

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. CAD06-10254

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND*

No. 1037

September Term, 2024

GEORGE A. REDRICK, JR.

v.

ROSALIND J. REDRICK

Reed,
Tang,
Wright, Alexander, Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

Opinion by Wright, J.

Filed: November 18, 2025

* This is an unreported opinion. This opinion may not be cited as precedent within the rule of stare decisis. It may be cited for its persuasive value only if the citation conforms to Rule 1-104(a)(2)(B).

This appeal arises from the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County’s grant of a motion to compel discovery in aid of enforcement of a judgment. The judgment was entered in 2007 against George Redrick, Jr. (“Husband”), appellant, and in favor of Rosalind Redrick (“Wife”), appellee, in the parties’ divorce case. Husband presents two issues¹ on appeal, which we combine as one:

I. Did the circuit court err by granting Wife’s motion to compel discovery to aid enforcement of a judgment that was entered more than twelve years earlier and had not been renewed in accordance with Md. Rule 2-625?

For the following reasons, we answer that question, “Yes,” and reverse the order of the circuit court.

BACKGROUND

By judgment entered August 17, 2007, Wife was granted an absolute divorce from Husband. As part of the divorce decree, the court entered a judgment against Husband in favor of Wife in the amount of \$39,556 as “a monetary award resolving the [Wife]’s claims for child support arrearage, mortgage contribution, repairs and improvements to the marital home, legal fees and the Parties[’] respective claims for dissipation of marital assets[.]”

¹ The issues as posed by Husband are:

I. Whether the trial court erred in granting Appellee’s Motion to Compel Discovery in Aid of Enforcement?

II. Whether the trial court erred in denying Appellant’s Motion to Alter or Amend, or in the Alternative, Motion to Stay Enforcement of Judgment Pending Appeal?

Thereafter, Wife recorded a judgment lien against real property owned by Husband in Bumpass, Virginia.

In 2010 and again in 2011, Wife filed in the circuit court to attempt to enforce her judgment. First, in December 2010, she filed a motion to enforce monetary judgment, along with a motion to modify child support. In a letter to the Clerk of the Court with respect to the motion to enforce the judgment, she alleged that Husband still owned the land in Virginia and would not deed it to her. She asked for the judgment to be enforced through “wage, bank account and asset garnishment” and provided a legal description of the land in Virginia. The court held a hearing on the motion to modify child support, but the record does not reflect any action on Wife’s motion to enforce the judgment.²

Second, in May 2011, Wife filed a request for a writ of garnishment of wages, naming First Transit, Inc. at Baltimore Washington International Airport as the garnishee. Notice was served upon First Transit, Inc. and, later that month, it responded that Husband was an employee, that he earned \$24.72 per hour, that he was paid biweekly, and that \$434.77 was garnished per pay period subject to a child support order for the parties’ child. It does not appear from the record that Husband’s wages were attached to satisfy the judgment but, in any event, by July 2011, Husband no longer was employed by First Transit according to Wife.

² According to Husband, at that hearing, the Family Law Master advised Wife that the circuit court lacked jurisdiction over a lien on real property in Virginia.

More than a decade later, on December 21, 2023, Wife, through counsel, served upon Husband requests for production of documents and interrogatories in aid of enforcement of the 2007 judgment. The next month, Husband, through counsel, responded that the docket entries in the divorce case did not reflect that Wife ever had renewed the 2007 judgment and consequently, that the judgment was “now well beyond the specialty statute of limitations of 12 years.” He asked Wife’s counsel to provide evidence of renewal of that judgment, if any existed. Wife’s counsel responded that, because of the “nature of this judgment[,]” counsel disagreed that the twelve-year limitations period applied.

On April 18, 2024, Wife filed in the circuit court a motion to compel discovery in aid of enforcement. She attached to her motion the discovery requests served upon Husband and the response from Husband’s attorney. Wife alleged that the circuit court entered judgment in her favor on August 17, 2007, and that the “entry of the judgment specified that the judgment never expired.” Since that time, Wife had “encountered numerous roadblocks and obstacles in attempting to collect on the judgment.” Wife asserted that it was “well-established” that the twelve-year statute of limitations was inapplicable to a “judgment arising from child support arrearages, alimony, or similar obligations[,]” citing two cases decided by this Court, *Bland v. Larsen*, 97 Md. App. 125 (1993), and *Weidner v. Weidner*, 78 Md. App. 367 (1989). She asked the court to enter an order compelling Husband to respond to the discovery requests within five days and award her fees and costs.

Husband opposed the motion, asserting that, contrary to Wife’s allegations, “there are no judgments in Maryland that do not expire” and that, under Md. Rule 2-625, a “money judgment expires 12 years from the date of entry or most recent renewal.” He further emphasized that our decisions in *Bland* and *Weidner* directly supported that position. Husband asked the court to deny the motion to compel and award him attorneys’ fees and costs. Husband further requested a hearing on the motion.

