

I, Diana R. Williams, the Petitioner who is being represented Pro Se, hereby, requests that her: Motions For A Stay And Hearing On The Petitioner's Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Carrion's

COURT'S WEBSITE

MOTIONS FOR A STAY AND HEARING ON THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE CARRION'S FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 6-3-26 AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311, APPLICATION PURSUANT TO COURT ORDER SEEKING LEAVE TO FILE A MOTION IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF: 1.) PETITIONER'S 1ST MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION OF JUDGE CARRION FOR VIOLATING HER 14TH AMENDMENT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C, SECTION 242 BY BREACHING FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) AND, THUS, FOR THE 3RD TIME COMMITTING FRAUD UPON COURT AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 5-8-26, 3-30-26, AND 2-25-26 MOTIONS BECAUSE THERE IS AN APPEARANCE THAT JUDGE CARRION WOULD BE IMPARTIAL AND/OR BIAS SINCE JUDGE CARRION, ALONG WITH THE 3 OTHER PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGES, WHICH INCLUDE JUDGE CARRION BEING ASSIGNED IN 2020 AS THE CHIEF JUDGE IN THE PANEL OF 3 IN BANC JUDGES, ARE BEING ALLEGED IN THESE MOTIONS, TO HAVE COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 40 TIMES, INVADDED UPON THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C, SECTION 242 DUE TO, COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 40 TIMES, COMMITTING THE FEDERAL CRIMES OF VIOLATING FEDERAL STATUTE U.S.C & 1621, FEDERAL STATUTE U.S.C & 1623, FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR HAVE CONSPIRED TO VIOLATE FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C, & 1091 (CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY") AND DUE TO BREACHING, COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 40 TIMES, FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 18.101.11 5 (c), MARYLAND RULE 2-311, ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, AND/OR, HAVE COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMES. 2.) JUDGE CARRION HAS, FOR THE 2ND TIME, UNLAWFULLY DENIED THE PETITIONER'S RIGHT TO HAVE HER MOTIONS DISPLAYED ON THE CIRCUIT

IN THE MATTER	*	
THE PETITION OF	*	
DIANA R. WILLIAMS	*	
	*	
CIRCUIT COURT	*	
	*	
FOR	*	
	*	
BALTIMORE CITY	*	
	*	
Case No. 24-C-17-004535	*	



Findings And Orders Docketed On 6-3-26 As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Application Pursuant To Court Order Seeking Leave To File A Motion In Order To Determine If: 1.) The Petitioner's 1st Motion For Disqualification Of Judge Carrion For Violating Her 14th Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And, Thus, For The 3rd Time Committing Fraud Upon The Court As The Presiding Judge Over The Petitioner's 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions Because There Is An Appearance That Judge Carrion Would Be Impartial And/Or Bias Since Judge Carrion, Along With The 3 Other Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges, Which Include Judge Carrion Being Assigned In 2020 As The Chief Judge In The Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges, Have Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Invaded Upon The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To, Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Committing The Federal Crimes Of Violating Federal Statute U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute U.S.C & 1623, And/Or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes Against Humanity”) And Due To Breaching, Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Crimes. 2.) Judge Carrion Has, For The 2nd Time, Unlawfully Denied The Petitioner's Right To Have Her Motions Displayed On The Circuit Court's Website 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, which the Petitioner certifies are new Motions, never before raised and disposed of on the merits by any court, Motions that are, undeniably, not frivolous or in bad faith, and the Petitioner certifies truthfully on penalty of perjury that her Motions are material for the Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner, is: 1.) For the 1st time, the Petitioner is motioning for a Stay and a for a hearing on her Motion For Reconsideration of Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders docketed on 6-3-26 as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, application pursuant to Court Order seeking leave to file a Motion in order to determine if: a.) The Petitioner's 1st Motion For Disqualification of Judge Carrion for violating her 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and, thus, for the 3rd time committing Fraud upon the Court as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions because there is an appearance that Judge Carrion would be impartial and/or bias since Judge Carrion, along with the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion being assigned in 2020 as the Chief Judge in the panel of 3 in Banc Judges, have collectively and for over 40 times, invaded upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to, collectively and for over 40 times, committing the Federal crimes of violating Federal Statute U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute U.S.C & 1623, and/or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 (“Crimes against Humanity”) and due to breaching, collectively and for over 40 times, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, committed misconduct in office,

