

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No.: C-16-CV-23-005768

UNREPORTED*

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 244

September Term, 2025

IN THE MATTER OF
CHRISTINA DEWS

Graeff,
Berger,
Wright, Alexander, Jr.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: May 5, 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.

In 2023, the Housing Authority of Prince George’s County, appellee, notified Christina Dews, appellant, of a subsidy adjustment and a recalculation regarding a \$10,051 overpayment of subsidy. Dews challenged both actions through the Housing Authority’s grievance procedure. The parties appeared before a Hearing Officer, who ultimately issued a written decision upholding the agency’s actions. Dews then petitioned for judicial review in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County, which affirmed the decision. This appeal followed.

In reviewing an administrative appeal, we look through the judicial proceedings and evaluate the agency’s decision. *Motor Vehicle Admin. v. Carpenter*, 424 Md. 401, 413 (2012). For mixed questions of law and fact, we apply the substantial evidence standard of review. *Crawford v. Cnty. Council of Prince George’s Cnty.*, 482 Md. 680, 695 (2023). Under this standard, we “must affirm the agency decision if there is sufficient evidence such that a reasoning mind reasonably could have reached the factual conclusion the agency reached.” *Id.* at 695–96 (cleaned up).

Under 24 C.F.R. § 982.551(b)(2), (4), Dews was required to supply “true and complete” information requested by the Housing Authority for use in reexamination of her income. On appeal, Dews first contends that the Housing Authority miscalculated her income. According to her, the agency incorrectly added her unemployment income to the income she earned during her period of employment. At the administrative hearing, the Housing Authority produced evidence showing that it calculated the overpayment during this period by subtracting the payment it would have made had Dews reported her employment income, from the payment it actually made, which was based on Dews’s

reported unemployment income. The agency did not add the incomes together. Thus, the Hearing Officer’s decision to uphold the calculation was supported by substantial evidence.

Dews next contends that “[t]he alleged overpayment was not identified or communicated until approximately three years later, making it unreasonable to demand repayment after such a long delay.” She did not raise this argument before the Hearing Officer. As a result, the issue is not preserved for our review. *See Brodie v. Motor Vehicle Admin. of Md.*, 367 Md. 1, 3–4 (2001).

Finally, Dews contends that the overpayment was the result of an administrative error by the Housing Authority because it occurred during a period when the agency was understaffed and unable to process rent adjustments promptly. Dews claims that she made good-faith efforts to report her income but that she did not have a case manager at the time. At the administrative hearing, however, the only evidence Dews produced of her attempts to contact the Housing Authority was a single email sent in response to the 2023 notice of adjustment in rental payment. In contrast, the Housing Authority produced evidence showing that Dews failed to update her income once she began working two months after her 2021 annual income reexamination was conducted. The evidence also showed that Dews failed to include in her 2022 income certification, expected earnings from employment she had obtained a week earlier. Accordingly, there was substantial evidence

to support the Hearing Officer’s decision to uphold the Housing Authority’s Notice of Adjustment and Notice of Tenant Re-Payment Agreement, and we shall affirm.

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