

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 833

September Term, 2025

---

MARK WALKER

v.

JEFFERY SISCO, *et al.*

---

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.

Mark Walker, appellant, appeals from a default judgment entered against him, and in favor of Jeffery and De Raye Sisco, appellees, in the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County. He raises three issues on appeal: (1) whether the court erred in entering a default judgment because appellees failed to present evidence supporting their claim against him; (2) whether the court erred in entering a default judgment because he “has no legal relationship to the plaintiffs”; and (3) whether the court erred by failing to dismiss the complaint for “failure to state a claim and lack of jurisdiction[.]” For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm.

Appellees filed a complaint against appellant, and two other defendants, for breach of contract, seeking to recover funds that they invested in a real estate project. Thirty days after he was served, appellant filed a document entitled “Writ of Summons Response Defendant’s Objections and Responses to Plaintiff’s Interrogatories.” That response did not address the allegations raised in appellees’ complaint, and instead consisted almost entirely of various “objections” to appellees’ “interrogatories[.]” Appellees filed a motion to strike the pleading on the grounds that they had not served him with any interrogatories. Appellees further requested the court to enter an order of default because appellant had not filed an answer to the complaint within 30 days of service. The court entered an order on August 8, 2024, striking appellant’s pleading and entering an order of default. The court subsequently entered orders of default against the other named defendants after they failed to file an answer.

On September 6, 2024, appellant filed a “Motion to Vacate the Order of Default” stating that: (1) he objected because “the plaintiff’s request is sought in bad faith, or would

cause unreasonable annoyance, oppression, burden or expense”; (2) he objected because appellees were “requesting compensation before the property is sold, which conflicts with what was agreed”; and (3) the request for default “appears not ethical” because appellees had agreed to “an adjusted timeline[.]” The court denied the motion to vacate on September 27, 2024. Following a hearing on damages on May 16, 2025, the court entered a judgment against appellant and the other defendants in the amount of \$96,215.00. This appeal followed.

On appeal, appellant contends that the court erred in not dismissing the complaint, and in entering a judgment against him because: (1) appellees failed to “provide any contract, legal obligation, or admissible evidence linking [him] to the subject matter”; and (2) he has “no legal relationship to the plaintiffs” or the corporate defendant named in the complaint.<sup>1</sup> We disagree. As an initial matter, appellant does not contend that the court’s entry of a default judgment against him was procedurally improper. And in any event, the record indicates the court fully complied with the requirements of Maryland Rule 2-613 prior to entering the default judgment as (1) appellant was properly served with a copy of the summons and complaint; (2) appellant did not file an answer after 30 days; (3) the court

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant also generally asserts that the court erred in denying his challenge to the court’s subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Maryland Rule 2-322(b). But appellant never raised this issue in the circuit court. And in any event, such a claim lacks merit as a county circuit court has subject matter jurisdiction over a civil cause of action such as a contract dispute unless a law limits or confers exclusive jurisdiction upon a different court. *R.A. Ponte Architects, Ltd. v. Investors’ Alert, Inc.*, 382 Md. 689, 696 (2004).

issued an Order of Default; and (4) the court had not vacated the Order of Default within 30 days after its entry. *See* Md. Rule 2-613(a)-(f).<sup>2</sup>

Instead, the issues raised by appellant all go to his liability for breach of contract. But a “judgment by default constitutes an admission by the defaulting party of its liability for the causes of action set out in the complaint.” *Pac. Mortg. and Inv. Grp., Ltd. v. Horn*, 100 Md. App. 311, 332 (1994). Consequently, appellant cannot raise those claims on appeal.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT  
COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE’S  
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO BE  
PAID BY APPELLANT.**

---

<sup>2</sup> Additionally, appellant does not assert that the court erred in either striking his response to the complaint or in denying his motion to vacate the Order of Default. Consequently, we do not consider those issues on appeal. *See Klauenberg v. State*, 355 Md. 528, 552 (1999) (“[A]rguments not presented in a brief or not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal.”).