

Circuit Court for Harford County
Case No. 12-C-14-003825

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 2293

September Term, 2018

KEITH J. JEFFRIES

v.

CARRIE M. WARD, *et al.*

Arthur,
Shaw,
Woodward, Patrick L.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: April 27, 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.

In 2014, appellees, acting as substitute trustees,¹ filed an Order to Docket Foreclosure in the Circuit Court for Harford County seeking to foreclose on real property owned by Keith J. Jeffries, appellant. Although the property has not yet been sold, appellant has filed numerous motions to stay or dismiss the foreclosure action. In this consolidated appeal, appellant is appealing from six orders issued by the circuit court in the foreclosure case denying such motions: (1) an August 20, 2018 order denying his “Emergency Motion for Stay of Foreclosure Sale on August 23, 2018, Stay of Execution of Judgment Pending Outcome of Appeal, Request for no Entry of Bond, and Disqualification of Judge Angela Eaves (Conflict of Interest) + Other Reasons”; (2) an August 22, 2018 order denying his “Emergency Motion to Stay And/Or Dismiss Foreclosure Action for Violations of RESPA, FDCPA, and CFPB Regulations”; (3) an August 23, 2018 order denying his “Emergency Motion for Hearing on Emergency Motions to Stay Foreclosure Sale”; (4) an August 27, 2018 order denying his “Emergency Motion for Stay of Foreclosure Sale on August 23, 2018”; (5) a July 14, 2021 order rejecting his “Affidavit as to Declaration of Exemption from Foreclosure Moratoriums”; and (6) an August 10, 2021 order denying his motion to reconsider the July 14 order

¹ Appellees are Carrie M. Ward, Howard Bierman, Joshua Coleman, Nicholas Derdock, Jacob Geesing, Richard R. Goldsmith, Elizabeth C. Jones, Jason Kutcher, Pratima LeLe, and Ludeen McCartney-Green.

rejecting his affidavit. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgments of the circuit court.²

On appeal, Mr. Jeffries sets forth twelve questions presented. However, the first ten questions presented do not address any of the orders that are before us in this appeal. In fact, with certain limited exceptions, appellant’s brief appears to be the exact same brief that he filed in prior appeals to this Court, wherein he sought review of orders which had denied other motions to stay or dismiss that he had filed in the foreclosure action.³ Appellant even acknowledges as much in his brief, noting that the “10 legal questions presented [in his previous appeal] have still not been adjudicated, and remain in this brief.” However, a notice of appeal must be filed within 30 days after the entry of the order or judgment from which the appeal is taken. *See* Maryland Rule 8-202(a). And the notices of appeal that were filed in the instant appeal were timely only as to the six orders set forth

² Appellees have filed a motion to dismiss the appeal. In support of that motion, they first contend that the appeal should be dismissed because appellant does not raise any specific arguments with respect to the orders on appeal. For the reasons set forth herein, we agree with appellees. But appellant’s failure to raise any particularized arguments with respect to those orders only affects the extent to which we will address the merits of his claims. It does not render the appeal subject to dismissal. Appellees also assert that the court’s August 10, 2021, order denying appellant’s motion to reconsider his affidavit of declaration is a non-appealable interlocutory order. However, in that motion, he also requested the court to stay the foreclosure proceedings. And the denial of a motion to stay in a foreclosure action is appealable on an interlocutory basis as an order refusing to grant an injunction. *See Huertas v. Ward*, 248 Md. App. 187, 202 (2020). Consequently, we shall deny the motion to dismiss.

³ In Case No. 2179, Sept. Term 2016, this Court dismissed appellant’s appeal. In Case No. 452, Sept. Term 2018, we affirmed the judgment of the circuit court denying appellant’s motion to stay or dismiss the foreclosure action. *See Jeffries v. Ward*, No. 452, Sept. Term 2018 (filed April 6, 2021).

above. Therefore, our review in this appeal is limited to those orders and we will not consider any issues raised by appellant with respect to the validity of other interlocutory orders that have been issued by the circuit court in the foreclosure action.⁴

Appellant also sets forth two additional questions presented which reference the orders that are properly before us in this appeal:

11. Was it legally correct for the trial court to reject an affidavit for no legal reason?
12. For each of the four appealed motions to stay, did the court abuse its discretion in failing to grant the stay?

But Maryland Rule 8-504(a) requires a party’s brief to contain “a clear concise statement of the facts material to a determination of the questions presented,” a “concise statement of the applicable standard of review for each issue,” and “[a]rgument in support of the party’s position on each issue.” And as to those last two issues, appellant’s brief contains none of those things. In fact, he does not address either of those questions presented in the statement of facts or the argument section of his brief. Although we are mindful appellant is proceeding *pro se*, it is not this Court’s responsibility to “attempt to fashion coherent legal theories to support” appellant’s claims of error. *See Konover Property Trust, Inc. v. WHE Assocs., Inc.*, 142 Md. App. 476, 494 (2002). Because the last two claims are not presented with particularity, we will not address them in this appeal. *See Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (noting that arguments that are “not presented with

⁴ Appellant may seek review of those orders after a final judgment has been entered in the foreclosure action. *See Huertas*, 248 Md. App. at 204 n.6.

particularity will not be considered on appeal” (quotation marks and citation omitted)).

Consequently, we shall affirm the judgments of the circuit court.

**APPELLEE’S MOTION TO DISMISS
DENIED. JUDGMENTS OF THE
CIRCUIT COURT FOR HARFORD
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO
BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**