

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**  
*Southern Division*

**CARGYLE BROWN SOLOMON,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Civil Case No.: PWG-13-2436**

**SHAREESE KESS-LEWIS, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**ORDER OF PREFILING INJUNCTION AND DISMISSAL**

This Order summarizes the findings made during the Show Cause Hearing on November 25, 2013, which are incorporated by reference. *See* Tr. of Show Cause Hearing, ECF No. 5. On September 30, 2013, I preliminarily found it proper to issue a prefiling injunction preventing Plaintiff Cargyle Solomon (“Plaintiff”, or “Solomon”) from “filing future actions in this District arising from or relating to the Prince George’s County Child Custody Proceedings without the preapproval of a judicial officer of this Court.” Mem. & Order to Show Cause 8, ECF No. 3. Those preliminary findings are explained thoroughly in the Memorandum and Order to Show Cause and are incorporated by reference. I ordered Plaintiff to file a written response to show cause why the prefiling injunction should not issue within fourteen days of that Order. *Id.* Further, I ordered the parties to appear for a show cause hearing on November 25, 2013. *Id.* at 9. The Defendants did not appear at the hearing, apparently because Plaintiff did not return the forms with which the U.S. Marshals Service would serve the summons and complaint. Further, Plaintiff did not file a written response and did not appear for the Show Cause Hearing on November 25, 2013. Tr. 8–9.

Accordingly, Solomon has failed to provide any factual or legal basis to rebut the preliminary findings of the Memorandum and Order to Show Cause. I am satisfied that a pre-filing injunction is necessary to prevent Solomon from further wasting judicial resources by “instituting vexatious, malicious, frivolous, or meritless litigation.” Mem. & Order to Show Cause 7. For the reasons explained in the Memorandum and Order to Show Cause and at the Show Cause Hearing, Solomon’s cases are examples “of a litigant’s continuous abuse of the judicial process by filing meritless and repetitive actions.” Tr. 6. The six prior cases Solomon filed in this Court suing the local officials, state Circuit Court Judge, her attorneys, and the foster parents appointed to care for her children, all were without merit. Her demonstrated intention to continue to sue these same individuals relating to the same underlying events requires a pre-filing injunction. She has been provided with notice and opportunities to be heard and has declined to take advantage of those opportunities. *See Cromer v. Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc.*, 390 F.3d 812, 819 (4th Cir. 2004).

Therefore, I will prepare an Order for signature by the Chief Judge of this Court enjoining Plaintiff “from instituting any new civil cases, habeas corpus petitions, and from filing any new documents in any existing case in this Court arising from or relating to the Prince George’s County Child Custody Proceedings without the preapproval of a judicial officer of this Court.” Mem. & Order to Show Cause 7. Once that Order has been signed, the Clerk shall refer Solomon’s future filings to the Chief Judge for review before entering them on the docket. Absent prior approval to enter a new filing on the docket, the Clerk will be directed to dispose of the new filing without additional action. Solomon is advised that nothing in this injunction will be construed as limiting her ability to defend herself in any civil or criminal matter in this Court.

