

Circuit Court for Baltimore County
Case No. C-03-FM-23-001706

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 172

September Term, 2025

ZAFAR WAQAR

v.

TAYABA AFTAB, ET AL.

Wells, C.J.,
Albright,
Meredith, Timothy E.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: March 25, 2026

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

Zafar Waqar, appellant, appeals from an order, of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, finding him guilty of constructive civil contempt for failure to pay child support. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

Mr. Waqar and appellee Tayaba Aftab have three children in common. In May 2013, Ms. Aftab lived in Ontario, Canada, and Mr. Waqar lived in Fayetteville, Arkansas. That month, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice ordered Mr. Waqar to pay child support to the children. In October 2015, the Court of Queen’s Bench in Battleford, Saskatchewan, ordered that the “previous child support order . . . that order[ed Mr. Waqar] to pay \$1,003 per month . . . be varied to be \$1,409.00 per month commencing July 1, 2015.” In August 2018, the Court of Queen’s Bench ordered Mr. Waqar to “pay the sum of \$1,242.00 CDN each month to [Ms. Aftab], commencing January 1, 2018, and continuing on the first of each month thereafter.”

On March 20, 2023, the circuit court sent to Mr. Waqar notice that a “support order [had] been filed and registered in the Registry of Foreign Support Orders of Baltimore County.” The court attached to the notice an affidavit of “an agent of the Director of the Family Responsibility Office” of the Government of Ontario, in which the agent stated that “[a]rrears have . . . been claimed under the” May 2013, October 2015, and August 2018 orders, and the “total amount of periodic payments in arrears as of August 18, 2022 is \$100,487.50.” On October 11, 2023, the court issued an order of confirmation, in which it ordered that the August 2018 order “is registered and confirmed as a Maryland Order,” that Mr. Waqar “pay the sum of \$1,242.00 per month for current child support,” that “arrearages

are \$73,110.90 USD as of August 18, 2022,” and “that said child support and arrearage payments shall be made payable to and through the Maryland Child Support Account.”

On April 14, 2024, appellee Baltimore County Office of Child Support filed a petition for contempt, in which the Office contended that as of April 2, 2024, Mr. Waqar was “delinquent in the payment of support monies in the amount of \$97,950.90.” At a hearing on the petition, the Office called Wanda Joyner, who testified that she is a “Child Support Specialist” for the Office. Ms. Joyner testified that Mr. Waqar’s case is “an arrears only case,” and the “total balance is \$106,644.90.” Ms. Joyner confirmed that Mr. Waqar is “supposed to be paying” \$310.50 per month, but there has “never been a payment in this case through the Office.” Ms. Joyner also confirmed that “to the best of [her] knowledge,” Mr. Waqar has not “contacted the agency in regards to non-payment” or “if there’s a conflict with him being able to pay.”

Following Ms. Joyner’s testimony, Mr. Waqar testified that each month from July 2024 through February 2025, he paid \$200 to “the Child Support Office in Canada.” Mr. Waqar also confirmed that for numerous reasons, “\$200 a month [is] the most amount of money [that he] can pay right now,” and once he is “able to pay more,” he “will . . . pay more.” During cross-examination, Mr. Waqar confirmed that he has “never made a payment through Baltimore County.”

Following the hearing, the court gave Mr. Waqar “credit for those two hundred [dollar] payments [made] to Canada.” Noting that Mr. Waqar was “supposed to pay through Baltimore County,” presented “no information about his income and expenses,” and made “no payments before July” 2024, the court found Mr. Waqar “in contempt by

clear and convincing evidence.” The court subsequently issued an order in which it restated its finding.

Mr. Waqar contends that, for four reasons, the court erred in finding him in contempt. Mr. Waqar first contends that because “Canada . . . continues to enforce the support order[] and the children reside in Ontario,” that country “retain[s] continuing, exclusive jurisdiction over” the order, and “Maryland courts may not modify or enforce [the] order.” But, Md. Code (1984, 2019 Repl. Vol., 2025 Supp.), § 10-340 of the Family Law Article (“FL”), states that “a foreign support order¹ may be registered in this State for enforcement,” and while “a tribunal of this State . . . may not modify[] a registered support order if the issuing tribunal had jurisdiction,” the “tribunal of this State shall recognize and enforce” the order. FL § 10-342(c). Hence, a Maryland court may enforce the orders of the Canadian courts in this case.

Mr. Waqar next contends that he “has complied with Canadian enforcement,” and “Maryland courts cannot penalize compliance with valid foreign orders.” But, Mr. Waqar was found in contempt not because he failed to make payments to Canadian authorities, but because he failed to make payments to the Maryland Child Support Account as specifically ordered by the court in its October 2023 order. Mr. Waqar did not dispute at the hearing on the petition for contempt that he did not make any payments to the Maryland

¹FL § 10-301(g) defines “foreign support order” as “a support order of a foreign tribunal.” FL § 10-301(h)(1) defines “foreign tribunal” as “a court, administrative agency, or quasi-judicial entity of a foreign country which is authorized to establish, enforce, or modify support orders or to determine parentage of a child.”

Child Support Account, and hence, the court did not “penalize [his] compliance with” the orders of the Canadian courts in this case.

Mr. Waqar next contends that the court’s finding violates “due process protections,” because he “was denied participation in the Canadian hearing and has faced duplicative enforcement in the U.S., including wage garnishments and threats of incarceration.” But, if Mr. Waqar wishes to challenge the orders of the Canadian courts in this case on the ground that the courts violated his right, under Canadian law, to due process, he must lodge such a challenge in those courts. Also, Mr. Waqar does not specify any evidence that Canadian authorities and Baltimore County are simultaneously attempting to enforce the orders of the Canadian courts, that his wages have been garnished, or that he has been incarcerated. Hence, the court’s finding does not violate Mr. Waqar’s right to due process.

Finally, Mr. Waqar contends that the Maryland Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (“UIFSA”), FL § 10-301 *et seq.*, “prevents conflicting orders and promotes uniform enforcement,” and the court’s “contempt finding undermines this statutory framework.” But, the orders of the Canadian courts and the circuit court are not in conflict. As previously described, the Canadian courts ordered Mr. Waqar to pay certain amounts per month for child support, and Baltimore County is attempting to enforce those orders. The court’s finding of contempt does not undermine the intention of the UIFSA, and hence, the court did not err in finding Mr. Waqar guilty of contempt.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY AFFIRMED.
COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**