

Circuit Court for Baltimore City
Case No. 24-C-18-001425

UNREPORTED
IN THE COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
OF MARYLAND

No. 658

September Term, 2020

CATHERINE RANDOLPH

v.

REGIONAL MANAGEMENT, INC., *et al.*

Fader, C.J.,
Ripken,
Kenney, James A., III
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: September 9, 2021

*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.

In 2018, Catherine Randolph, appellant, filed a complaint in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City against Regional Management, Inc. and TJX Companies, Inc., appellees, raising claims of breach of contract and invasion of privacy. The court granted appellees' motions to dismiss the complaint in June and August 2018 respectively. Over the next year, Ms. Randolph filed approximately 21 motions seeking reconsideration or other relief, all of which were denied. Regional Management, Inc. eventually filed a motion for a pre-filing order, which the circuit court granted following an August 2019 show cause hearing. Undeterred, Ms. Randolph continued to file various revisory motions in the circuit court. On July 30, 2020, the court entered an order with respect to several of those motions, finding that they had been filed in violation of the pre-filing order and that Ms. Randolph had not “present[ed] any basis for action” by the court. Ms. Randolph filed a notice of appeal on August 21, 2020.

On appeal, Ms. Randolph first claims that the court erred in dismissing her complaint. However, she did not file a timely notice of appeal from the dismissal order. *See* Maryland Rule 8-202(a) (requiring notice of appeal to be filed within thirty days of the judgment from which the appeal is taken). Consequently, that issue is not properly before us in this appeal.

Ms. Randolph also asserts that we should vacate the pre-filing order. But she does not provide any legal authority to support this contention or set forth any specific arguments indicating why the court erred in entering that order. Moreover, she does not claim that the court otherwise erred in issuing the July 30, 2020 order that found her in violation of the pre-filing order. Therefore, we need 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” (citation omitted)).

Finally, we note that even if Ms. Randolph had challenged the July 30th order, we would find no error. First, Ms. Randolph’s motions violated the pre-filing order, which prohibited her from filing “any further papers in this action other than a notice of appeal from [the pre-filing order] and papers directly related to perfecting an appeal or a good-faith motion to reconsider the [pre-filing] Order.” Moreover, even had they been allowable, the motions failed to comply with the pre-filing order’s requirement that she “place [a] legend prominently on the first page of any paper she file[d]” stating that the filing was subject to a pre-filing order and that no opposition was required unless the court approved the paper for filing. Finally, there was no basis for the court to allow Ms. Randolph to file the motions despite the existence of the pre-filing order. Specifically, the motions lacked merit because they were filed more than 30 days after the entry of the judgment dismissing her complaint and did not allege the existence of fraud, mistake, or irregularity within the meaning of Maryland Rule 2-535(b). *See generally Kent Island, LLC v. DiNapoli*, 430 Md. 348, 366 (2013) (noting that after 30 days have passed after the entry of a final judgment, a court may only modify its judgment upon a motion filed pursuant to Rule 2-535(b)).

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT
COURT FOR BALTIMORE CITY
AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE PAID
BY APPELLANT.**