

RECEIVED

SEP 02 2026

CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE CITY

IN THE

IN THE MATTER

THE PETITION OF

DIANA R. WILLIAMS

*

*

*

*

*

FOR

*

*

BALTIMORE CITY

*

Case No. 24-C-17-004535

MOTIONS FOR A STAY AND HEARING ON THE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF JUDGE CARRION'S FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 8-21-26 AS PERMITTED UNDER

MARYLAND RULE 2-311, APPLICATION PURSUANT TO COURT ORDER SEEKING LEAVE TO FILE A MOTION IN ORDER TO DETERMINE IF THE PRESIDING JUDGE, JUDGE CARRION BREACHED THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT AND CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18 U.S.C., SECTION 242 BECAUSE: 1.) FOR THE 1ST TIME, CARRION HAS VIOLATED MARYLAND RULE 2-322 (e) IN ORDERING THE CLERK ON 8-21-26 TO STRIKE THE PETITIONER'S 7-31-26 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 7 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 47 TIMES, MOTIONED FOR DISQUALIFICATION AS THE PRESIDING JUDGES BECAUSE THE MATERIAL FACTS AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS IN THE PETITIONER'S 7-31-26 MOTIONS, UNEQUIVOCALLY, SUBSTANTIATE THAT THE PETITIONER'S 14TH AMENDMENT 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 OTHER 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, HAVE NOT ONLY INFRINGED UPON MARYLAND RULE 2-311 BUT, HAVE, ALSO, 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, AND/OR 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"). C.) MARYLAND RULE 18.102.11, MARYLAND RULE 18.101.11 5

(c), ARTICLE IV & 22 OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION, HAVE COMMITTED MISCONDUCT IN OFFICE, AND/OR HAVE COMMITTED OTHER CRIMES. 2.) FOR THE 4TH TIME, MOTION TO HAVE THE PETITIONER'S MOTIONS DISPLAYED ON THE CIRCUIT COURT'S WEBSITE

1, 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 Findings And Orders Docketed On 8-21-26 As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Application Pursuant To Court Order Seeking Leave To File A Motion In Order To Determine If The Presiding Judge, Judge Carrion Breached The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Because: 1.) For The First Time, Judge Carrion Has Violated Maryland Rule 2-322 (e) In Ordering The Clerk On 8-21-26 To Strike The Petitioner's 7-31-26 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 7 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 47 Times, Motioned For Disqualification As The Presiding Judges Because The Material Facts and Legal Arguments In The Petitioner's 7-31-26 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 18.103.11 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 4TH Time, Motion To Have The Petitioner's 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 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 1st time, the Petitioner is motioning for a Stay and a for a hearing on her Motion For Reconsideration of Judge

Carroll's Findings and Orders docketed on 8-21-26 as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311, application pursuant to Court Order seeking leave to file a Motion in order to determine if the presiding Judge, Judge Carroll breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 because: **A.)** For the 1st time, Judge Carroll has violated Maryland Rule 2-322 (e) in ordering the clerk on 8-21-26 to strike the Petitioner's 7-21-26 Motions from the record which include the Petitioner's 2nd Motion for Disqualification of the presiding Judge, Judge Carroll, who has, unlawfully, presided over the Petitioner's 7-21-26, 7-6-26, 6-15-26, 5-8-26, 4-18-26, 3-30-26, 2-25-26, and 1-14-26 Motions and which include disqualification of Judge Carroll as the Chief Judge in the panel of 3 in Banc Judges who initially, unlawfully, presided over the Petitioner's in Banc Review in 2020, as well as the 3 other presiding Judges, and all of the other former presiding Judges. **B.) Collectively And For Over 47 Times**, Judge Carroll and all of the present and former Officers of the Court, which include Judge Carroll who was the Chief Judge of the panel of 3 in Banc Judges who, initially, in 2020 presided over the Petitioner's present in Banc Review have infringed upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) and, thus, committing Fraud upon the Court and treason to the Constitution, which suggest that Judge Carroll 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. **C.) Collectively And For Over 47 Times**, Judge Carroll and all of the present and former Officers of the Court, which, again, include Judge Carroll have committed the Federal crimes of breaching 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"). **D.) Collectively And For Over 47 Times**, Judge Carroll and all of the present and former Officers of the Court, which, again, include Judge Carroll have violated 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 4th time, the

STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

As declared in her other Motions, the Petitioner's family was paying the bill to maintain her website, www.diananarwilliams.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 Carroll's Findings and Orders docketed on 8-21-26 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 Carroll's Findings and Orders docketed on 8-21-26 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.

