

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. CAS21-02863

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 823

September Term, 2021

BELLAMY KRAVITZ

v.

DORIS NAMA FOMBIN, *et al.*

Graeff,
Zic,
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: May 25, 2022

*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.

Bellamy Kravitz, appellant, and Doris Nama Fombin, appellee, are the parents of two minor children, E.K. and N.K. In April 2021, the Prince George’s County Office of Child Support, appellee, filed a complaint for child support against Mr. Kravitz on behalf of Ms. Fombin in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County. Mr. Kravitz filed an answer wherein he stated that he “did not oppose the child support action,” but challenged the validity of some of the monthly expenses that Ms. Fombin alleged she was incurring to support the minor children.

The parties appeared for a virtual child support hearing before a magistrate, during which they both testified about their salaries and monthly expenses. Following that testimony, the court asked Mr. Kravitz if there was “anything else [he] want[ed] to say on [his] behalf.” He then told the magistrate that the amount Ms. Fombin claimed she was paying for daycare “was a lie” and asserted that she had wrongfully kicked him out of the house and prevented him from seeing the children. Mr. Kravitz also indicated, however, that he did not “disagree with . . . paying child support” and was “perfectly fine with that.” Following the hearing, the magistrate applied the child support guidelines schedule and recommended that Mr. Kravitz pay child support to Ms. Fombin in the amount of \$2,493 per month beginning July 1, 2021. The magistrate did not recommend that Mr. Kravitz’s child support obligations be retroactive. Mr. Kravitz did not file any exceptions to the magistrate’s recommendations and the circuit court subsequently entered an order adopting the magistrate’s recommendations. This appeal followed.

On appeal, Mr. Kravitz contends that the child support order violated his rights under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

Specifically, he asserts that: (1) the child support order violated his due process rights because there was no evidence establishing that he was an unfit parent; (2) the child support order violated his rights under the Equal Protection Clause because the burden of child support was put “squarely on the male and not the female”; (3) he was “not informed of his right to counsel”; (4) he was required to testify against himself; and (5) the complaint for child support was fatally defective because it did not allege a criminal offense. However, Mr. Kravitz did not raise these claims at the hearing before the magistrate or in any other pleading that he filed in the circuit court. Consequently, these issues are not preserved, and we will not address them for the first time on appeal. *See* Maryland Rule 8-131(a) (noting that an appellate court will ordinarily not decide any issue “unless it plainly appears by the record to have been raised in or decided by the trial court”). Mr. Kravitz does not otherwise contend that the court erred in calculating the amount he owed in child support. Consequently, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

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