

Circuit Court for Carroll County  
Case No.: C-06-FM-21-823295

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 1609

September Term, 2023

---

CHARLES WILLIAM FREDERICK CRUMP

v.

TIFFANY OLIVIA CRUMP

---

Graeff,  
Arthur,  
Eyler, James R.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: May 15, 2024

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

In November 2021, Tiffany Olivia Crump, appellee, sought a temporary protective order from the Circuit Court for Carroll County against her ex-husband, Charles William Frederick Crump, appellant. The court denied Ms. Crump’s petition at the temporary stage. On February 14, 2023, Mr. Crump filed a request to shield under Md. Code Ann., Family Law § 4-512. After a hearing, the court denied the request on March 3. Mr. Crump did not appeal. Instead, on March 17, he filed another request to shield. The court denied this second request, without a hearing, on March 20. Again, Mr. Crump did not appeal. Instead, five months later, on August 22, he filed a third request to shield. After a hearing, the court denied this third request on September 15. Mr. Crump timely appealed.

On appeal, Mr. Crump focuses his argument on the merits of the circuit court’s March 3 denial of his request to shield. Maryland Rule 8-202 requires that a notice of appeal be filed “within 30 days after entry of the judgment or order from which the appeal is taken.” A timely postjudgment motion to alter or amend filed within 10 days under Rule 2-534 will toll this deadline; one filed after 10 but within 30 days under Rule 2-535(a) will not. *See Leese v. Dep’t of Lab., Licensing and Regul.*, 115 Md. App. 442, 445 (1997); Md. Rule 8-202(c).

As mentioned, Mr. Crump did not file a motion to alter or amend within 10 days of the March 3 Order. Thus, the deadline for him to note an appeal from that order was April 3.<sup>1</sup> He did not do so, and his appeal is therefore untimely with respect to the merits of that order.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thirty days from March 3, 2023, was April 2—a Sunday. The deadline would therefore have moved to the following Monday: April 3. Md. Rule 1-203(a)(1).

As for Mr. Crump’s follow-up requests to shield: They were, substantively, motions asking the court to exercise its revisory power over the March 3 Order. Mr. Crump did not note an appeal from the denial of his first *de facto* revisory motion, however. And although his notice was timely as to the denial of the second *de facto* revisory motion, “[t]he denial of [a] second motion to revise is not appealable because it is not a final judgment.” *Pickett v. Noba, Inc.*, 114 Md. App. 552, 560 (1997) (noting that a “second motion to revise filed more than [30] days after the entry of judgment, even though within [30] days after denial of the first motion, cannot be granted”). Consequently, we shall dismiss the appeal.

**APPEAL DISMISSED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**