FACTS CITED, VERBATIM, FROM JUDGE CARRION'S FINDINGS AND ORDERS DOCKETED ON 8-21-26, 7-21-26, 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 7-21-26, 7-6-26, 6-15-26, 5-8-26, 4-18-26, AND 3-30-26 MOTIONS, RESPECTIVELY.

As evidenced by the citing entered on the Circuit Court's website on 8-21-26 (Exhibit 336 on the Petitioner's website is Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders), which respond to the Petitioner's 7-21-26 Motions, the presiding Judge, Judge Carrion, "ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for a Stay and Hearing be, and the same is, hereby not accepted for filing; and it is further ORDERED, that Baltimore City Circuit Court Clerk's Office shall STRIKE Plaintiff's Motion for a Stay and Hearing received by the Clerk's Office on July 31, 2026; 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 citing entered on the Circuit Court's website on 7-21-26 (Exhibit 327 on the Petitioner's website is Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders), which respond to the Petitioner's 7-6-26 Motions, the presiding Judge, Judge Carrion, "ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for a Stay and Hearing be, and the same is, hereby not accepted for filing; and it is further ORDERED, that Baltimore City Circuit Court Clerk's Office shall STRIKE Plaintiff's Motion for a Stay and Hearing received by the Clerk's Office on July 6, 2026; 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 citing entered on the Circuit Court's website on 6-25-26 (Exhibit 324 on the Petitioner's website is Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders), which respond to the Petitioner's 6-15-26 Motions, the presiding Judge, Judge Carrion, "ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for a Stay and Hearing be, and the same is, hereby denied. It is further Ordered that the Pre-filing Order dated April 28, 2026, shall remain in full force and effect."

As evidenced by facts stated in Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders entered on the Circuit Court's website on 6-3-26 (Exhibit 320 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the Petitioner's 5-8-26 Motions, Judge Carrion justifies denying the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-3-26 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 the 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 was 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 the Petitioner's 7-6-26 Motions (Exhibits 324 on the Petitioner's website), as evidenced by the facts stated above from the Circuit Court's website and/or from the facts stated in the actual Findings and Orders of Judge Carrion docketed on 7-21-26 (Exhibit 323 on the Petitioner's website), and/or as evidenced by the facts cited from the Circuit Court's website of Judge Carrion's Findings and Orders, Judge Carrion fails to consider, disclose, and resolve in of her Findings any of the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 7-6-26 Motions, which would, undeniably, change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's in Banc appeal in proving that, collectively and for over 40 times, Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding judges, which include Judge Carrion being the Chief Judge of the panel of 3 in Banc Judges who, initially, in 2020 presided over the Petitioner's in Banc Review, have breached the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 243 by not only, collectively and for over 40 times, violating the Petitioner's right to have a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 to substantiate that Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding Judges have, collectively and for over 40 times, violated 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"), impeded upon 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, have committed misconduct in office, and/or have

committed other crimes. Moreover, as evidenced by the 8-21-26 Findings and Orders of Judge Carrion quoted above from the Circuit Court's website, verbatim, and/or as stated in Judge Carrion's mailed Findings and Orders (Exhibit 335 on the Petitioner's website), and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 7-31-26 Motions, from which Judge Carrion responded to and whose Motions Judge Carrion has ordered the clerk of the Court to strike from the record, the material facts and the legal arguments in the Petitioner's 7-31-26 Motions are substantiated with documentation which are assigned as Exhibits on the Petitioner's website, but the facts cited in Judge Carrion Findings fails to give one piece of evidence in the record and/or one fact as substantiate her Findings and Orders. Further, as evidenced in her Findings, Judge Carrion fails to cite any evidence to substantiate explanation for her action, which is essential to maintain clarity add accountability in this court proceeding. According to "The peoples-law Library of Maryland, when a judge denies a motion, they are required to provide a written decision. This decision must include the reasons for the denial, ensuring transparency in the judicial process. This requirement helps all parties involved understand the basis for the court's ruling. Moreover, if a judge orders a party's motion to be struck from the record, then he/she must also provide a written explanation for this action, which, again, is essential for maintaining clarity and accountability in court proceedings.

