

Circuit Court for Montgomery County  
Case No. 88351FL

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 464

September Term, 2025

---

BILLY ROGER NEWSON

v.

SUZANNE JENKINS

---

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

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: February 20, 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.

Billy Roger Newson, appellant, challenges the denial, by the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, of an “Amended Motion for Leave of Court to File a Motion to Modify (Reduction) [of] Child Support.” For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

Mr. Newson and Suzanne Jenkins, appellee, are the parents of one child, born in December 2008. On March 24, 2015, the court issued a consent order in which it ordered, among other orders, that “commencing and accounting from April 1, 2015, [Mr. Newson] shall pay to [Ms. Jenkins] as and for child support the sum of \$1,750.50 per month, plus an additional \$200 per month to be credited against child support arrears accrued through March 31, 2015.” On May 25, 2017, the court ordered that Mr. Newson “shall not file any action seeking a modification of custody, access (visitation), and/or child support without demonstrating good cause for same in a written motion to which [Ms. Jenkins] shall be entitled to respond, and receiving leave of” the court. On June 23, 2017, the court found Mr. Newson to be in civil constructive contempt of the March 2015 order. Mr. Newson subsequently purged the finding of contempt.

On August 29, 2024, Mr. Newson filed a motion for leave to file a motion to modify child support, in which he contended that he “was laid off [from his] job on October 30, 2023,” and had insufficient funds to make payments for child support. On November 27, 2024, the court issued an order in which it denied the motion “with leave to amend within fifteen (15) days of entry of this Order with documentation submitted under oath that [Mr. Newson] was laid off from his job on October 30, 2023 and that he is currently receiving unemployment benefits.” On December 11, 2024, Mr. Newson filed the amended motion

for leave of court, in which he stated that he was “laid off [from his] job on” October 30, 2023, and that he “received unemployment benefits (which have since run out).” Mr. Newson attached to the motion a “Separation Memorandum,” dated October 30, 2023, and in which his previous employer agreed to “provide [him] with continuation of [his] salary at [his] normal biweekly rate of pay for Thirteen (13) Weeks,” unless Mr. Newson commenced new employment sooner. Mr. Newson also attached an “Initial Statement of Wages and Monetary Determination” of the Maryland Department of Labor, dated March 22, 2024, and in which the Department stated that he could receive a weekly benefit amount of \$430.00 “if [he was] unemployed and [met] all eligibility requirements.” The court subsequently denied the motion.

Mr. Newson first contends that for numerous reasons, the court erred in denying the motion. We disagree. There is no indication in the Separation Memorandum provided by Mr. Newson to the court that his employment was terminated on October 30, 2023, and there is no indication in the Department of Labor’s Initial Statement that Mr. Newson received unemployment benefits at any time following that date. Mr. Newson failed to follow the court’s instructions to produce “documentation . . . that [he] was laid off from his job on October 30, 2023 and that he [was then] receiving unemployment benefits,” and hence, the court did not err in denying the motion.

Mr. Newson next contends that the court “erred when it found [him] in contempt,” the court “erred when it accused [him] of maintaining two addresses,” and Ms. Jenkins and other individuals “conspired to perpetrate a Fraud Upon the Court to prevent a modification (reduction) of child support in previous hearings.” But, Mr. Newson either failed to raise

these contentions before the circuit court or failed to appeal from the appropriate judgment. Hence, we shall not reach the contentions.

Finally, Mr. Newson contends that a hearing on the motion “was requested” pursuant to Rule 2-311(f) but “did not take place.” But Rule 1-101(b) states that Title 2 of the Maryland Rules applies not to family law matters, but to “civil matters in the circuit courts.” Title 9 of the Maryland Rules governs family law matters, including actions to modify child support, and Mr. Newson does not cite any authority in that Title that required the court to hold a hearing on his motion. Hence, the court did not err in failing to hold such a hearing.

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