FACTS CITED, VERBATIM, FROM JUDGE CARRION'S FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 6-3-26 AND ON PAGES 2 AND 3 OF HER FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 4-28-26, WHICH RESPOND TO THE MATERIAL FACTS AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS IN THE PETITIONER'S 5-8-26 AND 3-30-26 MOTIONS, RESPECTIVELY

- 1.) Federal Statute 18, U.S.C & 1621
- 2.) Federal Statute 18, U.S.C &
- 3.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a)
- 4.) Title 18, U.S.C, Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242
- 5.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11
- 6.) 14th Amendment of the Constitution
- 7.) Maryland Rule 2-311
- 8.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c),
- 9.) Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution

MARYLAND CONSTITUTION

APPLICABLE FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS, MARYLAND RULES, AND, THE

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying the bill to maintain her website, *www.dianaarwin.com*, so that the Petitioner can, amongst other things, continue to post her Motions, the Findings and Orders from the presiding Judges, and other relevant Exhibits in the Petitioner's civil litigation, which began in 2017. Although she is on a fixed income, the Petitioner is now able to make her monthly payments, but can't afford to, at this time, make copies of all of the pages of all of the Exhibits that are cited as Exhibits to support the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions for a Stay and for a hearing on her Motion for Reconsideration of Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders docketed on 6-3-26 as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, application pursuant to Court Order seeking leave to file a Motion. Thus, although most of the documents that support the Petitioner's claim should be in the record of "this Court", the Petitioner assigns on her website these documents as Exhibits and gives the relevant Exhibit numbers in her Motions. Therefore, the Petitioner is pleading that these documents be included as evidence to substantiate the Petitioner's material facts and legal arguments in her Motion for Reconsideration of Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders docketed on 6-3-26 as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, application pursuant to Court Order seeking leave to file a Motion because the Petitioner is, financially, unable to make copies of such voluminous and material documents, which would be exceedingly more costly than what she pays to maintain her website.

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

and/or have committed other crimes. b.) For the 2nd time, Judge Carrion has unlawfully denied the Petitioner's right to have her Motions displayed on the Circuit Court's website.

As evidenced in her instant Motions, for the 1st time, the Petitioner is motioning for Disqualification of Judge Carrion as the presiding Judge due to Judge Carrion violating the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. 8, 455 (a) and, thus, for the 3rd time committing Fraud upon the Court because there is an appearance that Judge Carrion would be impartial and/or bias since: 1.) As evidenced in the material facts and

As evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions (Exhibits 310, 302, and 296 on the Petitioner's website) and as evidenced by the signature stamped on the Findings and Orders docketed on 6-3-26, 4-28-26, and 3-18-26 (Exhibits 320, 309, and 301 on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner's Motions respond to the facts asserted without sufficient evidence in Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders.

As asserted by our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump on TRUTH SOCIAL on 1-5-26, "NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW!"

As evidenced by the facts asserted in her Findings and Orders docketed on 4-28-26 (Exhibit 309 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Carrion justifies the denying the material facts and legal arguments in her adopted Findings that "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 paper 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") not to accept any future filings in this action other than an Order of Appeal," 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 appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera" to preside over her Motion to Reconsideration. 4. Since the closing of this case in 2017, Williams has filed approximately 50 Motions. Each of the motions filed by Williams have been repetitive and frivolous give that this matter was adjudicated pm December 22, 2017, and that this Court has repeatedly denied Williams' Motion for Reconsideration."

As evidenced by the facts cited in her Findings and Orders docketed on 6-3-26 (Exhibit 320 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Carrion justifies denying the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 5-8-26 Motions (not disclosed on the Circuit Court's website, but is Exhibit 310 on the Petitioner's website) by simply stating that "The Court having reviewed Plaintiff's Application Pursuant to Court Order Seeking Leave To File, filed on May 08, 2026 and the Pre-Filing Order, dated April 28, 2026, it is this 1st day of June 2026, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 23, hereby Found, that the Plaintiff's Application Pursuant to Court Order Seeking leave To File a frivolous, and it is therefore ORDERED, that the Plaintiff's Application Pursuant To Court Order Seeking Leave To File is hereby DENIED; and it is further ORDERED, that the Clerk's Office for the Circuit Court for Baltimore City shall not accept the filing of this paper, and it is further ORDERED, that the Pre-Filing Order dated April 28, 2026, shall remain in full force and effect."

Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621 and Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623 cites, amongst other things,

that any Judge who fails to consider, disclose, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in a litigation which would, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the proceedings infringes upon Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621 and Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 162 and can face up to 5 to 10 years in prison. The evidence of the facts stated in Judge Carron's Findings and Orders docketed on 6-3-26, 4-28-26, and on 3-18-26 (Exhibits 321, 309, and 301, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions, respectively (Exhibits 310, 302, and 296, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), especially the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 5-8-26 which are cited, verbatim, below, substantiate that Judge Carron has redundantly and/or deliberately failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in her 6-3-26, 4-28-26, and 3-18-26 Findings and Orders all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 5-8-26, Motions, (some of which are paraphrased in the Petitioner's 3-30-26 and 2-25-26 Motions) which alone, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's in Banc proceedings. Although Judge Carron's orders in her Findings and Orders docketed on 6-3-26 and on 4-28-26, which respond to the Petitioner's 5-8-26 and 3-30-26 Motions, that the Clerk not to display the Petitioner's Motions on the Circuit Court's website unless given permission by the Judge, as evidenced by the stamped receipt from the Circuit Court citing "RECEIVED MAY 08 2026 CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY", the Petitioner's Motions are in the record of the Circuit Court and are, again, assigned as Exhibit 310 on the Petitioner's website.

The verbatim citing below of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 5-8-26 Motions substantiate that Judge Carron's Orders from her 6-3-26 and 4-28-26 Findings and Orders are null and void because Judge Carron has repetitiously and/or intentionally impeded upon the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C, Section 242 due to, again, violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), committing Fraud upon the Court and because the evidence substantiate the material facts and legal arguments that Judge Carron, the 3rd other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carron who was the Chief of the panel of 3 in Banc Judges assigned, initially in 2020, to preside over the Petitioner's in Banc appeal "), have, collectively and for over 40 times, impeded upon Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or conspired to flout Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. Beginning on page 5 and ending on page 14 of the Petitioner's Motions filed on 5-8-26, the, verbatim, material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 5-8-26 Motions which Judge Carron failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in her 6-3-26 Findings and Orders but which, unmistakably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's in Banc proceedings assert

"FACTS CITED, VERBATIM, FROM PAGES 2 AND 3 OF JUDGE CARRION'S 4-28-26 FINDINGS AND ORDER, WHICH RESPOND TO THE MATERIAL FACTS AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS IN THE PETITIONER'S 3-30-26 MOTIONS

In Proverbs 12:19-22, the WORD OF GOD declares that "The lip of truth shall be established for ever, but a lying tongue is but for a moment. Deceit is in the heart of them that imagine evil: but to the counsellors of peace is joy. There shall no evil happen to the just; but the

LEGAL FORCE

AND, THEREBY, DEEMING THE 9 ORDERS IN JUDGE CARRION'S 4-18-26 VOID AND OF NO COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMINAL ACTS TO BREACH FEDERAL U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY"), U.S. CODE, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – GENOCIDE, AND/OR HAVE ATTEMPTED TO AND/OR CONSPIRED FEDERAL STATUTE 18, U.S.C. & 1623, FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), AND/OR FEDERAL ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, FEDERAL STATUTE 18, U.S.C. & 1621, MARYLAND RULE 2-311, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11 5 (C), AMENDMENT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 DUE TO BREACHING HAVE, COLLECTIVELY AND FOR OVER 40 TIMES, VIOLATED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH PRESIDE, INITIALLY, OVER THE PETITIONER'S IN BANC REVIEW IN 2020 IN THE CIRCUIT COURT, JUDGES, WHICH INCLUDE JUDGE CARRION, WHO WAS THE CHIEF JUDGE ASSIGNED TO CIRCUIT COURT, THE OTHER 3 PRESIDING JUDGES, AND ALL OF THE FORMER PRESIDING JUDGE CARRION, THE CIRCUIT COURT ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE AND CHIEF JUDGE OF THE DISCLOSE, AND RESOLVE IN HER FINDINGS WHICH SUBSTANTIATE THE ALLEGATIONS THAT MATERIAL FACTS AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS WHICH JUDGE CARRION FAILED TO CONSIDER,

