

PETITIONER'S MOTIONS

MOTIONS FOR A STAY AND HEARING ON THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE CARRION'S FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 6-25-26 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 2ND 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 4TH TIME COMMITTING FRAUD UPON COURT AS THE PRESIDING JUDGE OVER THE PETITIONER'S 6-15-26, 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, 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, FEDERAL 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 3RD TIME, UNLAWFULLY DENIED THE PETITIONER'S RIGHT TO HAVE HER MOTIONS DISPLAYED ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE. 3.) JUDGE CARRION HAS, FOR THE 1ST TIME, BREACHED MARYLAND RULE 2-311 BY FAILING TO ALLOW THE ALLOTTED TIME OF 18 DAYS FOR THE DEFENDANT TO RESPOND TO THE

IN THE MATTER

THE PETITION OF

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

CIRCUIT COURT

FOR BALTIMORE CITY

RECEIVED

JUL 06 2026

FOR

CIRCUIT COURT

BALTIMORE CITY

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

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 Carron's Findings And Orders Docketed On 6-25-26 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 2nd Motion For Disqualification Of Judge Carron 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 4th Time Committing Fraud Upon The Court As The Presiding Judge Over The Petitioner's 6-15-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, And 2-25-26 Motions Because There Is An Appearance That Judge Carron Would Be Impartial And/Or Bias Since Judge Carron, Along With The 3 Other Presiding Judges, And All Of The Former Presiding Judges, Which Include Judge Carron 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 Carron Has, For The 3rd Time, Unlawfully Denied The Petitioner's Right To Have Her Motions Displayed On The Circuit Court's Website. 3.) Judge Carron Has, For The 1st Time, Breached Maryland Rule 2-311 By Failing To Allow The Allotted Time Of 18 Days For The Defendant To Respond To The Petitioner's Motions 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 certify 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 certify 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 2nd time, the Petitioner is motioning for a Stay, and for the 1st time, motioning for a hearing on her Motion For Reconsideration of Judge Carron's Findings and Orders docketed on 6-25-26 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 2nd Motion for Disqualification of Judge Carron 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 4th time committing Fraud upon the Court as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 6-25-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions because there is an appearance that Judge Carron would be impartial and/or bias since Judge Carron, along with the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carron 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 by breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and, thus, for the 4th time committing Fraud upon the Court as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 6-25-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions because there is an appearance that Judge Carron would be impartial and/or bias since Judge Carron, along with the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carron 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 by breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and, thus, for the 4th time committing Fraud upon the Court as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 6-25-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions because there is an appearance that Judge Carron would be impartial and/or bias since Judge Carron, along with the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carron 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 by breaching Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) and, thus, for the 4th time committing Fraud upon the Court as the presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 6-25-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions because there is an appearance that Judge Carron would be impartial and/or bias since Judge Carron, along with the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carron 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 &

- 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

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

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying the bill to maintain her website, *www.dianarubin.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 6-25-26 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 6-25-26 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

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. 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. c.) For the 1st Time, Judge Carrion has breached Maryland Rule 2-311 by failing to allow the allotted time of 18 days for the Defendant to respond to the Petitioner's Motions

8.) Maryland Rule 18.102.11 5 (c),

9.) Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution

FACTS CITED, VERBATIM, FROM JUDGE CARRION'S FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 6-25-26, 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 6-15-26, 5-8-26 AND 3-30-26 MOTIONS, RESPECTIVELY

As evidenced by the facts cited in her Findings and Orders docketed on 6-25-26 (Exhibit 323 on the Petitioner's website), Judge Carrion justifies denying the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-15-26 Motions (not disclosed on the Circuit Court's website, but is Exhibit 324 on the Petitioner's website) by simply stating that "Upon consideration of Diana R. Williams' (Plaintiff's Motion for a Stay and Hearing filed on June 15, 2026, and the contents of the record herein, it is this 25th day of June 2026, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Part, 23, hereby ORDERED THAT Plaintiff's Motion for a Stay and Hearing be, and the same is, hereby DENIED; and it is further ORDERED, that the Pre-filing Order dated April 28, 2026, shall remain in full force and effect."

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."

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 Petitioner's 3-30-26 Motions (Exhibit 302 on the Petitioner's website) by simply proclaiming 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 wad adjudicated pm December 22, 2017, and that this Court has repeatedly denied Williams 'Motion for Reconsideration."