On May 29, 2024, without holding a hearing, the court entered an order granting Wife’s motion to compel, ordering Husband to respond to the discovery requests within five days, and ordering Husband to pay Wife’s attorneys’ fees and costs.

Within ten days, Husband moved to alter or amend the judgment and requested that the court stay the judgment pending appeal. He argued that, because there was no judgment to enforce, Wife was not entitled to discovery in aid of enforcement of it.

Wife opposed that motion. She attached to her motion a copy of the Maryland Judiciary Case Search docket entries and highlighted information appearing in a section entitled, “Judgment Information.” That section reflected that a judgment was entered against Husband and in favor of Wife on August 17, 2007 for \$39,556 and included the following language:

Judgment Expiration Date: Does not expire

By order entered July 2, 2024, the court denied the motion to alter or amend. This timely appeal followed.³

DISCUSSION

Maryland Rule 2-633 provides for post-judgment discovery in aid of enforcement of a judgment. Under subsection (a) of that Rule, “a judgment creditor may obtain discovery to aid enforcement of a money judgment” through depositions, interrogatories, requests for documents, and other methods.” Md. Rule 2-633(a). The rule “authorizes discovery in aid only of *an actual, existing money judgment*[.]” *Johnson v. Francis*, 239 Md. App. 530, 546 (2018) (emphasis added). At issue in this case is whether there is a money judgment in existence subject to enforcement or whether the judgment expired after twelve years. Because our resolution of this issue turns upon statutory interpretation and interpretation of the Maryland Rules, we review the grant of Wife’s motion to compel *de novo*. *Wheeling v. Selene Fin. LP*, 473 Md. 356, 373 (2021).

Section 5-102 of the Courts and Judicial Proceedings Article (“CJP”) of the Maryland Code governs limitations on actions on specialties. It provides that an action on

³ We recognize that discovery orders ordinarily are interlocutory orders and are not immediately appealable under the final judgment rule. *Baltimore City Dep’t of Soc. Servs. v. Stein*, 328 Md. 1, 14 (1992) (“It is well settled in Maryland that discovery orders usually are not immediately appealable.”). Here, however, because a final judgment was entered in the underlying case in 2007, the only issue left to be decided is whether Wife is entitled to discovery to enforce the money judgment. Consequently, the order entered by the circuit court is properly before us. *See Johnson v. Francis*, 239 Md. App. 530, 540-41 (2018) (reasoning that an order granting protective orders and quashing subpoenas relative to post-judgment discovery was immediately appealable).

a judgment must be brought within twelve years after entry of the judgment. CJP § 5-102(a)(3). “Rule 2-625 implements the twelve-year limitations period found in [CJP § 5-102(a)].” *State, Cent. Collection Unit v. Buckingham*, 214 Md. App. 672, 674 (2013). That Rule states: “A money judgment expires 12 years from the date of entry or most recent renewal. At any time before expiration of the judgment, the judgment holder may file a notice of renewal and the clerk shall enter the judgment renewed.” Md. Rule 2-625. *See also Kroop & Kurland, P.A. v. Lambros*, 118 Md. App. 651, 657 (1998) (“A circuit court money judgment expires twelve years from its date of entry or twelve years from the date on which it was most recently renewed.”).

Contrary to Wife’s argument in her motion to compel discovery, Maryland law does not exempt money judgments arising from child support or alimony from this twelve-year limitations period. Both cases cited in the circuit court by Wife in support of that argument state the opposite. *See Bland*, 97 Md. App. at 133-34 (affirming award to ex-wife of child support arrearages for prior twelve years, but not beyond, due to application of CJP § 5-102(a)(3)); *Weidner*, 78 Md. App. at 375-76 (affirming award of alimony arrearages and noting that the ex-wife “did not claim that she was entitled to arrearages in alimony for more than 12 years, acknowledging the limitation on collection of judgments imposed by [CJP § 5-102(a)(3)]”).

In the instant case, the judgment was entered on August 17, 2007. Though Wife attempted to enforce it on two occasions, she never renewed the judgment. Consequently,

the judgment expired on August 16, 2019, twelve years after it was entered.⁴ Because there was no existing money judgment capable of being enforced when Wife filed her motion to compel discovery in aid of enforcement, she was not entitled to that relief. For all these reasons, we reverse the order of the circuit court compelling Husband to propound discovery responses and to pay fees and costs.

**ORDER OF THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY
REVERSED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY
APPELLEE.**

⁴ We decline to address Wife's argument that she detrimentally relied upon the language that now appears on the docket stating that the "Judg[.]ment does not expire." Our review of the record reveals that, as of September 19, 2022, when the docket entries were printed out, the language "Judgment does not expire" did not appear on the docket. Thus, while it is unclear when this erroneous language first was added to the docket, it was sometime after the expiration of the judgment.