

Judge Carrion Has Violated Maryland Rule 2-322 (e) In Ordering The Clerk On 7-21-26 To Strike The Petitioner's 7-6-26 Motions From The Record, Which Include The Petitioner's 2nd Motion For Disqualification Against Judge Carrion As The Presiding Judge Over The Petitioner's Last 6 Motions, And, Who, As One Of The Former Panel Of 3 In Banc Judges Who, Initially, In 2020 presided Over The Petitioner's In Banc Review, And Who, Along With All Of The Other Present And Former Presiding Judges, Have Been, Collectively And For Over 46 Times, Motioned For Disqualification As The Presiding Judges Because The Material Facts and Legal Arguments In The Petitioner's 7-6-26 Motions, Unequivocally, Substantiate That The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Have Been, Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Breached By Judge Carrion And By All Of The Present And Former Officers Of The Court Due To Judge Carrion And All Of The Other Present And Former Presiding Judges, Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Not Only Having Infringed Upon Maryland Rule 2-311 But, Also, Having, Collectively And For Over 40 Times, Impeded Upon: A.) Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) And, Thus, Committing Fraud Upon The Court And Treason To The Constitution, Which Suggest That Judge Carrion And The Other Present And Former Presiding Judges Are Engaging In Criminal Acts Of Treason And May Be Engaging In Extortion And/Or Interference With Interstate Commerce. B.) 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 Have Conspired To Violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C, & 1091 ("Crimes Against Humanity"). C.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 18.101.11 5(c), Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 Of The Maryland Constitution, Have Committed Misconduct In Office, And/Or Have Committed Other Crimes. 2.) For The 3rd Time, Motion To Have The Petitioner's 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

The above-captioned matter comes before the Circuit Court for Baltimore City on Plaintiff Diana R. Williams' ("Williams") Motion for Reconsideration/Request for Hearing dated March 30, 2026. The Court examines the events underlying these matters below.

Maryland law permits the courts to craft narrowly-tailored remedies to discourage abuse of the judicial system by litigants who file repeated, meritless cases. *Riffin v. Cir. Ct. for Baltimore City*, 190 Md. App. 11, 23 (2010). One such manner in which a court may act is by issuing a pre-filing order that requires a litigant to obtain leave of the court before filing additional papers or pleadings. *Id.* at 29 (stating that a pre-filing order "if properly issued, is a remedy available to a Maryland court to control the actions of a vexatious or frivolous litigant"). Maryland Rule 15-502 provides "clear authority" for a court to issue a pre-filing order to control the actions of such a litigant. *Id.* at 28-29. Furthermore, Maryland Rule 16-105(b)(12) authorizes the County Administrative Judge of a circuit court to perform "any [] administrative duties necessary to the effective administration of the internal management of the court and the prompt disposition of litigation in it." Md. Rule 16-105(b)(12).

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

ORDER

DIANA R. WILLIAMS, *Plaintiff,*
v. *Defendants.*
HAMEEDULLAH VIRK, *et al.*
BALTIMORE CTY, PART 23
CIRCUIT COURT
FOR
IN THE
*
*
*
*
*
*
Case No.: 24-C-17-004535

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 *Saffir 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

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 Long

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