

Circuit Court for Prince George's County  
Case No.: CAD19-32798

UNREPORTED\*

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF MARYLAND

No. 817

September Term, 2025

---

FERDINAND HOUNLEKPO

v.

NASSITA TAAH HOUNLEKPO

---

Friedman,  
Kehoe, S.,  
Kenney, James A., III  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: June 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.

In February 2021, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County entered a judgment of absolute divorce, ending the marriage between appellant Ferdinand Hounlekpo (“Husband”) and appellee Nassita Taah Hounlekpo (“Wife”). Within ten days, Husband moved to alter or amend the judgment, which the court denied except to strike a provision awarding Wife an interest in Husband’s military pension. Husband did not appeal.

In August 2021, Husband moved to modify custody and child support. The court ultimately modified Husband’s access schedule with the children but declined to modify his child support obligation. Husband did not appeal.

Then, in October 2022, Husband moved to vacate the divorce judgment under Maryland Rule 2-535(b), alleging fraud. The court denied his motion, Husband appealed, and this Court affirmed. *See Hounlekpo v. Hounlekpo*, No. 255, Sept. Term, 2023 (filed March 19, 2024) (unreported).

Finally, in April 2025, Husband moved to revise the divorce judgment, arguing that the court’s calculation of child support arrears was inconsistent with the testimony at trial.<sup>1</sup> The court denied his motion, and this appeal followed.

Maryland Rule 8-202 requires that a notice of appeal be filed “within 30 days after entry of the judgment or order from which the appeal is taken.” The only order entered in the 30 days preceding Husband’s notice of appeal was the circuit court’s denial of his third revisory motion. But although this notice was timely as to the denial of that revisory motion, the order is not appealable.

---

<sup>1</sup> We note that Husband tried to raise this issue in his prior appeal. *See Hounlekpo*, No. 255, Sept. Term, 2023, slip op. at 1 n.2.

This Court has previously observed that “[t]he denial of [a] second motion to revise is not appealable because it is not a final judgment.” *Pickett v. Noba, Inc.*, 114 Md. App. 552, 560 (1997) (noting that a “second motion to revise filed more than [30] days after the entry of judgment, even though within [30] days after denial of the first motion, cannot be granted”). Here, Husband’s April 2025 motion was his third request for the court to exercise its revisory power. Its refusal to do so is not appealable. Consequently, we shall dismiss this appeal as not allowed by law.<sup>2</sup> *See* Md. Rule 8-602(b)(1).

**APPEAL DISMISSED. COSTS TO BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Even if the claims raised in Husband’s motion were properly before us, we would nevertheless affirm. In essence, Husband alleged that the circuit court miscalculated the child support arrears and, in doing so, imposed an improper retroactive child support obligation. But even if true, this would, at best, be a legal error, not fraud, mistake, or irregularity, and, as such, it would not be correctable through Rule 2-535(b). *See generally Facey v. Facey*, 249 Md. App. 584, 632–34, 638–40 (2021) (discussing fraud and mistake); *Davis v. Att’y Gen.*, 187 Md. App. 110, 125 (2009) (discussing irregularity). The circuit court therefore did not err in denying Husband’s revisory motion.