As evidenced by the facts cited in Judge Carrion's Findings, Judge Carrion simply declares on pages 2 and 3 in her adopted Findings that "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 paper 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") not to accept any future filings in this action other than an Order of Appeal," 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 appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera" to preside over her Motion to Reconsideration. 4. Since the closing of this case in 2017, Williams has filed approximately 50 Motions. Each of the motions filed by Williams have been repetitive and frivolous give that this matter was adjudicated pm December 22, 2017, and that this Court has repeatedly denied Williams' Motion for Reconsideration."

wicked shall be filled with mischief. Lying lips are abomination to the LORD: but they that deal truly are HIS delight.”

1.) As asserted on page 1 of Judge Carrion Findings and Order docketed on 4-28-26, “prior to issuing a pre-filing order, the court should examine and document the circumstances that warrant” such Orders. Contrary to Judge Carrion’s first fact in her “adopted Findings” citing that “The above-captioned matter was closed by this Court on December 22, 2017”, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s 3-30-26 Motions, from which Judge Carrion’s 4-28-26 Findings and Order respond to, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Petitioner’s nearly “50 Motions” (Exhibits 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 47, 53, 58, 60, 64, 67, 67”, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 80, 94, 96, 98, 100, 113, 114, 139, 142, 143, 147, 148, 149, 155, 156, 180, 181, 182, 187, 215, 216, 217, 218, 234, 250, 286, 292, 296, 302, and 308 on the Petitioner’s website) and the evidence of the facts declared in the 4-28-26 Findings and Order of Judge Carrion, of the 3 other present presiding judges, and the facts declared in the Findings and Orders of all of the former of 3 in Banc judges assigned initially in 2020 to preside over the Petitioner’s in Banc Review in the Circuit Court, substantiate that the Petitioner’s Civil Case was not closed on 12-22-17 (Exhibits 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 57, 59, 63, 65, 70, 73*, 74*, 75*, 93*, 95, 97, 99, 112, 138, 141, 146, 154, 185, 214, 233, 249, 291, 301, and 307 on the Petitioner’s website) [Exhibit numbers with the “*” represent the Findings and Orders of the panel of 3 in Banc Judges]. Further, the evidence that substantiate that the Petitioner’s civil case was still ongoing and not closed on 12-22-17 is affirmed by the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s 1-3-18 Motions (Exhibit 35 on the Petitioner’s website), which respond to Judge Karen Friedman’s Findings and Order docketed on 12-22-17 (Exhibit 47 on the Petitioner’s website), the first presiding Judge over the Petitioner’s 2017 Civil Complaint. The evidence of the facts stated in Judge Karen Friedman’s 1-31-18 Findings and Order (Exhibit 48 on the Petitioner’s website) substantiate that Judge Karen Friedman’s Findings and Order respond to the Petitioner’s 1-31-18 Motions. Moreover, the evidence of the Petitioner’s civil case being ongoing and not closed on 12-22-17 can be substantiated by the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s Motions filed on 1-26-18 (Exhibit 40 on the Petitioner’s website), which respond to the Defendant’s Motion to dismiss the Petitioner’s civil case, and by the evidence of the facts cited in the 3-1-18 Findings and Order by Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 49 on the Petitioner’s website), which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s 2-15-18 Motions. Still too, as evidenced by the facts asserted in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in Judge Karen Friedman’s

