

Circuit Court for Prince George's County  
Case No. CAD06-26267

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1148

September Term, 2021

---

STARSHA SEWELL

v.

JOHN HOWARD

---

Arthur,  
Shaw,  
Woodward, Patrick L.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: May 4, 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.

Starsha Sewell, appellant, and John Howard, appellee, are the parents of two minor children. On July 29, 2014, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County entered an order granting Mr. Howard sole legal and physical custody of the children; denying Ms. Sewell visitation; and ordering Ms. Sewell to pay child support. Thereafter, Ms. Sewell filed numerous motions to vacate the custody order pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b), claiming that the circuit court had lacked jurisdiction to enter the custody order and that various parties involved in her case, including the judge, the Assistant State’s Attorney, the Prince George’s County Police Department, and the Department of Social Services had engaged in fraudulent or discriminatory activity. The circuit court denied those motions in January 2018. Ms. Sewell appealed, and we affirmed, holding that the circuit court had jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order and that Ms. Sewell had failed to demonstrate the existence of any fraud, mistake, or irregularity that would have warranted the court vacating that judgment. *See Sewell v. Howard*, No. 2266, Sept. 2017 (filed August 31, 2018).

Undeterred, Ms. Sewell has continued to file motions to vacate the 2014 custody order and all directives issued by the circuit court to enforce that order. Ms. Sewell appealed from the denial of some of those motions, and in each instance, we affirmed, finding that her claims are barred by the law of the case doctrine. *See e.g. Sewell v. Howard*, No. 366, Sept. Term 2020 (filed May 11, 2021); *Sewell v. Howard*, No. 2102, Sept. Term 2019 (filed July 28, 2020); *Sewell v. Howard*, No. 3312, Sept. Term 2018 (filed April 13, 2020); *Sewell v. Howard*, No. 852, Sept. Term 2018 (filed July 1, 2019); *Sewell v. Howard*, No. 162, Sept. Term 2021 (filed Nov. 30, 2021).

Ms. Sewell now appeals from the circuit court’s denial of one more such motion, her August 31, 2021, “Emergency Motion to Stay Child Support Order as Null and Void & Relievable Fraud lack of jurisdiction, due to the Federal Remand Order Dated September 18, 2021 Under MD Rule 2-535(b).” On appeal, Ms. Sewell again claims that the court erred in denying that motion because the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order. However, we have previously addressed that contention on appeal and held that it lacks merit. Consequently, Ms. Sewell’s claim is barred by the law of the case doctrine. *See Baltimore County v. Baltimore County Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 4*, 220 Md. App. 596, 659 (2014) (noting that “neither the questions decided [by the appellate courts] nor the ones that could have been raised and decided are available to be raised in a subsequent appeal” (quotation marks and citation omitted)).<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Moreover, even if Ms. Sewell’s claims were not barred by the law of the case doctrine, we would affirm because none of the contentions raised in her motion establish the existence of fraud, mistake, or irregularity within the meaning of Rule 2-535(b).