

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND\*

No. 1332

September Term, 2022

---

TIA BROWN

v.

NEBIYOU SEYOUM

---

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

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: April 4, 2023

\*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.

\*At the November 8, 2022, general election, the voters of Maryland ratified a constitutional amendment changing the name of the Court of Special Appeals of Maryland to the Appellate Court of Maryland. The name change took effect on December 14, 2022.

Tia Brown, appellant, and Nebiyou Seyoum, appellee, have been involved in an ongoing custody dispute involving their minor child, A.S. In 2019, appellee filed a motion in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City to modify appellant’s access to supervised visitation. Following a hearing, the Magistrate issued a report, recommending that the court grant the motion. Appellant filed exceptions, and the circuit court held a hearing on those exceptions in March 2022. Following that hearing, the court issued orders on April 27, 2022, denying appellant’s exceptions, and granting appellee’s motion to modify appellant’s access to supervised visitation.

On May 11, 2022, fourteen days after the court issued its final judgment granting the motion to modify, appellant filed a “Motion Pursuant to Md. Rules 2-534, 2-632, 15-502 and Request for Hearing.” In that motion, appellant raised a number of issues with respect to the court’s denial of her exceptions and requested the court to “alter, amend, vacate, and or stay” its orders and to “grant additional injunctive relief.” On July 1, 2022, the court entered an order construing her motion as a motion to reconsider and denying it without a hearing. This appeal followed. Appellant’s sole claim on appeal is that the court erred in denying her May 11 motion without holding a hearing.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup> In her brief, appellant does not address the merits of that motion. Moreover, she does not address the merits of the court’s orders denying her exceptions or granting the motion to modify supervised visitation. In any event, the latter two orders are not properly before us as they were not timely appealed. *See* Md. Rule 8-202 (a) (stating that a “notice of appeal shall be filed within 30 days after entry of the judgment or order from which the appeal is taken”).

Although partly styled as a motion for injunctive relief, in substance, appellant’s May 11 motion was a post-judgment attack on the validity of the court’s orders denying her exceptions granting the motion to modify her supervised visitation access. In any event, because the circuit court had already issued its final judgment, its subsequent denial of appellant’s motion was not dispositive of a claim or defense. Consequently, the court was not required to hold a hearing on her motion, even though one was requested. *See In re Adoption/Guardianship of Joshua M.*, 166 Md. App. 341, 357 (2005) (“[A] court is not required to hold a hearing prior to denying a motion under Rule 2-534.”); *Lowman v. Consol. Rail Corp.* 68 Md. App. 64, 76 (1986) (“By denying the motion for reconsideration, the court merely refused to change its original ruling which had disposed of appellant’s claims. That ruling was not ‘dispositive of a claim or defense,’ and thus no hearing was mandated under Rule 2-311(f) even though a hearing was requested.”).

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT  
COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY  
AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY  
APPELLANT.**