Findings and Order and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's Motions, from which Judge Karen Friedman responds to, Judge Karen Friedman fails to consider, disclose, and resolve in her Findings and Order all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions, that would, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's civil case by substantiating that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 had been violated by Judge Karen Friedman because, as alleged in the Petitioner's Motions filed on 3-30-26, 2-25-26, and/or on 1-14-26, and/or in the Petitioner's Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 38 on the Petitioner's website) mailed to our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump, because: 1.) The evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions and in her Official Complaint against Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 38 on the Petitioner's website) substantiate the material facts that the Petitioner's civil case should not be dismissed and that Judge Karen Friedman repeatedly committed the prejudicial error of perjury in failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in her Findings all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions, which would, undoubtedly, substantiate that the Petitioner's civil proceedings should not be dismissed. 2.) There is an appearance that Judge Karen Friedman would be partial and/or bias since: a.) Judge Karen Friedman was appointed in 2014 to the prestige position of an Administrative Judge by Martin O'Malley, who is being avowed in the Petitioner's Motions and Civil Complaint to have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. b.) Being appointed to her privileged position in 2014 by Martin O'Malley, who is being asserted in the Petitioner's Motions to have committed "Crimes against Humanity", it does appear that Judge Karen Friedman would be have an interest in the outcome of my civil litigation. c.) Moreover, as declared in my recent Motions filed on 3-30-26, 2-25-26, and/or on 1-14-26, being appointed to her privileged position by Martin O'Malley, who is being alleged to have committed have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts, it, also, appears that Judge Karen Friedman would attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public from being cognizant of the material facts that she, along with Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, is being alleged to have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. d.) Still too, it does appear that Judge Karen Friedman would have an interest in the outcome of the Petitioner's present civil proceedings and/or would repeatedly and/or deliberately attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public exposure of these material facts because Judge Karen Friedman is being alleged in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 3-30-

26, 2-25-26, and/or on 1-14-26, and/or in my Official Complaints and Addendums mailed to our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump, to have violated Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes.

2.) Moreover, contrary to Judge Carrion stating in her adopted Findings docketed on 4-28-26 that "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 paper 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") not to accept any future filings in this action other than an Order of Appeal," Judge Pierson noted in his Order that Williams "continues to file repetitive and/or frivolous pleadings because prior rulings are not to her liking", the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Petition and Memorandum filed on 1-14-20 (Exhibits 71 and 72, respectively on the Petitioner's website) substantiate that the Petitioner appealed the 1-2-20 Findings and Orders of Judge Michel Pierson (Exhibit 70 on the Petitioner's website) in the Circuit Court. In her adopted Findings, Judge Carrion fails to consider, disclose, and resolve all material facts and legal argument in the Petitioner's Petition and Memorandum filed on 1-14-20, which would, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's civil litigation and cause the 9 Orders in Judge Carrion's 4-28-26 to be deemed null and void. The material facts and the legal arguments in the Petitioner's Memorandum substantiate that the evidence of the facts asserted in and/or the lack thereof of facts declared in Judge Michel Pierson's, Judge Fletcher-Hill's, and Judge Karen Friedman's Findings and Orders and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's Motions and material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's Motions and Orders of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman fail to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions, which would, indisputably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's civil litigation and cause the 9 Orders in Judge Carrion's 4-28-26 to be deemed null and void. Moreover, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 1-14-20 Petition for An In Banc Review in the

Circuit Court, in her Memorandum and in her Motions, which respond to the 1-2-20 Findings and Orders of Judge Michel Pierson (Exhibits 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 53, 58, 60, 64, 67, and 67', 71, and 72 on the Petitioner's website), the evidence of the facts stated in Judge Michel Pierson's 1-2-20 Findings and Order and all of his other Findings and Orders (Exhibits 70, 66, and 63 on the Petitioner's website), the evidence of the facts declared in all of the Findings and Orders of Judge Fletcher-Hill (Exhibits 46, 50, and 57 on the Petitioner's website), and Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibits 46, 47, 48, and 49 on the Petitioner's website), and the evidenced of the material facts and legal arguments declared in the Petitioner's Official Complaints against Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman (Exhibit 38, 43, 44, 45, 54, 55, 56, 58, 61, 62, 65, 68, and more on the Petitioner's website) mailed to our Hon. 45th - 47th President Trump substantiate that: a.) The Petitioner's civil case should not be dismissed and that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by repeatedly committing the prejudicial error of perjury, which would, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's civil litigation and cause the 9 Orders in Judge Carrion's 4-28-26 to be deemed null and void, due to Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman failing to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders all of the material facts and evidence that substantiate that the Petitioner's civil proceeding should not be dismissed and which would, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's civil litigation and cause the 9 Orders in Judge Carrion's 4-28-26 to be deemed null and void. b.) The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 had been impeded upon because the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions and the facts asserted in the Findings and Orders of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman substantiate that these Officers of the Court have violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) because there is an appearance that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman would be partial and/or bias due to: 1.) Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman were appointed to their prestigious Administrative positions as Administrative Judges by Martin O'Malley and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being avowed in the Petitioner's Motions and in her Official Complaints against Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and against Judge Karen Friedman to have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 2.) Being appointed to their privileged Administrative positions by Martin O'Malley and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being asserted in the Petitioner's Motions and Official Complaint to have committed

