

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1216

September Term, 2024

STEPHEN NIVENS

v.

ST. MARKS CHURCH, *et al.*

Berger,
Tang,
Eyler, James R.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: June 2, 2025

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

In November 2023, Stephen Nivens, appellant, filed a complaint under the Child Victim, Hidden Predator Act in the Circuit Court for Howard County against St. Mark’s Church and one of its parishioners, appellees.¹ On March 28, 2024, the court sent appellant a Notice of Contemplated Dismissal indicating that the the action was “subject to dismissal, without prejudice” because the parties “have not been served, or the court has not otherwise acquired jurisdiction over them[.]” Appellant filed a motion to defer dismissal, which the court granted on April 17, 2024. In granting the motion, the court ordered that if “service on each Defendant has not been effectuated with proof of service filed with this Court” within 90 days, the Clerk “shall dismiss the [] case, without prejudice, for lack of prosecution.” Appellant did not file proof of service, and on July 24, 2024, the Clerk entered an order dismissing the case without prejudice for lack of prosecution pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-507(f). This appeal followed.

Appellant raises four issues on appeal. But none of those issues address the actual reason for the dismissal of his complaint, specifically that he had failed to provide proof of service on appellees within the time ordered by the court. Therefore, we need not consider that issue on appeal. *See Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (noting that arguments that are “not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal” (quotation marks and citation omitted)). Appellant ultimately bears the burden of

¹ Notably, in 2011 appellant pleaded guilty to the offenses of second-degree sex offense and first-degree burglary wherein the same parishioner was the victim.

demonstrating that the court committed reversible error in dismissing his complaint pursuant to Rule 2-507. Because he has not done so, we shall affirm.

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