

Circuit Court for Baltimore City  
Case No. 24-C-18-001734

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 293

September Term, 2019

---

OLABANJI BADERINWA

v.

STONEFIELD INVESTMENT FUND IV, LLC

---

Berger,  
Leahy,  
Zarnoch, Robert A.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: July 14, 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.

In this appeal from a civil action in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Olabanji Baderinwa, appellant, challenges the court’s entering of judgment foreclosing the right of redemption on a property. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

In May 2017, Henry J. Raymond, Director of Finance and Collector of Taxes for the City of Baltimore, issued a “Certificate of Tax Sale,” in which he certified that MDINV LLC (“MDINV”), purchased “at public auction, property in the City of Baltimore known as” 920 North Fulton Avenue, Unit O. The property, “having been assessed to” Mr. Baderinwa, “[w]as sold for the sum of” \$9,184.94, \$1,658.27 of which was “the total amount of taxes and other municipal liens due on the property at the time of the sale, together with interest and penalties thereon and expenses incurred in making the sale.” Mr. Raymond certified that the property was “subject to redemption” if the “balance due on account of the purchase price and all taxes and other municipal liens, together with interest and penalties on them accruing subsequent to the date of sale, [were] paid to the Collector.” MDINV subsequently assigned the certificate to Stonefield Investment Fund IV, LLC (“Stonefield”).

In March 2018, Stonefield filed a “Complaint to Foreclose Rights of Redemption” against Mr. Baderinwa and other defendants, pursuant to Md. Code (2001, 2012 Repl. Vol., 2017 Supp.), § 14-833(a)(2) of the Tax-Property Article (“TP”) (“at any time after 9 months from the date of sale of owner-occupied residential property located in Baltimore City, a holder of any certificate of sale may file a complaint to foreclose all rights of redemption of the property to which the certificate relates”). Counsel for Stonefield

attached to the complaint an affidavit in which he affirmed under the penalties of perjury that, prior to the filing of the complaint, he “caused to be mailed [to Mr. Baderinwa] by certified mail[,] return receipt requested,” two notices as required by TP § 14-833(a-1). In April 2018, a private process server “posted notice to” Mr. Baderinwa by posting the complaint and related documents “near the front door” of the property. In August 2018, the server again “executed service of process upon [Mr. Baderinwa] by serving” his mother at her residence in Riverdale.

In January 2019, Stonefield assigned the certificate of tax sale to LMG 17, LLC (“LMG 17”). LMG 17 subsequently filed an “Affidavit of Compliance and Request for Judgment.” In March 2019, the court ordered “that judgment be . . . entered in favor of [LMG 17] foreclosing the right of redemption in the property.”

Mr. Baderinwa challenges, on numerous grounds, the validity of the taxes, proceedings, and sale.<sup>1</sup> But, TP § 14-842 states that “unless a defendant in the proceeding

---

<sup>1</sup>Specifically, Mr. Baderinwa contends:

[T]he Bureau of Revenue collections should not have had [Mr. Baderinwa’s] home and property in a tax sale. The Bureau of Revenue Collections should have been more humane in the handling of the . . . matter as the entire nation is currently facing housing crisis in many quarters. The Bureau of Revenue Collections should have collected the amount paid for 2017/2018 taxes and used it to offset any previous balance that [Mr. Baderinwa] had with their office. And if there were any issues regarding the . . . property the title should have been held by Baltimore City and not permitted to be auctioned out.

[LMG 17] should have been more responsive to the request of [Mr. Baderinwa] to settle this matter amicably and fairly. [LMG 17] should be aware of current housing issues within the nation and should not have made

(continued)

shall, by answer, set up as a defense the invalidity of the taxes or the invalidity of the proceedings to sell or the invalidity of the sale,” the “validity of the procedure is conclusively presumed.” Here, Mr. Baderinwa, despite being notified four times of the taxes, proceedings, and sale, did not file an answer to the complaint. Hence, the validity of the procedure is conclusively presumed, and the court did not err in entering judgment foreclosing the right of redemption in the property.

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

---

a possible settlement unaffordable to redeem for [Mr. Baderinwa]. [LMG 17] should have had more consideration for [Mr. Baderinwa] as opposed to the position of which [LMG 17] is taking that would render [Mr. Baderinwa] homeless. [LMG 17] should not have attempted to frighten [Mr. Baderinwa] in an attempt to pre-empt judgment.

(Citations and record reference omitted.)