

Circuit Court for Prince George's County  
Case No: CAEF15-37462

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 325

September Term, 2018

---

MARVA BAIRD-ALLEYNE, *et al.*

v.

CARRIE M. WARD, *et al.*

---

Nazarian,  
Leahy,  
Raker, Irma S.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: November 12, 2019

\*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 2017, appellees, acting as substitute trustees, filed an Order to Docket in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County, seeking to foreclose on real property owned by Joseph F. Edwards. The property was subsequently sold at a foreclosure auction on December 27, 2017. In response, Marva Baird-Alleyne, appellant, filed a motion in opposition to the sale and complaint for damages with the court, seeking to prevent ratification of the foreclosure sale. In a March 29, 2018 order, the court denied Ms. Baird-Alleyne’s motion because she “fail[ed] to meet the requirements of standing to bring the [m]otion” and “failed to provide proof that she [had] been appointed as the personal representative of the Estate of Joseph F. Edwards.” Ms. Baird-Alleyne noted a timely appeal of the court’s order on April 10, 2018.

In her brief, Ms. Baird-Alleyne fails to raise any argument which addresses the court’s decision that she lacked standing to participate in the foreclosure action. Instead, she raises issues completely inapplicable to the matter at hand, including references to irrelevant administrative agency procedure and a non-existent motion for reconsideration. We will not consider on appeal “arguments not presented in a brief and not presented with particularity.” *Klaunberg v. State*, 355 Md. 528, 552 (1999). We, therefore, decline to review whether the court erred in denying Ms. Baird-Alleyne’s motion for lack of standing and affirm.

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