

Circuit Court for Cecil County
Case No.: C-07-CV-24-000154

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND*

No. 1592

September Term, 2024

BRIAN K. WEDDLE

v.

METICIA HUFFINGTON

Leahy,
Albright,
Kehoe, Christopher B.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: October 29, 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.

The facts in this case are undisputed. Appellant, Brian K. Weddle, rented space in the home of Appellee, Meticia Huffington. That rental space included a bedroom and storage area. Soon after moving into the premises, Mr. Weddle and Ms. Huffington clashed. Both sought protective orders against the other. After being barred from the premises, Mr. Weddle stopped paying rent and thereafter Ms. Huffington sought to evict him.¹ After the protective order expired, Mr. Weddle sought to retrieve his belongings but learned that Ms. Huffington had disposed of them. Mr. Weddle, representing himself, then filed a complaint for replevin in the District Court of Marland for Cecil County seeking the return of his property, which he valued at \$950,000. Because of the amount in controversy, the matter was transferred to the Circuit Court for Cecil County. Following a hearing held on September 16, 2024, the circuit court found that the parties agreed that Mr. Weddle’s property could not be returned to him because it is “gone[.]” The court also found that Mr. Weddle had not produced evidence of the value of items, and it denied his request for monetary relief.

Mr. Weddle, who continues to represent himself, appeals the ruling. On appeal, Mr. Weddle reiterates his complaints about Ms. Huffington and the troubles he experienced as her tenant. He does not contend that the circuit court erred in denying relief, but he claims that “[a]fter researching the Values at Market Price,” his “Loss was around \$940,000.” He also seeks an additional \$500,000 for “mental emotional” damages.

¹ Ms. Huffington did not show up in court for the eviction hearing.

We shall affirm the judgment. Having reviewed the record before us, including the transcript from the September 16, 2024 hearing, we cannot say that the circuit court erred in denying relief. It is clear to us that the court was sympathetic to Mr. Weddle’s predicament, but it was unable to order the return of his possessions given that they were “gone” and it was unable to grant him a monetary award because of the lack of evidence as to the value of his property.

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