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 material facts and legal arguments in in the Petitioner's 6-15-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions (Exhibits 324, 310, 302, and 296 on the Petitioner's website) and as evidenced by the signature stamped on the Findings and Orders docketed on 6-25, 6-3-26, 4-28-26, and 3-18-26 (Exhibits 323, 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 evidenced in her instant Motions, for the 2nd 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 & 455 (a) and, thus, for the 4th 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 legal arguments in the Petitioners 6-15-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions, Judge Carrion, along with 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion as the Chief Judge in 2020 of the panel of 3 in Banc Judges presiding over the Petitioner's In Banc Review, are being alleged to 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 beaching, collectively and for over 40 times, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other crimes. 2.) Since Judge Carrion is being alleged in these instant Motions and in the Petitioner's 6-15-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions to have committed Federal crimes, namely, that 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 to have infringed upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, Maryland Rule 2-311, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, and/or have committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes, it does appear that Judge Carrion would have a vested interest in the outcome of the Petitioner's In Banc proceeding and would repetitiously and/or intentionally deny the Petitioner's right to a hearing on her Motions, although the Petitioner has pleaded over 40 times to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, and, for the 3rd time, deny the Petitioner's right to have her Motions displayed on the publicly accessible Circuit Court's website in order to attempt to prevent the exposure of these allegations and others, which include the assertions in the Petitioner's most recent Motions filed on 6-15-26, 5-8-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 that: a.) Martin O'Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, former Chief

Judge Barbera, the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, which include Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, and Jack Young, as well as the present Mayor, Brandon Scott, and all of the present members of the City Council and those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993 have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other crimes. b.) Judge Carrion, the other 3 presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion, who was the Chief Judge of the panel of 3 in Banc Judges who presided over the Petitioner's initial In Banc Review in 2020, other Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials have ignored for years the alleged heinous crimes against the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore City, namely, that of repetitiously and/or knowingly exposing our children to lead poisoning for over a quarter of a century, and, thereby, committing Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts. c.) Other Officers of the Court and/or other government officials have refused to prosecute, for over 25 years, the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials are being alleged in the Petitioner's 5-8-26, 3-30-26, 2-25-26, and in her 1-14-26 Motions, and/or in her Addendums to our Hon. 45th – 47th President Trump, to have continuously and/or deliberately committing Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or committing other criminal acts.

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 10 years in prison. The evidence of the facts stated in Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders docketed on 6-25-26, 6-3-26, 4-28-26 (Exhibits 323, 321, 309, and 301, respectively, on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-15-26, 3-30-26, and 2-25-26 Motions, respectively (Exhibits 324, 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, in the Petitioner's 6-15-26 Motions and, again, below, substantiate that Judge Carrion has redundantly and/or deliberately failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in her 6-25-26, 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 6-15-26 Motions, (some of which are paraphrased in the Petitioner's 5-8-26, 3-30-26 and 2-25-26 Motions) which alone, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's In Banc proceeding. Although Judge Carrion's orders in her Findings and Orders docketed on 6-25-26, 6-3-26, and on 4-28-26, which respond to the Petitioner's 6-15-26, 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 Carrion's Orders from her 6-25-26, 6-3-26, and 4-28-26 Findings and Orders are null and void because Judge Carrion 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 Carrion, the 3 other presiding judges, and all of the former presiding judges, which include Judge Carrion 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 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 6-15-26 and on 5-8-26, the, verbatim, material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 5-8-26 Motions which Judge Carrion 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 proceeding by substantiating that: 1.) The first presiding Judge, Judge Karen Friedman, violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by unlawfully granting the Defendant's Motion to dismiss the Petitioner's Civil Complaint and that all of the presiding judges, thereafter, which include Judge Carrion, who was the Chief Judge in the panel of 3 in Banc Judges who presided, initially, in 2020 over the Petitioner's In Banc Review, failed to consider, disclose, and resolve in their Findings and Orders if the evidence that accompanied the Petitioner's Motions filed on 11-27-17, 1-3-18, 2-1-18, 2-15-18, and 3-9-18 (Exhibits 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, on the Petitioner's website), which respond to Judge Karen Friedman's and Judge Fletcher-Hill's Findings and Orders (Exhibits 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, and 57 on the Petitioner's website) substantiate that the Defendant's Motion to dismiss my Civil Complaint was unlawfully granted by Judge Karen Friedman and Judge Fletcher-Hill. 2.) Judge Carrion and all of the present and former presiding judges, which include Judge Carrion have, collectively and for over 40 times, invaded upon the 14th Amendment Right and Civil Rights due to violating 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, Maryland Rule 4-204, Article IV & 22 of the Maryland Constitution, 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.

Since the colossal material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-15-26 Motions are material in proving, undeniably, that the Petitioner's 6-15-26 Motions should not have been denied because Judge Carrion failed to consider, disclose, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-15-26 Motions (Exhibit 324 on the Petitioner's website) , which respond to Judge Carrion's 6-3-26 Findings and Orders (Exhibit 323 on the Petitioner's website) and which, undoubtedly, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's In Banc Review, the Petitioner will quote, verbatim, these material facts, which are, too, stated, verbatim, from the Petitioner's 5-8-26 Motions (Exhibit 310 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to Judge Carrion's 4-28-26 Findings and 9 Orders (Exhibit 309 on the Petitioner's website). As evidenced by the facts stated in her 6-25-26 Findings and Orders cited, verbatim, above, and as evidenced by the, verbatim, citing from the Petitioner's 6-15-26 and 5-8-26

Motions, Judge Carrion failed to consider, disclose, and resolve the numerous material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-15-26 Motions which include the following stated, verbatim, in the Petitioner's 6-15-26 and 5-8-26 Motions and declare, amongst other things, the following : "FACTS RESPOND TO THE MATERIAL FACTS AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS IN THE PETITIONER'S 3-30-26 MOTIONS

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 wad adjudicated pm December 22, 2017, and that this Court has repeatedly denied Williams 'Motion for Reconsideration."

