

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1091

September Term, 2015

---

DONALD CONOVER, ET AL.

v.

JEFFREY B. FISHER, ET AL.

---

Eyler, Deborah S.,  
Wright,  
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.  
(Retired, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

Opinion by Moylan, J.

---

Filed: May 18, 2016

\*This is an unreported opinion, and it may not be cited in any paper, brief, motion, or other document filed in this Court or any other Maryland Court as either precedent within the rule of stare decisis or as persuasive authority. Md. Rule 1-104.

We find this appeal by the pro se appellants, Donald Conover and Deborah A. McGlaulin, to be incomprehensible. It is a rambling and diffuse outpouring of numerous complaints about and attacks on the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County and its Clerk's Office that fails to focus cleanly on any specific judicial ruling on any specific date but jumps randomly from one complaint to another in scattershot fashion.

The obvious origin of the controversy was a mortgage foreclosure proceeding against the appellants' property, but that is now far from the direct subject of the present appeal. As of 2001, the appellants, husband and wife, owned a residential property at 2682 Claibourne Court in Annapolis. On August 21, 2001, the appellants refinanced the property with a loan from the Navy Federal Credit Union in the amount of \$510,000. The appellants executed a note in that amount to the lender secured by a deed of trust on the property. The appellants fell into default on the loan in April of 2010 and Navy Federal Credit Union appointed substitute trustees of the deed of trust, the appellees in this case, who filed the foreclosure action on May 29, 2013.

The appellants contested the foreclosure and filed a Counterclaim and Third Party Complaint on August 22, 2013. The property was sold by the substitute trustees at public auction on October 21, 2013. A Report of Sale was filed with the Circuit Court on that day seeking ratification of the sale. The appellants filed exceptions to the sale on November 12, 2013. The exceptions were overruled by the Court on December 18, 2013.

A flurry of unsuccessful last-minute efforts by the appellants to forestall the sale led to a series of abortive appeals. The appellants' Motion to Stay and Dismiss on June 14, 2013 was denied by the court on July 13, 2013. The appellants petitioned for In Banc review by the Circuit Court, which was denied on September 10, 2013. The appellants then filed a Motion for Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction and Permanent Injunction on October 11, 2013. After an emergency hearing before the trial court on October 16, 2013, the motion was denied. For the second time on October 18, 2013, the appellants petitioned for In Banc Review by the Circuit Court. The petition was denied on December 11, 2013, and the foreclosure was ratified.

At that point, the appellants filed a Notice of Appeal with this Court on December 18, 2013. For what reason we are not told, the appellants filed a second appeal to this Court on April 1, 2014. In an extraordinarily unilluminating appellate brief and record extract, we are given no idea what those appeals may have covered. In any event, both appeals were dismissed on May 29, 2014. The appellants then filed a Request for a Writ of Certiorari with the Court of Appeals, which also was denied on July 24, 2014. But for the later establishment of fraud or illegality in the foreclosure proceedings, the validity of the foreclosure was at that point conclusively established. As the Court of Appeals held in Ed Jacobsen, Jr. Inc. v. Barrick, 252 Md. 507, 511, 250 A.2d 646 (1969):

"So the law is firmly established in Maryland that the final ratification of the sale of property in foreclosure proceedings is res judicata as to the validity of

such sale, except in case of fraud or illegality and hence its regularity cannot be attacked in collateral proceedings."

(Quotation omitted). See also, Hersh v. Allnutt, 252 Md. 513, 519, 250 A.2d 629 (1969); McKenna v. Sachse, 225 Md. 595, 171 A.2d 732 (1961); Kline v. Chase Manhattan Bank, 43 Md. App. 133, 403 A.2d 395 (1979); Alexander Gordon, IV, GORDON ON MARYLAND FORECLOSURES, § 24.03 (4th ed. 2004), p. 682.

Although those dismissals by this Court and by the Court of Appeals do not constitute actual contentions now before us, the appellants can't quite let go of their chagrin, as they continue to insist:

"Appellees filed papers on May 20, 2014 and July 29, 2014, during the pendency of Appellant's previous appeals, which show that ... every decision made by this Honorable Court and the Court of Appeals on the original appeals during 2014, ... was made based upon false and fraudulent information provided by Appellees through the alleged foreclosure sale."

(Emphasis added; record citation omitted). The very tone of such a charge affords insight into the inherent insubstantiality of the present appeal.

