

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. C-16-FM-22-000233

UNREPORTED*

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 1685

September Term, 2024

MATAW BOYD

v.

KIMBERLY B. LEE

Nazarian,
Zic,
Kenney, James A., III
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

Opinion by Zic, J.

Filed: January 14, 2026

* This is an unreported opinion. This opinion may not be cited as precedent within the rule of stare decisis. It may be cited for its persuasive value only if the citation conforms to Maryland Rule 1-104(a)(2)(B).

This case arises from divorce proceedings in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County. Appellant Mataw Boyd timely noted an appeal following the circuit court’s dismissal of his complaint and denial of his post-hearing and post-judgment motions.¹

Mr. Boyd’s appellate counsel, Michael A. Troy, Esq., did not file paper copies of Mr. Boyd’s brief or a record extract. As explained below, we exercise our discretion under Maryland Rule 8-602(c)(5) and dismiss the appeal.²

DISCUSSION

In 2022, Mr. Boyd filed a complaint against Kimberly B. Lee, appellee, for a limited divorce, or in the alternative, an absolute divorce, on the ground of cruelty of treatment. Following an August 2024 merits hearing at which Mr. Boyd proceeded *pro se*, the circuit court denied Mr. Boyd’s complaint, declined to consider his amended

¹ Mr. Boyd phrased the questions on appeal as follows:

1. Did the [c]ircuit [c]ourt err in denying [Mr. Boyd’s] Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment when [Mr. Boyd] was forced to proceed without counsel in a complex divorce trial, resulting in a fundamentally unfair proceeding?
2. Did the [c]ircuit [c]ourt abuse its discretion by failing to continue the merits hearing under [Maryland] Rule 2-508(a), despite [Mr. Boyd] having only 12 days to obtain new counsel?
3. Did the [c]ircuit [c]ourt err by failing to address the equitable distribution of marital property, contrary to [Maryland] Rule 9-207 and Md. Fam. Law Code Ann. § 8-205?

² Maryland Rule 8-602(c)(5) states that this Court “may dismiss an appeal if[] a brief or record extract was not filed by the appellant within the time prescribed by Rule 8-502.”

complaint—which was filed after the merits hearing concluded—and denied his post-hearing and post-judgment motions. Mr. Boyd noted a timely appeal on October 23, 2024, and his appellate counsel, Mr. Troy, filed a brief and “record extract” on April 2, 2025.³

Mr. Troy did not file eight paper copies of Mr. Boyd’s brief or record extract as required by Maryland Rules 20-404(b) and 20-406(a)(2)(B).⁴ On April 30, 2025, this Court issued a notice to file paper copies of the brief and a record extract. Mr. Troy did not file the paper copies or otherwise respond to the notice.

On October 24, 2025, this Court ordered Mr. Troy, within 15 days of the entry of the order, to file the required paper copies, or show cause, in writing, why Mr. Boyd’s brief and “record extract” should not be stricken, and the appeal dismissed. Again, Mr. Troy did not file paper copies or otherwise respond.

On December 2, 2025, we ordered Mr. Troy to show cause, in writing, why he should not be sanctioned and why he should not be referred to the Attorney Grievance Commission for citing to “hallucinated” and unsubstantiated case law in Mr. Boyd’s brief. That order stated:

³ The electronic document filed by Mr. Troy and labeled as Mr. Boyd’s “record extract” contains only a chronological list of event entries in the case before the circuit court.

⁴ Maryland Rule 20-404(b) requires that “[i]n addition to the electronic filing, the party filing a brief shall file eight copies of the brief in paper form.” A filing is timely filed “if (A) the electronic submission is filed within the time allowed by the applicable Rule in Title 8, and (B) the paper copies are mailed, delivered to a third-party commercial carrier, or delivered to the clerk’s office on the next business day.” Md. Rule 20-406(a)(2).

