

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1142

September Term, 2023

MATTHEW LIVERPOOL

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND

Graeff,
Arthur,
Eyler, James R.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: May 13, 2024

*This is a per curiam opinion. Consistent with Rule 1-104, the opinion is not precedent within the rule of stare decisis nor may it be cited as persuasive authority.

Following a jury trial in the Circuit Court for Anne Arundel County, at which he represented himself, Matthew Liverpool, appellant, was convicted of fleeing from police, driving on a suspended license, resisting arrest, possession of CDS, and other related offenses. On appeal, appellant claims that: (1) the court erred by “not stating a constitutional jurisdiction” after he “filed an affidavit of sovereignty;” (2) the “affidavit of trust [] was not followed by a trustee/judge/prosecutor/clerk,” as required by Article 6 of the Maryland Constitution, and (3) an “invalid warrant was served.”

As an initial matter, our ability to review appellant’s claims is constrained by the fact that appellant has not filed a transcript of this trial. Appellants are required to ensure that the record on appeal contains the transcripts necessary for this Court to issue a decision. *See* Md. Rule 8-413(a) (listing the required contents of the record on appeal); Md. Rule 8-602(c)(4) (granting this Court the discretion to dismiss an appeal when the record does not comply with Rule 8-413). And it was appellant’s burden “to put before this Court every part of the proceedings below which were material to a decision in his favor.” *Lynch v. R. E. Tull & Sons, Inc.*, 251 Md. 260, 262 (1968). In *Kovacs v. Kovacs*, 98 Md. App. 289 (1993), this Court held that the party asserting error has the burden to show “by the record” that an error occurred. *Id.* at 303. And “[t]he failure to provide the court with a transcript warrants summary rejection of the claim of error.” *Id.* Because appellant has not provided a copy of his trial transcript, we must reject his claims of error for that reason alone.

But even had the transcript been provided we would still affirm. Maryland Rule 8-504(a) requires a party’s brief to contain a “clear concise statement of the facts material to a determination of the questions presented,” a “concise statement of the applicable standard

of review for each issue,” and “[a]rgument in support of the party’s position on each issue.” Appellant’s brief contains none of these things. Rather, it consists of three conclusory allegations of error unsupported by any legal argument. Moreover, as best as we can discern, appellant is attempting to raise claims based on legal theories advanced by the “sovereign citizen” movement, which we have noted “have not, will not, and cannot be accepted as valid.” *Anderson v. O’Sullivan*, 224 Md. App. 501, 512-13 (2015).

Although we are mindful that appellant is representing himself in this appeal, it is not our responsibility to “attempt to fashion coherent legal theories to support [his] . . . claims” of misconduct. *Konover Prop. Tr., Inc. v. WHE Assocs., Inc.*, 142 Md. App. 476, 494 (2002). Rather, it is appellant’s burden on appeal to demonstrate that the trial court committed prejudicial error. Because he has not met that burden, we shall affirm the judgments.

**JUDGMENTS OF THE CIRCUIT
COURT FOR ANNE ARUNDEL
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO
BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**