In an avalanche of paper, the appellants barraged the trial court with over 60 pleadings, motions, and oppositions. In none of them, however, did they deny having received the proceeds of the loan or did they deny the default on their part which was the basis for the foreclosure. In barraging us, in turn, with pointless and extraneous detail, the bulk of the record extract consists of 123 pages of over 850 docket entries with basically no relevance to anything we have to decide.

**Required Contents of Appellant's Brief and Record Extract:  
Maryland Rules 8-501 and 8-504**

This sprawling appeal comes to us in so unfocused a form that it is virtually impossible to frame a tightly focused response. Our biggest challenge has been to attempt to organize the appellants' undifferentiated angst into something resembling an appellate brief. Among many inadequacies, the most glaring is the failure to comply with the requirements of Maryland Rules 8-501 and 8-504 for the contents of the appellants' brief and record extract. We simply have not been given the information necessary to make a decision on the merits. Instead of legal argument, moreover, we are given only sweeping insinuations of skullduggery and actual criminality on the part of the entire judicial system of Anne Arundel County.

**Rule 8-504(a)(2):**

This inadequacy is relatively minor, but it is indicative of the general inadequacy of the appellants' brief. Subsection 8-504(a)(2) requires:

"A brief statement of the case, indicating the nature of the case, the course of the proceedings, and the disposition in the lower court, except that the appellee's brief shall not contain a statement of the case unless the appellee disagrees with the statement in the appellant's brief."

(Emphasis added).

The appellees in their brief provided their own Statement of the Case because, in their judgment, the appellants' brief did "not give an accurate statement regarding the procedural

status of the case." In their reply brief the appellants chose to excuse any inadequacy in this regard by relying on their reference to another Statement of the Case in another appeal.

"Counsel raises a series of red herrings, canards and obfuscations, which need to be addressed herein. He first argues that we failed to provide a Statement of the Case, but we argue that our Statement of the Case is sufficient, particularly as it incorporates by reference the Statement of the Case contained in our related appeal, MDEC No. CSA-REG-2122-2014, which is still before this Honorable Court. We hereby restate and reincorporate by reference that Brief and Statement of the Case herein."

(Emphasis added).

That simply will not do. Anything the appellants would like to tell us on this appeal they had best tell us within the four corners of their brief in this appeal. Arising out of the same foreclosure proceeding, the appellants have apparently taken another appeal, Donald Conover, et al. v. Jeffrey Fisher, et al., No. 2122, September Term, 2014, which is currently before another panel of this Court. The appellants, however, have not chosen to tell us what that appeal is all about, and it is not our obligation to go tracking it down. The two appeals have not been consolidated.

**Rule 8-504(a)(4):**

Rule 8-504(a)(4) provides:

"A clear concise statement of the facts material to a determination of the questions presented, except that the appellee's brief shall contain a statement of only those additional facts necessary to correct or amplify the statement in the appellant's brief. Reference shall be made to the pages of the record extract supporting the assertions. If pursuant to these rules or by leave of court a

record extract is not filed, reference shall be made to the pages of the record or to the transcript of testimony as contained in the record."

(Emphasis supplied).

Even with respect to the critical decision of Judge Wachs on July 22, 2015, to deny the appellants' Motion to Strike Pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b), the appellants do not provide us with a factual background. They simply refer to a letter written by one of the appellants on May 13, 2015, to Robert P. Duckworth, the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County. Albeit in the record, the letter is itself sprawling and unfocused and the appellants leave it to us to cull out the parts that may be pertinent from many other parts that are not. Not only are we not obligated or otherwise inclined to do so, but the contents of the appellants' letter are their own assertions and conclusions and not established fact.

**Rule 8-504(a)(3), (5) and (6):**

These subsections provide:

"A statement of the questions presented, separately numbered, indicating the legal propositions involved and the questions of fact at issue expressed in the terms and circumstances of the case without unnecessary detail.

\*\*\*

"A concise statement of the applicable standard of review for each issue, which may appear in the discussion of the issue or under a separate heading placed before the argument.

\*\*\*

"Argument in support of the party's position on each issue."

(Emphasis supplied).