As evidenced by the facts stated in her Findings and Orders entered on the Circuit Court's website on 8-21-26 and as evidenced by the material facts in Maryland Rule 2-322 (e), for the 2nd time, Judge Carrion has violated Maryland Rule 2-322 (e) in ordering the clerk on 8-21-26 and on 7-21-26 to strike the Petitioner's 7-31-26 and 7-6-26 Motions, respectively, from the record because Maryland Rule 2-322 (e) stipulates that a Court may order a Motions stricken from record only if the Motions contain an insufficient defense, improper and scandalous matters, or if the Motions are filed late and non-compliant with Court rules. As evidenced by the facts cited in her Findings and Orders entered on the Circuit Court's website on 8-21-26 and on 7-21-26, for the 2nd time, the presiding Judge, Judge Carrion, has not only denied the Petitioner's 7-31-26 Motions for a Stay and Reconsideration of Judge's Carrion Findings and Orders docketed on 7-26-26 and 6-25-26 (Exhibit 323 on the Petitioner's website), and her pleading for a hearing on her Motions, but has, too, ordered that the Petitioner's 7-31-26 and 7-6-26 Motions received by the clerk be stricken from the record, which include the Petitioner's 2nd Motion for Disqualification of the presiding Judge, Judge Carrion, who as one of the former presiding Judges along with the 3 other presiding, and as one of the former presiding Judges who along with all of the other present and former presiding Judges have, collectively and for over 40 times, violated 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"), impeding upon 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, committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other crimes. Still too, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 7-6-26 Motions (Exhibit 324 on the Petitioner's website) respond to the facts stated in Judge Carrion's 6-25-26 Findings and Orders (Exhibit 323 on the Petitioner's website), which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 6-15-26 Motions (Exhibit 322 on the Petitioner's website), the Petitioner declares on page 1 of her 7-6-26 Motions that she certify in good faith under Federal rule CR59 (a)(4) that the "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 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, 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. "

Further, as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 7-6-26 Motions, beginning on page 8 and ending on page 16, the Petitioner quotes, verbatim, the same material facts and legal arguments from her 6-15-26 Motions which are quoted, verbatim from the Petitioner's 5-8-26 Motions because of these material facts and legal arguments trace the history of the allegations, beginning with the first presiding Judge over the Petitioner's 2017 Civil Complaint in order to substantiate that Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding Judges, which include Judge Carrion, violated the Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right and Civil right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by, collectively, and for over 40 times, 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”), impeding upon 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, committing misconduct in office, and/or committing other crimes.

The material facts and legal arguments in the Petitioner's 7-6-26 Motions, which change the whole outcome of the Petitioner's in Banc Appeal, which substantiate the allegations declared above against Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding Judges, and whose material facts and legal arguments are contained in the very Motions that Judge Carrion, has ordered the clerk to have the Motions stricken from the record, cites, verbatim, on pages 8-16 that "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."

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.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 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 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 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.

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 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 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 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. & 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 Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455 (a) as a result of Carrion, the 3 other president presiding judges, and all of the former presiding judges, which include Judge Carrion who was the Chief Judge of the 3rd In Banc judges who initially presided over the Petitioner's In Banc Review in the Circuit Court, having, collectively and for over 40 times, failed to voluntarily disqualify and recused themselves as presiding judges since there is an appearance of Judge Carrion and all of the other present and former presiding judges would be impartial and/or bias because: a.) Judge Carrion, the 3 other 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 Melissa 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 to 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 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 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, 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

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, have infringed upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 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 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."

Conclusion

Thus, the Petitioner is pleading that her 9-2-26 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 2nd of September 2026, a copy of the foregoing: Motions Motions For A Stay And Hearing On The Petitioner's Motion For Reconsideration Of Judge Carrion's Findings And Orders Docketed On 8-21-26 As Permitted Under Maryland Rule 2-311, Application Pursuant To Court Order Seeking Leave To File A Motion In Order To Determine If The Presiding Judge, Judge Carrion Breached The Petitioner's 14th Amendment Right And Civil Right Under Title 18 U.S.C., Section 242 Because: 1.) For The First Time, Judge Carrion Has Violated Maryland Rule 2-322 (e) In Ordering The Clerk On 8-21-26 To Strike The Petitioner's 7-31-26 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 7 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 47 Times, Motioned For Disqualification As The Presiding Judges Because The Material Facts and Legal Arguments In The Petitioner's 7-31-26 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 4th 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

Attachment 1

DIANA R. WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff,
v.
HAMEEDULLAH VIRK, et al.,
Defendants.
Case No.: 24-C-17-004535

ORDER

* * * * *

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

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 Barbara" 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. Cantlon
Administrative Judge
Circuit Court for Baltimore City
Case No. 24-C-17-004535

CLERK TO SEND COPIES TO:

All counsel on record.

Ms. Diana Williams
131 Calvin Hill Court

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

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