

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No. CAD06-26267

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 162

September Term, 2021

STARSHA SEWELL

v.

JOHN HOWARD

Nazarian,
Leahy,
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: November 30, 2021

*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.

Starsha Sewell, appellant, and John Howard, appellee, are the parents of two minor children. On July 29, 2014, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County entered an order granting Mr. Howard sole legal and physical custody of the children; denying Ms. Sewell visitation; and ordering Ms. Sewell to pay child support. Thereafter, Ms. Sewell filed numerous motions to vacate the custody order pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b), claiming that the circuit court had lacked jurisdiction to enter the custody order and that various parties involved in her case, including the judge, the Assistant State’s Attorney, the Prince George’s County Police Department, and the Department of Social Services had engaged in fraudulent or discriminatory activity. The circuit court denied those motions in January 2018. Ms. Sewell appealed, and we affirmed, holding that the circuit court had jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order and that Ms. Sewell had failed to demonstrate the existence of any fraud, mistake, or irregularity that would have warranted the court vacating that judgment. *See Sewell v. Howard*, No. 2266, Sept. 2017 (filed August 31, 2018).

Undeterred, Ms. Sewell continued to file motions to vacate the 2014 custody order and all directives issued by the circuit court to enforce that order. Ms. Sewell appealed from the denial of some of those motions, and in each instance, we affirmed, finding that her claims are barred by the law of the case doctrine. *See e.g. Sewell v. Howard*, No. 366, Sept. Term 2020 (filed May 11, 2021); *Sewell v. Howard*, No. 2012, Sept. Term 2019 (filed July 28, 2020); *Sewell v. Howard*, No. 3312, Sept. Term 2018 (filed April 13, 2020); *Sewell v. Howard*, No. 852, Sept. Term 2018 (filed July 1, 2019).

Ms. Sewell now appeals from the circuit court’s denial of two more such motions: (1) her March 18, 2021, “Emergency Motion to Stay & Covid 19 Child Support Modification to Vacate the Order as a Product of Fraud and To Correct the Record Pursuant to MD Rule 8-414,” and (2) her March 19, 2021, “Emergency Motion to Correct the Record” pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-535(b). On appeal, Ms. Sewell again claims that the court erred in denying these motions because the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order. However, we have previously addressed that contention on appeal and held that it lacks merit. Consequently, Ms. Sewell’s claim is barred by the law of the case doctrine. *See Baltimore County v. Baltimore County Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 4*, 220 Md. App. 596, 659 (2014) (noting that “neither the questions decided [by the appellate courts] nor the ones that could have been raised and decided are available to be raised in a subsequent appeal” (citation omitted)).¹

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

¹ Moreover, even if Ms. Sewell’s claims were not barred by the law of the case doctrine, we would affirm because none of the contentions raised in her motions establish fraud, mistake, or irregularity within the meaning of Rule 2-535(b).