This was the brief's most glaring inadequacy, as we groped to get a meaningful handle on what were the precise contentions before us on this appeal. In only one place did the appellants' brief even attempt to lay out precise contentions, as opposed to simply rambling complaints. On Pages 5 and 6, the appellants listed their ostensible contentions:

**"QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

- "1. Did Judge Wachs and/or someone acting in his name and on his behalf violate Judge Wachs' obligations under the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct by decided and by signing the Order of July 22, 2015?
- "2. Have Appellants' Rights of Due Process of Law and Equal Protection of the Law under Amendments 5 and 14, § 1 of The Constitution of the United States been violated by Judge Wachs' Order of July 22, 2015, and by the four Orders complained of in the underlying motion?
- "3. Referring to the four Orders, which Appellants sought to strike in this matter, have the Constitutional Rights of Appellants been violated under Article IV, § 23 of The Constitution of Maryland when they have been placed on the record more than two months after the time that they were due?
- "4. May Circuit Court Orders be entered out of order and back dated in the Case History?
- "5. Are Circuit Court Orders effective when they have not been served on pro se litigants?
- "6. What remedies should be afforded Appellants in the primary case in chief, Case No. 02-C-13-178786 and CSA-REG-2122-2014, in the

face of obvious judicial and/or administrative irregularities and/or criminal misconduct presented in this appeal?"

(Emphasis supplied).

As we now focus in more closely on these six "Questions Presented" to see how many of them amount to actual contentions that are before us for resolution, let us make it clear that we are not about to frame for the appellants contentions which, in our judgment, they would like to have framed (or could have framed with more likelihood of success) but nonetheless failed to frame for themselves. We turn our attention to the "Questions Presented."

#### **Questions Presented # 4, 5, and 6.**

These latter three Questions Presented are abstract questions and not remotely contentions that a precise ruling by the trial court constituted reversible error affecting the foreclosure action. With respect to Question Presented #4, for instance, the appellants do not even suggest why an archival error in entering a circuit court order "out of order" or "back dating it in the Case History," even assuming arguendo such an archival error to have occurred, would not be harmless error as far as the mortgage foreclosure is concerned. In Question Presented #5, for instance, the appellants do not tell us what circuit court orders they are talking about or what evidence was presented that copies were not served on them. These three Questions Presented are simply not cognizable appellate contentions.

### **Questions Presented # 2 and 3**

Questions Presented #2 and #3 refer to the same legal ruling made by Judge Wachs on July 22, 2015, which is being challenged by Question Presented #1. Whereas Question Presented #1 claims that the ruling was erroneous according to the statutory law and caselaw of Maryland, Question Presented #2 claims that the ruling was in contravention of the Due Process Clause of the federal Fifth Amendment (actually the pertinent Due Process Clause applicable to the states is in the Fourteenth Amendment) and the Equal Protection Clause of the federal Fourteenth Amendment. Question Presented #3 charges that subsidiary orders referred to in the ruling of July 22, 2015, were "placed on the record more than two months after the time that they were due" in violation of Article IV, § 23 of the Maryland Constitution.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>If the merits of this question were even to be addressed, the appellants could not prevail. Article 4, § 23 provides:

"The Judges of the respective Circuit Courts of this State shall render their decisions, in all cases argued before them, or submitted for their judgment, within two months after the same shall have been so argued or submitted."

With respect to such a violation, Maryland State Bar Association v. Hirsch, 274 Md. 368, 373-74, 335 A.2d 108 (1975) has held:

"Next, he argues that he was denied due process of law when the opinion and recommendations of the panel were not filed within two months of the date of the hearing, presumably relying on Maryland Constitution Art.

(continued...)

With respect to Questions Presented #2 and #3 (as, indeed, with respect to all of the Questions Presented), the requirements of 8-504(a)(3), (5) and (6) are not remotely complied with. The appellants' brief, after listing the six Questions Presented, devotes slightly less than two scant pages to a single collective and undifferentiated "Argument." There is not, as required, "a statement of the questions presented, separately numbered, indicating the legal proposition involved." There is no "statement of the applicable standard of review for each issue." There is no "argument in support of the party's position on each issue."

After simply listing Questions Presented #2 and #3, the appellants offer not one word of argument in support of them. Neither the federal Constitution nor the Maryland Constitution is so much as mentioned. There is no caselaw cited bearing on these

---

<sup>1</sup>(...continued)

IV, s 23 and Rule 18 a, which is a codification of that section. We have long held these provisions to be directory and not mandatory."

(Emphasis added).

For this Court, Chief Judge Robert C. Murphy also wrote in Quinn v. Quinn, 11 Md. App. 638, 653, 276 A.2d 425 (1971):

"We find no reversible error in the circumstances of this case, ... by reason of the Chancellor's failure to render his decision within two months after the trial was concluded. While both Article IV, Section 23 of the Maryland Constitution, and Maryland Rule 18 b were violated by the Chancellor's failure to render his decision within that period of time, these provisions are directory only, and not mandatory."

