

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 2240

September Term, 2022

---

LISA R. HENDERSON

v.

SHOWCASE HOME IMPROVEMENTS, INC.

---

Arthur,  
Leahy,  
Eyler, James R.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: January 5, 2024

\*This is a per curiam opinion. Consistent with Rule 1-104, the opinion is not precedent within the rule of stare decisis nor may it be cited as persuasive authority.

In August 2022, Showcase Home Improvements, Inc., appellee, filed a complaint in the Circuit Court for Howard County against Lisa R. Henderson, appellant, for breach of contract and to establish and enforce a mechanic’s lien, claiming that it had not been paid for work performed on her property. Appellant filed a counterclaim for breach of contract and fraud. After extensive litigation regarding discovery, appellee filed a second motion for sanctions alleging multiple insufficiencies in appellant’s discovery responses. Following a hearing, the motions court found that appellant had repeatedly failed to respond to appellee’s legitimate discovery requests, and entered an order sanctioning appellant by establishing a final mechanic’s lien in favor of appellee, and entering a default judgment against appellant in the amount of \$91,145.90. In that order, the court also granted appellee’s motion to dismiss appellant’s counterclaim with prejudice. This appeal followed.

As an initial matter, we note that appellant’s brief is extremely difficult to follow. Moreover, it appears to raise numerous legal theories advanced by the proponents of the “sovereign citizen” and “redemptionist” movements, in which individuals seek to “dodge [their] legal and financial responsibilities by claiming [to be a] ‘general executor,’ denying [their] citizenship, or through any other filings or declarations to these effects.” *Anderson v. O’Sullivan*, 224 Md. App. 501, 512-13 (2015). However, in *Anderson*, we noted that such theories “have not, will not, and cannot be accepted as valid.” *Id.* at 512.

As best as we can discern, appellant raises two cognizable claims, neither of which have merit. First, she generally asserts that the motions judge had a “conflict of interest” and “show[ed] favoritism, and discriminated against [her].” However, this contention is

not preserved as appellant did not file a motion to recuse or otherwise raise these allegations in the circuit court. But even if preserved, this issue is not presented with particularity as appellant does not identify why there was a conflict of interest or identify any specific instances of favoritism, other than the fact that the motions judge ruled against her. Consequently, we will not consider it on appeal. *See Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (noting that arguments that are “not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal” (quotation marks and citation omitted)).

Appellant also asserts that the circuit court erred by entering the default judgment in violation of an automatic stay that had been imposed as the result of a Chapter 13 bankruptcy proceeding that she filed in North Carolina. To be sure, appellant had a pending bankruptcy case at the time the final judgment was entered. However, appellant did not make the circuit court or appellee aware of the automatic stay until after the final judgment had been entered. Upon learning of the existence of the automatic stay, appellee sought relief from the stay in the Bankruptcy Court. And the Bankruptcy Court issued an order on June 2, 2023, granting appellee’s request for relief from the automatic stay and annulling the automatic stay, *nunc pro tunc*, to permit this case to proceed from its inception. In light of that order, we hold that appellant’s claim that the circuit court violated the automatic stay lacks merit.<sup>1</sup>

**APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT DENIED.  
JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT  
COURT FOR HOWARD COUNTY**

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant has also filed a “Motion for Summary Judgment.” We shall deny that motion.

**AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE PAID  
BY APPELLANT.**