“Crimes against Humanity”, it does appear that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman would be have an interest in the outcome of the Petitioner’s civil litigation. 3.) Moreover, as declared in the Petitioner’s recent Motions filed on 3-30-26, 2-25-26, and/or on 1-14-26, being appointed to their privileged positions by Martin O’Malley and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, both of whom are being alleged to have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts, it, also, appears that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman would attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public from being cognizant of the material facts that they, along with Martin O’Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, are being alleged to have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. 4.) Still too, it does appear that Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman would have an interest in the outcome of the Petitioner’s civil proceeding and/or would repeatedly and/or deliberately attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public exposure of these material facts because Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman are being alleged in the Petitioner’s most recent Motions filed on 3-30-26, 2-25-26, and/or on 1-14-26, and/or in her Official Complaints and Addendums mailed to our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump, to have violated Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts.

Still too, the evidence of the 4 facts cited in her adopted Findings” and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s 3-30-26 Motions, from which Judge Carrion’s Findings respond to, substantiate that Judge Carrion failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in her 4-28-26 Finding and Order all of material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner’s 3-30-26 Motions, which would, unequivocally, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner’s civil litigation and cause the 9 Orders in Judge Carrion’s 4-28-26 to be deemed null and void, which include the material facts and legal arguments which substantiate that the Petitioner’s 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were repetitiously and/knowingly infringed upon due Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding Judges not only, collectively and for over 40 times impeding upon Maryland Rule 2-311, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, Federal Statute 18, U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18, U.S.C & 1623, and/or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (Crimes against Humanity”), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes, but, also, due to,

office, and/or have committed other crimes, it, also, appears that Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding judges, which again, include Judge Carrion, would attempt to cover-up, attempt to dismiss the Petitioner's civil litigation, and/or attempt prevent the Petitioner from having a hearing on her Motions in order to continue to hide from the public that Judge Carrion and all of the present and forming presiding judges, along with Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and former Chief Judge Barbera, are being alleged in the Petitioner's Motions to have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. d.) Still too, it does appear that Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding judges, which include Judge Carrion would have an interest in the outcome of the Petitioner's present civil proceeding and/or would repeatedly and/or deliberately attempt to cover-up and/or prevent the public exposure of these material facts as a result of Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding judges being alleged in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 3-30-26, 2-25-26, and/or 014-26, and/or in her Official Complaints and Addendums mailed certified to our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump, to have violated Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C. & 1623, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. e.) Further, as evidence by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 1-29-20 Motions (Exhibit 74 on the Petitioner's website), there was public acknowledgement in a local newspaper of the close relationship among the panel of 3 in Banc judges and the former presiding judges over the Petitioner's civil litigation, namely, Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedmann.

3.) Contrary to the facts cited in the 4-28-26 Findings and Order of Judge Carrion

above declaring that, "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", some of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 3-30-26 Motions are, of necessity, repetitive, but are, undeniably, not frivolous, not without merit, and are not without legal or factual basis, but are in good faith. As evidenced from the facts in Judge Carrion's 4-28-26 Findings and Order, which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 3-30-26 Motions, Judge Carrion fails to consider, disclose, and resolve in her 4-28-26 Findings and Order all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions, which would, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's civil litigation and deem of void and of no legal force the 9 Orders in Judge Carrion's 4-28-26, which include the Petitioner

