

Circuit Court for Montgomery County
Case No. 430312V

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 812

September Term, 2019

NINA TAGHVA

v.

DIMITRIOS BALOURDOS

Friedman,
Gould,
Wright, Alexander Jr.
(Retired Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

Opinion by Friedman, J.

Filed: May 26, 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.

Dimitrios Balourdos and Nina Taghva were romantic and business partners who entered into a series of deals to purchase properties, rehabilitate, and resell them. When their partnerships ended, Balourdos sued Taghva on a variety of theories. At trial, Balourdos was unexpectedly unrepresented and, acting as a self-represented litigant, was unable to prove most of his claims. He was, however, successful in proving that he had loaned \$20,000 to Taghva and that she had failed to repay the loan. The circuit court, in an oral ruling, stated that Taghva had “defrauded” Balourdos and entered judgment against Taghva for the \$20,000.

In this appeal, Taghva asserts that the trial court erred in finding that she was liable for fraud.¹ That theory, however, is predicated on a misunderstanding. The trial court did

¹ The elements of fraud are:

- (1) the defendant asserted a false representation of a material fact to the plaintiff;
- (2) the defendant knew that the representation was false, or the representation was made with such reckless disregard for the truth that knowledge of the falsity of the statement can be imputed to the defendant;
- (3) the defendant made the false representation for the purpose of defrauding the plaintiff;
- (4) the plaintiff relied with justification on the misrepresentation; and
- (5) the plaintiff suffered damages as a direct result of the reliance upon the misrepresentation.

Hoffman v. Stamper, 385 Md. 1, 28-31 (2005). The trial court found that Balourdos did not “make his case” for the fraud allegation.

not find her liable for fraud. Rather, the trial court simply observed that Taghva had “defrauded” Balourdos out of the \$20,000, using the word in its colloquial sense. It is plain to us on the face of the record that the trial court found that Taghva owed a debt to Balourdos and reduced it to a judgment. We, therefore, affirm.

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