

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 496

September Term, 2025

IN THE MATTER OF CAROLYN STROMAN

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.

Carolyn Stroman, appellant, rented an apartment owned by Inigo’s Crossing, LLC, appellee. In 2022, Ms. Stroman filed a complaint with the Montgomery County Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs (the OLTA), claiming that: (1) there was an unexplained credit on her account; (2) she was incorrectly charged for common area electricity; and (3) she was being charged a rental rate that was above the allowable Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit Rate. The OLTA investigated and found no merit to appellant’s complaint. It then presented a case summary of appellant’s complaint to the Commission on Landlord-Tenant Affairs (the Commission), which ultimately voted not to accept jurisdiction of the case and dismissed the matter. Appellant filed a petition for judicial review in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, which entered an order remanding the case to the Commission to conduct further proceedings.

The Commission held a hearing on appellant’s complaint in December 2024. Prior to the Commission issuing a decision, appellant filed a motion to reopen the case in the circuit court for “status and review.” The court denied that motion on March 4, 2025. The commission entered a final decision on February 13, 2025, finding that no county code violations had occurred, and dismissing the case for lack of jurisdiction. On March 14, 2025, appellant filed another motion to reopen the case for further proceedings, which did not indicate that the Commission had entered a final judgment or request judicial review of that judgment. The court denied the motion on April 8, 2025, finding that appellant had not “set forth a sufficient basis for the granting of reconsideration of” its March 4, 2025, order. Appellant now appeals from that order. Appellee has filed a motion to dismiss the appeal as not allowed by law. For the reasons that follow, we shall dismiss the appeal.

The right to appeal in this State is wholly statutory. *Prince George’s Cnty. v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.*, 358 Md. 166 (2000). And no statute authorizes a direct appeal to this Court from a final decision of the Commission. Rather, Section 29-49 of the Montgomery County Code provides that a person aggrieved by a final action of the Commission can seek judicial review of that in the “Circuit Court under the Rules of Procedure for a review of those actions.” A party who is aggrieved by a final judgment of the circuit court following judicial review may then “appeal to the Appellate Court of Maryland in the manner that law provides for appeal of civil cases.” State Gov’t Art. § 10-223(b)(1). Here, however, appellant has not filed a petition for judicial review that complies with Maryland Rule 7-202.¹ Consequently, no right to appeal from the Commission’s final decision exists, and the appeal must be dismissed.²

**MOTION TO DISMISS APPEAL
GRANTED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY
APPELLANT.**

¹ We decline to construe appellant’s second motion to reopen the case for further proceedings as a petition for judicial review as it did not request judicial review, did not identify any order or action for which review was sought, and did not otherwise make the court aware that the Commission had issued a final decision. Moreover, we note that the court’s denial of that motion was not a final judgment and, therefore, not appealable independent of the Commission’s decision.

² Even if the appeal was not subject to dismissal, we would affirm. The entirety of appellant’s argument on appeal is: “TRUTH, the Word of ALMIGHTY GOD. Whereby a hand is placed upon, and one takes an Oath of Office. Standard of living life, and The Only Source of Life Everlasting.” This, however, does not raise a cognizable legal issue that this Court can review.

The correction notice(s) for this opinion(s) can be found here:

<https://mdcourts.gov/sites/default/files/import/appellate/correctionnotices/cosa/unreported/0496s25cn.pdf>