

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. C-16-FM-24-006067

UNREPORTED*

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 2313

September Term, 2025

EMMANUEL IFEAGWU

v.

CHIDINMA IFEAGWU

Graeff,
Friedman,
Zic,

JJ.

Opinion by Friedman, J.

Filed: July 16, 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 persuasive value only if the citation conforms to MD. RULE 1-104(a)(2)(B).

In this appeal, appellant Emmanuel Ifeagwu (“Father”), representing himself, argues that the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County erred in dismissing his motion to modify child support without first granting him a hearing. For the reasons that follow, we affirm the circuit court’s order.

DISCUSSION

The parties were granted an absolute divorce on October 15, 2025. In the judgment, appellee Chidinma Ifeagwu (“Mother”) was awarded primary physical and sole legal custody of the parties’ three children, and Father was ordered to pay \$1,543 in monthly child support beginning October 1, 2025. This amount was calculated based on imputed income equal to the federal minimum wage because Father had testified to the circuit court that he was unemployed.

Less than two months after the circuit court entered its order, Father filed a motion to modify his child support obligation on the grounds that he had lost his job. In response, Mother filed a motion to dismiss, asserting that Father had failed to allege any material change of circumstances because his child support obligation was already based on Father’s assertion to the court that he was unemployed. The circuit court granted Mother’s to dismiss without a hearing in December 2025.

On appeal, Father argues that the circuit court erred in dismissing his motion without holding a hearing because (1) the court needed to receive evidence to make factual findings regarding Father’s income, and (2) a hearing was mandatory under Maryland Rule 2-311(f) because the circuit court’s ruling was dispositive. Neither argument has merit.

First, Father alleges that the circuit court needed to take evidence and make findings regarding his actual income and employment status to determine whether his unemployment was involuntary and whether income should be imputed. But the circuit court already heard that evidence and already made those findings during the parties' divorce proceedings.¹ Father has not alleged any facts in his motion to modify child support that differ from the evidence and findings already in the record. A court does not need to hold a hearing to take evidence for facts it has already established.

Second, under Rule 2-311(f), a party seeking a hearing must: (1) state that a hearing is requested in the title of the motion and (2) request one under the heading "Request for Hearing." MD. R. 2-311(f). These were not included in Father's motion. Moreover, even if Father had properly requested a hearing, whether to hold one was a discretionary decision for the circuit court to make. Contrary to Father's assertion, the circuit court's order dismissing his motion to modify child support is not dispositive as to the matter of child support.² As a result, the Rule doesn't apply.

¹ Specifically, Father had testified at the merits hearing that he was a licensed architect but was unemployed while attending graduate school, and that he relied solely on friends and family for financial support. The circuit court found Father's testimony regarding his financial resources and employment to be not credible, implicitly found that Father was voluntarily impoverished, and imputed an income to him equal to the federal minimum wage. These findings were affirmed on direct appeal in an unreported opinion. *Ifeagwu v. Ifeagwu*, September Term 2025, No. 1842 (filed June 2, 2026).

² A party may move, at any time, to modify child support so long as the reasons for modifying the support obligation are based on a material change of circumstances. *Ley v. Forman*, 144 Md. App. 658, 665 (2002). As mentioned, the circuit court based its most recent child support order on Father's unemployment. His continued unemployment does not constitute a material change of circumstances. Because either party—Father or

Finally, this Court notes that the circuit court had already ordered that a status hearing would be held approximately 6 months after entry of the Judgment of Absolute Divorce to reevaluate the parties' financial circumstances to determine if Father's child support obligation should be modified. That hearing is currently scheduled for this very week.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT
COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO
BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**

Mother—may file future motions to modify child support, the circuit court's dismissal of Father's motion does not make it dispositive.