

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 721

September Term, 2024

SEAN CRUDUP

v.

SPENCER R. LITTLE, *et al.*

Berger,
Tang,
Eyler, James R.
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: June 2, 2025

*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.

Sean Crudup, appellant, filed a complaint in the Circuit Court for Baltimore County against Spencer Little and K.C. Delivery Services, Inc., appellees, for negligence arising from an automobile accident. Following a jury trial, appellant was awarded \$7,251.00 in past medical expenses and \$20,000 in non-economic damages. Thereafter, appellant filed a timely motion for a new trial claiming that the “jury failed to base its verdict upon the evidence presented during the trial and thus rendered an inadequate verdict.” In support of this contention, appellant alleged that: (1) the jury could not have reviewed his medical records during its less than two hours of deliberations; (2) the jury’s request for a photo that was not introduced into evidence indicated that it had considered more than the evidence presented at trial; and (3) the trial court had failed to adequately respond to a question from the jury during deliberations as to whether he had obtained worker’s compensation benefits as a result of the accident. Appellees filed a response asserting the amount of non-economic damages awarded by the jury was reasonable in light of the evidence and that appellant had failed to object to the trial court’s response to the jury’s question regarding worker’s compensation. The trial court denied the motion for a new trial without a hearing. This appeal followed.

On appeal, appellant raises the same claims that he raised in his motion for a new trial. Our ability to review appellant’s claims is constrained, however, because he did not supply this Court with a transcript of the trial. Thus, it is impossible to discern, for example, whether the jury’s verdict was reasonable in light of the evidence, whether the court responded appropriately to the jury’s question during deliberations, or whether appellant’s claims are preserved for appellate review. Appellants are required to ensure

that the record on appeal contains the transcripts necessary for this Court to issue a decision. *See* Md. Rule 8-413(a) (listing the required contents of the record on appeal); Md. Rule 8-602(c)(4) (granting this Court the discretion to dismiss an appeal when the record does not comply with Rule 8-413). And it was appellant’s burden “to put before this Court every part of the proceedings below which were material to a decision in his favor.” *Lynch v. R. E. Tull & Sons, Inc.*, 251 Md. 260, 262 (1968). Appellant, however, has not done that.

In *Kovacs v. Kovacs*, 98 Md. App. 289 (1993), this Court held that the party asserting error has the burden to show “by the record” that an error occurred. *Id.* at 303. “Mere allegations and arguments . . . , unsubstantiated by the record, are insufficient to meet that burden.” *Id.* Moreover, “[t]he failure to provide the court with a transcript warrants summary rejection of the claim of error.” *Id.* Because a transcript of the trial is necessary to resolve appellant’s contentions on appeal, and appellant has not provided a copy of that transcript, despite a February 27, 2025, order from this Court directing him to do so, we shall affirm the judgment of the circuit court.

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