

Circuit Court for Prince George's County  
Case No. CAD09-41268

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 389

September Term, 2025

---

CHRISTOPHER A. NELSON

v.

PATRICIA A. NELSON

---

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

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: May 4, 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 2011, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County granted Christopher Nelson, appellant, and Patricia Nelson, appellee, an absolute divorce. The court also ordered that a Settlement Agreement between the parties be “incorporated but not merged” in the divorce judgment. Shortly thereafter, appellee filed a petition to hold appellant in contempt of the settlement agreement. Following a hearing, the court found in favor of appellee and granted her a judgment of \$45,879.76. Appellant appealed the judgment to this Court, and we affirmed. *Nelson v. Nelson*, No. 2196, Sept. Term 2013 (filed March 3, 2016).

In July 2024, appellee obtained a writ of garnishment to recover the proceeds from the contempt judgment. Two months later, appellee also renewed the judgment against appellant. Appellant responded by filing a package of six motions including: (1) a motion to set aside the renewed judgment; (2) a motion to quash the writ of garnishment; (3) a motion to reconsider the renewed judgment; (4) a motion to vacate the original contempt judgment; (5) a motion to compel appellee to relinquish her interest in jointly deeded property that they owned in Colorado; and (6) a motion for sanctions for acting in bad faith. The court denied appellant’s motions on January 3, 2025, without a hearing, writing “DENIED” on the first page of the motions package.

On January 24, 2025, appellant filed a “Motion for Clarification,” requesting the court to clarify “the reasoning underlying the denial of [his] six (6) motions” so that he could “ascertain whether the motions were denied on procedural, substantive, or evidentiary grounds.” On March 24, 2025, the court denied the motion, noting that it had denied his “omnibus motion, as it completely lacked any merit.” This appeal followed.

The sole issue raised on appeal is whether the court abused its discretion in denying his motion for clarification. However, the trial court was not required to “elaborate on the reason” for its decisions. *Att’y Grievance Comm’n v. Jeter*, 365 Md. 279, 288 (2001). And we “presume that trial judges know the law and correctly apply it.” *Id.* Appellant cites no rule or statute requiring the court to provide a statement of reasons when it denies any of the motions that he filed.<sup>1</sup> And “[b]y choosing not to create such a requirement, the General Assembly and the Supreme Court of Maryland implicitly have expressed their views that such a requirement is not necessary to ensure that litigants” are able to obtain review of the court’s decisions. *Est. of Brown v. Ward*, 261 Md. App. 385, 459 (2024). Similarly, we are not persuaded that the court violated appellant’s due process rights by declining to further explain its ruling when it denied his motions. Consequently, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Although appellant relies on Maryland Rule 2-522(a), that Rule only applies when a judge enters a decision in a contested court trial, which did not occur here.