INSPECTOR GENERAL OF BALTIMORE CITY ISABEL MERCEDES CUMMING, ESQ., *et al.*	*	**IN THE**
	*	**CIRCUIT COURT**
***Plaintiffs*,**	*	**FOR BALTIMORE CITY**
v.	*	**CASE NO.: C-24-CV-26-001410**
MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE,	*	
		Part 88
***Defendant*.**	*	

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

ORDER

Upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment (June 18, 2026), opposed by Defendant, with Maryland Rules 2-501 and 15-501 et seq., for reasons stated by Opinion on Summary Judgment and otherwise appearing in the Record, it is on this 21st day of September 2026, hereby

ORDERED that the Motion for Summary Judgment by Plaintiffs Inspector General Isabel Cumming, Advisory Board Chair Gayle Guilford, and Advisory Board Secretary James Godey ("OIG") is **GRANTED** in substantial part and, therefore, relief shall be Ordered and Judgment Declared against Defendant Mayor and City Council of Baltimore pursuant to the Maryland Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act, Md. Code Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. I §§ 3-401 et seq.

It is **ORDERED AND JUDGMENT DECLARED** that the Baltimore City Office of the Inspector General has the legal authority to issue and enforce subpoenas without restrictions, including subpoenas to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore City; and

ORDERED AND JUDGMENT DECLARED that all subpoenas, past, present, and future, issued by the Baltimore City Office of the Inspector General shall be given the full force

and effect of any subpoena issued under local, state, and federal law and without limitation or restricted response under the Maryland Public Information Act; and

ORDERED AND JUDGMENT DECLARED that the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore City must fully comply and respond to all current and any future subpoenas issued by the Baltimore City Office of the Inspector General without restricting or withholding unspecified or inapplicable attorney-client communications or work product documents.

It is further **ORDERED** that Defendant Mayor and City Council are **ENJOINED** from denying subpoenas or withholding complete responses to subpoenas by the Inspector General to City offices and employees; and

ORDERED that Defendant Mayor and City Council are **ENJOINED** from denying Baltimore City Office of the Inspector General investigatory requests to City offices and employees by the misapplication of the Maryland Public Information Act or attorney-client privilege; and

ORDERED that Defendant Mayor and City Council are **ENJOINED** from taking any actions that would impede, inhibit, or restrict the Baltimore City Office of the Inspector General from investigatory responsibilities of the office; and

ORDERED that Defendant Mayor and City Council are **ENJOINED** from revoking or restricting Office of Inspector General permissions and access to the City resources extant through 2025; and

ORDERED that Defendant Mayor and City Council shall promptly produce withheld documents and reinstate access to records as follows:

1. Beginning no later than 5 days from the date of this Order and completing no later than 45 days from the date of this Order, Defendant City shall produce, without redaction or

limitation, all documents responsive to each subpoena issued in 2025 and 2026 by the Inspector General pursuant to Section 4(c) and (d) of Charter Article X.

(a) Defendant City may accompany each production with a Privilege Log comprehensively identifying each and any document produced or withheld that is asserted to be (i) an attorney-client confidential communication or (ii) a 'work product' document or electronically stored information prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for the City official, employee, board member or contractor, and/or containing mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, or legal theories of an attorney or other representative concerning the anticipated litigation.

2. Within 2 business days of the date of this Order, Defendant City shall completely restore all permissions to access City systems that were held by Assistant Inspector General of IT Operations Bryan Bartsch as of January 22, 2026, including:

(a) Defendant's M365 Cloud Administrator account that allows utilization of Defendant's (i) M365 ediscovery tool (Purview); (ii) Azure activity directory to view users, devices, and activity logs; (iii) Sharepoint access; (iv) OneDrive access; and (v) Exchange access to place mailboxes on litigation hold and review mailbox permissions;

(b) Enterprise Domain Administrator account, which allows for the review of domain permissions and delegated permissions within the Defendant's legacy directory services.

(c) Enterprise Server Administrator account to enable administration of servers across the Defendant's Enterprise IT infrastructure as it relates to investigations;

(d) Enterprise workstation Administrator account to enable administration of workstations across Defendant's enterprise as it relates to investigations; and

(e) Access to Defendant's Enterprise log server (Splunk) with the permissions provided to "ESS Analyst group" to enable review logs ingested by the server as it relates to investigations; and it is further

09/21/2026
Date

Senior Judge Pamela J. White

cc: All parties of record