

UNREPORTED  
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS  
OF MARYLAND

No. 548

September Term, 2022

---

IN THE MATTER OF TERRI TORAIN

---

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

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: December 2, 2022

\*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.

Terri Torain, appellant, received a housing subsidy through the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP), which was administered by the Charles County Housing Authority, appellee (CCHA). The CCHA terminated the housing subsidy on the grounds that appellant had failed to disclose all his sources of income and bank accounts, as required by HCVP regulations. After the termination was upheld by an independent hearing officer, appellant filed a petition for judicial review in the Circuit Court for Charles County.

The administrative record was received on March 29, 2022, and a hearing on the petition was scheduled for May 23, 2022. Appellant filed his memorandum on May 18, 2022, five calendar days, and three business days, before the hearing. Appellee filed a motion to dismiss the petition for judicial review pursuant to Maryland Rule 7-207(d), asserting that appellant’s memorandum was untimely because it had not been filed within 30 days after the clerk sent notice of the filing of the administrative record; that appellant had not requested a motion for extension of time; and that it had been prejudiced because it did not have sufficient time to file an answer before the hearing and the late-filed memoranda did not set forth “a concise statement of the questions presented for review, a statement of facts material to those questions, and argument on each question,” as required by Maryland Rule 7-207(a). On the day of the hearing, the court heard arguments from the parties and granted appellee’s motion to dismiss. This appeal followed.

Although appellant raises seven issues on appeal, none of those issues address the reasons for the court’s dismissal of his petition for judicial review. For example, he does not contend, even in a cursory manner, that the court erred in finding that his memorandum was untimely or that appellee was prejudiced as a result. Therefore, we will not consider

these issues on appeal. *See Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (noting that arguments that are “not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal” (quotation marks and citation omitted)). Appellant ultimately bears the burden of demonstrating that the court erred in dismissing his petition for judicial review pursuant to Rule 7-207(d). As he has not done so, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

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