

Circuit Court for Baltimore City
Case No. 24-C-22-003970

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 1282

September Term, 2024

IRISTINE TILLMAN

v.

STONEFIELD INVESTMENT FUND IV,
LLC, *et al.*

Shaw,
Ripken,
Meredith, Timothy E.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: April 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.

Iristine Tillman, appellant, appeals from an order issued by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City which foreclosed the right of redemption on her property following a tax sale. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

On May 17, 2021, Henry J. Raymond, Director of Finance and Collector of Taxes for the City of Baltimore, issued a “Certificate of Tax Sale,” in which he certified that Stonefield Investment Fund IV, LLC (Stonefield), appellee, had purchased “at public auction, property in the City of Baltimore known as 2925 Norfolk Ave.” The property, “having been assessed to” appellant, was sold for the sum of \$5,673.01, \$4,119.22 of which was “the total amount of taxes and other municipal liens due on the property at the time of the sale, together with interest and penalties thereon and expenses incurred in making the sale.” Mr. Raymond certified that the property was “subject to redemption” if the “balance due on account of the purchase price and all taxes and other municipal liens, together with interest and penalties on them accruing subsequent to the date of sale, [were] paid to the Collector[.]”

In September 2022, Stonefield filed a “Complaint to Foreclose Rights of Redemption” against appellant and other defendants. Stonefield subsequently assigned the tax sale certificate to MD Tax Lien 2021, LLC (MD Tax Lien), appellee, who was substituted as the plaintiff. In January 2023, appellant filed a pleading, which the court treated as a motion to dismiss, indicating that she was “trying to resolve this matter” and believed that the City of Baltimore had not credited a prior overpayment to her account. The City of Baltimore filed a response indicating that, although there was a credit balance on her water bill account, “[w]ater charges were not included in the 2021 tax sale.” Rather,

the “delinquent liens included in the tax sale were real property taxes for 2017/18, 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21 along with an environmental bill and miscellaneous bill.” This response was supported by an affidavit from the Delinquent Accounts Manager for the Bureau of Revenue Collections for the City of Baltimore.

Based on that response, the court denied the motion to dismiss, and ordered that MD Tax Lien file redemption figures for the property. MD Tax Lien filed an affidavit indicating that the redemption “amount due under the tax sale certificate [was] \$4,119.22 plus interest” and that the “[t]otal attorney fees and expenses due [were] \$2,434.84.” Shortly thereafter, appellant filed a pleading indicating that she intended to redeem the property within 90 days. On December 7, 2023, the court entered an order establishing the total redemption amount to be “\$8,391.32 as of December 14, 2023,” with \$6,031.48 of that amount representing the tax sale lien amount plus interest and the remaining amount being attorney fees and expenses. That order was mailed to the parties on December 12, 2023, and stated that if the property was not redeemed “before January 28, 2024, the Court may enter a Judgment Foreclosing the Right of Redemption.” On February 20, 2024, MD Tax Lien filed a request for judgment, stating under oath that “the time in which the property could be redeemed has expired, and that no party has redeemed the delinquent taxes.” Appellant did not file a response. The court entered a judgment foreclosing the right to redemption on July 31, 2024. This appeal followed.

On appeal, appellant claims that the court erred in foreclosing her right of redemption because: (1) she paid appellee’s attorney \$2,434.84 to redeem the property, and (2) after the payment was made no one ever “email[ed] [her] or mailed [her] anything about

this foreclosure.” However, these contentions are not properly before us as they were not raised in the circuit court, and rely on evidence, including email communications between the parties, that is not part of the record. *See* Maryland Rule 8-131(a) (“Ordinarily, an appellate court will not decide any [] issue unless it plainly appears by the record to have been raised in or decided by the trial court[.]”).¹ Consequently, we shall affirm the judgment.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE CITY AFFIRMED.
COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**

¹ Although we decline to address the merits of appellant’s claims, this opinion is without prejudice to appellant raising them in an appropriate motion to vacate the judgment filed in the circuit court.