

circumstances that warrant such an order, including the "number and content of the filings." *Id.*

Prior to issuing a pre-filing order, the court should examine and document the

prompt disposition of litigation in it." Md. Rule 16-105(b)(12).

duties necessary to the effective administration of the internal management of the court and the

authorizes the County Administrative Judge of a circuit court to perform "any [] administrative

control the actions of such a litigant. *Id.* at 28-29. Furthermore, Maryland Rule 16-105(b)(12)

Maryland Rule 15-502 provides "clear authority" for a court to issue a pre-filing order to

remedy available to a Maryland court to control the actions of a vexatious or frivolous litigant").

additional papers or pleadings. *Id.* at 29 (stating that a pre-filing order "if properly issued, is a

issuing a pre-filing order that requires a litigant to obtain leave of the court before filing

Baltimore Cnty., 190 Md. App. 11, 23 (2010). One such manner in which a court may act is by

of the judicial system by litigants who file repeated, meritless cases. *Riffin v. Cir. Ct. for*

Maryland law permits the courts to craft narrowly-tailored remedies to discourage abuse

dated March 30, 2026. The Court examines the events underlying these matters below.

Plaintiff Diana R. Williams' ("Williams") Motion for Reconsideration/Request for Hearing

The above-captioned matter comes before the Circuit Court for Baltimore City on

ORDER

* * * * *

Defendants. * Case No.: 24-C-17-004535

HAMEEDULLAH VIRK, *et al.* * BALTIMORE CITY, PART 23

v. * FOR

Plaintiff, * CIRCUIT COURT

DIANA R. WILLIAMS, * IN THE

Attachment 1

at 33. In *Riffin*, the Appellate Court of Maryland noted five factors that may be helpful for the court to examine in drafting a pre-filing order:

(1) The litigant's history of litigation and in particular whether it entailed vexatious, harassing, or duplicative lawsuits;

(2) The litigant's motive in pursuing the litigation, e.g., does the litigant have an objective good faith expectation of prevailing;

(3) Whether the litigant is represented by counsel;

(4) Whether the litigant has caused needless expense to other parties or has posed an unnecessary burden on the courts and their personnel; and

(5) Whether other sanctions would be adequate to protect the courts and other parties.

190 Md. App. at 35 (citing *Safir v. U.S. Lines Inc.*, 792 F.2d 19, 24 (2d Cir. 1989)).

Pursuant to the above-referenced authorities, and having considered the record in the

above-captioned matter, the undersigned adopts the following findings.

1. The above-captioned matter was closed by this Court on December 22, 2017.
2. Between the closing of the case in 2017 through January 2020, Williams has continued to file numerous repetitive frivolous papers which resulted in Judge W. Michel Pierson issuing an Order on January 2, 2020, ordering the Clerk's Office for the Circuit Court for Baltimore City ("Clerk's Office") to not accept any future filings in this action other than an Order of Appeal.¹ Judge Pierson noted in his Order that Williams "continues to file repetitive and/or frivolous pleadings because prior rulings are not to her liking."
3. Since the issuance of the January 2, 2020, Order, Williams continues to file numerous repetitive vexatious papers, requesting this Court to assign a judge "who was not

¹ This Court is not clear on why the Clerk's Office have accepted subsequent filings by Williams in this matter.

Maryland, or apply to any case in which Williams is a defendant; and it is further

apply to suits filed on Williams' behalf by an attorney admitted to practice in the State of
ORDERED that this Order only restricts unapproved self-represented filings. It does not

sufficient grounds for denying leave to file; and it is further

attached to each motion filed. Failure to comply strictly with the terms of this Order will be

“Application Pursuant to Court Order Seeking Leave to File.” A copy of this Order must be

so certify truthfully on penalty of perjury. Motion for leave to file must be captioned

court. Williams must also certify that the claims are not frivolous or in bad faith, and that they

they wish to present are new claims never before raised and disposed of on the merits by any

ORDERED that, to seek leave to file, Williams must certify that the claim or claims

represented filings are accepted for docketing by the Clerk's Office; and it is further

ORDERED that Williams is required to seek leave of the Court before any such self-

and docketed normally; and it is further

of this Court, except for notices of appeal of a decision of this Court, which shall be accepted

actions, papers, or pleadings in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City without first obtaining leave

ORDERED that, effective immediately, Williams shall not file any self-represented

the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 23 hereby

The undersigned having considered all of the above, it is this 28th day of April 2026 by

Williams' Motion for Reconsideration.

matter was adjudicated on December 22, 2017, and that this Court has repeatedly denied

Each of the motions filed by Williams have been repetitive and frivolous given that this

4. Since the closing of this case in 2017, Williams has filed approximately 50 motions.

Barbera” to preside over her Motion to Reconsider.

appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge

ORDERED that this Order does not apply to any pleadings or papers necessary to

perfect an appeal from an order issued by this Court, which shall be accepted and docketed

normally; and it is further

ORDERED that the employees of the Clerk's Office are directed not to docket any self-

represented filings, papers, or pleadings submitted by Williams, except for notices of appeal,

unless and until the undersigned determines that the pleading is filed in good faith, not for an

improper purpose, and that it has a colorable basis in both law and fact; and it is further

ORDERED that, if Williams attempts to seek leave to file any paper or pleading

pursuant to the process outlined herein, the Clerk's Office shall forward the item to the

undersigned for her consideration before docketing the item in Odyssey; and it is further

ORDERED that any failure to comply with the terms of this Order may result in a

finding of contempt; and it is further

ORDERED that, pursuant to Maryland Rule 1-341(a), upon motion by an adverse party,

this Court may require Williams to bear the costs and reasonable expenses, including reasonable

attorneys' fees, incurred by the parties in litigating these proceedings.

04/28/2026 11:15:17 AM

Audrey J.S. Carrion

Audrey J.S. Carrion

Administrative Judge

Circuit Court for Baltimore City

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

Kenneth A. Conroy

CLERK TO SEND COPIES TO:

All counsel on record.

Ms. Diana Williams

131 Calvin Hill Court

Entered: Clerk, Circuit Court for
Baltimore City, MD
April 28, 2026

Dundalk, Maryland 21222
Plaintiff, Pro-Se
Larry H. Kirsch, Esq.
Law Office of Larry H. Kirsch
402 Long Trail Terrace
Rockville, Maryland 20850
Counsel for Defendant

DIANA R WILLIAMS VS HAMEEDULAH VIRK, ET AL

DIANA R WILLIAMS
131 CALVIN HILL COURT
DUNDALK, MD 21222

Case Number:
Other Reference Numbers:

24-C-17-004535

CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY,
MARYLAND
CIVIL DIVISION
111 N. Calvert Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202



MAIL: 410-333-3733
Civil: 410-333-3722
Criminal: 410-333-3750
Family: 410-333-3709/3738
Juvenile: 443-263-6300

Arana Williams
131 Galvin Hill Ct
Balto, Md. 21222

Mr. K. Conway
Clerk of the Circuit
111 North Calvert St. Rm 412
Balto, Md. 21202

Please, please, please read!
Marked on 5-8-26

Arana Williams
131 Galvin Hill Ct
Balto, Md. 21222

Larry H. Kusch Esquire
1803 Research Blvd., suite 125
Rockville, Md. 20850