

Circuit Court for Baltimore City  
Case No. 24-O-13-004935

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 388

September Term, 2018

---

LORIANN KNIGHT

v.

JEFFREY B. FISHER, *et al.*

---

Berger,  
Arthur,  
Moylan, Charles E., Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: June 6, 2019

\*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.

After Loriann Knight, appellant, defaulted on a deed of trust loan on her home, appellees, acting as substitute trustees, filed a foreclosure action in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City.<sup>1</sup> Ms. Knight’s home was ultimately sold at a foreclosure sale and the circuit court ratified the sale on December 3, 2015. On June 7, 2016, the circuit court entered a protective order prohibiting Ms. Knight from filing any new pleadings in the foreclosure action that challenged the validity of the deed of trust, the validity of the sale, or the ratification of the sale without first obtaining leave from the circuit court (protective order). Ms. Knight filed her notice of appeal from the protective order on April 20, 2018. For the reasons that follow, we shall dismiss the appeal.

Ms. Knight previously filed a notice of appeal from the protective order on August 17, 2016. However, the circuit court struck her notice of appeal from that order as having been untimely filed. Ms. Knight appealed to this Court and we affirmed, holding that although the protective order was an immediately appealable interlocutory order, her notice of appeal was untimely because it was filed more than 30 days after the protective order was entered. *See Knight v. Fisher*, No. 2643, Sept. Term 2016 (filed March 7, 2018). We further noted that, because she did not file a timely interlocutory appeal, Ms. Knight “must wait to seek review of the order after the entry of a final judgment.” *Id.*

As in her first appeal from the protective order, Ms. Knight’s notice of appeal in this case was filed more than 30 days after the court entered the protective order. Therefore, we will not entertain an interlocutory appeal from that order and Ms. Knight must wait

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellees are Jeffrey B. Fisher, Doreen A. Strothman, Virginia S. Inzer, Thomas C. Valkenet, and Carletta M. Grier.

until the entry of a final judgment to seek appellate review. *See In re Guardianship of Zealand W.*, 220 Md. App. 66, 78 (2014) (“Even when interlocutory appeals are permitted, however, such an appeal must be filed within thirty days of the entry of the order from which the appeal is taken.”). And the court has not entered a final judgment in the foreclosure action because the auditor’s report has not yet been filed or ratified. *See McLaughlin v. Ward*, 240 Md. App. 76, 83 (2019) (holding that “if the court refers the matter to an auditor to state an account . . . it may not enter a final judgment until it has adjudicated any exceptions to the auditor’s report”). Consequently, we must dismiss the appeal.

**APPEAL DISMISSED. COSTS TO BE  
PAID BY APPELLANT.**