

Circuit Court for Harford County
Case No. C-12-FM-18-000604

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 1299

September Term, 2020

IN THE MATTER OF NATALYA HAMPEL
aka DEVOTED LADY HAMPEL

Kehoe,
Zic,
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: January 28, 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.

Natalya Hampel aka Devoted Lady Hampel, appellant, appeals from an order issued by the Circuit Court for Harford County on December 13, 2020, denying her petition to terminate the guardianship of her person and property. On appeal, she raises several issues with respect to the denial of a prior petition to terminate the guardianship that she filed in 2019. However, she previously filed a notice of appeal from the court’s order denying that petition, and this Court affirmed the judgment. *See Devoted Lady Hampel v. University of Maryland Harford Memorial Hospital, Inc.*, No. 1341, Sept. Term 2019 (filed May 6, 2020). Therefore, any claims with respect to that judgment are 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)).

Appellant does not raise any claims of error with respect to the court’s December 13, 2020 order, the only order that is properly before us. Consequently, we will not consider the validity of that order 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)).¹ As appellant has not

¹ Moreover, we note that, even if she had specifically challenged the December 13, 2020, order, our review would be limited by the fact that appellant has not provided a copy of the transcript of the hearing on her 2020 petition to terminate the guardianship. And, as the party claiming error, she has the burden to show “by the record, that the error occurred.” *Kovacs v. Kovacs*, 98 Md. App. 289, 303 (1993).

demonstrated that the circuit court erred in denying her 2020 petition to terminate the guardianship, we shall affirm.

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