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

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 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 presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion who was the Chief Judge of the panel 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

2.) 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 proceeding 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 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 proceeding 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.

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 paraphrased in her Petition and Memorandum filed on 1-14-20 substantiate that, as evidenced by the facts asserted in the 1-2-20 Findings and Orders of Judge Michel Pierson, as evidenced by the facts proclaimed in all of the other Findings and Orders of Judge Michel Pierson, Judge Fletcher-Hill, and Judge Karen Friedman, the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's Motions substantiate 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 proceedings 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 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, collectively and for over 40 times, breaching and/or have committed other crimes, as a result of Carrion, the 3 other president presiding judges, and all Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455 (a) as Carrion, the 3 other president presiding judges, and all of the former presiding judges, which include Judge Carrion, were appointed by Martin O’Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being averred in the Petitioner’s 3-30-26 and in other Motions to have breached 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. Judge Carrion’s appointment by Chief Judge Barbera as an Administrative Judge for the Eighth Circuit for Baltimore City became effective on January 12, 2020. Judge Mellissa Phinn was appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O’Malley on December 28, 2012. Judge Julie Rubin was, also, appointed as an Associate Judge on the 8th Judicial Court for Baltimore in Maryland by Martin O’Malley on December 28, 2012. Although his term expired in 2019, one of the present presiding judges in the Petitioner’s civil case, namely, Judge John Nugent, was appointed as one of the judges on the Alternative Dispute Resolution Committee by Chief Judge Barbera in 2017. Another presently presiding judge, namely, Judge Dorsey, Charles III, was appointed to his superlative Administrative position by Larry Hogan in 2016. Still too, another presently presiding judge, namely, Judge M. Schreiber II, was, also, appointed to the honored position as an Administrative Judge in 2022 by Larry Hogan. The first presiding judge over the Petitioner civil litigation was Judge Karen Friedman and she was appointed to her privileged position as an Administrative Judge by Martin O’Malley in 2014. Judge Michel Pierson was appointed in 2013 by Chief Judge Barbera. Judge Fletcher-Hill was appointed to his Administrative position in 2009 by Martin O’Malley. Judge J. Geller was, also, appointed by Martin O’Malley to the elite position of an Administrative Judge in May of 2012. b.) Being appointed to their distinguished positions by Martin O’Malley, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged in these Motions to have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal acts, 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 appeal in the In Banc proceeding, c.) Moreover, as asserted in the Petitioner’s Motions filed on 3-30-26, 2-25-26, and/or on 1-14-26, being appointed to their privileged positions Martin O’Malley, Larry Hogan, Wes Moore, and/or by former Chief Judge Barbera, all of whom are being alleged to have committed Crimes against Humanity, misconduct in 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 former 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 01-4-26, 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 Friedman.

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, and are 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

Petitioner's 3 separate 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 ("Crimes against Humanity"), 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 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."


Since as evidenced by one of Judge Carrion's 9 Orders, Judge Carrion declares "ORDER 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 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, 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."

For the 1st time, the presiding Judge, Judge Carrion has not allowed the Defendant the 18 days to respond to the Petitioner's Motions before issuing her ruling, thus, violating Maryland Rule 2-311.

Conclusion

Thus, the Petitioner is pleading that her 7-8-26 Motions be granted.

Respectively Submitted



Diana R. Williams, Pro Se

131 Calvin Hill Court

Baltimore, Maryland 21222

410-868-6013

Certificate of Service

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 3rd 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 6-25-26 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 2nd 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 4th Time Committing Fraud Upon The Court As The Presiding Judge Over The Petitioner's 6-15-26, 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 3rd Time, Unlawfully Denied The Petitioner's Right To Have Her Motions Displayed On The Circuit Court's Website. 3.) Judge Carrion Has, For The 1st Time, Breached Maryland Rule 2-311 By Failing To Allow The Allotted Time Of 18 Days For The Defendant To Respond To The Petitioner's Motions, and the Petitioner has

included "Attachment 1" as mandated in Judge Carrion's 6-25-26, 6-3-26, and 4-28-26 Findings and Orders which respond to the Petitioner 6-15-26, 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

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 Cty., 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.

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

TO: MR. X. CONAWAY, CLERK OF THE COURT

FROM: MS. D. WILLIAMS



RE: COPY OF MY MOTIONS RECEIVED ON THIS DAY

DATE: 7-3-26

DUE TO EXPENSES, A COPY OF MY MOTIONS STAMPED "RECEIVED JULY 03 2026" AND WAS FILED IN THE
CIRCUIT COURT TODAY, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 324 ON MY WEBSITE,