

Circuit Court for Montgomery County  
Civil Case No. 435178

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 584

September Term, 2018

---

EDMUND AWAH

v.

FAVOR PETER

---

Friedman,  
Beachley,  
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: July 1, 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.

Edmund Awah, appellant, filed a complaint in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County alleging seven causes of action against Favor Peter, appellee, arising from her alleged breach of a residential rental agreement. Ms. Peter responded by filing a counter-claim for breach of contract and damage to property. At the close of Mr. Awah’s case-in-chief, the trial court granted Ms. Peter’s motion for judgment as to all his claims except breach of contract, trespass, and conversion. The court then instructed the jury on those claims, as well as Ms. Peter’s counter-claims. Those claims were also set forth in the verdict sheet that was submitted to the jury. The jury ultimately found Mr. Awah liable for breach of contract and awarded Ms. Peter \$750.00 in damages.

Mr. Awah now appeals, raising four issues: (1) whether the court erred in granting Ms. Peter’s motion for judgment; (2) whether the docket sheet contradicts the court’s oral ruling granting Ms. Peter’s motion for judgment; (3) whether the court erred by submitting a verdict sheet that “completely mischaracterized [his] Causes of Action”; and (4) whether the court erred by giving the jury instructions that “had no nexus to any theory of recovery articulated in [his] claims for relief.” Because Mr. Awah does not argue the first issue with particularity, the docket sheet correctly reflects the court’s oral ruling on Ms. Peter’s motion for judgment, and the remaining issues are not preserved, we affirm.

Mr. Awah first contends that the trial court erred in granting Ms. Peter’s motion for judgment. However, Mr. Awah does not indicate which causes of action he believes were improperly dismissed or set forth any facts or relevant case law to support this contention. In fact, outside of a conclusory statement of error contained in his “questions presented,” he does not address this claim in his brief. Consequently, we will not consider it on appeal.

*See Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (noting that arguments that are “not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal” (citation omitted)).

Mr. Awah also contends that, although the court orally granted Ms. Peter’s motion for judgment, the docket sheet indicates that the motion was denied. He further asserts that the contradiction between the docket sheet and the trial court’s oral ruling “proved prejudicial to [his] claims for relief.” However, this claim is belied by the record as the docket entries clearly state that Ms. Peter’s motion for judgment was granted in part and denied in part at the close of Mr. Awah’s case-in-chief.

Finally, Mr. Awah contends that the verdict sheet and the jury instructions were erroneous. However, because he did not object to the form of the verdict sheet or to the jury instructions, these claims are not preserved for appeal. *See* Maryland Rule 8-131(a); *see also French v. Hines*, 182 Md. App. 201 (2008) (noting that “to preserve . . . contentions concerning the law that should have governed the jury’s deliberations, [a party is] required to note exceptions to the trial court’s jury instructions” (citation omitted)). Moreover, even if preserved, these claims lack merit. Mr. Awah does not allege that the jury instructions or the verdict sheet were improper as to the causes of action that were not dismissed. Rather, he appears to contend that the court erred by not submitting all the causes of action in his complaint to the jury. But, as previously noted, all but three of Mr. Awah’s claims were dismissed at the close of his case-in-chief and he has not demonstrated their dismissal

was improper. And because they were dismissed, the trial court was not required to instruct the jury on those claims or to submit them to the jury.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT  
COURT FOR MONTGOMERY  
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS  
TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**