declaring, the new evidence and, thereby, in her 3-30-26 Motions, from which Judge Carrion respond in her 4-28-26 Findings and Order, cites that a "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 Petitioner, who is being represented Pro Se and making the application, which could not have reasonably been discovered and produced earlier by the Petitioner, is that: 1.) For the 2nd time, the Petitioner is motioning to have a Judge who was not appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera to preside over the Defendant's Motion for a hearing on her Motion for Reconsideration of Judge Carrion's Order docketed on 2-2-26, which is the Petitioner's 1st Motion for a hearing as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 in order to determine if the evidence substantiate that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 have been violated by: A.) The presiding Judge, Judge Carrion, who has, for the 2nd time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in her Findings Order any of the material facts or legal arguments in the Petitioner's 17- page Motions filed on 2-25-26, from which she responds to and which substantiate that the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 have been continuously violated by the 3 other presiding Judges, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, and by Judge Schreiber II, and by all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion, due to their invading upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, U.S.C. & 1091("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes, impeding upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, and/or Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. B.) Judge Carrion, for the 2nd time as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and as one of former presiding Judges, along with the other present and former presiding Judges have, collectively and for over 40 times, impeded upon Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, and/or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, U.S.C. & 1091("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed other crimes, impeding upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, and/or Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution. C.) Judge Carrion, for the 2nd time as the office, and/or have committed other crimes.

Judge In Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and as one of former presiding Judges, along with the other present and former presiding Judges have, collectively and for over 40 times, infringed upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and committed Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming Judge Carrion's Order and all of the Orders of the present and former presiding Judges as void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because Judge Carrion and all of the present and former presiding Judges have failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, along with the 3 other presiding Judges, namely, Judge John Nugent, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, Judge Schreiber, and the former presiding Judges, namely, Judge Geller, Judge John Nugent, Judge Fletcher-Hill, Judge Carrion, Judge M. Phinn, Judge Rubin, Judge Michel Pierson, and Judge Karen Friedman would be impartial and/or biased due to Judge Carrion and all of the present and former presiding Judges being appointed to their privileged positions by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 2-25-26, 1-14-26, and on 5-21-25, in the Petitioner's 3 separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in her Motions filed on 11-1-23, and/or her Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. D.) Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Judge Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion, 455 (a) and committed Fraud upon the Court and, thus, deeming Judge Carrion's Orders and all of the Orders of the 3 other presiding Judges and the former presiding Judges void as a matter of law and of no legal force or effect because all of these Officers of the Court have failed to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Judges since there is an appearance that Judge Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion, would be impartial and/or biased due to Judge Carrion, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges being appointed to their privileged positions by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in the Petitioner's 2-25-26, 1-14-26, 5-21-25, 4-18-25, and 2-18-25 Motions, in her 3 Separate Motions filed on 12-26-24, in her 11-1-23 Motions, in other Motions, and/or in the Petitioner's Complaints and/or Addendums to our Hon. 45th-47th President Trump to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity"), committed misconduct in office, and/or committed


Certificate of Service

410-868-6013

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

131 Calvin Hill Court

Diana R. Williams, Pro Se



Respectively Submitted

Thus, the Petitioner is pleading that her 6-15-26 Motions be granted.

Conclusion

Since as evidenced by one of Judge Carrion's 9 Orders, Judge Carrion declares "ORDER outlined herein, the Clerk's Office shall forward the item to the undersigned for consideration that, if Williams attempts to seek leave to file any paper or pleading pursuant to the process 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, the Court may require Williams to bear the costs and reasonable expenses, including reasonable attorney fees, incurred by the parties in litigating these proceedings" and that the Clerk of the Court, Mr. X. Conway, received a copy of Judge Carrion's 4-28-26 Findings and Order, and Mr. X. Conway is the Clerk of the Court, the Petitioner is pleading that the Clerk of the Court, a neutral party, be assigned to be the undersigned for consideration "before docketing the item in Odyssey" and forward copies of his Findings to the Petitioner and the opposing party."

other criminal acts. F.) Collectively and for over 40 Times, Judge Carrion, as the Judge in Charge of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and as one of the former presiding Judges, the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges have violated Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a), Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute 18 U.S.C & 1623, and/or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091-Genocide, and/or have attempted to and/or have conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code & 1091 ("Crimes against Humanity") and, thereby, have committed Federal offenses, collectively and for over 40 times. 2.) Collectively and for over 40 Times, a Motion to have a hearing on these instant Motions and/or the Petitioner's over 40 other Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311."

