th Amendment right had been infringed upon by Judge Fletcher-Hill’s unlawful granting of the Defendants’ motion to dismiss Ms. Williams’ 2014 Civil Complaint. ……” ….“Therefore, all public information relevant to Ms. Williams’ 2017 Civil Complaint ….that led up to her 2006, 2015, and 2016 Petitions to the Supreme Court will be able to be viewed by the public on Ms. Williams’ website.”….** The Plaintiff’s website is [www.dianarwilliams**.com**](http://www.dianarwilliams.com)**. 9.** The Plaintiff alleges that, in her 2015 Motion for Reconsideration to the In Banc judges in the Circuit Court (Exhibit 32 on website), in her 2015 Writ to the Court of Appeals of Maryland (Exhibit 11 on website), and/or in her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court (Exhibit 7 on website), she provided the irrefutable evidence to support the fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, the Federal Supremacy Clause of the U.S., and her 14th Amendment Right by unlawfully granting the Defendants’ motions to dismiss her 2014 Civil complaint in order to cover up the relevant and material facts that O’Malley and other government officials intentionally committed misconduct and possibly criminal activities. **10.** The Plaintiff alleges that, of all of her appeals that led up to her filing 3 Petitions to the Supreme Court in 2006, 2015, and 2016, it is her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court that would have taken the Justice of the Supreme Court less than 10 minutes to read in order to determine that the Court of Appeals of Maryland deliberately committed perjury which caused the issues raised in the Plaintiff’s appeal to the Court of Appeals of Maryland never to be addressed or resolved by this court, which includes the assertion that the In Banc judges committed perjury, breached the Plaintiff’s 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Plaintiff’s 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants’ motions to dismiss the Plaintiff’s 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that O’Malley and other government officials intentionally committed misconduct and possibly criminal activities. **11.** Thedeliberate perjury by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, which caused the issues raised in the Plaintiff’s Petition to the Court of Appeals of Maryland never to be addressed or resolved, is that the evidence support the allegation that the Court of Appeals of Maryland lied under oath in their Order dated 9-21-15 by citing that the Plaintiff’s Writ to their court was denied because it was filed late, and the Court of Appeals of Maryland deliberately lied under oath after refusing to correct their lie after being referenced to the two exhibits in their record which, undeniably, support the fact that YES, the Court of Appeals of Maryland committed perjury. **12.** The Plaintiff asserts that the Justices of the Supreme Court, excluding Justice Gorsuch who was not yet appointed as one of the Justices to the Supreme Court, were obligated by Rule 10 in the manual of the Supreme Court to exercise their supervisory power and take corrective actions against the Court of Appeals because intentional perjury is not the accepted and usual judicial proceedings by any court. **13.** In order to determine that the first 5 exhibits on the Plaintiff’s website, which accompanied her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court, and which the 8 Justices of the Supreme Court could have read in less than 10 minutes in order to determine that the Court of Appeals of Maryland deliberately committed perjury, it’s essential to know that Maryland Rule 7-104 allows 30 days to file an appeal to the Court of Appeals, with the first day starting on the day that the last judgment of the Circuit Court is filed in the record by the clerk. The first exhibit, which is on Plaintiff’s website as Exhibit 1, is copy of the document that gives the date of the In Banc judges’ last judgment, which was their denial on July 6, 2015 of the Plaintiff Motion for Reconsideration and a New Trial. The next exhibit which is on the Plaintiff’s website as Exhibit 2 is a copy of the docket receipt from the clerk of the Court of Appeals which gives the date that the Plaintiff’s 2015 Petition for a Writ to the Court of Appeals was filed in the record of this court, namely, on August 3, 2015. The third exhibit which is on the Plaintiff’s website as Exhibit 3 is a copy of the Court of Appeals’ Order dated 9-21-15 which declares that the Plaintiff’s Writ was denied because it was filed late to the Court of Appeals of Maryland. The fourth exhibit which is on the Plaintiff’s website as Exhibit 4 is a copy of her Motion for Reconsideration to the Court of Appeals of Maryland which asserts that, amongst other things, the evidence in the record of this court, namely, Exhibits 1 and 2, support the fact that the Plaintiff’s Writ was filed in the Court of Appeals of Maryland prior to the 30-day expiration.  