(Emphasis added).

constitutional issues, state or federal. There is no academic authority cited commenting on the possible constitutional aspects of the case, state or federal. The appellants themselves do not pro se even argue the constitutional issues or even mention them. These two potential contentions have simply been baldly asserted and then flatly abandoned. For our purposes the bottom line is that six theoretical contentions are now reduced to one.

### **Question Presented # 1**

Question Presented #1 concerns the appellants' Motion to Strike four earlier issued orders pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b). That motion at least avoids the danger of being untimely filed. Rule 2-535(b) provides:

"On motion of any party filed at any time, the court may exercise revisory power and control over the judgment in case of fraud, mistake, or irregularity."

(Emphasis supplied).

At last we have something that looks like a contention. It is, of course, subject to all of the flaws which we have pointed out with respect to the other Questions Presented, to wit, the failure to comply with the requirements spelled out by Rule 8-504(a)(3), (5) and (6). In challenging the denial of this particular motion, however, in contrast to the denials of other motions, the appellants in the record extract give us the full text of the motion ultimately denied.

**"NOW COMES** Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff/Third-Party Plaintiff  
Donald L. Conover and Moves this Honorable Court to strike the four (4)

Orders included in his letter to Mr. Robert Duckworth, Clerk dated May 13, 2015, as Exhibits A, B, F, and G and in support of his **MOTION TO STRIKE ORDERS PURSUANT TO MARYLAND RULE 2-535(b)** states as follows:

1. Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff/Third-Party Plaintiff Donald L. Conover incorporates by reference herein the contents of his letter to Mr. Robert P. Duckworth, Clerk of the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County dated May 13, 2015, which was docketed and appeared on the record on May 19, 2015, and asserts that the contents of said letter are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

2. Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff/Third-Party Plaintiff asserts that it is appropriate to strike the four Orders included with the May 13, 2015 letter to Mr. Duckworth on the ground that those Orders entered the record because of fraud and/or irregularity as set forth in the aforesaid letter, and they are no longer appropriate to be included within the record of this case.

#### **REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

3. Plaintiff/Counter-Plaintiff/Third-Party Plaintiff respectfully requests an evidentiary hearing on his **MOTION TO STRIKE ORDERS PURSUANT TO MARYLAND RULE 2-535(b)** on the ground that in order to decide this Motion this Honorable Court will need to take oral testimony from Judge Michael Wachs and his judicial clerk regarding whether an/or the circumstances under which he signed the aforesaid Orders; and from Mr. Robert P. Duckworth regarding the circumstances in which the aforesaid Orders were added to the record."

As we prepare to address this lone contention, let us repeat our earlier admonition that, just as we are not going to frame contentions for the appellants that they have not framed for themselves, neither are we going to reframe a contention in order to afford it greater relevance and potency.

On July 22, 2015, Judge Wachs denied the motion, after finding, "no fraud and/or irregularity within any of the named Orders in Defendants' Motion or Correspondence." In their primary contention, the appellants contend that Judge Michael Wachs committed error when, on July 22, 2015, he denied the appellants' Motion to Strike Order and Request for a Hearing. The precise contention, however, is not that Judge Wachs erred on the legal merits of the motion but that, in ruling as he did, he violated his "obligations under the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct."

"Did Judge Wachs and/or someone acting in his name and on his behalf violate Judge Wachs' obligations under the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct by deciding and by signing the Order of July 22, 2015?"

(Emphasis supplied). The contention thus framed, does not raise a question about the legal requirements and legal implications of a Rule 2-535(b) motion, but generates a very different question about judicial ethics. The appellants do, indeed, devote six full pages of their brief to setting out fully the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct.

The appellants' argument made reference to a May 13, 2015 letter they had written to the Clerk of the Anne Arundel Circuit Court. In referring to that letter, the appellants' brief recited:

"The May 13, 2015 letter included the suggestion, although stated in a discrete manner out of deference to the Maryland Judiciary, that Judge Wachs himself and/or one or more members of the judicial staff and/or the staff of the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County have committed multiple criminal counts of Perjury ..., Obstruction of Justice ..., and/or Tampering with or Fabricating Physical Evidence ... in connection with

---

Appellants' case, with the thinly veiled objective of denying Appellants our rights to Due Process of Law and Equal Protection of the Law pursuant to Amendments 5 and 14, § 1 of The Constitution of the United States."

(Emphasis supplied).

The argument in support of this contention then expressly attributed a sinister motivation to the court's ruling.