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 15th June 2026, a copy of the foregoing: Motions For A Stay And Hearing On The Petitioner's Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Carrion's Findings And Orders Docketed On 6-3-26 As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Application Pursuant To Court Order Seeking Leave To File A Motion In Order To Determine If: 1.) The Petitioner's 1st Motion For Disqualification Of Judge Carrion For Violating Her 14th Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 By Breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And, Thus, For The 3rd Time Committing Fraud Upon The Court As The Presiding Judge Over The Petitioner's 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions Because There Is An Appearance That Judge Carrion Would Be Impartial And/Or Bias Since Judge Carrion, Along With The 3 Other Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges, Which Include Judge Carrion Being Assigned In 2020 As The Chief Judge In The Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges, Have Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Invaded Upon The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 Due To, Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Committing The Federal Crimes Of Violating Federal Statute U.S.C & 1621, Federal Statute U.S.C & 1623, And/Or Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, And/Or Have Attempted To And/Or Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity") And Due To Breaching, Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Crimes. 2.) Judge Carrion Has, For The 2nd time, Unlawfully Denied The Petitioner's Right To Have Her Motions Displayed On The Circuit Court's Website, and the Petitioner has included "Attachment 1" as mandated in Judge Carrion's 6-6-26 and 4-28-26 Findings and Orders which respond to the Petitioner 5-8-26 and 3-30-26 Motions, respectively, and certify that the Petitioner's Motions are new Motions, never before raised and disposed of on the merits by any court, her Motions are, undeniably, not frivolous or in bad faith, and the Petitioner certify truthfully on penalty of perjury, and were mailed, postage paid to: Larry H. Kirsch, Esquire, 1803 Research Blvd., Suite 125, Rockville, Maryland 20850.



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

REQUEST FOR A HEARING

Cc: Our 45th-47th Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, the Attorney General, the Director of the FBI, Mr. K Patel, and U.S Attorney for Maryland, Attorney M. Hayes

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.

appointed by Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera" to preside over her Motion to Reconsider.

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

Each of the motions filed by Williams have been repetitive and frivolous given that this matter was adjudicated on December 22, 2017, and that this Court has repeatedly denied Williams' Motion for Reconsideration.

The undersigned having considered all of the above, it is this 28th day of April 2026 by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part 23 hereby

ORDERED that, effective immediately, Williams shall not file any self-represented actions, papers, or pleadings in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City without first obtaining leave of this Court, except for notices of appeal of a decision of this Court, which shall be accepted and docketed normally; and it is further

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

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

ORDERED that, to seek leave to file, Williams must certify that the claim or claims they wish to present are new claims never before raised and disposed of on the merits by any court. Williams must also certify that the claims are not frivolous or in bad faith, and that they

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

"Application Pursuant to Court Order Seeking Leave to File." A copy of this Order must be attached to each motion filed. Failure to comply strictly with the terms of this Order will be

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

ORDERED that this Order only restricts unapproved self-represented filings. It does not

apply to suits filed on Williams' behalf by an attorney admitted to practice in the State of Maryland, or apply to any case in which Williams is a defendant; and it is further

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


Ms. Diana Williams
131 Calvin Hill Court

All counsel on record.

CLERK TO SEND COPIES TO:



Audrey J.S. Carrion
Administrative Judge
Circuit Court for Baltimore City
Case No. 24-C-17-004535



04/28/2026 11:15:17 AM

attorneys' fees, incurred by the parties in litigating these proceedings.
this Court may require Williams to bear the costs and reasonable expenses, including reasonable
ORDERED that, pursuant to Maryland Rule 1-341(a), upon motion by an adverse party,

finding of contempt, and it is further
ORDERED that any failure to comply with the terms of this Order may result in a

undersigned for her consideration before docketing the item in Odyssey, and it is further
pursuant to the process outlined herein, the Clerk's Office shall forward the item to the

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

improper purpose, and that it has a colorable basis in both law and fact, and it is further
unless and until the undersigned determines that the pleading is filed in good faith, not for an

represented filings, papers, or pleadings submitted by Williams, except for notices of appeal,
ORDERED that the employees of the Clerk's Office are directed not to docket any self-

normally; and it is further

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

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

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