The fifth exhibit which is on the Plaintiff’s website as Exhibit 5 is the second denial of her Writ by the Court of Appeals of Maryland. Consequently, the second denial by the Court of Appeals of Maryland is indicative of the fact that this court refused to correct their prejudicial error, even after receiving the Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration which references Exhibits 1 and 2 in their record to prove that her Writ was filed on time. **14.** The Plaintiff asserts that the evidence that accompanied her 2016 Petition to the Supreme Court includes a copy of the Plaintiff’s addendum to her 7-14-14 initial complaint against 13 Officers of the Court to Attorney General Loretta Lynch from the Department of Justice (hereinafter (“DOJ”), which substantiate that the Justices of the Supreme Court knew that she had filed a complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill on 9-22-15 to the DOJ requesting an investigation by Attorney Lynch of the allegations that Judge Fletcher-Hill, along with the judges listed above, obstructed justice by committing, nonfeasance, misfeasance, malfeasance, and violating her 14th Amendment right. **15.** The Plaintiff declares that the evidence in the courts and/or on her website, substantiates that the Supreme Court deliberately committed judicial misconduct and obstructed justice in 2016 by failing to uphold, protect, and defend her 14th Amendment Right and Rule 10 in the manual of the Supreme Court as a result of failing to take corrective actions against the intentional prejudicial error of perjury by Court of Appeals Maryland, who deliberately committed perjury in stating that the Plaintiff’s 2015 Petition was filed late to their court and, thereby, avoided addressing and resolving the issues raised in the Plaintiff’s Writ to the Court of Appeals, which includes the issue that the In Banc judges in the Circuit Court committed perjury, breached the Plaintiff’s 14th Amendment Right and infringed upon Federal Law, 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause to cover up the material fact that Judge Fletcher-Hill violated the Plaintiff’s 14th Amendment Right and breached Federal Law, 42 U.S.C & 1983, Federal Law 42 U.S.C & 1985, and the Federal Supremacy Clause in order to unlawfully grant the Defendants’ motions to dismiss the Plaintiff’s 2014 Civil Complaint, which would have revealed the relevant and material facts that O’Malley and other government officials intentionally committed misconduct and possibly criminal activities. **16**. The Plaintiff asserts that, because of the alleged intentional judicial misconduct by the Courts and/or deliberate misconduct by O’Malley and other government officials, all of her civil litigations were unlawfully dismissed and, thus, she has yet to receive justice for the 21 years of injustices and emotional distress she has endured, and that she continues to endure emotional distress as she considers the possible negative health effects of thousands of children in Maryland public schools that have been exposed to lead poisoning since 1993 by O’Malley and by other government officials, who are responsible for the health and safety of children in public schools, but have intentionally exposed our children to lead-tainted drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards and have yet to test or compensate all the children that have been exposed to this potentially fatal toxic. 2. **CR 59 (a)(4) cites that newly discovered evidence, material for the party making the application that could not have reasonably discovered and produced earlier are grounds for granting the Plaintiff’s Motions. The newly discovered evidence, material for the Plaintiff making the application which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Plaintiff is that, under Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363, Judge Fletcher-Hill has committed judicial misconduct as a result of failing to disqualify himself from presiding over the Plaintiff’s 2nd Motions but choosing to infringe upon Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3, and obstruct justice by violating Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. &455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3, which have prevent the Plaintiff from exercising her 7th and 14th Amendment Rights as stipulated in the Constitution of the U.S.** Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363 assigns judicial misconduct to any judge who acts in a manner that is considered illegal, immoral, unethical, shows impropriety, inappropriate, or otherwise violate the judge’s obligation of impartial conduct. Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363, also, gives citizens of the U.S. the right to file a complaint of judicial misconduct and have our substantiated allegations of judicial misconduct addressed and resolved. Although the Plaintiff will exercise her right under Federal Law 28 U.S.C &363 by filing an email addendum to her 1st Judicial Complaint, requesting that the President and Congress have the Special Prosecutor, also, include in their investigation the allegation of intentional judicial misconduct and obstruction of justice against Judge Fletcher-Hill as alleged in this 1st Motions and in the Plaintiff’s 1st Judicial Complaint, this Circuit Court should sanction Judge Fletcher-Hill for committing intentional judicial misconduct and obstructing justice. Judge Fletcher-Hill, under Federal law, 28 U.S.C & 363, has committed judicial misconduct due to his breaching Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3 and, moreover, has obstructed justice by infringing upon Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. & 455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3, which prevent the Plaintiff from exercising her Constitutional Rights as stipulated in 7th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution. The Plaintiff has a right to have her 2017 Civil Complaint against the Defendants, to have a hearing before a jury of her peers, as well a right to due process in this civil proceeding, and not to have her 2017 Civil Complaint dismissed due to Judge Fletcher’s committing judicial misconduct and obstructing justice, thus preventing the Plaintiff’s civil case be from being heard before a jury of her peers, where the relevant and material facts germane to Plaintiff’s civil reveal that O’Malley and other government officials deliberately committed misconduct and possibly criminal acts will be revealed and where O’Malley will be called to testify.   **ARGUMENT**  The language of the Canons leaves no doubt that, in the first instance, the recusal process is to be self-executing, without the need for a judge to wait for a recusal motion to be filed. A reasonable mind would assume that Judge Fletcher-Hill, as the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court, would have initiated the recusal and/or disqualification process as the presiding judge over the Plaintiff’s 2nd Motions due to the **16 material facts** cited above, thereby, avoiding an actual conflict of interest and/or an appearance of a conflict of interest and/or an impropriety and/or an appearance of impropriety and, thus, to avoid violating Federal law 28 U.S.C & 363 by committing judicial misconduct due to breaching Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3 and, moreover, has obstructed justice by infringing upon Federal Statute, 28 U.S.C. & 455 and Canons 1, 2, and 3, which prevent the Plaintiff from exercising her Constitutional Rights as stipulated in 7th and 14th Amendments to the Constitution.  **Conclusion**  Thus, in conclusion, the Plaintiff is requesting that this Honorable Court grant all of the Plaintiff’s 1st Motions.  Respectively Submitted  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Diana R. Williams, Pro Se  131 Calvin Hill Court  Baltimore, Maryland 21222  410-288-6123  **Certificate of Service**  I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 6th day of April 2018 a copy of the Plaintiff’s Motion For Judicial Disqualification Of Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion, Motion Sanction Judge Fletcher-Hill, Motion To Have Judge Nance For A Substitution, Motion To Disqualify The Judges Listed Below, and Motion To Dismiss Judge Fletcher-Hill’s Orders to Deny The Plaintiff’s Motion For Judicial Disqualification Of Judge Karen Friedman, Motion For Sanctions Against Judge Karen Friedman For Committing Judicial Misconduct, Motion For Clarification, Motion For Another Substitution, Motion To Dismiss Judge Karen Friedman’s Orders, And To Have Another Judge Consider The Plaintiff’s Motions For Reconsideration, For a New Trial By Jury, To Enter A New Judgment Because Of Additional Evidence, And Granting Of The Plaintiff’s Motion To Amend the Punitive Damage In the Plaintiff’s Civil Complaints were mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 402 Long Trail Terrace, Rockville, Maryland 20850.  Cc: Hon. Judge Lance  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  Diana R. Williams, Pro Se |  | |  | |