"On July 22, 2015, Judge Wachs himself allegedly signed an Order denying our **MOTION TO STRIKE ORDERS PURSUANT TO MARYLAND RULE 2-535(b)** in violation of more than two-dozen provisions of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct. This decision was particularly noteworthy inasmuch as it came almost as quickly as possible from the Circuit Court, when Appellants have had other motions on the record for well over two years, which have never been ruled upon. This fact gives rise to the inference that Judge Wachs, one or more members of the judicial staff, and/or one or more members of the staff of the Clerk, Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County was specifically watching for our motion, with the express objective of squelching it before other members of the Circuit Court judiciary saw it, thereby committing further criminal acts of Obstruction of Justice in the process."

(Emphasis supplied; citations omitted).

Pray, on whose behalf? For what conceivable purpose? This is conspiracy theory run rampant. There is not a word anywhere in the record even to suggest such a sweeping charge. The allegation is not simply without merit. It is outrageous. The thrust of the contention is nonetheless clear, as the appellants assert in the opening sentences of their Statement of Facts:

"This appeal comes from the fact that by ruling on Appellants' **MOTION TO STRIKE ORDERS PURSUANT TO MARYLAND RULE 2-535(b)** ..., Judge Wachs or someone pretending to be Judge Wachs has

violated multiple provisions of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct, Maryland Rule 16-813, giving rise to reasonable inferences of criminal behavior and the miscarriage of justice in Appellants' case in chief, Circuit Court No. 02-C-13-178786 and CSA-REG-2122-2014. Judge Wachs' ruling undermines the very foundation of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct, Maryland Rule 16-813, particularly the purpose of maintaining 'conduct that ensures the greatest possible public confidence in their independence, impartiality, integrity, and competence' contained in § C-102 of the Preamble to the Code."

(Emphasis supplied).

By contrast, the appellants offer no cogent argument as to why Judge Wachs' denial of their Rule 2-535(b) motion on July 22, 2015, was erroneous on its legal merits. There is not a word of discussion as to what precisely is "fraud" or "mistake" or "irregularity" within the contemplation of the rule. There is simply a bald assertion:

"As Appellants have shown in the foregoing, Judge Wachs' apparent violations of his obligations under the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct fall well below the level of reasonable judicial conduct. We assert that there are very few reasonable Citizens of the State of Maryland, if given all of the facts, who would believe Judge Wachs' decision on July 22, 2015 falls within [the] parameters of what is and should [be] permissible in the judicial system of the State."

(Emphasis supplied).

Except for the appellants' unrestrained indulgence in conspiratorial implications, however, there is no suggestion that an erroneous docket entry or a chronological misfiling is, with respect to the case that was tried, anything other than harmless error. The leap from some recording error or archival misfiling to criminal conspiracy, however, is dramatic. A small sampling includes such charges as:

"[T]here is a reasonable inference that Judge Wachs, one or more members of the judicial staff and/or one or more members of the staff of the Clerk of the Circuit Court was trying to hide the circumstances under which Judge Wachs signed these Orders."

\*\*\*

"Appellants assert that the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County's failure to amend the Case Summary on our request, proven by the facts, amounts to at least one additional count of Perjury, Obstruction of Justice, and/or Tampering with or Fabricating Physical Evidence."

\*\*\*

"On this point alone, it is clear that the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County is willfully presenting facts to this Honorable Court, which are untrue and intended to mislead this Honorable Court about the relevant dates. The fact that these Orders were never served on Appellants give rise to a reasonable inference that Judge Wachs, one or more members of his judicial staff, and/or one or more members of the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Anne Arundel County's staff was trying to hide the circumstances of these Orders when these Orders were introduced to the record."

\*\*\*

"As we have stated in our other appeal, ... this case has been riddled with fraud and falsehoods from Appellees since inception, and has no business continuing in the courts of the State of Maryland. ... Now, added to everything else is apparent judicial and administrative malfeasance."

(Emphasis added; citations omitted).

The attacks on the trial judge's integrity continued unabated in the appellant's reply brief.

"Appellants' July 2, 2015 Motion, to which this appeal relates, should never have come before Judge Michael Wachs in the first place because of numerous questions of fact regarding fraud and irregularity related to his

handling of the case. It was completely inappropriate for him to rule, because he or someone acting in his name committed multiple violations of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct in so doing, as set forth in Appellants' Brief. The substantive issues raised by Appellants' **MOTION TO STRIKE ORDERS PURSUANT TO MARYLAND RULE 2-535(b)** ... were never reached because of this Judicial and/or Administrative malfeasance with respect to this matter, as more fully set forth in Appellants' Brief.