The Court has identified several issues with cases cited in [Mr. Boyd's] brief. Of the 14 cases cited in [his] brief, at least [six] contain a citation irregularity:

- 1) *Md. State Bd. of Elections v. Libertarian Party of Md.*, 426 Md. 488 (2012), *see* Appellant's Br. at 3, 7, does not support [Mr. Boyd's] stated proposition.
- 2) *Lohrmann v. Lohrmann*, 148 Md. App. 456 (2002), *see* Appellant's Br. at 3, 7, does not exist.
- 3) *Townsend v. Meyer*, 129 Md. App. 598 (2000), *see* Appellant's Br. at 3, does not exist.
- 4) *Davis v. Davis*, 280 Md. 119 (1977), *see* Appellant's Br. at 4, 7, does not support [Mr. Boyd's] stated proposition.
- 5) *Lee v. Andochick*, 182 Md. App. 268 (2008), *see* Appellant's Br. at 4, 7-8, does not support [Mr. Boyd's] stated proposition.
- 6) *Bowie v. Bowie*, 182 Md. App. 57 (2008), *see* Appellant's Br. at 4, 8, does not exist.^[5]

Accordingly, it is, this 2nd day of December 2025, by the Appellate Court of Maryland, on its own initiative,

ORDERED that, not later than 4:30 p.m. on December 9, 2025, Mr. Troy shall show cause to this Court, in writing: (1) why he should not be sanctioned; and (2) why the Court should not refer him to the Attorney Grievance Commission. The written submission shall take the form of a sworn declaration and shall provide the Court with a detailed explanation as to how [Mr. Boyd's] brief was generated, how counsel came to locate the apparently fictitious cases, and why other cases do not stand for the proposition cited; and it is further

⁵ We later identified two additional citation irregularities, which were cited in Mr. Boyd's brief but not in the table of authorities:

- 1) *Pickett v. Noba, Inc.*, 122 Md. App. 566 (1998), *see* Appellant's Br. at 6, does not support [Mr. Boyd's] stated proposition.
- 2) *Furr v. Furr*, 199 Md. App. 1 (2011), *see* Appellant's Br. at 6, does not exist.

ORDERED that [Ms. Lee] may file a written response, including any request for sanctions, within [five] days after the filing of Mr. Troy’s response to this Order to Show Cause[.]

Although Mr. Troy timely responded to the December 2, 2025 order to show cause, his response did not include a certificate of service as required by Maryland Rule 1-323. Mr. Troy filed a corrected late submission shortly after this Court struck his initial submission. Ms. Lee did not reply.

As of the filing of this opinion, Mr. Troy has not filed paper copies of Mr. Boyd’s brief or a record extract or otherwise responded to the April 30, 2025 notice or the October 24, 2025 order to show cause. Therefore, we exercise our discretion under Maryland Rule 8-602(c)(5) and dismiss the appeal.

We briefly address the evident artificial intelligence issue that, while not dispositive here, warrants comment. It is unacceptable for counsel (or unrepresented parties, for that matter) to submit or attempt to rely on statements or authorities that are fabricated, hallucinated, or unsubstantiated, whether they are generated by artificial intelligence tools or “real” ones. The signature of an attorney contained in a brief constitutes a certification that the attorney has read the brief, and that “to the best of the attorney’s knowledge, information, and belief there is good ground to support it[.]” Md. Rule 1-311(b). Thus, signing and filing a brief that contains hallucinated law may implicate the Maryland Attorneys’ Rules of Professional Conduct. *Mezu v. Mezu*, 267 Md. App. 354, 369, 374 (2025) (holding that counsel’s submission of brief with hallucinated case law implicated the Rules of Professional Conduct and referring case to

the Attorney Grievance Commission). This conduct can also result in sanctions. *Id.* at 371-72 (declining to impose monetary sanctions when none were requested by opposing counsel).

Had we reached the questions presented to us here, we would have held they are without merit. Mr. Boyd did not timely request a continuance to obtain counsel before the merits hearing; thus, the contention that the circuit court erred by not continuing the merits hearing is not preserved. Md. Rule 8-131(a) (“Ordinarily, an appellate court will not decide any other issue unless it plainly appears by the record to have been raised in or decided by the trial court[.]”). Likewise, the court did not abuse its discretion by denying Mr. Boyd’s motion to alter or amend, in which Mr. Boyd argued that he was improperly “required to proceed without counsel at the divorce merits [hearing.]” We also note that Mr. Boyd did not file a property statement as required when a party seeks equitable relief pursuant to § 8-205 of the Family Law Article of the Maryland Code (1984, 2019 Repl. Vol.). Md. Rule 9-207(a).

CONCLUSION

Despite being given multiple opportunities, Mr. Troy failed to file with this Court eight paper copies of Mr. Boyd’s brief and a record extract. *See* Md. Rules 20-404(b) and 20-406(a)(2). We, accordingly, exercise our discretion pursuant to Maryland Rule 8-602(c)(5) and dismiss the instant appeal.

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