

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. CADV14-07581

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 173

September Term, 2019

STARSHA SEWELL

v.

JOHN HOWARD

Fader, C.J.,
Graeff,
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: June 2, 2020

*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.

Starsha Sewell, appellant, and John Howard, appellee, are the parents of two minor children. On March 31, 2014, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County entered a final protective order prohibiting Ms. Sewell from having any contact with Mr. Howard or the minor children, prohibiting Ms. Sewell from threatening or harassing Mr. Howard and the minor children, requiring Ms. Sewell to stay away from the children’s school, and requiring Ms. Sewell to participate in family therapy and psychological counseling. The protective order expired on March 31, 2015. Ms. Sewell did not file a notice of appeal, although she later filed three motions for relief from the protective order, all of which were denied.

In 2019, Ms. Sewell filed a “Motion for Relief and Expungement,” seeking to vacate the protective order as well as the “immediate return of her children.” The motion, which included several “supplemental exhibits,” alleged that Mr. Howard had conspired with various persons and entities to “conceal an illegal property taking and an illegal parental rights flip, in violation of Federal Order issued from the United States District Court and the US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, and the Eighth Amendment to the US Constitution.” She also contended that there had been unspecified extrinsic fraud that prevented her from having an adversarial trial. The circuit court denied the motion without a hearing.

On appeal, Ms. Sewell raises four issues, which reduce to one: whether the circuit court erred in denying her “Motion for Relief and Expungement.” As an initial matter, we note that Ms. Sewell’s brief is very difficult to follow and consists almost entirely of conclusory allegations of misconduct against various persons and entities. But, because the protective order was entered in 2014 and has since expired, the only possible avenue

for Ms. Sewell to set it aside would have been pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b). We have reviewed the record and are persuaded that none of the claims in Ms. Sewell’s motion demonstrated the existence of fraud, mistake, or irregularity within the meaning of that Rule. Consequently, the circuit court did not err in denying her “Motion for Relief and Expungement.”

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT
COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE’S
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO
BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**