\*\*\*

"Surely it goes without saying that when Citizens of the State of Maryland are complaining about the apparent crimes of perjury, record tampering and obstruction of justice, they are damaged if that is true. We are complaining about the fact that injustice is being committed against us, and we are being denied Due Process of Law and Equal Protection of the Law. Surely, when Appellants complain that it appears that a Circuit Court Judge and/or a member of his judicial staff and/or a member of the Clerk's administrative staff improperly entered Orders in violation of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct not only Appellants but all Citizens of the State of Maryland are damaged because of the doubt raised as to the integrity of the judicial process in the State of Maryland.

\*\*\*

"The Order of Judge Wachs ..., which violated numerous provisions of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct, and gives rise to the inference that Judge Wachs, and/or one of his judicial clerks, and/or an administrative clerk was attempting to cover up the malfeasance complained of in this appeal[.]

\*\*\*

"The fraudulent misrepresentations, which Judge Wachs or someone acting in his name inappropriately ruled on by his Order ignoring his judicial duties and responsibilities under the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct as set forth in Appellants' Brief, provide reinforcement for our argument that the Appellees' case was flawed from the beginning."

(Emphasis supplied).

Notwithstanding the command of Rule 8-504(a)(6) that the appellants' brief contain "argument in support of the party's position on each issue," the appellants have offered no shred of argument that Judge Wachs violated the Maryland Code of Judicial Ethics. Although their initial Statement of Facts had alleged that his ruling of July 22, 2015, had been "in violation of more than two-dozen provisions of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct," the ultimate Argument failed to mention a single one of those "more than two-dozen provisions" or to argue precisely how any of them had been violated in any way. There was nothing more than the conclusory assertion:

"We assert that there are very few reasonable Citizens of the State of Maryland, if given all of the facts, who would believe Judge Wachs' decision on July 22, 2015 falls within their parameters of what is and should [be] permissible in the judicial system of the State."

(Emphasis supplied). That is a bold assertion.

In the absence of any supporting argument (or sane rationale for that matter, whether argued or not), this is simply not a cognizable contention. The judgment below is hereby affirmed.

### **An Irrelevant Aside**

Simply as an aside, what the appellant wanted to attack on this appeal, but didn't, was the accuracy of archival record keeping. Looked at in its totality, the appellants' brief does not challenge the validity of the foreclosure sale. It is simply a two-pronged attack on the accuracy of judicial record keeping. One prong of the attack is aimed at the Clerk's Office

of the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County. The claim is that the docket entries are sometimes erroneous. It claims that a judge's order, for instance, is sometimes not filed until three or four days, or even three or four weeks, after the date shown on the document itself. It claims that sometimes various docket entries are not in chronological order.

Shorn of their conspiratorial insinuations, however, any errors referred to, even if arguendo assumed to be true, would have no conceivable impact on the foreclosure proceeding that is the subject of this appeal.

The other object of the appellants' wrath is the Maryland Judiciary Case Search. The appellant claims that the four key rulings dealt with by their Rule 2-535(b) motion were improperly docketed by the Clerk's Office because those documents did not appear on the Judiciary Case Search System. That system, however, is not an official repository on which the appellants are entitled to rely. It is a service provided to the public by the state judiciary for informational purposes. The Judiciary Case Search, on its face, provides the following disclaimer:

"IV. Reliability of Information

"This site reflects the electronic record of cases presented and may not always reflect the information maintained within the official case file. The data may not be reliable in the sense that further action may occur in the case that would affect the record.

"The Maryland Judiciary, its agencies, officers, or employees do not guarantee the accuracy, reliability or timeliness of any information contained in this system. Users rely on this information at their own risk."

(Emphasis supplied).

The appellant's numerous references to what information was or was not available through the Maryland Judiciary Case Search were self-evidently non-starters as instances of reversible error. The relief sought by the appellants, moreover, goes well beyond our appellate authority:

"Appellants urge this Honorable Court to take those steps necessary to close these obvious flaws in these systems for future litigants, and to insist that an electronic audit trail be created, which clearly identifies who accessed which case records and when, what they did while they accessed them, and makes it impossible to insert papers of any kind in the middle of material already filed."

(Emphasis supplied).

**JUDGMENT AFFIRMED; COSTS  
TO BE PAID BY APPELLANTS.**